Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, February 3rd, 2020
Approved
Lumpkin Center, President's Room
3:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

In Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex Officios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Chris Markwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Deborah Bordelon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCoBCS</th>
<th>CoEHP</th>
<th>CoLS</th>
<th>CoA</th>
<th>Library</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Bryant</td>
<td>Mark McCarthy</td>
<td>Samuel Abegaz</td>
<td>Joseph Girard</td>
<td>David Owings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rania Hodhod</td>
<td>Alcia Bryan</td>
<td>Clint Barineau</td>
<td>Andrew Donofrio</td>
<td>Alison Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Ray</td>
<td>Tugce Gul</td>
<td>Courtney George</td>
<td>Nicholas McMillan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal Thomson</td>
<td>Gwendolyn Miller</td>
<td>Ryan Lynch</td>
<td>Stephanie Patterson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyrum Carrol, Alternate</td>
<td>Saoussan Maarouf</td>
<td>Jennifer Newbrey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehal Shukla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandt Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guihong Fang, Alternate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markus Weidler</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absent w/ notification
Ianthe Marini, CoA

Guests
Theresa Grove, Randy Garver, Jason Matt (guest of Dr. Bordelon), Alan Karass, Pat McHenry, Tim Howard, Susan Hrach
I. Call to order 3:02

II. Approval of Minutes – Nicholas McMillan
   A. Motion to approve
      1. 21 Yes
      2. 1 Abstention

III. President’s comments and announcements - Chris Markwood
   A. Updates
      1. Legislative session
         a) We don’t have a particular project there are several things that could have an impact. The governor appears to have sent a message discouraging tuition increase. He made that statement with the expectation that there would not be an increase.
         b) Staff salaries there were not general increase merit put in the proposal. There was a line for lower paid staff members making 40K or below to have a pay increase. There’s some calculations to see how that would be paid. That only funds the state part of the salary. We’re keeping our eye on that particular issue.
         c) There is discussion about whether or not to allow casino gaming in Georgia. The Columbus city council has expressed interest in having one in Columbus. In some areas there has been the argument put forward that sometimes when large entertainment focused casinos come into a town they have an ability to buy up, suck up, or consolidate a lot of the rights to productions and plays and those kinds of things. So with the rich arts culture that we have in Columbus and at CSU, the question has been raised by some, would that impact us in some way, shape, or form and have a negative impact on our College of the Arts, on the RiverCenter, on the Springer. The answer is unknown, but it is a conversation worth having.
         d) We’re having discussions with foundations about the foundations next area of focus which is raising money for CSU for scholarships. We have finished a successful 21 million dollar campaign and we’re thrilled that now our trustees are excited for what’s next.
      2. Critical Hire Process- Carole
         a) 12 requests for critical hire. They have been approved internally and none have had to be referred to the board. Some key things we’re seeing on the requests (FAQs) we’re working one on one with hiring managers and trying to walk them
through the process. We’ve developed a one page FAQ in front of EAQ tomorrow that we hope to send out to the campus. We encourage hiring managers to call and get our assistance up front rather than having to supplement it after rejection.

b) Specific clarifications- they want us to focus on critical versus important. USG has a definition of what critical means which is that the position is necessary to maintain student success, etc. Anything below 40,000 we’re still going through the process of asking for a critical hire. It does not apply to temporary positions but have to apply it to positions moving from interim positions. If you have a failed search you need to be approved.

c) Deborah Bordelon- Are we talking about faculty promotions or staff promotions?
   (1) Carole- staff promotions only. Faculty promotions are not included.

d) Unknown - For those positions that are necessary for student safety, is there a threshold of faculty student ratio or number of students we have on campus and the number of police officers we have, is there some threshold for that or is that variable?
   (1) Carole- It is variable. There isn’t a hard and fast number for ratios. I think what is important if we have that and what are standard has been we should include that in our [inaudible].

e) Clint- Tenure promotion part of critical hire process?
   (1) Carole- tenure promotion and and faculty promotions are not part of the critical process.

f) Guihong Fan- So for the critical hiring is it the department submitting or is it human resources?
   (1) Carole- It will be the department. Human resources doesn’t have enough information about each position to be able to provide the justification. We are simply there to provide some guidance. We are not the submitters for the forms that go through the internal process. When it comes to submission to the board we are aggregating all the requests that have been approved via the internal process and we are submitting to the board so we have a central point of contact.

