FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
April 3, 2012
Academic Library
12:30-2:00pm

Members Present: Yan Searcy, Phillip Beverly, Gabrielle Toth, William Jason Raynovich, Sharon O'Donnell, Sabita Busch, Barbara Price, Deborah Williams, Elizabeth Wittbrodt, Eddy H. Gaytan, John Erickson, Philip Cronce, Alesia Richardson, Anser Azim, Kathy Rosa**,** Lorraine Lazouskas**,** Elizabeth Arnott-Hill, Mohammad Newaz**,** Sarah Buck, Soo Kang, N. Yakubu Ubangiji, Heather Fields, Ben C. Liu, Mohammad Salahuddin

Visitors: Geb Mulugeta, Sandra Westbrooks, Michael Sukowski, Ce Cole Dillon, Liz Osika, Debrah Jefferson

I.   **Welcome and Introductions/Check-in**

Introductions began at 12:40pm by Yan Searcy.

II.   **Review and approval of minutes (February 2012)**

ACTION ITEM 1: Approval of February 2012

22 Yes, 0 No, 0 Abstain

PASSED

III. **Committee Reports and Academic Affairs**

a.   **HLC Steering Committee Campus Visit and Faculty Self-Study Questions (Sarah Austin)**

Sarah Austin was not present. FSP Searcy conveyed the information about the need for a faculty self-study.

Mulugeta presented the new outcomes and thanked faculty for participation.

Cronce agreed and allayed his previous concerns and supports the new outcomes.

ACTION ITEM 2: New General Education Outcomes
23 Yes, 1 No, 0 Abstain
PASSED

Dr. Mulugeta continued and affirmed that we are making progress toward our self-study.

b.   **Ad-Hoc Process Committee Clearinghouse**

(flow chart that defines the processes and procedures for how and at what point to engage the committees of the Faculty Senate)
https://sites.google.com/a/csu.edu/csu-clearinghouse/search-committees

Sen. Erickson presented the new flowchart and looks for improving this document.

ACTION ITEM 3: Accept work so far on Ad-Hoc Process Committee Clearinghouse
19 Yes, 1 No, 1 Abstain
PASSED

FSP Searcy explained the next step.   He gave the committee one more month for this action. If the Senate approves the new flowchart it will be implemented at that point. This clearinghouse will be a place where ALL meetings will be documented at this website. He used as an example conflicts from last week in meetings.

Searcy stressed the importance of using this new system. There was a request via email to suggest that there is a Meeting Committee to facilitate efficient meeting times and invited a motion to create a committee of oversight.

Beverly: suggested that we wait until the document is finalized that we passed.

c.   Shared Governance (Computer Policy)

Beverly: There is no update on the Computer Policy. He has not signed anything and has not heard anything as of now.

Beverly: Also requested a special meeting of the Faculty Senate to review the bylaws and impliment a revised set of bylaws for the Fall of 2012.

ACTION ITEM 4: Reading of the Shared Governance Report to the Board of Trustees
18 Yes, 2 No, 1 Abstain
PASSED

d.   Academic Affair

Buck: We have two issues.

ITEM 1: Her committee determined that the term "Thesis" was too broad. Clarifying, many programs already have a capstone project in place.

Cronce: As chair of UCCC, had three items to consider:
1: Implimentation should go to UCCC only when required.
2: There should be a rationale.
3: There should be a consideration of the process from this body.

ACTION ITEM 5: Academic Affairs Committee approves a final project that can be a Senior Thesis, Capstone Project, or Research Paper for all Undergraduate Programs.
9 Yes, 6 No, 6 Abstain
FAILED

Cronce: There should be a paragraph discussing the failures and a paragraph on the implimenation.

The issue will come be revisited in the next Faculty Senate Meeting.

ISSUE 2:
"For the spring 2012 semester, all courses will be evaluated using the new online student evaluations as a pilot using questions selected through a faculty survey. A faculty member may choose to complete his/her evaluations using the current process during this semester in order to satisfy their current DAC requirements."

Osika clarified the newe student evaluation process. There is nothing stopping faculty from using current process for fulfilling the DAC requirments. However, this semester faculty will be able use a new online student evaluations. She will be meeting with individual departments about questions that they would like to see on a questionnaire. In addition, faculty may request specific questions as well. There will be 5-8 core questions. Appropriate faculty, committees, Chairs, Deans, and Administrators will be able to see the answers to these questions. There has been no determination who will be able to see department-level results. Individual faculty member questions will only be able to seen by the respective individual faculty members.

Sen. O'Donnell raised a concern with the concept of giving extra credit for doing the evaluations.

Osika: She will only give out the student names who do it if more than ten students complete the assessment in a class.

Gaytan: raised a concern with the scale for evaluating a faculty member's effectiveness.

Osika: We were asked to provide an initial scale. Each department must decide for itself what is the appropriate scale for their respective departments.

Gaytan: What happens if no students evaluate the class?

Osika: This happens with paper forms as well. If you look at what happens in academia, automation is the current trend. Paper evaluations take longer to process. More and more students are going online with their phones. This is simply another process of using the internet.

Rosa: It is unethical to reward students for filling out evaluations, especially with regards to lotteries.

Osika indicated that other institutions are doing this.

ACTION ITEM 6: For the spring 2012 semester, all courses will be evaluated using the new online student evaluations as a pilot using questions selected through a faculty survey. A faculty member may choose to complete his/her evaluations using the current process during this semester in order to satisfy their current DAC requirements.
11 Yes, 4 No, 3 Abstain
PASSED

Buck: Reminded us that a survey will go out today to allow for the questions on the assessment.

e. Building and Grounds

Searcy: The parking lots will be repaved. All of the B Lot at the cost of 1.3 million. Also, 9 million dollars for the exterior renovations and 20 million for the interior renovations of RUC.

Liu: When is the repavement supposed to be done and asked about the elevators.

Searcy: Repavement is supposed to be done this summer. Also, the library requires 3.5 million in renovations. The library is not ADA compliant.

NO ACTION ITEM

f. APERC

Cronce: the committee is meeting. We are going to need to request new members for next year to stay compliant with our bylaws.

NO ACTION ITEM

g. UCCC

Issues were raised concerning the bylaws and communication with the administration. Searcy reminded the body that todays discussion was informational and that nothing is solid as of the current time..

NO ACTION ITEM

h. Semate Recommendations for service on university committees:

AdAstraTechcommittee:

Eric Peters
William Raynovich
Kay Dawson

Arts and Sciences Dean Search Committee Recommencdations:

Felix Rivas
Douglas Thomas
Gayle Porter

NO ACTION ITEM

IV. CIUS

Toth went to the meeting. At the meeting it was affirmed that Faculty Senates are the moral compasses of the institutions. The Faculty Senates are the organizations, which keep the knowledge of the institutions. Performance-based funding and pension issues were significant

topics of discussion. The Presidents of the state universities are already fighting these issues. The question of whether a faculty member should be on the BoT was raised as well. It was pointed out that BoT's have student representatives.

NO ACTION ITEM

V.   **Board of Trustees Report**

NO ACTION ITEM

VI.   **Old Business and 2012-2013 Agenda Setting**

NO ACTION ITEM

VII.   **Open**

NO ACTION ITEM

Meeting adjourned at 2:14pm by Yan Searcy.

Respectfully submitted by William Jason Raynovich