

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 11, 2024

University Center 260 and Microsoft Teams

11:15am to 1pm

Attendance (senators denoted in bold): Eric Bridges, Kate Cotter-Reilly, Larry Menter, Corlis Cummings, J. Celeste Walley-Jean, Cephas Archie, **Erin Nagel**, Antoinette Miller, Mary Lamb, Eugene Ngezem, **Adam Kubik**, **Ken Nguyen**, **Michael Lindsay**, Pinar Gurkas, **Samuel Maddox**, Georj Lewis, Carol Moore, Adam Tate, Ade Thompson, Adel Novin, Alexander Hall, Allie Reece, Aloysius Amin, Amber Bradberry, Amirrah Beeks, Amy Black, Andrea Jacques, Angela Hollis, Anna King, Anthony Hannah, Anthony Stinson, Antoinette France-Harris, Antoinette Miller, Antwan Aiken, Arianne Adams, Ashlee Spearman, Ashley Washington, Aubrey Dyer, Barbara Hennie, Brenda Carr, Brian Goldman, Brianna Vick, Bridgette McDonald, Brigitte Byrd, Byron Jeff, Carol White, Caroly Walcott, Cassandra Parker, Ceimone Henderson-Strickland, Cephas Archie, Charles Henderson, Charlie Harris, Chen-Miao Lin, Chizara Jones, Christie Burton, Christina Grange, Christopher Stotemyer, Comfort Obi, Connor Wright, Corlis Cummings, Craig Hill, **Crystal Marchant**, David Brown, David Gilbert, David Greenbaum, David Pena **David Plaxco**, **David Williams**, Deborah Davis, Denise Allen, Dennis Attick, Derrick Vanmeter, Devon Ellis-Grant, Diane Day, Son Stansberry, Dwyane Hooks, Ebrahim Khosravi, Eckart Werther, Elicia Collins, Elizabeth Taylor, Elizabeth Tillman, Elliot Krop, Elnora Farmer, Emanuel Abston, Emily Surber, Erica Dotson, Erica Gannon, Erin, Nagel, Evelyn Blanch-Payne, Everett Sullivan, **Everod Davis**, Feechi Hall, Francine Norflus, Frederick Bloom, George Nakos, **Hae Ryong-Chung**, Heather Hutton, Jada Mitchell, Jamal El-Amin, James Pete, Jelinda Spotorno, Jennifer Harris, Jere Boudell, Jesse Zinn, Jessica Conrad, Jillian Morgan, Joe Johnson, Joey Helton, John Meyers, John Phelps, Joshua Meddaugh, Junfeng Qu, Justin Spurley, Kamran Moghaddam, Karen Young, Keith Driscoll, Keith Miller, Kelli Nipper, **Ken Nguyen**, Kenja McCray Kevin Demmitt, Kimberley Campbell, Kimberly Campbell, Kirill Sheynerman, Kitty Deering, LaKeisha Levy, LaSonia Espino, Larry Menter, Latasha Adams, Lila Roberts, Linda “Joie” Hain, Lou Orchard, Louisa Catalano, Marcia Bouyea-Hamlet, Marcia Butler, Margaret Thompson, Mario Norman, Marko Maunula, Marla Cineas, Matthew Carter, Matthew Sansbury, Matthew Smith, Md Rokonzman, Melanie Poudvigne, Meri Stegall, Mesa Davis, Michael Lindsay, Michelle Furlong, Miles Thompson, Monay Sanders, Muhammad Rahman, Naquilla Thomas, Narem Reddy, Nasser Momayezi, Nayab Hakim, Nichelle Gause, Nick Henry, Pamela Gordon, Patricia Smith, Patrick Coleman, Paul Melvin, Penelope Cliff, Rebecca Gmeiner, **Rebecca Morgan**, Reginald Porter, Richard Bell, Robert Vaughan, Ronda Hughes-Oguagha, Royal Baxter, Sandra Pisen, Sanjay Lal, Sara Harwood, Scott Stegall, Shannon Cochran, Shannon Montgomery, **Sharon White**, Sharrell Porter, Shontelle Thrash, Shuju Bai, Sonya Gaither, Spenser Emerson, **Stacey Reynolds**, Stephanie Bennett-Walker, Steven Anderson, Taralyn Keese, Tashira Jones, Terence Malloy, Terry Appleberry, Todd Janke, Tuni Acosta, Ursula Gordon, Victoria Foster, Xueyu Cheng, and over a dozen “Unknown Users”

1. **Introduction of senators.**—In person then online.