3. The Board of Regents we are planning for the visit after Easter. We submitted the uptown location and the cunningham center. It depends what best fits their needs. That
will determine our opportunities to showcase student work. We’re awaiting input from them and their decision but we’re looking forward to getting that planning underway.

IV. Provost’s comments and announcements – Deborah Bordelon

A. Following up on the legislative session that was one item passed by the senate last week on dual enrollment. The way right now, students can enroll in dual enrolled classes with us at no cost. There is no limit at what the student can take. Legislation states that there will be a cap on what the state will pay for. The limit will be 30 credits that will be tied to core courses. Students may take more courses past the 30 hours but they will have to pay for those on their own. In the legislation it basically talks about the eligible high schools but they do not talk about the delivery of dual enrollment. We have dual enrollment on campus and we also have our faculty who go to the high school to teach and we certify high school teachers who meet the SAC requirements to teach. They not only cover the tuition but also the books up to 30 credit hours. I believe it has passed the house and senate and as soon as it is signed we’ll have that.

1. Neal Thomas- 30 hours total in the entire program or for the year?
   a) Deborah Bordelon- For the entire program. Glad you brought that up because they will be shifting to juniors and seniors.

2. Rania- when you say core courses does this mean general education courses?
   a) Deborah Bordelon- yes.

B. Academic master plan. We are looking at programs that we may want to take a look at. What’s interesting is that there were some concerns on should we be focusing on cuts and eliminating the programs instead of building the programs. As we’re looking at enrollment growth we can’t focus on cutting. We really need to look at how we move things forward. We’ll keep working through the master plan and look at what are aligned to our partners, the needs, it’s been interesting conversation and i know sometimes when we’re talking about budgets it can be easy to say “we need to eliminate” instead of we need to grow. We need to be forward thinking. More to come on this process and I’ll be giving updates throughout the semester to the senate.

C. Sent out the reassigned time application. Highly recommend you fill out an application if you are interested in for the fall semester. Please take advantage of the many times available.

D. Tower day we are trying something new. We are holding tower day and scholastic honors on the same day, April 24. Tower day will be morning through afternoon in the Cunningham that will be designed like a conference for students to present at. Please encourage your
students to submit proposals. At four we will move into scholastic honors in the cunningham center as well styled more as a gala and we're hoping that parents participate. We're hoping to be able to bring in the students who are tower day to flow into scholastic honors.

1. Laura- Abstract portal was supposed to be open but it's not. We'll let you guys know when it's open for students to submit proposals.

E. Another update from the USG: The core is being revised. We have two representatives on that committee: Tim Howard and Dean Greer

1. Specifics are difficult right now because drafts are going through and changing. Thanks to everyone who participated on the website and provided input. Input was taken into account. We met in January and talked about ideas to provide coherence to the structure that was coming out of that process. What I've seen evolve is they're talking about having about eight common domains across the system and then they would have some blocks for institutional options described in a more specific way than in the past. Last draft being discussed had the eight common domains, three student options, three institutional zones, and a field of study zone of six blocks. We haven't addressed that in specifics at all. The February BOR will address this version of the draft. The April BOR is when they're targeting for approval of the model. We don't know enough to plan anything on campus yet.

   a) Dr. Markwood- have they discussed universal transfer yet?
      
      (1) What has been discussed is 60 hours of universal transfer.

   b) Dr. Bordelon- we may have institutional block we may have certain courses in that area but if a student transfers to or from us we would accept that block for institutional. It is a seamless transfer among students in the USG.

F. Email went out today about travel to china I sent an email today. We've had to stop any travel to China. The USG will not approve any travel at this time for the spring semester. This includes study abroad, research, and conferences. The email talks about having a contingency plan in place if you have something planned for the summer.

V. Executive Officer’s comments and announcements – Clint Barineau

A. I will coordinate with Alisha to reach out to all the committees to have a verbal and written senate report at some point. We will send an email about that. I was gonna invite Carole but she's already said her piece. We'll move on to old business.

VI. Old Business

A. Update on Senator Terms (Mark McCarthy)
1. The issues that had arisen before were based around the idea that we had some elections that didn’t happen at the appropriate time. We have found a solution. Some volunteers have taken the opportunity to shorten their term so we will have elections for each college.

