

## Clayton State University Faculty Senate

## Meeting Minutes

August 27, 2018

**Senate Members present:** Augustine Ayuk, Scott Bailey, Gail Barnes, Marcy Butler, Deborah Gritzmacher, Craig Hill, Byron Jeff, Catherine Matos, Lawrence Menter, Stephanie Richardson, Kathryn Pratt Russell, Andrew Sbaraglia, Kendolyn Smith, MeriBeth Stegall (Secretary), Mark Watson (Chair), David Williams (Vice-Chair)

**Senate Members Absent:** Laura Herndon, Adam Kubik, Eugene Ngezem

**Guests:** Tim Hynes, Kevin Demmitt, Jill Lane, Lila Roberts, Chaoqui Zhang

Agenda Item	Discussion	Senate Action/Resolution/Tasks
1) Reading & Approval of Minutes		Minutes of April 23, 2018, approved as distributed.
2) Reports of President, Provost, & Standing Committees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. President's Report</li> <li>b. Provost's Report</li> <li>c. Reports of Standing Committees</li> </ul>	<p>The President's Report is attached as Appendix A.</p> <p>President Hynes also addressed the following questions:</p> <p>Question 1. Salary increases. No funds were provided at the state or system level. The institution could provide increases solely funded from the internal resources of the institution. Some programmatic increases at CSU were funded, e.g., increases in part-time faculty salaries. Other areas for increases will be identified at the budget and planning meeting in two weeks.</p> <p>Question 2. Is the Free Speech policy posted? The policy has been reviewed, but not posted. It will be posted after all the open meetings have concluded.</p> <p>The Provost's Report is attached as Appendix B.</p>	
3) Reports of Special Committees		
4) Special Orders		
5) Unfinished Business and General Orders		
6) New Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Clarification of Institutional Policy on DFW rates course redesign/faculty development</li> </ul>	a. Dr. Demmitt and Dr. Hynes responded to questions regarding the Gateways to Completion program. (Abbreviated questions below. See Appendix C. for complete questions.)	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Senate Action/Resolution/Tasks
	<p>1) Was the decision to send faculty to the USG seminars a board decision or an institutional decision?  <i>CSU participation in the program is mandatory. Every university in system required to participate.</i></p> <p>2) Was there an effort to find compensation at the institutional or system-level for the individual faculty work time/effort involved at any point?  <i>No additional compensation for faculty participation unless in summer outside a summer contract. Seen as ongoing course development.</i></p> <p>3) Does the administration see this as a course redesign project or a faculty development project? What do we do about courses with multiple sections and numerous faculty, some of whom are adjuncts?  <i>Discussion of course redesign under the Gateways to Completion program. Viewed as starting point for asking what is happening and what changes may increase success in a course.</i>  <a href="https://www.usg.edu/academic_partnerships_accreditation/gateways">https://www.usg.edu/academic_partnerships_accreditation/gateways</a></p> <p>CSU courses:  MATH 1101 Math Modeling  ENGL 1101 English Composition I  MATH 1231 Introductory Statistics  CRIT 1101 Critical Thinking</p> <p><i>MATH 1101 and ENGL 1101 were identified by the system and MATH 1231 and CRIT 1101 were identified by CSU.</i></p> <p><i>If courses have multiple sections, this will be handled at the department level.</i></p> <p>4) Are these training seminars run by faculty with appropriate subject matter expertise?  <i>Training seminars will be faculty run. Gardner Institute will not be developing courses. Gardner Institute will be: assessing and sharing what other institutions are doing; providing a portal that can be accessed for webinars; and, providing support for individual institutions.</i></p>	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Senate Action/Resolution/Tasks
<p>b. Standing Committee appointments</p> <p>c. Name plates for senators</p>	<p>5) Were USG faculty involved in selecting the consultants to run these seminars? <i>Selection of consultants was at system level.</i></p> <p>Follow-up question on cost of program: <i>Estimated cost of program: \$40,000-45,000 for Gardner Institute contract and travel. CSU pays half of Gardner Institute contract plus travel. System pays other half of Gardner Institute contract.</i></p> <p>6) Concern regarding “scalability” of redesigned courses. <i>Scalability not the objective of the program. Things that work can be adopted. Ongoing process. (Reference to scalability in Dr. Denley’s presentation appears primarily to be to GA Tech’s online master’s degree programs.)</i></p> <p>c. Name plates will be produced for use at Senate meetings.</p>	<p>b. Standing Committee appointments:</p> <p>Academic Affairs: Agustine Ayuk &amp; Andrew Sbaraglia</p> <p>Faculty Affairs: Larry Menter &amp; Eugene Ngezem</p> <p>Graduate Affairs: Marcy Butler &amp; MeriBeth Stegall</p> <p>Student Affairs: Byron Jeff &amp; Kendolyn Smith</p> <p>UCC: Catherine Matos &amp; David Williams</p>
6) Adjournment		Andrew Sbaraglia moved that the meeting adjourn. The motion was seconded and passed. The meeting adjourned at 12:07pm.

