Chicago State University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 1, 2024
October 2024 - Zoom Link

Present: William Jason Raynovich (President), Amzie Moore (Vice President), Sarah Buck (Recording Secretary), Yashika Watkins (Corresponding Secretary), Leslie Baker- Kimmons, Charlene Snelling, Brandle Blakely, Eddy Gaytan, Sarah Austin, Nadeem Fazal, Mohammad Islam, Austin Harton, Gabriel Gomez, Dan Hrozencik, Carlette Bailey, Jon Patterson, Kristy Mardis, Mike Williams, Jon Patterson, Lieu Jiang, Mohammad Newaz, Saleem Abuleil, Sonja Feist-Price (Provost), Joanna Kolendo, Gayle Porter, Anser Azim, Jubilee Dickson, Katherine Haan, Olanipekun Laosebikan, Soo Kang, Tatjana Petrova, Tekleab Gala, Karen Witherspoon, Walid Al-Ghoul, Asmamaw Yimer

A. Call to order   12:31

B. Agenda

   a. Approval of Agenda

   b. Rules of the Day (**Appendix A**)

      i. Snelling moved to approve the agenda and rules, Fazal seconded > approved by unanimous consent

C. Approval of Minutes (September 2024) (Rec. Sec.)

   a. Gomez moved to approve, Watkins seconded > motion carried unanimously

D. Senator Comments/Speeches

   a. Baker- Kimmons- concern regarding AI plagiarism software not allowing upload of full documents. This is insufficient. It is being requested for the university to procure better software to check for plagiarism. (This will be addressed in new business)

   b. Blakely- regarding PackBack, AI detection does not work as CSU was told it would. They will extend their algorithms. She will also discuss with BrightSpace their AI detection software.

E. Provost Report (Provost)

   a. 1 credit hour course on data literacy- to help students understand importance of having informed decisions about information found online. Being proposed as a new requirement for all undergraduates (only). Would be content area

specific. Shared syllabus that faculty would help develop. Those with an Associates Degree would be exempt as part of the IL Gen Ed requirements. This topic will be kicked to the Academic Affairs Committee.

b. Will be setting recruitment and retention goals with Deans and Chairs (3-5%). Tables are being created to understand expectations for next year

c. Search committee being gathered for the Dean of the College of Pharmacy and Health Sciences

F. IBHE update (IBHE Representative)

a. FAFSA forms delayed until December

b. SB 3965 Funding Bill- moving through State Senate. Unlikely to move prior to Nov election

c. Initiative to redo Community College funding similar to Higher Ed funding

d. If you have ideas for common concerns across universities in the State, send this to Hrozencik

G. Old Business

a. Formal Evaluations of university offices and functions (**Appendix B**)

    i. Will be newly addressed in Appendix C, although Appendix C is more regarding administrators

b. Chair policy and Shared Governance will be addressed in November (Watkins)

H. Standing Committee Reports

a. Executive Committee (Pres. of Faculty Senate)

    i. Room reservations- Raynovich has been communicating with Dawn Deener. ED 100 (lecture hall, "presentation room") has been reserved for Faculty Senate. If any Unit A faculty would like to have a meeting of some sort, ED 100 would be the room. A second room is also being pursued. Ultimately, Raynovich is the point person for this.

    ii. Have had standing meetings with President and Provost

b. Rules and Operation Committee

       i.   Elections (link)

            1. Most elections have been completed

            2. Faculty Senate bylaws need to be changed because we are out of compliance due to the merging of the College of Pharmacy and the College of Health Sciences

                 a. UPC currently is maintaining separate seats for Pharmacy and for Health Sciences (note UPC is not under Faculty Senate purview, but FS is supposed to run the election for the UPC). UPC bylaws state "at least one person per College".

I. New Business

    a. Exploring the 360 Evaluation Processes (**Appendix C**)

       i.   Comments were raised related to concerns about what happens if admin pushes back on the process, the timeline

      ii.   Austin indicated the proposal is just to explore versus implement

     iii.   Watkins moved to add the following statement as a friendly amendment: the exploration would be completed by February 1, 2025. FS President will report the findings of the exploration to the Faculty Senate. Buck seconded > Austin and Dickson accepted the friendly amendment

     iv.   Watkins moved as a friendly amendment to strike the "or once every three years?" from the proposal, Buck seconded > Austin declined the friendly amendment. Motion carried with 14 yes, 2 no, 6 abstain

      v.   Vote on the current amended proposal (Appendix C)> Motion carried with 18 yes, 1 no, 4 abstentions

    b. November Faculty Senate Meeting- campus closing on election day

       i.   Austin moved to meet on the second Tuesday, Dickson seconded > motion carried with 14 yes, 5 no, 2 abstentions. Meeting will be November 12.

