

Chicago State University Faculty Senate
Meeting Agenda
Tuesday, October 7, 2025, 12:30 p.m.
[Oct 2025 - Zoom Link](#)

Present: William Jason Raynovich (President), Leslie Baker Kimmons (Vice President), Sarah Buck (Recording Secretary), Yashika Watkins (Corresponding Secretary), Elaina Khasawneh, Gabriel Gomez, Eddy Gaytan, Lieu Jiang, Delonte LeFlore, Sarah Austin, Jubilee Dickson, Oscar Rodriguez, Saifuddin Saif, Soo Kang, Ehab Yamani, Austin Harton, Jennifer Doucet, Tekleab Gala, Tatjana Petrova, Anser Azim, Carlette Bailey, Gayle Porter, Olanipekun Laosebikan, Saleem Abuleil, Charlene Snelling, Brandle Blakely, Brent In, Sonja Feist-Price

- A. Call to order 12:31
- B. Agenda
 - a. Approval of Agenda
 - i. Watkins moved to approve agenda and rules, Gomez seconded > approved by unanimous consent
 - b. Rules of the Day (**Appendix A**)
- C. Approval of Minutes (September [2025](#)) (Recording Sec.)
 - a. Watkins moved to approve, Khasawneh seconded > motion carried with 16 yes, 1 abstention
- D. Vacancy of Elected Seats
 - a. Parliamentarian
 - i. Current Parliamentarian stepped down
 - ii. Nominations will be requested from the Senate and vote will be taken in Brightspace
 - b. Rules and Operations Committee
- E. Senator Comments/Speeches
 - a. Sarah Austin (**Appendix B**)
 - b. Elaina Khasawneh
 - i. Regarding action item approved in Feb 2023 about timing of student evaluations. Summer session term timing must also be considered (i.e., before final exam week)
 - c. Sarah Buck

- i. The Faculty Senate has recently discussed faculty morale, so I am speaking to that today. If you suffer from productivity dysmorphia, which is the feeling that regardless of how productive you are, you feel like it is not enough, then you are like me. If you suffer from “yesism”, which is the inability to say no without feeling guilty, so you wind up saying yes even if it disrupts your life, then you are like me. If your Sunday Scaries, which is the anxiety, fear, or dread that comes with the start of a new work week, starts on Saturday mornings, then you’re like me. If you have received an email on a weekend morning demanding a response by noon that day, then you’re like me. I have a suggestion for my faculty colleagues. Protect your weekends as much as you are able to. Unless it is an emergency, respond to emails on the next business day. Set an evening deadline during the work week, after which you will not respond to any notifications on your phone. Mine is 7pm. Prioritize your work/life balance. I’m not there yet, but I hope you’ll join me in reaching this goal.
 - d. Leslie Baker Kimmons
 - i. Discussed the political climate regarding ICE actions. If you are aware of issues with students/students being fearful, please alert the Latino Resource Center
 - ii. Dickson requested “know your rights” materials be generated

F. Provost Report (Provost)

- a. 2025-2030 strategic plan approved (work ongoing). Developing metrics to go along with each goal/objective. Request to academic and non-academic units to create/update a strategic plan that is consistent with CSU strategic plan
- b. Numerous programs going up for accreditation. There will be an accreditation forum offered to provide an opportunity to share high impact and promising practices from programs that were recently accredited
- c. Preparing for HLC mid-cycle review (report due Feb 1, 2027; site visit March 1, 2027)
- d. Retention goals: record improvements. Deans, Chairs, and faculty were credited with this improvement. New reach goals and stretch goals will be set for all units on campus
- e. Much attention being given to Freshmen and Sophomores (assessment data being collected)

G. Enrollment Management (VP of Enrollment Management)

- a. Faculty Volunteer Initiative

- i. https://apply.csu.edu/portal/faculty_recruitment_volunteer
 - ii. Faculty have the opportunity to volunteer during group visits for potential students
 - iii. Blakely will include this information in the next CTRE weekly email
- b. Retention points
 - i. Retention rates were up across each group (freshmen, transfers, graduate)
 - ii. Due to higher enrollment, there is a need for additional classes. Some of these classes were added at the last minute

H. Old Business

- a. Grants proposing Gen Ed requirements (**Appendix C**)
 - i. Provost indicated that they don't envision grants that would require Gen Ed courses; there are multiple ways students can acquire a knowledge base. Provost and Mardis will meet with Raynovich to discuss
- b. 360 Evaluation of the CSU Faculty Senate President and Senate (**Appendix D**) (Parliamentarian 2024-2025)
- c. Standardized Faculty Evaluation Forms (**Appendix E**) (Director of CTRE, guest)
 - i. Two different forms exist for face to face vs online/hybrid courses. The only overlapping question is "comments". This makes it difficult for faculty to find an average score for their portfolios.
 - ii. If passed, change will be implemented for rest of academic year
 - iii. Watkins moved to take new student evaluations back to respective departments and to vote on at the November meeting, Gomez seconded > Raynovich requested friendly amendment of all feedback be returned by October 27 (vote for friendly amendment Oct 27 deadline 15 yes, 2 no, 2 abstentions) to faculty senate@csu.edu. Feedback will be integrated and discussed with Executive Committee and Blakely. Final draft will be presented for a vote at the November meeting > motion carried with 15 yes, 2 no, 2 abstentions

- iv. Question was asked why Pharmacy has a different evaluations survey than the rest of the faculty; the answer is unclear. Raynovich recommended Petrova to take the proposed new questions back to Pharmacy to determine if they wish to have the same questions as everyone else

I. Standing Committee Reports

a. Executive Committee

- i. Surveys (surveys below stemmed from questions that were raised with FS meeting with the President. All data are being sent to President so she is aware of the issues)