2. **Approval of minutes.**—Next Meeting.
3. **Remarks and Q & A, Dr. Georj Lewis, President of Clayton State University.**—Brief updates today. From the capital: We want to mention that the house has on their budget \$500,000 for the design budget for Harry S. Downs and we will work with the senate to get the other \$500,000. FY25 reductions are still in the works. Recommendations should come around mid-April. We are approaching the end of the strategic plan launch. The final draft should be with the printers right now, same with the strategic enrollment plan. FYI strategic plan: there is a new mission, and we need to submit that to USG and it probably won't get voted on until the April meeting (4/15) after our launch. We are operating under the current mission because that's what SACS has as well. Enrollment today is 5,622 which is up but drop for nonpayment is tomorrow. Early alerts for classes will be March 20 through mid-April. Not a political announcement—but Desera Lennon - Bachelor of Science Government and Law student, introduced the president at the event he had on Saturday. The first lady announced, "A student from Clayton State," and so it was good to hear our name out there.
4. **Remarks and Q & A, Dr. Carol Moore, Interim Provost, and Vice President of Academic Affairs.**—The deans and provost office are working hard on meeting our budget target. It is not a fun job to take away as opposed to add on. We will meet the president and system's timeline. Something will go out to students sometime tomorrow to talk about the year long registration that we are going to experiment with to help with retention. Please do what you can to encourage them to register for the year. The research behind it indicates that we may jump retention 1% and that would be great. It's new and like anything new please encourage students to follow through. She's not really on any of the grapevines on campus but happened to hear that there were some folks looking for references after her mentioning the drop off between sophomore and junior year. There will be articles in the library on the topic if you want to look into it. Thanks to Mary Lamb, to all of her labors and everyone else who helped with the SACS stuff. I feel obligated to mention—honesty is the best policy, but you don't have to air your dirty laundry. Be short and direct with your answers, don't give them more than they asked for. Please make sure to share our successes. Most of our challenges are not unlike everyone else so feel free to say that we are working on it. Success points she's a fan of are the Nessie data and Kristi Clark is putting together a one pager kind of thing in particular about academics and faculty. She wants to time it to come out right before the SACS people come. Students have their complaints of course but they also had a lot of good things to say about the education they received here. So, pat yourself on the back and take pride in it. Those who are going to be teaching in the core: we're going to be thinking of any supports that you might need. There are very explicit outcomes that are required from the core which might not be the ones in mind when you taught these classes in the past. She went to the ASPIRE meeting with Celeste and they did just fine with the system folks talking about programs to be phased out, new programs, and what our strategic goals are moving forward. That seemed to go well—Celeste would know better since this was her first time. The system has changed and we have to

spend about an hour with them talking about what we're doing, what our goals are, they will help us by giving guidance on what we are thinking in moving forward. Any programs that have had low enrollment for 2 cycles need to come off or we need to set up a new meeting to address why we think it should stay. It was a very productive meeting. They are laser focused on measurable quantifiable outcomes. They will be asking every 6 months to a year to see how we're doing—basically a program review. What are you doing? How can you show us that it's working? They wanted very SPECIFIC examples of what we were doing, so the year long registration was an example we gave, and they asked what our prediction was for how much it would change retention. Celeste did an amazing job getting us ready for this meeting.

Question about DFW rates excluding Ws—is that still being looked at. Dr. Williams tried to look and see if he could pull the data himself, but it was impossible. Will that data be pulled/made available? Yes, that will be made available—it was on the to-do list, but then other time sensitive things had to take priority, but it is still on the to-do list.

To what extent do you expect a review of DFW rates to influence future policies? How do you intend to interpret those things? We're not laser focused on any one number, that would be foolish, but when you have the data on those that the institution has and you can look at it, I think it's alarming, it's alarming to me. I'm hoping it will alarm others and that they will think about what the possibilities are to improve that data. I expect it to improve. Collectively that data is not our shining star, and we better pay attention to it and improve it. I don't have any silver bullets to improve it, but I think people can think about different options and opportunities to improve that data. Get everyone thinking about how to get students to be more successful than those 10 pages of numbers indicate. Would you say then that a success may be measured best by group gains as opposed to individual gains? Sure, because when you look at the data as a whole, those numbers are clustered (not all, but most) I would assume that departments would get together to remedy things together. It's important to look at the individuals within the collective as well so that those within a department who are lagging can be supportive by their peers. A visceral reaction to these numbers is appropriate. You can't get every student to pass, but to say that half of the class isn't passing creates a visceral reaction. How can we make students more successful? What can we do and what can we afford to provide as supports so that they can be successful. We have DFW rates as a data point, but also graduations rates, etc. The provost sent out this morning an email concerning graduation rates for their departments. All of these additional data points will help us compliment figuring out the way forward and the best way to be successful. We are not just using the singular DFW data point in what we are doing.

