
Non-Members Present: President T. Hynes, K. Demmit, S. Bailey, A. Miller

- Approval of Minutes from the August 25, 2014 meeting. Minutes approved.

- Reports:
  - President: Dr. Hynes highlighted a few things from his written report, starting with the budget. He pointed out the monthly links (http://www.usg.edu/regents/documents/board_meetings/agenda_2014_09.pdf) to the Board of Regents’ agenda for their meeting, and pages 15-38 of the report for next year’s fiscal year’s budget, being discussed the next day. Dr. Hynes stated that performance-based funding will not be used for funding requests in this fiscal year, that it has been put on hold for a while. Dr. Hynes urged Faculty Senate members to share with colleagues this material about effects of system budget on our ability to serve our core business of learning. Dr. Hynes focused next on advising futures. Based on conversations with three large groups on campus, he saw a recurring theme of having advising at some single space. Dr. Hynes communicated that 1) advising is NOT related to a single physical space and 2) utilizing data is expected to be used to make recommendations of alternative academic programs for students who may be initially unsuccessful in their first choice of program. Lastly, Dr. Hynes expressed appreciation for the achievements of the institution, mentioning the celebration at the end of this month. He thanked Eric Bridges, the faculty representative of Faculty/Staff drive, which had its best year yet last year, resulting in the largest number of scholarship dollars to our students to date. Barbara asked about which projects had been put forward to be funded. Dr. Hynes stated that projects included renovations of A&S, and a $3million request to upgrade our computer infrastructure and networking, especially a redundant loop for our connectivity.

- Provost: Dr. Demmit elaborated on the processes involved in advising. They are tackling 2 questions: 1) How should academic advising be structured? 2) What data/tools should be used as part of advisement structure? The plan is for faculty to take on more of a mentoring role. They want faculty talking about career paths, etc. The Advisement Structure Task Force has an equal number of advisors and faculty, and is co-chaired by Susan Hornbuckle and Diana Johnson. One tool that has been introduced is the Student Success Collaborative (SSC). SSC uses analytics to determine student success. Georgia State University has been using SSC, with good results, and has shares demographic similarities to CSU. We will have an all-day training session on SSC for the advisors on Tuesday. A lot of the data from SSC will be fed back to the faculty to help identify roadblocks, and help guide changes to policies to help students. Dr. Demmit shared news that the MS in Criminal Justice was approved. The MS in Digital Rhetoric was not accepted, but is being revised. Several Bachelor’s programs are in development. Dr. Demmit stated that department chairs will turn in summer schedule by October 15, instead of the usual February. This will allow more time to promote courses and identify problem areas, such as scheduling to avoid conflicts to enable students take 3 classes. This will also allow advisors to encourage students to hold back part of their financial aid for summer, since they will be able to plan courses for the summer earlier. Celeste asked since the nuts and bolts of advising will be moved to professional advisors, whether faculty advising/mentoring still be compulsory, and questioned how students would regularly engage with faculty for mentoring. Barbara added that since faculty will be talking more about careers, it would be a good idea to incorporate more from Career Services and beef up their resources. Dr. Demmit added that we need to get our students to be future-thinking, that we need to get them to realize
that holding back money for summer will allow them to graduate without having to go get private loans, etc. 2 lattes a day will pay for all summer tuition and most of fees.

New Business

Update on Implementation of No Tobacco Policy: Randall gave an update. The committee met on August 29, and was tasked with addressing language in the Faculty Handbook regarding this policy. The proposed draft is similar to the Board of Regents’ new employee policy. Discussion ensued about student and contractor compliance with the new policy, budget for signage to inform people of the new policy, and marketing strategies to make the policy more a part of the campus conscience. The vote was tabled until the next Faculty Senate meeting, to allow more discussion to take place.

Report on Recommendations from the Sexual Violence Task Force: Celeste and Christine gave the update. The policies are needed to bring us further into compliance with the new 2013 federal law. The 12-member committee looked at current policies and made 14 recommendations in June, including conducting a survey of the climate on campus, implementing a website and training faculty. The first meeting this semester will be September 24th. Barbara asked if training would be implemented by the end of the year. Human Resources will be the unit to deal with that over the semester.

Old Business

2nd Vote on changes to Faculty handbook regarding CV requirements: Randall moved to accept the changes, and the motion was seconded by K. Kemp. The motion passed unanimously.

Vote on Children on Campus policy: A brief discussion was had on the Children on Campus policy. Changes to definitions of supervised and unsupervised child was voted on and passed unanimously. The policy was tabled until questions were answered in response to comments from Corlis Cummings.

Discussion on Portfolio Proposal from FAC: Further discussion on the portfolio proposal was had. Ximena voiced the opinion that we should get the Provost’s opinion as to whether the change should be made or to wait until later, since we have just made a lot of changes to the P&T process. K. Pratt commented that the proposal changes the P&T committee’s analysis to a more qualitative one instead of a quantitative one. Ximena questioned what items would be considered “everyday” things that would be left out of the portfolio’s under this proposal. Celeste answered that departments would be able to define this, that the proposal gives the determination of what the portfolio looks like back to the departments. Dr. Demmit commented that the goal of the proposal was to reduce the amount of required evidence to substantive pieces of information.

Updates from Subcommittees

APC
- Nothing to report.

FAC
- Nothing to report.

SAC
- Nothing to report.

UCC
- Meeting is being held on the 12th.

GAC
- Meeting is being held on the 8th.

SEI ad hoc committee
- Nothing to report.

The next meeting will be held September 22, 2014.
Adjourn: 12:16pm