2. On our team we do not have anyone from TCOB and we will need to have an election. I would like to ask one of our FS members from TCOB if they would like to help make some initial introductions to gain some nominees. [inaudible] Otherwise the problems seem to be solved and we will undergo elections in the fall.

   a) Clint- Do we have a sense of how many people will rotate off? Or how many per college?
      (1) Mark- 2. For the most part in the COLS they didn’t have a problem with that. There were colleges that didn’t have anyone.

VII. New Business

   A. Probation/Exclusion Policy (Fady Mansour)
      1. The old policy that institutional gap is below 2. Three possibilities. Students can be removed from probation if gpa exceeds 2.0. Second possibility is academic exclusion and the another possibility is continued academic probation.
      2. We suggest that we change the word probation to alert to create a less punitive approach.
      3. Pre-alert will occur when student institutional gpa reaches 2.25 and triggers CSU Advise to reach out.
      4. Alert: when the gpa is below 2.0 and becomes mandatory for a student to meet with CSU Advise
      5. Continued alert status
      6. In the case of repeated courses, count the highest grade and not the most recent.
         a) Aisha- once they raise their gpa above 2.0 since it’s automated system would it retrigger?
            (1) Fady- yes we can keep the students on a pre-alert status.
            (2) Aisha- with the removal should that be higher of how will that play out practically?
            (3) Fady- maybe they go from alert to removal from alert with above 2.25. Another possibility is say they go from 1.9 to 2.1. We can still send them the same message.
(4) Aisha- I think the student may need to be aware that they are still in the cycle even though the hold and the alert has already happened.
(5) Academic Standards committee. I would like to commend Fady and all these suggestions have been supported by the Academic Standards committee. Often times if they fall below the gpa it could be something completely outside the realm of higher ed.
(6) Is this being done in other places? How many students are we talking about?
(a) I don’t have the data with me now.
(i) What GPA are we talking about and is this for alert of a change in how we calculate GPAs here at CSU?
(b) It’s not something we’re required to do. We will talk this through.
(7) Rania- How many semesters are we giving the student to bump up the gpa?
(a) There is no time set. The student will stay on alert as long as the gpa is in the category. There is a financial burden on students and an incentive for them to get out of alert.
(8) Phillip Bryant- So it’s possible that a student could be participating in this plan and enrolling in classes semester after semester even though their gpa is progressively getting worse?
(a) It’s possible. But there is a strong incentive for students to get out of it.
(9) Susan Hrach- Isn’t there some data on students who never make it back from the exclusion?
(a) Yes it was a tiny number
(10) Neal Thomson- I’m looking at a list in our system. I have yet to find another institution that has this before midterms
(11) Ryan Lynch- what happens practically with an alert? How do we make sure that the intervention is useful to the students? My question is specifically on CSU Advise. When they get this request to set up a mandatory advisement meeting is that going to be with their normal adviser or are we going to build out a team of advisers who will specialize in this?
(a) Maybe we have some coordination between Advisors, the faculty, and the [inaudible].

(b) What we imagine is building out an entire system of services that matches the service to their needs. The other thing is that this is a good time to do this because we have a grant that is 600,000 a year. We have a lot of services that we’re now offering to students that seem to be making a difference.

(c) Neal Thomson- the key thing on this is that I have yet to be able to find a way in which telling a student that they can’t come back has actually helped them. We need to get rid of this thing that is shoo-ing the student off to somewhere else and replace it with something that will actually help them.

(d) Clint- I want to make sure that we’re not having students racking up debt semester after semester if they’re not getting out of this whole.

(i) I think that’s a financial aid question. But I agree with Dr Neal Thomson. It is not our responsibility to make financial decisions about students. Our part is to eliminate these barriers for them so they are able to stay in school.

(ii) This doesn’t change any financial aid rules. We can’t really change those. If they’re not able to dig themselves out they’re going to run into unsatisfactory problems.

(12) How many primarily online students does this effect? What support services will be geared towards these students who aren’t on campus?

(a) That’s a good question that I don’t know the answer to. A component of this will have to be available online.

