

Minutes of the Regular Meeting, Faculty Senate, Clayton State University, April 11, 2016

Members Present: Randall Gooden, Kathryn Pratt Russell, Celeste Walley-Jean, Junfeng Qu, Muhammad Rahman, Catherine Matos, John Mascaritolo, Reza Kheirandish, Craig Hill, Laura Herndon, Adam Kubik, Marcy Butler, Debra Cody, Charlotte Swint, Barbara Musolf, Kathryn Kemp, Chris Pitsikoulis, Chris Raridan

Non-members: Tim Hynes, Kevin Demmitt, Pat Todebush, Eugene Ngezem, Gary May, Bobby Hamill, Elaine Manglitz, Jeff Jacobs

I. The minutes of the March 28 meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

II. Reports of President, Provost and Standing Committees

A. President's Report

President Hynes submitted a written report to the Senate so that he could move on to a discussion of strategic planning headed by Dr. Gary May. Details from that written report follow.

"As of this writing, Governor Deal has not acted on Campus Carry legislation. Whatever the outcome, we will need to be engaged as a campus on a whole array of safety related issues—actions such as the recently announced upgrade of the campus emergency communication system RAVE <http://www.ravemobilesafety.com> by Chief Hamill—as we have noted on a number of occasions, the low levels of criminal activity on campus relative to the area and nationally (universityprimetime.com one of 25 safest campuses over 5000 in the US). The campus safety committee was discussed at our last meeting, and its work will be part of campus conversations in coming weeks and months.

[. . .] The Board of Regents April meeting on allocations will be held by phone on April 13, with information on our allocation available then (and shared with this group and others shortly thereafter). [. . .] Official notification of the Academic core dollars (roof renovations) will come after the governor approves the 2017 state budget."

B. Strategic Planning. Dr. Gary May presented on the Strategic Plan, pointing out that the Senate had received the plan and that he was now here to outline it and to receive feedback on it from the Senate. Dr. May indicated that the entire process of developing the plan would be finished by the beginning of the coming academic year (2016-17). The Strategic Plan is building on the work of strategic planning in the university's past. The plan focuses on strategies and tactics for university development, employing a measurement system with scorecards. The planners of the Laker Solutions portion of the plan used focus groups of CSU students to engage with the ideas from Georgia Tech's "innovative enterprises" plan. Dr. May spoke of meeting that afternoon with the CSU student government, and also meeting in the near future with the Foundation board and high school principals. The overarching goal of the Strategic Plan is for CSU to become a national model for university-based community engagement, and to equip students with knowledge, skills, and motivations. Dr. Hynes pointed out that the PACE and EDGE programs for student engagement are crucial to this goal. Dr. May continued to acknowledge that the Strategic Plan is aspirational, and our university "mission" is what we do for a living in pursuit of the vision outlined in the plan. The plan is geared toward diverse students succeeding in a diverse society. There are five core values defined in the document: Collegiality, Excellence, Innovation, Integrity, and Transparency. The challenges that CSU faces in realizing its aspirations include

environmental trends in education, new standards of accountability, revenue challenges, new delivery models, and globalization. The Strategic Plan used the perceptions of 75 community members from various focus groups in order to evaluate strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats for the university. The planners identified the university's strategic position (in the marketplace), strategic priorities, implementation, specific projects, and measures of success. These are university-level aspects of the plan, but the planners expect that colleges and departments will develop their own projects. Dr. Hynes will be documenting the seven criteria developed for "Position" with statistics/metrics. Each Strategic Plan objective will be staffed with a cross-disciplinary tactical project team of 5-7 people. The Presidential Cabinet will be set up for periodic check-ins with the tactical project teams and university administrators. In the question session, Dr. Walley-Jean commented that she had noticed that only first-time, full-time freshmen are listed in official enrollment counts. Dr. Hynes agreed that this method of counting enrollment could be unfavorable to CSU, which graduates twice as many in a graduating class as the university enrolls in a full-time freshman class. The university will push for an enrollment counting method that accounts for transfer students. Dr. May suggested that a potential study might include a measure of how many credit hours each graduate earned at CSU that applied to their degree. Dr. Demmitt added that the university is now tracking at individual level the retention of individual students (year by year). Dr. Cody asked where recruitment appeared in the marketing goals. Dr. May responded that it is one of the first initiatives of the Strategic Plan. Professor Mascaritolo asked if marketing will be implemented in an integrated fashion across the university, like in enrollment and admissions. Dr. Hynes replied that yes, they would, and the resources will be allocated based on how programs show that they are actualizing university goals. Assessment teams will be establishing benchmarks for achievements across the institution. Professor Mascaritolo commented that it would be a shame to see conflicts between interest groups canceling out progress. Dr. Hynes added that individual programs will review themselves, with no central controls over activities. Programs will make a case to individual offices after the regular forum/process has given the university an opportunity to come to an agreement. Dr. Demmitt added that the Presidential Cabinet will review decisions (e.g., if an office makes a decision that doesn't seem to make sense).

- C. Student Affairs Committee Report. Dr. Chris Pitsikoulis reported that the committee brought up the issue of campus-wide civility awareness. A forum planned for the first week of classes in August 2016 will have workshops related to civility. Also beforehand, organizers will take a survey of faculty for specific issues to address at workshops. The Campus Carry law and other issues were raised as the committee discussed the issue of civility in the classroom. Dr. Walley-Jean asked if the survey would be sent to faculty and students? Dr. Pitsikoulis answered that the first plan was just to survey faculty. Dr. Gooden pointed out that he had talked with a student who said faculty civility is also an issue, not just student civility. Dr. Demmitt suggested that maybe civility should be covered in Faculty Development training at the beginning of year. A grant in the works might give us funding for activities.

III. Reports of Special Committees

IV. Special Orders

V. Unfinished Business and General Orders

VI. New Business

A. Motion to Approve History Course Changes, As Approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on March 18, 2016. Dr. Kemp moved to approve the motion, explaining that many of the changes approved by UCC were largely adjustments for DegreeWorks. Changes voted on here included separating the current African-American History course offering into two courses, one covering the years before 1877, and one covering the years after. The vote was unanimous to approve.

B. Motion to Approve Visual and Performing Arts Changes, As Approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on March 18, 2016. This was a second reading. The vote to approve was unanimous.

C. Motion to Approve Chemistry and Physics Changes, As Approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee on March 18, 2016. Second reading. There was a unanimous vote to approve. Dr. Walley-Jean asked if the Senate could regularize the process through a memo from the UCC, to avoid bias about what is presented as complicated and what is simple. Dr. Gooden replied that he is working with the UCC to try to regularize it.

D. Guest Speaker: Campus Safety Task Force. Mr. Hamill and Dr. Manglitz took the floor in order to ask the Senate questions that they had posed to other focus groups. Senate members volunteered that Campus Safety was doing well with communication, and with alerts, including alerts. Faculty have had positive experiences with getting into buildings and cars, and the occasional tire-change. The top concerns of faculty include security response times when there are threatening incidents involving students. Faculty gave examples of delayed responses. Other faculty described how phones on campus podiums do not have working connections to Campus Safety. Dr. Hamill said that he would bring this issue to IT so they can test the phones. Another Senate member pointed out that lights on campus are not bring at night. Dr. Manglitz replied that students mentioned lights a lot on the survey. Dr. Hynes added that there need to be more reminders of safety-providing escorts that are now available. There was more discussion of surveillance cameras and fire alarms.

VII. Adjournment: Dr. Qu moved to adjourn, Professor Mascariolo seconded, and the meeting was adjourned at 12:10 p.m.