

Clayton State University Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes

September 24, 2018

Senate Members present: Scott Bailey, Marcy Butler, Deborah Gritzmacher (also serving as proxy for Gail Barnes), Craig Hill (also serving as proxy for Lawrence Menter), Byron Jeff, Adam Kubik (also serving as proxy for Laura Herndon), Catherine Matos, Eugene Ngezem, Stephanie Richardson, Kathryn Pratt Russell, Andrew Sbaraglia, Kendolyn Smith, MeriBeth Stegall (Secretary), Mark Watson (Chair), David Williams (Vice-Chair)

Senate Members Absent: Augustine Ayuk, Gail Barnes, Laura Herndon, Lawrence Menter

Guests: Kevin Demmitt, Tim Hynes

Agenda Item	Discussion	Senate Action/Resolution/Tasks
1) Reading & Approval of Minutes		The minutes of the September 10, 2018, meeting were approved as distributed.
2) Reports of President, Provost, & Standing Committees i) President's Report ii) Provost's Report	The President's Report is attached as Appendix A. The Provost's Report is attached as Appendix B.	
3) Reports of Standing Committees		
4) Special Orders		
5) Unfinished Business and General Orders		
6) New Business a. Motion to Commit SEI Charge to the Faculty Affairs Committee	Discussion of the motion included concern regarding the development of the instrument; the structure of the instrument. The charge to the committee allows for flexibility in the structure of the instrument. The assignment of the questions to FAC rather than SAC. Given the SEI role in the evaluation of faculty, it was assigned to FAC. Applicability to both graduate and undergraduate classes.	Mark Watson presented the following motion and accompanying charge: To commit the SEI questions to the Faculty Affairs Committee, which shall form an ad-hoc committee to study and report back to senate on its recommendations for revising the SEI. This ad-hoc committee will meet weekly, and the FAC will update senate on the committee's progress on a monthly basis until its recommendations are complete. The charge for the SEI Committee: 1. Review current Clayton State Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) to ensure compliance with BOR policies.

Agenda Item	Discussion	Senate Action/Resolution/Tasks
<p>b. Motion to Approve University Curriculum Committee Items</p>		<p>2. Evaluate the usefulness of the current items in the SEI survey with regard to their intended purpose of improving pedagogical practices and course design.</p> <p>3. Recommend the modification, addition or subtraction of individual survey items</p> <p>4. Evaluate the applicability of the current SEI survey with regard to online courses.</p> <p>5. Recommend whether faculty should have the flexibility to add customized survey questions for a particular course.</p> <p>6. Make policy recommendations for peer reviews of instruction (e.g. Should peer reviews be required? Should there be a standard format for peer reviews at the college or departmental level?)</p> <p>7. Review current response rates for student completion of SEI survey.</p> <p>8. Make recommendations with regard to current practices for administering the SEI survey.</p> <p>The motion was voted on by show of hands. 16 voted aye. No nays. One abstention.</p> <p>Mark Watson presented the motion by the UCC to approve the curriculum items approved by the University Curriculum Committee. All course modifications and new courses below were approved by unanimous consent.</p> <p>Modifications to: EDUC 4004, EDUC 4005, EDUC 4740, EDUC 4745, EDUC 4049, EDUC 3025</p> <p>New courses: EDUC 3029, EDUC 3403, EDUC 3404, EDUC 3405 EDUC 3406, EDUC 3407, EDUC 3410 MATH 2008 Foundations of Numbers and Operations</p> <p>The UCC also forwarded an information item from CIMS regarding the deactivation of the WebBSIT Program at Clayton State.</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion	Senate Action/Resolution/Tasks
<p>c. Discussion item: annual evaluation</p>	<p>The Senate began discussion of the annual evaluation process. Questions were raised regarding the timing of the process: Why do they occur in January rather than the end of the academic year? Tied to state requirement that state employee raises be based on performance and the timing of the decision making process regarding contracts.</p> <p>Question regarding the ease of using Digital Measures as a tool in this process and the promotion and tenure process. Also discussion regarding clarification of Digital Measures categories—the general “clunkiness” of Digital Measures as a tool.</p> <p>What are the goals of the annual evaluation relative to P&T? Alignment regarding the annual evaluations and the promotion and tenure process. Department and college differences in requirements for the annual review. Appropriateness of requiring fully digital portfolios without sufficient staff support. What is “sufficient evidence” and who defines it. Difference in requirements for evidence for tenure and promotion vs post-tenure review.</p>	
<p>7) Adjournment</p>		<p>Marcy Butler moved that the meeting adjourn. The motion was seconded. All voted in favor. The motion passed and the meeting adjourned at 12:15pm.</p>