B. CSU Faculty Workload-Quality of Life Study (Clint Barineau, Susan Hrach)

1. Clint and I have been looking forward to presenting you with the results of this study that we began conducting in the Fall of 2018. I was interested in participating because I’ve been here for 20 years and it always struck me how dedicated the faculty and staff at CSU is. The study was focused on faculty who spent at least a 50% teaching load. Phase one was conducted October through April. Phase two was conducted towards the end of the academic year (April through May). Clint will walk you through the degree of participation in the study.
2. Clint- All information conducted was completely anonymous. The faculty database consisted of 283 unique CSU faculty. In the next couple weeks we hope to release the full final report that has all the information. Our weak spot for days of participation was Friday. So I hope that means that you guys aren’t checking your email on Saturdays. First thing we looked at in phase 1 study is we asked people to report on hours they spent on work for the previous day. If you look at the on campus work it has a reasonable distribution of data. But once we throw in the zeros and off campus work it’s less normal. Probability of working on the weekend shows that the mean was 80% and more than 90% of our faculty said they work on the weekends. All respondents reported working a mean of 54 hour work week. Half of our faculty regardless of rank work more than 54 hour work week on the average week. Even though the phase one data is hard to remodel it is consistent with what we saw in phase two. We feel like it’s telling us something very important in both cases. In phase two 64% of all our respondents fell in the 50-60 hours per week category. The overwhelming majority of faculty work on the weekend. Weekend work may take up 25% of the workload.

3. Susan- I hypothesized that if people felt that they had more control over workload. Those who have full professor rank tend to perceive more control over their workload. Lectures reported the highest degree of perceived control. The good news of this study is that everyone feels really positive about what they do. Nobody thinks that what they’re doing isn’t making a difference. And most of us feel that our creative and scholarly activities are important. The last thing that we asked about was whether or not you feel your expectations are reasonable. This one feels that maybe we’re feeling some tension between balancing all of this stuff. We also asked how likely we are to seek employment elsewhere and a large percentage are keeping their options open. We are not necessarily expecting a silver bullet to have the answer to why we’re tired on a Monday afternoon. But I do want to get the conversation going on some different ideas. One thing that hasn’t had time that hasn’t had time to take effect is the Provost reassign time policies. We’re gonna have to see how that new opportunity helps to ease some pressure. I think maybe at the college we could think of some creative ways that we might be able to meet these student credit hour targets. Are there different ways offering a little more flexibility? Maybe we just need to force ourselves to be more clear about those expectations. Maybe we could follow Dr. Markwood’s good example and do walking office hours at the rec center. None of those things will fix it
instantly but this is an opportunity for us to be innovative and creative. CSU is not at all unique in this situation. This is very common in higher education.

a) Markus Weidler- one detail that stuck out to me is that lectures reported the most sense of control over workload. Did you mean to distinguish between workload and time management?

(1) Susan- I think it says something about when you have one job and you can really zone in and focus on one thing. But this is a counter-intuitive result.

(2) Clint- one question I would get as chair is “am i doing what i’m supposed to be doing?” So maybe that’s what they’re responding to. I will say in the preliminary analysis by college, college of business reported the highest feeling of control over their workload. And that could be a result of the XYZ straight forward.

b) Ryan Lynch- I look forward to seeing the whole report. Thanks to both of you for this effort. We can see clearly that we’re not doing 80% teaching and 20% service. Sometimes I struggle with the feeling that my frustrations over my workload is that there doesn’t seem to be any incentive for all of this extra work that I’m doing. In the corporate world you would imagine you’d get a raise but that’s very rare especially in public higher education.

(1) Susan- Well I think that maybe I could do more to establish a feeling of rewards as the Faculty Center. Some Teaching and Learning centers allow students to recognize faculty for what they’ve done.

(2) Ryan- I feel like, it may sound cheesy, but there’s not much of a sense of culture of gratuity here at Columbus State.

c) I agree with you Ryan, as an assistant professor, I would like to see what’s next. It was surprising to see the amount looking for other jobs, that’s scary. Then we need to talk about faculty retention. We talk a lot about student retention, what about faculty retention. Why are they leaving?

(1) Ryan- It’s the desire to leave that ultimately we want to try and correct. “You want to train your colleagues well enough that they can go to any job they want but treat them well enough that they don’t.” There are some people who came here because we genuinely believe in it.
d) Stephanie- I’m curious to see will there be questions asked to see what the cause is? That could be really useful in correcting the problem.

(1) Susan- I would suspect that that might be a process for college by college.

(2) Clint- I think it does take that conversation at the college and department level.

VIII. Other Items

A. Please sign the sign in sheet before you leave so we know you were here. Guests also please.

B. Motion to adjourn 4:48