Clayton State University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2018

Senate Members Present: Scott Bailey, Gail Barnes, Marcy Butler, Randall Gooden, Deborah Gritzmacher, Adam Kubik, John Mascaritolo, Catherine Matos, Keith Miller, Kara Mullen, Kathryn Pratt Russell, Muhammed Rahman, Andrew Sbaraglia, MeriBeth Stegall (Secretary), Celeste Walley-Jean (Chair), Mark Watson (Vice-Chair), David Williams

Senate Members Absent: Eugene Ngezem, Kendolyn Smith

Guests: Tim Hynes, Kevin Demmitt, Mark May

Agenda Item	Discussion	Senate Action/Resolution/Tasks
1) Reading & Approval of Minutes		The minutes of the February 12, 2018, meeting were approved as distributed.

2) Reports of President and Provost
   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	Mark Watson discussed a forthcoming motion from the FAC to amend the university P&T form in the Faculty Handbook that will be presented at the March 9, 2018, Faculty Senate meeting. FAC recommends the following change to the university P&T form in the faculty handbook. We think community-engaged teaching should be a line item under the "Teaching" section. Proposed line and justification written by Senator Eugene Ngezem: Pursuant to the mission and vision of Clayton State University, Partnering Academics and Community Engagement (PACE) was launched in 2014. As part of CSU's Quality Enhancement Plan, this program enhances students' learning, as it blends classroom learning with community-based engagement. Because of the foregoing, faculty members have and continue to	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Senate Action/Resolution/Tasks
	incorporate PACE projects into their curriculum, thus enabling students to apply classroom theory to the actual world via engaging collaboration with local community partners. Faculty members need incentives to engage such laudable projects. Those who incorporate Community Engagement projects into their curriculum should be given the opportunity to seek or earn credit for such daunting task. We, therefore, request that the line below should be added to the list of items under Superior Teaching in the Faculty Handbook: "*Design and/or implementation of community engagement course or academic community engagement activity"	
4) Special Orders		
5) Unfinished Business and General Orders		
6) New Business	(The memo from the UCC pertaining to items a. and b. are attached as Appendix C.) a. Motion to Approve Modification of the Course Description and the Changing of the Prerequisites for CMS 4560 as approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on February 9, 2018. b. Motion to Approve the New Learning Support Courses, MATH 0998A, 0998B, 0999B as approved by Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on February 9, 2018 c. Discussion: Proposed Policy on Senate Participation (Celeste) The proposed policy is attached as Appendix D.	a. The motion passed. b. The motion passed. c. After discussion, the Senate took no further action regarding a Senate Participation policy.
7) Adjournment		MeriBeth Stegall moved that the meeting adjourn. The motion was seconded. The motion passed and the meeting adjourned at 11:42 am.

Appendix A. Faculty Senate

President's Report

February 26, 2018

- **Request for guidance** the topics usually chosen in these reports reflect my current take on campus, system, and external issues. My request to members of the senate and their representatives are for topics you would find valuable to address in a brief report (or perhaps the topic of broad based campus meetings). This will increase the chance these reports will provide information useful for you and colleagues' efforts
- **Administrative Review** While shared with this group several months ago, we are approaching this task here at CSU in coming months. https://www.usg.edu/adminreview/overview_and_timeline/white_paper contains an overview of the activities, aimed at identifying on campuses ways to reduce administrative costs, and thus potentially have resources to advance academic initiatives and support. We will likely be involved in these reviews (questionnaires completed by individuals in administrative positions, followed by interviews conducted by system consultants. Ms. Heidi Banford, of our library staff, and former chair of CSU staff council, has served on the system wide steering committee for this effort. More news as we have it
- **Vice President for Student Affairs Search** Dr. Elaine Manglitz has announced her decision to retire this academic year, currently scheduled for June 30, 2018. Several colleagues across campus have been asked to serve on this important leadership identification effort (Professors Butler, Goodman, Harris, Jones, Thompson; Dean Roberts and Provost Demmitt). As the search progresses, we will have further discussions with the senate seeking ways for broad input and perspective. As our strategic plan asks us to provide greater identification for support for our students to learn, and to apply class learning to external environments, our colleagues in Student Affairs will continue to play important and shared roles in the ways our students can learn. I thank our colleagues in advance for their work.
- **Legislative activity** it appears as though the state budget will be completed in the Georgia House sometime after this week. Crossover day is scheduled for Wednesday, March 1. In general, legislation (other than budget) must be approved by one house in order to be considered for passage in the other. Exceptions occur, but not all that often. Tax reduction legislation announced last week will likely pass the senate, already approved by the house, this week. The framework for USG budget issues will become clearer after the house version is passed.
- **Free speech on campus** http://www.legis.ga.gov/Legislation/20172018/174337.pdf the current form of the proposal discussed at our last session moves from proscribed actions by campuses to a requirement of annual reports to the legislature. Unclear of its fate in the House.
- **Questions and Thanks**

