

Clayton State University Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes

September 10, 2018

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

Senate Members Absent: Adam Kubik, Lawrence Menter, Eugene Ngezem, Andrew Sbaraglia, Kendolyn Smith

Guests: Kevin Demmitt, Bill Gruszka, Tim Hynes

Agenda Item	Discussion	Senate Action/Resolution/Tasks
1) Reading & Approval of Minutes		The minutes of the August 27, 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	<p>Discussion regarding the formation of an ad-hoc Senate committee to update the student evaluation instrument this semester. Mark Watson has been working with the Provost and President to get this started by looking at what UGA is doing and reviewing some of the literature on student surveys. Mark distributed the draft charge for the SEI Committee prior to the meeting for Senate members to consider and asked for amendments or additions. (See Draft Charge for SEI Committee in the attached Provost's Report.)</p> <p>Considerations suggested for addition included: the role of SEI in the annual review process; and, the role of SEI in the P&T process.</p> <p>Discussion followed regarding the structure of the committee and how to elect members to the committees resulted in a motion that the committee be formed from the faculty at large. Discussion continued regarding representation of colleges and departments within colleges. It was suggested that a</p>	<p>Mark Watson moved that the Faculty Senate form the SEI Committee from the faculty at large. The motion was seconded.</p> <p>David Williams moved to postpone further discussion until the next meeting to allow the SEI committee</p>

Agenda Item	Discussion	Senate Action/Resolution/Tasks
	<p>subcommittee of the Faculty Senate be appointed to determine how the committees would be formed.</p>	<p>charge to be circulated; to ask for recommendations for committee membership; and, to develop a timeline for committee formation by the next Senate meeting. The motion was seconded and passed.</p>
<p>6) New Business i) Report on Email Issues: Bill Gruszka, Vice President and Chief Information Officer</p> <p>ii) Discussion: Library service</p> <p>iii) Discussion: Bookstore service</p>	<p>Bill Gruska responded to strong faculty concerns regarding the recent limitation of access to email lists that was made in response to recent spamming attempts. Issues raised and discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • multi-factor authentication for email • methods for students to communicate and collaborate without exposing the system to inappropriate use, e.g. alternatives for student use of class email list • making use of the BCC option more accessible • automatic authentication of email from class list • the role of the Technology Committee which has faculty representation <p>An additional question was raised regarding emails from outside groups targeting faculty members based on political perspective.</p> <p>Representatives from the library responded to concerns affecting library resources regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cancellations of journal subscriptions due to budget cuts. Faculty suggested that input from faculty subject matter experts be obtained in the decision making process. • Saturday access to stacks • damaged projector in library meeting room <p>Slower return of ILL documents is due to change in the delivery system. Electronic system has very fast turnaround.</p> <p>Discussion of concerns that impacted student access to texts or resulted in students purchasing incorrect texts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bookstore confusion of titles assigned to courses when titles are closely related • insufficient supply or incorrect editions ordered • bundling of texts for different courses together and not allowing return 	

Agenda Item	Discussion	Senate Action/Resolution/Tasks
	Other comments noted the bookstore's prompt response to addressing book order concerns at the beginning of the semester.	
7) Adjournment		Deborah Gritzmacher moved that the meeting adjourn. The motion was seconded and passed. Adjournment at 12:11pm.

Submitted by MeriBeth Stegall, Faculty Senate Secretary, 9/11/18

Appendix A. President's Report

Faculty Senate

September 10, 2018

- **SACSCOC Minute** since mentioned at the last senate meeting, the SACSCOC principle associated with the Quality Enhancement Plan seems an appropriate next step. Similar to challenges facing institutions in learning outcome assessments, institutions often face challenges with the development of a workable Quality Enhancement Plan (not experienced last time by CSU, thanks to the good work of Dr. Jill Lane and Dr. Antoinette Miller). “7.2 The institution has a quality enhancement plan that (a) has a topic identified through its on-going, comprehensive planning and evaluation processes; (b) has broad based support of institutional constituencies; (c) focuses on improving specific student learning outcomes and/or student success; d) commits resources to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP; and e) includes a plan to assess achievement.” This reflects a change from the standard language under which CSU constructed the PACE program. But we acted in ways that reflect those changes—namely, that the QEP should be a reflection of the planning process, and, to quote the resource manual, was not considered as “something to be bolted on.” It also reflected our belief that the work over 5 years would reflect a beginning, and that completion only reflects the SACSCOC 5 year report. Personally, this standard helps focus a university’s attention on parts of a strategic plan that must involve the participation of campus faculty, and must be connected in some explicit way to student learning or conditions that can advance student learning and success.
- **PBAC** The group had its initial meeting for the semester on Friday August 31—membership list can be found at <http://www.clayton.edu/Portals/37/docs/2018/Planning%20and%20Budget%20Advisory%20Council%20Members%202018-2019.pdf> and includes by design faculty members, including the chair of the faculty senate. As questions arise in the process, please address them to any member, including myself or Professor Watson. There will likely be a number of budgetary uncertainties associated with FY 2020 until after the November elections. As enrollment and payment figures for the Fall become finalized, we will have a clearly view of the FY 2019 budget.
- **Comprehensive Administrative Review** Every USG institution, including the Board of Regents Central office, has been involved in a Comprehensive Administrative review, with an eye toward finding ways to streamline administrative offices and thus free resources for academic and academic support programs. The current consultant report is in draft form is being reviewed by a campus committee before it is finalized. That report will be shared in open meeting with the campus, and posted on our web site the. The committee is drawn from administrative and staff colleagues, since faculty activities are not currently subject to this analysis. That group is chaired by Dr. Jim Flowers, and includes representatives of ITS, Academic Affairs, Business and Operations, Student Affairs, and University Advancement.
- **Celebration for Best workplace September 13, 2018** please drop by as we say thanks to each other
- **THANKS and Questions**

