

Chicago State University Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, April 4, 2025

[April 2025 - Zoom Link](#)

Present: William Jason Raynovich (President), Amzie Moore (Vice President), Sarah Buck (Recording Secretary), Yashika Watkins (Corresponding Secretary), Anser Azim, Delonte LeFlore, Gabriel Gomez, Eddie Gaytan, Nadeem Fazal, Liefu Jiang, Mohammad Islam, Alvin Daniels, Gerrard McClendon, Jubilee Dickson, Carlette Bailey, Gayle Porter, Oscar Rodriguez, Jon Patterson, Ehab Yamani, Sonja Feist-Price, Michael Wannah, Tekleab Gala, Leslie Baker-Kimmons, Asmamaw Yimer, Soo Kang, Tatjana Petrova, Austin Harton, Olanipekun Laosebikan, Hafeez Faridi, Sarah Austin, Mohammad Newaz, Joanna Kolendo, Walid Al-Ghoul, Obayed Raihan

A. Call to order 12:33

B. Agenda

a. Approval of Agenda

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

- i. Watkins moved to approve the agenda and rules, Gomez seconded > approved by unanimous consent

C. Approval of Minutes ([March 2025](#)) (Recording Sec.)

a. Yamani moved to approve, Watkins seconded > approved unanimously

D. Senator Comments/Speeches

a. Sarah Buck

- i. For those who don't know me well, I am Sarah Buck and am a full professor in the former Department of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation in the Physical Education program. I started fall 2007. Later in this meeting, the Senate will be discussing a major student retention problem. My speech is about retention of faculty. I personally know four people who are leaving CSU at the end of this academic year. Three of them are in my program. This suddenly leaves me as the only full time faculty member left in what was once a vibrant program. What makes me not only heartbroken but angry is that this was entirely preventable. Of the four people I know who are leaving, three of them cite CSU as the reason. Harassment, badgering, and a lack of respect by administration both personally and against programs has resulted in this attrition. Another faculty member remarked she feels the last two years at CSU have been the most difficult of all, and she's been here nearly 20 years so she's seen

some stuff. Relatedly, in the past year, the call has been to hire more adjuncts rather than tenure track faculty. My departmental colleague, June Shingles, has been the only Unit A faculty in her Recreation program for several years, which actually caused the program to lose their accreditation. Low enrollment was cited as the reason for not being able to hire for people who left. However, it is impossible to run a program by yourself, let alone grow it. She and I began together. When we started, we had 8 full time faculty and one Unit B faculty member across two programs in the department. With the imminent departure of our colleagues, we will have 2 full time Unit A faculty across two programs, both of which have graduate and undergraduate programs, and because we recently got merged into another department, we no longer have our Chair position. Although there may be exceptions, adjunct professors do not contribute to a university in the same way as tenure track faculty. They do not produce scholarly content, they do not sit on committees, and they do not develop the same type of relationships with students as we do. Compounding this problem is that faculty in my department, and presumably in others, have now been held strictly to teaching only up to 24 cues, which forces us to hire adjuncts because we no longer have enough tenure track faculty to teach our curriculum. One adjunct we hired for a graduate class this semester is the worst teacher we have had, a situation made worse by the fact that new students are taking this person's class, which leaves them with the impression that they can expect subpar teaching at CSU. Why are we being forced to hire adjuncts, which is not an easy thing to do, when faculty such as myself are willing and able to teach more classes, especially when this is allowed in the contract as an override? The cost to pay me more outweighs the lower price paid to an adjunct when students do not get the education they deserve and the university does not grow academically. I can only hope that the sour experience the students have had this semester does not cause them to leave. In conclusion, I am now faced with how to keep up a once viable program without meaningful and useful support while I watch really good faculty, my colleagues, walk out the door. The issues of faculty and student retention are inextricably linked. When good faculty, staff, and administrators leave CSU, and cite CSU as the problem, this is a major concern. I wake up with fresh anxiety about what attack is coming next. Will I lose my office of 18 years because Athletics wants it? Will I be told I cannot hire Unit A faculty to replace the ones I've lost? Who is next to leave? How we are treated matters. Thank you.