There was clear feedback in student focus groups that may affect more the Ws and Fs and as faculty we need to address the academic pieces, but also the other pieces as well. How would those issues be addressed? Soon to come is the new strategic plan and a big part of that is student success and retention and the plan by its very nature is a comprehensive plan for the entire university and I assume everyone will look at it and consider what their role within the whole is. Corlis is working on a policy review at the moment where all of the main policies can be located. And looking at where some

policies might create barriers to students, and we need to look at that and see what needs to be changed. There is an early alert system, but it could be better and more intentional. Students will be strategic in their withdrawals as well—students withdrawal not necessarily because they are doing poorly. It seems that students are not preparing, so how do we deal with students who are not preparing? This isn't the first time she's heard a faculty member say that a student wasn't prepared for class and appears to have been exacerbated by the pandemic, particularly the traditional students coming in now. As an institution I think this is a collective issue, it's not just one faculty member or one class. We have to figure out how to get them to a point where they can be successful without watering down the course. How do we get them to that point? These are the students; they're not going to get brilliant overnight.

Psychology has pretty low DFW rates and has been pulling the rates from the university and has pulled just the DF rates as well. When we made a change over to cheaper textbooks DFW rates went down—a possible intervention. Quantitative classes have been doing hyflex for quantitative data. Having the data so that we can use it will be helpful, and we hope to have the graduation rates pulled soon. Please help and share data with Kristi.

The Writers' Studio found that they couldn't even start working on a paper because students came in not knowing how to use Word (the program) or other basics. The head of the WS came up with a difference between tech appointments and regular appointments.

DFW rate is just for everyone to own their role in this. There is a lot to look into and policies are definitely going to be revised to help support students in succeeding. There's no push/blame, it's accountability and this is ALL of us and we want people to own it.

Chair: Apologies to Spenser Emerson, please feel free to make comments after SGA pres.

5. **Student Government Association Updates- Laz Thompson, Student Government Association President.**—We are looking at new ways for the advising center to help students to handle life not just be in life and other programs to increase studying and grades. Senator suggestion to have a Redemption Week where during exam week students are given that time to make up work for up to 75% for retention. Looking at the dining hall issue and there's not much to do with it because of the budget and trying to figure out how to get dining hall dollars off campus. Having several events. Trying to work on trash issues for campus living. Trying to create a program to create a pathway for international students after they graduate. SGA elections are coming up—information on that coming out some time next week.
6. **Spenser updates from staff council**—They are looking for more volunteers to help with the graduate and job fair that is coming up. Will give Eric contacts for who to talk to to help out. Tuesday Laker walks around campus are at 12:15 for a half hour. Looking at having another health and wellness fair soon.

7. **Open Meetings Act discussion- Corlis Cummings, General Counsel and Chief Legal Officer.**—She has received communications from 2 or 3 individuals that have asked about the Open Meetings Act in relation to faculty senate (FS). Board of Regents (BOR) policy says FS is required to the Open Records Act and Open Meetings Act. The work we do is so important the state wants it available to the public. Primacy of Board of Regent’s Policy will trump everything, and state law is a key component that we have to follow. A couple of observations of FS bylaws: the questions came to her questions, bylaws, and whether votes have to follow the open meetings act—and yes, they do have to. Our bylaws allow electronic voting. Before an electronic vote at least 5 days of discussion must be given. Voting procedure is 2 working days—so perhaps those 2 things need to be rectified and made the same. Roberts rules are our parliamentary rules. However, it is not written in black and white and if we want to make any adjustments or updates, we have the power to do that. Another suggestion is this body may have tweaked somethings informally and we might want to pull together a committee to determine which Roberts rules we have taken a more relaxed use of and determine how the way we work going forward looks. Conversations about consistency in how we operate should probably be had. Turning to the Opening Meetings Act itself—go to 3.b.1: Except as otherwise provided by law all meetings should be taken in public and voting after those meetings the votes need to be taken within an actual meeting (when concerning actual policy). She has gone through the website and everything if we were audited would be available and easily seen by everyone. Kennesaw State University (KSU) and West Georgia are worth taking a look at because what we have right now is very plain, very minimum just to be in compliance. What qualifies openness? And what is considered a policy? What are the limitations on those things? Great question that people struggle with. President’s meetings are not subject to the Open Meetings Act, but there are topics that might trigger that act for them. Overall, most institutions were making suggestions and recommendations and there will always potentially be exceptions. The function of the faculty senate is simply to advise, and the president makes all decisions taking our recommendation or not. 3.2.3 specifically indicates that FS is subject to the Open Meeting laws. The BOR made that call and when it comes to our bylaws, we defer in case of conflict to the BOR policy. Section 1a of the Open Meetings Act lists just about every state-related entity. Was there collaboration with legal counsel when the bylaws were created? Not to their knowledge. It never occurred to anyone to consult with university legal representation. It might be time to take a look at the bylaws. Section 2b talking about the minutes do we have to do roll call votes under Open Meeting? The law does NOT require a roll call vote but the name of each person that votes for or against needs to be recorded. At the very least we need to record the Nays and the abstentions in the session. A roll call vote is not required, but the names of those who vote for or against (and abstentions) need to be recorded. Can you record the people who attended a meeting and the number of yay’s and nay’s, do you need the names specifically or just the vote? The names of those voting for or opposed must be recorded. However, in a larger group (like this senate and or KSU and other institutions and how they handle their electronic voting) it will depend on the