Appendix B. Faculty Senate Provost's Report

February 26, 2018

In this final report focusing on our promotion, tenure and annual review policies I will briefly discuss issues related to the standards for scholarship. It has been my observation that most of the focus on scholarship has been on research published in peer review journals. While publications can be valid measures of professional scholarship it is not the only indicator of rigorous research. Section 4.7.2 of the University System of Georgia Academic Affairs Handbook Faculty includes examples of different type of scholarship in which faculty can engage.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Definition: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is the "systematic examination of issues about student learning and instructional conditions which promote the learning (i.e., building on previous scholarship and shared concerns), which is subjected to blind review by peers who represent the judgment of the profession, and, after review, is disseminated to the professional community" (Research Universities Consortium for the Advancement of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning).

Evidence of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning:
- Evidence that the faculty member's scholarship in the schools or in the university classroom is public, peer reviewed, and critiqued
- Evidence that the faculty member's scholarship is exchanged with other members of professional communities through postings on website, presentations to h/her department or college, presentations at professional conferences, and/or written up and published.
- Evidence that the scholarship builds upon previous scholarship and shared concerns
- Evidence that the scholarship contributes new questions and knowledge about teaching and learning

The Scholarship of Engagement
Definition: The Scholarship of Engagement in schools is characterized by the following:
- It is to be conducted as an academic engagement with the public schools.
- It is to involve the responsible application of knowledge, theory and/or conceptual framework to consequential problems.
- It should test a research question or hypothesis.
- One must be able to use the results to improve practice and inform further questions.
- Resulting work should be available for dissemination for peer review of results. (Glassick, Huber and Maeroff).

Evidence of the Scholarship of Engagement:
- Evidence that the faculty member designs and implements a research agenda in at least one area of need recognized by the public schools
- Evidence that the faculty member applies relevant knowledge toward resolution of the identified need
- Evidence that the faculty member assesses the impact of the engagement
- Evidence that the faculty member disseminates for peer review the results of the outreach

The Scholarship of Discovery
Definition: The Scholarship of Discovery is basic research in the disciplines including the creative work of faculty in the literary, visual, and performing arts. It is the "pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, a fierce determination to give free rein to fair and honest inquiry, wherever it may lead" (Glassick, Huber and Maeroff). It contributes to the stock of human knowledge in the academic disciplines.

Evidence of the Scholarship of Discovery:
- Evidence that the faculty member's research is innovative (as opposed to routine) as judged by peers at the institution and elsewhere
- Evidence that the faculty member's research represents quality, rather than mere quantity
- Evidence of the faculty member's publications in high quality refereed journals and the quality and quantity of citations and reprints of h/her research publications
- If appropriate for the discipline, evidence of the ability to attract extramural funding
- Evidence of invited seminars and presentations (abstracts), if travel funds are provided, are also an indication of the Scholarship of Discovery

Our standards and indicators of faculty scholarship vary by department and college as one would expect given the variety of activities in the various disciplines. Some of this variation is exists because of external accreditation standards such as those required by AACSB. Just as there are no one-size-fits all standards for teaching and service, indicators of rigorous scholarship will vary from program to program.

While our current policies reflect some variation, most departments include a requirement for publication in a peer review journal as evidence of scholarship. It is not my intent to devalue the significance of having one's work receive the distinction of being selected for publication in a professional journal. Clayton State University is not primarily a research university, so finding the time and resources to carry out publishable research is a major accomplishment that should to be recognized and valued. But, I believe there are other forms of scholarly work that can appropriately be recognized in our evaluation of faculty.