Submitted by MeriBeth Stegall, Faculty Senate Secretary, September 25, 2018

Appendix A. President's Report

Faculty Senate

September 24, 2018

- SACSCOC minute** The resource manual for the principles of accreditation begins with the principle of integrity 1.1 “The institution operates with integrity in all matters.” It continues: “Institutional integrity is essential to the purpose of higher education. Integrity functions as the basic covenant defining the relationship between the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) and its member and candidate institutions. The principle serves as the foundation of a relationship in which all parties agree to deal honestly and openly with both their constituencies and with one another.” The policy statement for this principle can be found at <http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/integrity.pdf> A note there applying to this and other standards is worth emphasizing:” SACSCOC accredits institutions, not individuals. Therefore, any individual who reports to SACSCOC on behalf of an institution—either by virtue of his or her office or as delegated by the chief executive officer of the institution—obligates the institution in all matters regarding institutional integrity.” The institution can be at peril by the acts of individuals, either in leadership roles, or in academic or support roles at an institution. One institution, The University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, recently demonstrated that even the most prestigious of institutions can be called into account when they act contrary to basic principles of integrity. “It's a big deal,” said Belle Whelan, SACS president. “This issue was bigger than anything with which we’ve ever dealt, and it went on for longer than anything else. This is the first one I can recall in the 10 years I’ve been here that we put an institution on probation for academic fraud or academic integrity.” Our own efforts at transparency and evidence reflect just a small part of our own commitment to institutional integrity.
- Changing Landscape for higher education** https://www.chronicle.com/article/How-the-Great-Recession/244527?cid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en&elqTrackId=a03dedcaf9a2413d8edac68878238005&elq=8ee84f6e9f5b480bb21c0dab1d1ef525&elqaid=20533&elqat=1&elqCampaignId=9662 To be sure, I remain convinced that institutions of higher education will have bright futures if they adapt to external changes, and recognize that finding ways to prepare students to be adapt learners will be essential to that bright future. This **Chronicle** article may have been seen and read by many of you. While directed at the general American Higher Education Landscape, it certainly applies to the public education landscape here in Georgia. It reports the profound shift in perspectives over the last decade, including a view of higher education as a private benefit at least as much as a public good, among other changes. It is again a reminder of a need for data as we make our case for public support for our activities—cases that must account for narratives understood both inside and outside the academy. I am grateful in advance of assistance my colleagues can provide in helping us support continued reasons for higher education’s value to our state. And I remain convinced that shared approaches to answers to what is next will be superior in the long run to responses not benefiting from collaborative processes. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Reimagining-College-as-a/237588>
<https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2018/03/the-third-education-revolution/556091/>
- Budget Request Process** included in the report materials are several pages of questions which the institution must answer as a part of the annual budget request. This provides a context and a perspective for how we make our case for support to advance system and institutional strategic priorities. Again, as has been our practice, we will share with campus documents that we submit to the board staff that respond to these questions.
- Questions and thanks**

Appendix B. Faculty Senate September 24, 2018**Provost's Report****Academic Program Forecast**

Every year we are asked to submit a list of degree programs that are in the planning stages for the coming year. In consultation with the deans the following degrees were submitted:

- B.S. Early Childhood Education/Dual Cert in Special Education
 - Can be added to existing degree programs without additional full-time faculty
- Master of Supply Chain Analytics
 - College of Business is working with Department of Mathematics
- Master of Strategic Leadership
 - Specific concentrations for various career tracks will be added later

In addition to these new degree programs, the University has received permission to request that the Master of Science in Criminal Justice be changed to a Masters of Public Administration with a concentration in Criminal Justice.

Degree Reactivations

Two years ago the degree programs in music, theater and music education were removed from the USG's list of low productivity programs by combining the three degrees under the umbrella of a single degree program in performing arts. Fortunately, the BOR recently approved the disaggregating of degrees to better reflect the actual degree the student is obtaining while still allowing related degrees to be combined for the purposes of calculating productivity. For us, that means that we can return to offering Bachelor of Arts Degrees with majors in theater, music and music education. Dr. Kurt Zeller sums up the significance of the change this way:

That is indeed excellent news, and, as Kevin says, "the best of both worlds." We keep the innovative, unusually flexible curricular structure that we created a few years back, with the advantages it confers, but we no longer have the not-industry-standard degree names that bedeviled accreditors and prospective students alike. I am quite sure that it will, indeed, assist in recruitment to tell prospective students that they can, in fact, be MAJORS in "music," "music education," or "theatre," as they already have decided they wish to be, rather than in the amorphous "performing arts."

This will be a big help this year as our NASM re-accreditation team comes to visit; it was becoming increasingly clear that NASM was never going to accept our music education curriculum being labelled "performing arts."

Thank you to everyone who helped bring about this excellent turn of events!

Kurt-Alexander Zeller, D.M.A.
Coordinator, Division of Music