secretary. If you want to do a roll call vote you can. The names of nay's and abstains need to be recorded.

It is possible to read the statute as against a secret ballot—the vote was anonymous not secret. If nay's and abstentions are recorded it is presumed that everyone else voted yes. There needs to be a list of those in attendance and so those names not on the nay or abstention lists are assumed to be aye's.

<It is 1pm and Corlis needs to leave for another appointment.>

If you have further questions, she is happy to work with anyone on this issue.

Some comments in the chat about ambiguity; must record names for y and nay; could it leave it up to us as to how transparent we want our senate to be.

8. **SACSCOC Reaffirmation update from Dr. Mary Lamb**—We have 3 weeks to go until they are here on campus. What does a visit entail? They are here to get us in compliance, for us to show things are in compliance for things we weren't in compliance with before, etc. These are peer reviewers who are not compensated for this work. They will arrive in Morrow Monday afternoon April 1st. The main visits are that Tuesday and Wednesday. Over the next few weeks, we are getting all of the details ready. Meeting with all of the team leads for all 14 areas and getting them ready for questions that the team coming might have. Trying to create a schedule, but it depends on what they want to do/see as to what the schedule looks like. Please be ready! We also need volunteers to help out. We need drivers for the 3 vans that we rented to drive them around (back and forth from the hotel, etc.) We need 2 more drivers, mostly for the 2nd and 3rd of April. We will be prepping everyone as much as possible, having mock interviews in preparation, etc. We need to execute on all of the things that we have done to get ready for this now. "We have company coming." Dress up and be ready to put your best foot forward. Even if you're not on one of the teams or committees, you might meet the reviewers around campus, so please be ready. Check out the material Mary has pulled together—it has pictures of the reviewers so that you can recognize them should you see them around campus while they are here. Is it possible to get the feedback from the SACS reviewers? The feedback we have already gotten is not useful being released in bits and pieces. However, we will share everything once we get the feedback after the visit. Each area has a team that is in charge of dealing with specific things. We are still waiting to hear more from SACS to see what other questions they may also have.

We need to have some votes and need to check if we have a quorum—we do.

9. **Sub-committee reports, as needed.**
 - a. **University Curriculum Committee**
Meeting this Friday at 12pm.
 - b. **Academic Policy Committee**-senate vote to approve advisement policy
Did not meet on spring break. Next meeting in 2 weeks. How do we go forward after the electronic votes.
Voted for all 5 items together as one. -- All 10 yays.

If students change their major, they will not be able to implement that change after the add/drop date.

c. **Faculty Affairs Committee**

No update

d. **Student Affairs Committee**

We last met 2/29 and we meet again the 28th (I believe) this month. We are going to continue data collection of random sampling of classes over the semester. We are prepping for the possibility of having an activity hour again. Honors enrollment criteria—GPA specifically. Inclusion of students in student affairs committee.

10. **Faculty Athletic Representative report, Dr. Eric M. Bridges.**--Chair, President, and Germaine received the report from the consulting firm. As soon as we finish reading it we will let you know what it says.

11. **Old business.**

Revote on CORE IMPACTS course distribution of non-stem hours. There is still a quorum. —8 yays and 2 nos

Over spring break we took nominations for a chair of the newly created general education ad hoc committee Michael Lindsay has graciously stepped forward to chair that committee.

12. Adjourned at 2 hours6 minutes and 24 seconds.