E. Provost Report (Provost)

- a. The report was tabled in order to discuss Buck's speech. Provost heard other faculty speak about problems raised in other departments similar to HPER.

F. Old Business

- a. Report Exploring the 360 Evaluation Processes (**Appendix B**)
- b. Chair Elections - Shared Governance (**Appendix C**)
- c. Academic Building Maintenance and Safety (**Appendix D**)
- d. Inclusion of OER Workshops at Faculty Institute Day (**Appendix E**)
- e. Academic Amnesty (**Appendix F**)
 - i. Accepted and instituted as a policy
- f. Faculty Research Survey (**Appendix G**)
- g. Retention of Senator Seats from Merged Department (**Appendix H**)
- h. Retention of Senators, Committee Seats, and Officers (**Appendix I**)

G. Standing Committee Reports

- a. Executive Committee (Pres. of Faculty Senate)
 - i. Report (**Appendix J**)
 - ii. Retention discussion
 - 1. Concern was raised about increasing pressure on faculty for recruitment and what supports are available for faculty. The ensuing conversation was about recruitment rather than retention
 - 2. On July 1, admissions for the Graduate College will move under the Office of Enrollment Management
 - 3. Office of Undergraduate Admissions has been “rebuilt from the ground up”
 - a. Every completed application will yield an official decision within 14 business days. Some are decided within 7
 - b. 68% of campus visits has recently been elementary students. This has been flipped to increase number of juniors, seniors, and transfer students (have engaged with 1500 jrs/srs on campus and 300 transfers since July)

- c. Combination of on campus events and off campus events will occur. On April 8, CSU is going “on the road” (band, mascot, etc.) to Kenwood HS to celebrate 40 students who have been admitted to CSU and presented with a large check for the Aim High Scholarship.
- d. Completed individual admitted student tours (new initiative)
- e. Faculty who have research can share the information with EM so they can disseminate amongst new students
- f. Concern was raised about perception of CSU and how that shapes recruitment efforts
- g. Feist-Price asked faculty to point struggling students toward the wrap-around services offered at CSU
- h. Encourage students to pre-register (those who do not pre-register are more likely to not be retained in the following semester)

b. Research Committee

- i. Research Committee Name Change (**Appendix K**)
 - 1. Approved with 19 yes, 1 no, 1 abstention
 - 2. Feist-Price inquired about what it is not called “scholarly activity”. Austin responded that “research” is contract language

c. Rules and Operations Committee

- i. Elections- please be sure to vote when ballots are received (e.g., APERC, Rules and Operations, Grand Marshal, Senate)

d. Technology Committee

- i. Report- Kang
 - 1. No Moodle after June
 - 2. Bulk transfer of files from Moodle to Brightspace on May 15

3. If you teach online classes, back up your Moodle classes yourself (download onto your computer) (share with department)

- ii. Brightspace and Microsoft Transitions- did not discuss

H. New Business

- a. Amzie Moore, Vice-President
 - i. Leaving CSU on May 15
 - ii. An election is needed to replace him; it will occur in April or May by ROC. Anyone can run for it who is a Senator
 - iii. New person will be seated on May 16
- b. 360 evaluations (Austin; seconded by Watkins)- proposal is to have a 3 person ad-hoc committee of the Senate to investigate doing 360 evaluations. Contact companies who do this and learn about their services, determine the frequency of the evaluations and who would be included. Suggested to be done by October 2025 meeting. Information will be submitted to the Provost, President, and Board of Trustees
 - i. Motion carried with 3 abstentions
 - ii. Committee will be formed within two weeks

I. Adjournment

- a. Newaz moved to adjourn, Austin seconded > adjourned 1:59

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, Dr. Yashika Watkins, 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: Executive Committee

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 2/4/2024

Title: Exploring the 360 Evaluation Processes (Faculty Senate President Report)

Chair: William Jason Raynovich

President of Faculty Senate Report on 360 Evaluations Recommendation Faculty Senate – February 4, 2025