Appendix B. Provost's Report

Faculty Senate September 10, 2018

Annual Reviews, P&T Portfolios and Student Evaluation of Instruction

I am attaching draft charges for committees to follow-up on the three questions discussed at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Dr. Watson has already shared draft charges for the committee to improve the Student Evaluation of Instruction. He and I have worked together on these other draft charges as well. Much of the text of these charges come directly from the BOR Academic Affairs Handbook. The one sentence from the Handbook that sums it all up is: *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.* Above everything else, the improvement of teaching effectiveness needs to be the driving force behind these discussion.

Affirmation of proposals from the General Education Council

I received the following email from Dr. Barbara Brown at the BOR

Hello Dr. Demmitt,

The Council on General Education met on July 20, 2018. The following actions were taken with respect to the proposals submitted by your institution.

Approved the changed Learning Outcome for Area B.

Approved inclusion of the following course in Area D:

- ENV5 2022 Environmental Science 1

Approved inclusion of the following courses in Area D with the condition that the common course number (1121) be used:

- GEOL 1011 Introductory Geosciences
- GEOL 1011L Introductory Geosciences Laboratory

I am attaching a letter in Word format that provides official confirmation of the actions taken with respect to your proposals.

Additional feedback from the Advisory Committee(s) (part 2) that reviewed your proposals and the Council on General Education (part 4) is provided on the attached completed proposal forms. In most cases these documents will provide you with much more detail than can be provided in an email or summary letter.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have questions about these Council decisions.

Barbara L. Brown, Ph.D., Psy.D.
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Transitional and General Education

I have forwarded the detailed documents to Jill Lane, UCC and the Registrar's Office

Draft Committee Charges for Improving Annual Evaluations

How can we improve our annual evaluation processes?

1. Review Board of Regent's Policy Manual 8.3.5.1 Faculty and other relevant guidelines

Each University System of Georgia (USG) institution shall establish definite and stated criteria, consistent with Board of Regents' policies and the statutes of the institution, against which the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated. The evaluation shall occur at least annually. Institutional policies and procedures shall ensure that each faculty member will receive a written report of each evaluation and that the results of the evaluation will be reflected in the faculty member's annual salary recommendations. Institutions will ensure that the individuals responsible for conducting performance evaluations are appropriately trained to carry out such evaluations.

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. The evaluation procedures may also utilize a written system of peer evaluations, with emphasis placed on the faculty member's professional development. In those cases in which a faculty member's primary responsibilities do not include teaching, the evaluation should focus on excellence in those areas (e.g., research, administration) where the individual's major responsibilities lie.

2. Review Clayton State's annual evaluation policies in the Faculty Handbook (Section 202) and any variations in academic departments.
3. Evaluate the effectiveness of current policies and practices with regard to promoting professional growth and development.

Each University System of Georgia institution shall maintain a campus-wide professional growth and development program that supports the continuous improvement of all faculty in their roles as teachers, scholars, researchers, and professionals engaged in service to the institution, the community, and the profession. Each institution's program must be aligned with the institution's mission, key initiatives, and strategic plan and must cultivate and sustain a culture in which faculty professional development is valued and pervasive.

The program should specify how faculty development is incorporated into each area of faculty performance evaluations and should be grounded in best practices for faculty development to inform faculty of opportunities, empower them to stay current, and reward them for enhancing their skills. The program should be goal-driven, include a mechanism to evaluate its effectiveness, and explain how the information gathered will be used to enhance faculty development. Programs must be endorsed by the appropriate faculty governance process and the institution's President (BOR Policy Manual 8.3.13).

4. Recommend any changes to current annual evaluation process (collaborate with committee on digital documentation with regard to the physical or electronic formatting).

Draft Charge for Reducing Paperwork Committee

Can we reduce, or eliminate, the number of printed documents that are required for annual review and promotion and tenure review portfolios?

1. Review the necessity or usefulness of documentation that is currently required for annual reviews.
2. Review the necessity or usefulness of current documentation that is required for promotion and tenure portfolios.
3. Recommend any changes to required documentation.
4. Determine the feasibility of using digital documents for each of the required components.

Draft Charge for SEI Committee

1. Review current Clayton State Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) to ensure compliance with BOR policies.
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.
3. Recommend the modification, addition or subtraction of individual survey items
4. Evaluate the applicability of the current SEI survey with regard to online courses.
5. Recommend whether faculty should have the flexibility to add customized survey questions for a particular course.
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?)
7. Review current response rates for student completion of SEI survey.
8. Make recommendations with regard to current practices for administering the SEI survey.