**Submitted by:** MeriBeth Stegall, Faculty Senate Secretary, 8/29/18

## Appendix A.

### President's Report

#### Faculty Senate

August 27, 2018

- **Welcome back to the Fall, 2018 semester.** Thanks to each of you for your willingness to serve, as well as your participation in university leadership activities
- **Open Meetings Activities** To date, we have had three open campus meetings (to which students as well as faculty and staff were invited) to begin the semester—2 on HB 280 Campus Carry, and one to date on university free expression policies. There are two remaining open forums on free expression, with our intention to post this week at multiple locations on the website the policy. Special thanks to Chief Long and Lt. Taylor for the campus carry update, and Drs. Ward and Momayezi for the free expression sessions.
- **SACSCOC Minute** During this year, we will share during Senate sessions standards and some commentary from the 2018 Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement Dr. Jill Lane is our institutional liaison, and is often sought out by other institutions because of her expertise. All too often, SACSCOC is cited as a reason for taking certain actions. Our goal is to make certain those standards are shared accurately, and serve as an appropriate warrant for university actions. Here we start with the section on student achievement, with later discussions to include finance, financial stability, and institutional integrity, among others (frequent reasons for institutions found to be non-compliant with the Principles). Section 8.2.a states “the institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results for student learning outcomes for each of its educational programs.” In the same area, Section 8.2.b states “the institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results for student learning outcomes for collegiate-level general education competencies of its undergraduate degree programs.” For us, the centerpiece in the development of learning outcomes for general education and for specific academic programs starts with the institution’s faculty, as guided by CSU and Board of Regents academic policies—but the centerpiece for our need to comply must be in the determination of what our students learned, and not only what our faculty teach. This notion has been part of accreditation principles for nearly 30 years, and will certainly continue. (in the last 10 years, the responsibility for demonstrating evidence of what students have learned has also been extended to academic support and students service (8.2.c))
- **TOP WORKPLACE Congratulatory lunch** September 13, 2018 11:30AM-1:00PM lunch to congratulate faculty and staff who create the conditions across campus that make many of us happy to come to school daily
- **Thanks and Questions**

**Appendix B.**

## Provost Report

August 27, 2018

I don't think I have ever had anyone clap during my comments at a faculty meeting until this year when I brought up the idea of improving our processes for annual evaluations and promotion and tenure review. Nothing I said was profound, I was just echoing the dissatisfaction that exists with our current protocols that require so much written documentation that we are compelled to actually measure the thickness of the portfolios.

The thought of rewriting the entirety of our promotion and tenure requirements can be quite daunting. The last comprehensive rewrite took about three years to complete. I am not recommending that we go down that road again. In my talk and at the Faculty Senate retreat I proposed three questions that I think we can address in one academic year:

1. How can we improve our annual evaluation processes?
2. Can we reduce, or eliminate, the number of printed documents that are required for promotion and tenure review portfolios?
3. How can the Student Evaluations of Instruction instrument be improved?

While these questions are related, for the sake of expediency they could be addressed by separate task forces created by the Faculty Senate or the subcommittee to which these topics are assigned. The best outcome will be come from an effort that is led by the faculty with my office providing support as needed. My hope is that we can look back in May and feel that we have addressed this issue which is of concern to so many.

**Appendix C.** Questions regarding agenda item: 6) New Business a. Clarification of Institutional Policy on DFW rates course redesign/faculty development (Distributed to all faculty and administration by Mark Watson, Faculty Senate Chair, prior to meeting.)

- 1) Was the decision to send faculty to the USG seminars a board decision or an institutional decision? I understand this was a USG initiative, but there are multiple conflicting reports going around about whether institutions were required to send faculty.
- 2) Was there an effort to find compensation at the institutional or system-level for the individual faculty work time/effort involved at any point? (My understanding is that individual faculty members were told different things about compensation by chairs who may have been misinformed at some point.)
- 3) Does the administration see this as a course redesign project or a faculty development project? What do we do about courses with multiple sections and numerous faculty, some of whom are adjuncts?
- 4) Are these training seminars run by faculty with appropriate subject matter expertise? If so, why aren't departments being asked to address this on their own, given their expertise in their very different fields? Why do we want a third-party running the training?
- 5) Were USG faculty involved in selecting the consultants to run these seminars?
- 6) I have heard that the redesigned courses are meant to be "scalable." I believe Dr. Denley talked about this during his recent presentation. My concern is that a course is intrinsically unscalable--it's the creation of an individual faculty member with unique subject matter expertise, a product of craft and individual expert judgment. By scalable, do we mean duplicate versions of the same "course" being offered at the same time--not unlike eCore but with less control over the course design/pedagogy? This would seem to redefine what we mean by a "course," potentially removing the academic freedom component associated with individual and departmental autonomy in course design and pedagogy. My concern is that a less charitable description would be to describe it as "de-professionalizing" faculty into being teaching assistants for a predesigned "course" largely designed by a third-party non-faculty-member. I assume this is a misunderstanding/misinterpretation based on the limited information available to faculty at present, but I'm sure you'd agree there are significant concerns for faculty to have over making courses scalable.