On October 1, 2024, the Faculty Senate passed a resolution recommending that the Administration explore a **360 Evaluation process** at Chicago State University. This initiative aims to enhance shared governance and provide faculty with a formal mechanism to assess the effectiveness of administrators. The resolution was approved by a vote of **18 yeas, 1 nay, and 4 abstentions**. Below is the original resolution:

Proposed Action

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. The exploration would conclude by February 1, 2025 and the President of Faculty would report the findings of the exploration to the Faculty Senate. 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?*

The resolution outlined a step-by-step process for exploring the feasibility of a **360 Evaluation**. It also directed me, as Faculty Senate President, to report on the findings by **February 1, 2025**. Below is a timeline of key interactions with the Administration regarding this initiative:

Timeline of Events

- **October 1, 2024:** I informed President Scott of the Senate resolution during our regularly scheduled meeting.
- **October 3, 2024:** I emailed the resolution to Dr. Feist-Price (Provost) for consideration.
- **October 25, 2024:** Dr. Feist-Price and I discussed the resolution and the faculty's role in shared governance through this evaluation process.
- **November 19, 2024:** Dr. Rowan (Contract Administrator) contacted me via email to discuss implementation.
- **November 21, 2024:** Dr. Rowan and I had a **30-minute** phone conversation, during which I provided the resolution via email for clarity. We planned a follow-up discussion within two weeks.
- **November 27, 2024:** Dr. Rowan invited me to a meeting with the Provost to continue discussions. However, the meeting was later **canceled** when I was informed that President Scott indicated the matter was under the President's Office, rather than the Provost's Office.
- **December 3, 2024:** In our regularly scheduled meeting with President Scott, we discussed the 360 Evaluation resolution and the benefits of a 360 evaluation process.
- **December 11, 2024:** I met with Ms. Byrd-Reno (Chief of Staff to President Scott) to raise Faculty Senate's concerns. I raised this resolution, as another Action Item, and sent her the action item.
- **January 17, 2025:** I emailed Ms. Byrd-Reno requesting an update, given my reporting deadline to the Faculty Senate.

- **January 29, 2025:** I had an informal discussion with Ms. Byrd-Reno regarding my upcoming report.

Current Status & Concerns

At this time, I must report that while conversations with the Administration have taken place, I am **not aware of any concrete actions taken** to explore or implement the 360 Evaluation process. Specifically:

- I have not been informed whether the Administration has **contacted any agencies** that specialize in 360 Evaluations for academic institutions.
- I have not received information about **which agencies, if any, were consulted**.
- I have not engaged in discussions with the administration regarding the 360 evaluation processes used in **the College of Health Sciences and Pharmacy**.

While some discussions have occurred, the scope of the exploration remains unclear. During conversations in my discussions with Administration, key considerations I have reiterated discussions include:

- Identifying the **appropriate administrators** to be evaluated.
- Ensuring that **constructive feedback** leads to professional development opportunities.
- Determining the **frequency and cost implications** of the evaluation process.

Conclusion

Although the Administration has acknowledged the Faculty Senate's resolution, there has been no substantive progress toward the exploration. I respectfully urge the Administration to take meaningful steps to explore this process and actively engage faculty in shared governance.

I want to highlight the **Guiding Principles for Our Shared Governance Work**, which serve as the foundation for our collaborative efforts:

- We believe that a collaborative system of decision-making based on defined roles and responsibilities for each constituency and a definition of how those roles and responsibilities overlap and integrate is best to serve our campus and community.
- We desire to affirm and recognize that it is in the best interest of the University to have a sustainable system in which we actively engage to share responsibility for identifying and pursuing outcomes that are aligned with our mission, vision and priorities.
- We understand that shared governance is a partnership grounded in honest and transparent communication that fosters trust and promotes collaboration.
- We agree to work together to embrace and support practices and processes that promote the goal of maintaining our agreed-upon system of shared governance.