        ii.   Discussion was had about the powers that Faculty Senate alternates have regarding voting

   c. Technology committee discussed with Blakely alternates (Kang)

J. Announcements

   a. Research Committee (Kang)- recommendation of guaranteeing two people up to $1000 for conference presentation. Feist Price indicated this is not set yet

K. Adjournment

   a. Watkins moved to adjourn, Buck seconded > approved by unanimous consent 1:54

Appendix A

Rules of the Day

1. All Senators and guests shall have their full name as their Zoom signature.
2. All Senators shall send a private direct message to the Corresponding Secretary, Prof. Gabrielle Toth, for purposes of taking attendance and census for voting and quorum.
3. Only those who are recognized by the President of Faculty Senate shall speak.
    a. All Senators shall mute when not recognized.
4. Senators may speak on any Action at most twice during any action, the first time for two minutes and the second time for thirty seconds
5. To speak, a Senator shall put the "hand" up in the Zoom feature reactions.
6. All Action Items shall be voted on via Zoom polls.
    a. Only Senators shall vote in the Zoom polls.
    b. The polls shall be anonymous.
    c. The Parliamentarian and the President of Faculty Senate shall unanimously agree that the tally is the sense of the Senate.

Appendix B

Senate Committee: N/A

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 4/2/2024

Title: Formal Evaluations of university offices and functions

Chair/Sponsor: Sarah Austin

Co-Sponsor: Olanipekun Laosebikan

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale: The work of the faculty as teachers, researchers, providers of university service and as employees is often reliant the support of a range of different offices and functions within the university (CTRE, Contract Administration, HR, room reservations, procurement etc.). Our work is affected by academic leaders including department chairs, deans, the provost and the university president.. While the university has used a 360 evaluation process in the past, currently, faculty do not have formal opportunities to provide feedback to these vital functions of the university.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action: Faculty senate recommends that administration develop and implement mechanisms for faculty to provide regularly scheduled, formal evaluations of university offices and functions. This would include faculty eval/feedback to departments on campus that support faculty as employees, educators, researchers, etc. and also a return to the use of a formal 360 evaluation process in which faculty are invited to provide feedback to university leadership.

Appendix C

Senate Committee: N/A

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 10/1/2024

Title: Exploring the 360 Evaluation Processes

Chair/Sponsor: Sarah Austin

Co-Sponsor: Jubilee Dickson

<u>Proposed Action</u>

Context/Rationale:

The faculty of Chicago State University is deeply invested in promoting academic excellence, personal excellence, personal, professional and academic integrity, as well as lifelong learning. We believe that the performance evaluation processes of faculty and those to supervise them is central promoting these values.

Current Practices:

Currently, faculty's teaching is evaluated by students, peers and department chairs. Then, their overall performance is reviewed by everyone in their chain of command. This provides faculty with valuable information from a range of unique vantage points. Having this feedback helps to better guide faculty in setting and meeting professional goals that support CSU's values, mission and strategic plan.

Currently, chairs, deans and the provost are only evaluated by their direct supervisors. This process limits opportunities for these CSU employees to recognize their own excellence, and to identify growth opportunities. This in turn leaves them without an important source of information when they are setting goals for their future contributions to our academic community.

Future Opportunities:

A structured and supportive process of processing feedback from both a supervisor and those who are supervised could create opportunities for individual employees to take pride in themselves and in their contributions to CSU, and it can help to guide planning meaningful actions that will support lifelong learning. This approach also has the potential to contribute to a positive change in campus culture in which we each value our role in recognizing the

contributions of others and where we critique with kindness with a goal of promoting positive change.

Challenges:

The process of 360 evaluation has not been practiced on the CSU campus since before 2015. Beginning new processes ought to be done carefully and with proper study and planning. Expertise is needed to develop useful questions. There is potential for some faculty to use this anonymous process.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action:

PROPOSAL

The faculty senate recommends that the CSU Administration explore options for engaging in 360 evaluations. This should include:

1) Contacting at least two agencies that provide guidance/support/consultation related to 360 evaluations at academic institutions to learn about supports that they can provide.
2) Notify the President of the Faculty Senate of the two agencies that the administration is contacting.
3) Discussing faculty feedback to administrators with the Dean of the College of Health Sciences and Pharmacy (their accreditation requires this feedback).
4) Discussing the implications of potential options with the President of the Faculty Senate including
    a) Who might be included: Just Chairs and Deans or all academic administrators?
    b) Who might give feedback: Could a faculty member submit an evaluation for everyone in their chain of command, just for Chairs and Deans, or just chairs, while chairs give feedback to deans?
    c) How could faculty be provided with an introduction to this process?
    d) How can we support those who are receiving a new source of feedback? For example, consultation, training and development,
    e) How often might this be done: Yearly, or once every three years?