Next Steps

As I have written in my previous reports on the topic of evaluation of faculty, I am not proposing top-down changes in our policies and procedures. I believe that the best plans will be the result of deliberation by our faculty. My intent has been to present some of my thoughts in order to help start the conversation.

As a next step, I encourage the Senate and our academic departments to help determine the next steps by asking questions such as:

- Are faculty satisfied with current standards and processes when it comes to evaluating their work?
- Would moving to electronic portfolios improve our processes?
- Does our Student Evaluation of Instruction instrument meet the goal established by the Board of Regents which says that "Each institution, as part of its evaluative procedures, will utilize a

written system of faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness as the main focus of these student evaluations (USG Policy Manual 8.3.5.1)?

- Do current indicators of Service include the variety of activities that support the mission?
- Do current indicators of Scholarship recognize diverse ways that faculty may engage in rigorous scholarly activities?
- Are the current standards for evaluation, including post-tenure review, clearly written and communicated in a consistent manner to all faculty?

The answers to these questions, and others, will inform the next steps to be taken. Evaluating promotion, tenure and annual review processes is a major undertaking that takes time to complete in an inclusive and comprehensive manner. But, if my sense that many of our faculty are ready to take another look at our policies and procedures, then I believe it is worth taking the time and effort to do so.

As a follow-up to my Faculty Senate reports, I will be sharing my thoughts with the deans and department chairs. I also will be sharing a manuscript that was developed by a grant funded research project on this topic as one example of an attempt to improve the evaluation of faculty.

Appendix C.

CLAYTON STATE UNIVERSITY
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC)

Date: February 9, 2018
Presiding: Carol White (acting chair)

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	ACTION
NEW BUSINESS	-	
Department of Visual and Performing Arts CMS 4560 2ⁿᵈ reading	Mark May explained the needed changes to CMS 4560.	Approved.
Department of Health & Fitness Management HFMG 3140	Melanie Poudevinge voiced concern that the prerequisites to HFMG 3140 was not included in the course description changes from fall 2017.	Approved. Second Reading Waived.
Department of Mathematics Math 0998A, 0988B, & 0999B	Chaogui Zhang explained the need for the changes/new course numbers/hours credit mandated by the Board of Regents policies about mathematics support courses.	Approved. Second Reading Waived.

Appendix D. Faculty Senate Participation

Shared governance is vital to the health of institutions of higher learning. Our commitment and active participation in Faculty Senate is one important manifestation of shared governance. Being a present and active Senator is not only an honor, but an important responsibility bestowed on each of us by our colleagues. Our current policy (listed below) provides information on how Senator should proceed in the case of their absence; this policy, however, does not address chronic/perpetual absenteeism.

"While it is expected that faculty members will attend Faculty Senate meetings on a regular basis, a member unable to attend a meeting may provide the chair with a hardcopy or email proxy prior to a Senate meeting instructing the chair how the absent member's vote is to be cast on specified meeting agenda items.

In the instance of a proxy, the absent faculty member may inform the Faculty Senate chair in hardcopy or by email that a qualified substitute faculty member from the absent member's academic unit has been instructed to represent and vote for the absent member."

I requested information from my USGFC colleagues and the policies, if present, of our colleagues range considerably. Some institutions do not have a policy and are attempting to reduce absenteeism by changing perceptions at the unit level (UGA). Others have policies that allow for online/conference call participation (Albany State) or elected alternates to vote in the Senator's absence (Columbus State). Some policies incorporate feedback to either constituents directly (GA College & State) or the Senator's Dean (Dalton State; follows two absences without proxy). The strictest policy was upon two absences (unexcused or excused), the second absence would be considered voluntary resignation and the Senate Chair would contact the Department Head to schedule an election to fill the seat (University of North Georgia).

After obtaining this input and thinking about our Senate's culture, I propose the following for discussion:

During a semester, upon more than two (2) absences, with or without proxy, the Senate Representative's College/School shall be contacted by the Senate Chair to ascertain whether the Senator desires to recommit to Senate participation and/or the College/School would prefer to hold an election to replace the Senator. Whether and how to obtain feedback from constituents in the specific College/School shall be decided by the College/School.

I welcome your input.