The Faculty Senate's resolution embodies these principles by advocating for a collaborative, transparent approach to decision-making. Our goal remains a governance structure that ensures shared responsibility, supports informed evaluation, and strengthens our institutional mission through open dialogue and accountability.

Respectfully submitted,
William Jason Raynovich
President, Faculty Senate
February 2, 2025

Appendix C

Senate Committee: Shared Governance Committee

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 2/5/2025

Sponsor: Yashika Watkins

Co-Sponsor: None

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

Many Departments at Universities have a standard method in which Chairs are hired. At CSU, there appears to be differences across Departments in the methodology used to hire Department Chair. Given this, the Shared Governance Committee recommends that a standardized process be established for hiring Department Chairs. We also recommend that the process include faculty.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

The Faculty Senate recommends the establishment of a standardized process for hiring Department Chairs at CSU. The Faculty Senate recommends that the standardized process include faculty participation with all Departments using the same procedure.

Appendix D

Senate Committee: Buildings and Grounds Committee

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 2/5/2025

Sponsor: Charlene Snelling

Co-Sponsor: Anser Azim

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

Timely and effective building and campus maintenance can make CSU more functional, appealing, and increase safety and security for students, contributing to recruitment and retention.

Additional information:

[Chicago State University Faculty Senate Action Items-Winter2025Pt1Final-EditedB.pdf](#)

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

Develop, publish, present to the Faculty Senate, and implement a short-term and long-term strategy plan by April 1, 2025 for addressing deferred maintenance and campus-wide renovations to improve safety, security, functionality, and campus appeal at the next Faculty Senate sessions.

Appendix E

Title: Inclusion of OER Workshops at Faculty Institute Day

Senate Committee: Academic Affairs Committee

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 3/4/2025

Sponsor: Sarah Buck

Co-Sponsor: Olanipekun Laosebikan

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

The purpose is to provide faculty with information on what Open Education Resources are and how to obtain and use them in their classes.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

The Academic Affairs Committee recommends to include hands-on Open Education Resource workshops at the Faculty Institute Day to provide information to faculty on how to obtain resources for their classes.

Appendix F

Title: Academic Amnesty

Senate Committee: Academic Affairs Committee

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 3/4/2025

Sponsor: Sarah Buck

Co-Sponsor: Tekleab Gala

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

This proposal relates to what happens to D/F grades after student has been away from CSU for a period of time and wishes to be readmitted. CSU currently counts these grades in the GPA, resulting in the requirement of having to retake courses, even if not a part of their major. Most other schools have the GPA start fresh upon readmission.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

The Academic Affairs Committee moves to recommend the Faculty Senate approves a one-time academic amnesty policy for students to return two years subsequent to dismissal, at which time the GPA will be calculated from the point of readmission forward. Courses earning a D/F grade that are in the student's major must be retaken.

Appendix G

Title: Faculty Research Survey

Senate Committee: Research Committee

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 3/4/2025

Sponsor: Olanipekun Laosebikan

Co-Sponsor: Sarah Austin

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

In 2021, the Faculty Senate facilitated a survey of faculty research to gather data on faculty satisfaction with research resources, to track trends in research interests, and determine how faculty generally perceive the campus research environment. The survey produced revealing results which were shared with the administration. However, the survey was a stand-alone and has not been facilitated in the years since. We are calling for the creation of an ad-hoc committee to develop and disseminate a new faculty survey.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

Research Committee recommends the Faculty Senate create an ad hoc Committee to develop, disseminate, and produce a report with a new faculty survey regarding research as a follow up to the 2021 survey. The Committee's work shall conclude November 30, 2025 for approval at the December 2025 Senate session. The Senate shall attempt with all effort to make sure that each College and Library and Instruction Services are represented on the Committee.

Appendix H

Title: Retention of Senator Seats from Merged Department

Senate Committee: Rules and Operations Committee

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 3/4/2025

Sponsor: Yashika Watkins

Co-Sponsor: Amzie Moore

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

Mergers of Departments by the Administration are not necessarily conducted through a Shared Governance process with the faculty creating lack of representation in the Senate.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

The Faculty Senate shall, through the Rules and Operations Committee, modify the Elections procedures of the Senate to include the following statement, "Amongst merged Departments, Senator representation shall remain as indicated by the Faculty Senate documents since February 2025 despite mergers."

