

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

January 11, 2017

Recorded Attendees

Senate Members: Randall Gooden (Chair), Seth Shaw (Secretary), W. Gail Barnes, Marcy Butler, Debra J. Cody, John Mascaritolo (additionally serving proxy for Craig Hill), Keith Miller, Eugene Ngezem, Kathryn Pratt-Russell, Junfeng Qu, Kendolyn Smith, Meri Beth Stegall, J. Celeste Walley-Jean, Mark Watson, and David Williams.

Guests: Melanie Darby, Jill Lane, and Kara Mullen.

Minutes

- I. Reading and Approval of the Minutes
- II. Reports of the President and Provost
 - a. President's Report – the president was absent but a written report is attached. See appendix A.
 - b. Provost's Report – the provost was also absent, however, Jill Lane gave a few announcements on behalf of Academic Affairs.
 - i. Enrollments and credit hours for Spring 2017 are up (0.7% and 1%, respectively); however, non-payment and no-show purges are approaching.
 - ii. The Center for Instructional Development sent out a newsletter to the faculty via email and a few points from that message were reiterated; especially the issue of copyrighted material on the Relay server. Ngezem suggested that Department Chairs be asked to also disseminate this information to their faculty.
 - iii. Qu inquired about faculty access to faculty websites. Lane noted that there are still lingering problems with the transition of the campus website to the cloud. Faculty are encouraged to contact CID if they experience complications.
- III. Reports of Special Committees – *None*
- IV. Special Orders – *None*
- V. Unfinished Business and General Orders – *None*
- VI. New Business
 - a. Motion to Approve Changes to the Weighting of Teaching in Annual Faculty Evaluations, As Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee on December 2, 2016 (see appendix B).
 - i. Moved by Shaw.
 - ii. Discussion: Pratt-Russell and Watson indicated that, despite earlier concerns, they no longer were. Williams indicated that faculty in other colleges may still have reason to be concerned. Williams continued to indicate, based on the description of course-loads by the Provost in an earlier meeting, 60% seems reasonable, if the number is changed to a range it would imply the ability to negotiate teaching-loads,

which faculty can't do. Butler reiterated the language of the motion indicating that this discussion of percentage is a conversation between faculty and their departments. Miller indicated that all these percentages are arbitrarily set but should be backed with a documented rationale. Ngezem indicated that we haven't had a documented rationale previously. Discussion continued around each of these points with the addition of advocating for the range as necessary flexibility in either prioritizing necessary work and recognizing that effort with the counter-point that the flexibility could potentially be used against faculty. Williams also suggested that the teaching percentage be tied directly to course-load.

- iii. Vote by show of hands: 8 in favor, 6 opposed, 1 abstention. *The motion passed.*
- iv. Discussion continued: Pratt-Russell, along with others, advocated that the issue of how Annual Evaluation Weights across the three areas (Teaching, Service, and Scholarship) are determined, considering this motion's close vote, be given to a committee for further discussion.
- v. There arose a question as to when changes to the Faculty Handbook take effect when approved by the Senate; the assumption was that it required a vote by the faculty. Gooden indicated that Handbook changes do not need a faculty vote and that the motion approved by the Senate takes effect immediately. Williams stated that the Senate's ability to change the Faculty Handbook without a vote of the full faculty is a dangerous level of power.

VII. Meeting Adjourned

Appendix A

President's Written Report

Colleagues: I will provide a word form of this report later this week. And apologies if I fail to correct typos or grammatical errors in this iPad composed report.

* Happy New Year-- 2017 brings with it significant changes, but I remain convinced that change which we influence is positive.

* Clayton state day at the capital. We were joined by more than 100 participants, including a great number of faculty colleagues who put faces to the abstraction at a university can be to some. There were great presentations from alums, current student legislative interns, and nearly a dozen members of the general assembly, representing our delegation from Clayton, Henry and Fayette counties. The governor is scheduled to provide his budget later this week.

* board meeting today. It will include discussions of proposed additional consolidations, about which I will be able to share information at our next session. At this point, our information is limited to material shared with the extended cabinet or provided to general media.

* Making things better awards. Please participate in, and encourage colleagues to participate in, the making things better awards. The structure of these awards, guided by faculty and staff, focuses on a chance to celebrate good work of CSU colleagues. Thanks in advance for helping to celebrate the daily efforts on campus.

* Thanks-if there are issues you wish addressed, please share those inquiries at your convenience-timhynes@Clayton.edu

Once again, thanks for your contributions to CSU, and my apologies for not being with you.

Sent from my iPad

Appendix B

Motion to Approve Changes to the Weighting of Teaching in Annual Faculty Evaluations, As Approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee on December 2, 2016

"The Faculty Affairs Committee met on 12/2/16 to discuss the approved motion from the 11/14/16 Faculty Senate meeting: Examine the weighting of teaching, scholarship and service in annual faculty evaluations.

Our response:

According to the May 2016 Faculty Handbook, *The weight of each section of the evaluation will be determined by the department head/associate dean in consultation with the faculty member and with the approval of the dean of the school.*

The Faculty Affairs Committee proposes adding a range of 50-70 to Part I – Superior Teaching and leaving Parts II & III as they are.

Existing

Part I — Superior Teaching (Weight Factor 60)

Part II – Outstanding Service to the Institution and Larger Community (Weight Factor 15 to 30)

Part III – Scholarly Activities and Professional Development (Weight Factor 10 to 25)

Proposed Change

Part I — Superior Teaching (Weight Factor 50 - 70)

Part II – Outstanding Service to the Institution and Larger Community (Weight Factor 15 to 30)

Part III – Scholarly Activities and Professional Development (Weight Factor 10 to 25)"