Appendix I

Title: Retention of Senators, Committee Seats, and Officers

Senate Committee: Rules and Operations Committee

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 3/4/2025

Sponsor: Yashika Watkins

Co-Sponsor: Tekleab Gala

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

Whereas the Faculty Senate seeks to foster a spirit of collegiality;

Whereas maintaining institutional memory within the Senate and its subcommittees is essential for effective governance;

Whereas the Rules and Operations Committee has considered the unintended consequences of administrative changes;

Whereas modifications to Senator assignments may generate discord among faculty;

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

Be it resolved that, as a policy of the Faculty Senate, elected and/or appointed faculty members serving in positions under faculty jurisdiction shall retain their seats and complete their terms, regardless of changes to formal organizational structures, provided they maintain faculty status and have not assumed an administrative role at Chicago State University.

Appendix J

President of Faculty Senate Report on Behalf of the Executive Committee

April 1, 2025

Dear Provost, Senators, and Guests,

The Executive Committee has requested I provide a report on student retention at Chicago State University, following a concerning presentation at the Provost's Council on March 19, 2025. This presentation sparked a discussion within the Executive Committee during our March 24, 2025 meeting.

Retention Concerns

The data presented by Student Success revealed a troubling trend:

- Approximately **50% of students** do not return after their first year.
- Of those who continue into their second year, **another 50% leave** before their third year.
- This means that **less than 25% of students** persist into their third year.

These figures are alarming and warrant urgent attention.

Faculty Concerns and Challenges

During our Executive Committee discussion, members expressed deep concern and frustration regarding these retention rates. We acknowledge the evolving challenges students face in 2025, including the long-term effects of COVID-19, cultural shifts, and broader enrollment trends. However, as faculty, we must critically assess our role in improving student experiences, maintaining academic standards, and preparing students for 21st-century careers.

An example of academic standards concern is the **drop in class attendance**. Some faculty members have observed a noticeable decline in student participation, which directly impacts academic success and retention. If students are not consistently engaging in their coursework, their likelihood of persisting through their degree programs diminishes significantly. Addressing this trend requires us to explore ways to improve student engagement, reinforce the value of in-person and online instruction, and identify barriers preventing attendance. Issues regarding this include not only class attendance, but submitting homework, purchasing required materials, and attention during class.

I have personally spoken with at least ten faculty members who have raised concerns about student achievement. Like many of you, I find myself grappling with how best to support students while upholding rigorous academic expectations.

Call to Action

Given that **roughly 75% of students leave after two years**, coupled with concerns about declining attendance and student preparedness, the Executive Committee has allotted ten minutes for Senate discussion.

I encourage Senators to consider potential motions aimed at improving retention, student engagement, and academic success. Possible areas for action include:

- Enhancing academic advising and mentorship programs.
- Expanding faculty involvement in student support initiatives.
- Strengthening curricular strategies to address student needs.
- Identifying and addressing factors contributing to low class attendance.

Your insights and proposals are crucial as we work to address these challenges. I ask that we refrain from providing anecdotes on our experiences in the ten-minute discussion, but we share ideas that may result in action.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dr. William Jason Raynovich
President, Faculty Senate

Appendix K

Title: Research Committee Name Change

Senate Committee: Research Committee

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 4/1/2025

Sponsor: Sarah Austin

Co-Sponsor: Liefu Jiang

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

Context/Rationale: Creative and innovative thinking and learning is one of Chicago State University's core values. Faculty enact this value through a wide range of research and creative activities that include published research, choreography grantsmanship, composing and performing original music, program development, evaluation, and writing poetry. The group that is currently known as the senate research committee would like to work to support and encourage the full range of faculty's creative contributions to their fields

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

We propose to change the name of the CSU Faculty Senate Research Committee to: The CSU Faculty Senate Research and Creative Activities Committee.