1. Wi-Fi Survey (**Appendix F**)

- a. Raynovich will submit survey to Kang and Technology committee
- b. Majority of faculty reports problems with wi-fi if not daily, then weekly
- c. Most log on through “staff”

2. Faculty Needs (**Appendix G**)

- a. Out of 34 responses, four common themes were financial support for professional development, faculty/academic support (outside of funding), better communication across campus, improvement of facilities (bathrooms). 24/34 requested financial support for research (to attend professional conferences, individual research)

3. College of Education (**Appendix H**)

- a. Next step: share report and results with President Scott (email sent October 6 at noon).
- b. Discussion was had with Provost that emails had not been received by President/lawyer. Raynovich shared dates/times emails were sent

b. Technology Committee

- i. Significant confusion regarding Moodle to Brightspace on part of students. If a major change is anticipated in the future, better communication is needed across all divisions on campus
- ii. Google Drive will eventually go away, so make sure you move your files
- iii. University needs a calendar that displays various changes (e.g., Gmail to Outlook) to ensure too many things are not happening at once

J. New Business

- a. 360 Evaluations - ad hoc committee
 - i. Did not discuss
- b. Faculty Evaluation of the President of Chicago State University - ad hoc committee
 - i. Did not discuss
- c. UPC COE still needs a representative
 - i. Buck/Laosebikan should advise Raynovich on how to fill the position

K. Adjournment

2:02

- a. Gaytan moved to adjourn, Khasawneh seconded > approved by unanimous consent

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. Time-recording
 - a. The President shall keep use a timer to keep the Faculty Senate
 - b. The Parliamentarian will assist in keeping time and may compel the Faculty Senate to move to the next agenda item.
4. Only those who are recognized by the President of Faculty Senate shall speak.
 - a. All Senators shall mute when not recognized.
5. 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
6. To speak, a Senator shall put the “hand” up in the Zoom feature reactions.
7. 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

To Make Good Trouble, Ask Good Questions Senator Speech by Dr. Sarah Austin – Oct 7, 2025

I remember when the main job of the faculty senate was to hold votes of no confidence in the leadership of the University. Because of this history, it means a lot to me President Scott regularly meets with the senate to answer our questions. In our last meeting with President Scott, I was concerned that some of the questions were not respectful, or effective. I made a comment at the time, but I wanted to express my concerns more fully today.

For shared governance to work, the faculty have a responsibility to bring our voices and our questions to the table. At times, we need to bring our frustrations and even our anger to the table too. We need to be willing to ask hard questions of President Scott and other campus leaders, and we need press for answers when we are concerned about how administrative decisions affect our students, our colleagues, and our academic mission.

But, how we ask matters. It is not about softening our concerns. It is about framing our questions in a way that demands accountability while maintaining respect for the individuals involved. Hard answerable questions asked with clarity are far more effective than vague accusations. Hard questions open the door to productive dialogue.

At the same time, we must acknowledge that it is not always easy to ask hard questions in public. Power dynamics are real, and not everyone feels safe raising concerns. But we should not use the cloak of anonymity as a ticket that frees us from our responsibility to demonstrate respect for each other as colleagues.

So, as we prepare for future conversations with the President and other campus leaders, Let's ask hard but answerable questions. Let's embrace our duty to ask difficult questions in a way that is motivated by a desire to improve collaboration on this campus.

Let's ask questions that help faculty voices be both strong and respected.

Dr. Sarah Austin
Associate Professor
Dept. of Occupational Therapy
Chicago State University

Appendix C

Title: Grants that impact College and/or University curriculum

Senate Committee: Academic Affairs Committee

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 5/6/2025

Sponsor: Sarah Buck

Co-Sponsor: Leslie Baker-Kimmons

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

The purpose of this recommendation is to address the concern of grant proposals that include curricular changes that affect students across the university, specifically for General Education requirements.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

All grants that will propose a General Education change must seek prior approval from the Gen Ed Committee before grant submission. Successful grants with course creation or changes will still require the full, standard curriculum approval processes.

Appendix C

Title: Standardized Faculty Evaluation Forms

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 9/2/2025

Sponsor: Jubilee Dickson

Co-Sponsor:

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

The Director of the Center for Teaching and Research Excellence presented the three different sets of questions that are used for evaluations of faculty which differ significantly. The three sets are in-person, synchronous, asynchronous, and pharmacy. This creates difficulties in assessing faculty teaching.

Only one question is similar between the in-person and asynchronous

Link to questions: [Faculty Survey Redesign.docx](#)

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

The Summer Committee recommends a single standardized evaluation for all modalities (asynchronous, synchronous, and in-person) and set an internal deadline of October 15, 2025 for finalizing proposed survey language.

Appendix D

Evaluation of the Faculty Senate President

Table1. Legend of corresponding values to the agreeableness of statements

Legend	1	2	3	4
Value	1	2	3	4
Response	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree

Table 2. Faculty Senate President Evaluations by Groups AB (N = 12)

Item	The CSU Faculty Senate President is accessible and responsive to concerns and feedback.	The CSU Faculty Senate President models respect for diverse viewpoints .	Senate meetings are well-organized under the President's leadership.	The CSU Faculty Senate President encourage s inclusive participation among Senate members.	The CSU Faculty Senate President fosters collaboration between CSU faculty and administrati on.	The CSU Faculty Senate President effectively represents the interests and concerns of faculty to university leadership.	Average
Average	2.86	2.64	2.71	2.64	2.57	2.50	2.65
Rating	71.43%	66.07%	67.86%	66.07%	64.29%	62.50%	66.37%

Table 3. Faculty Senate President Evaluations by Group ($N = 5$)

Item	The CSU Faculty Senate President is accessible and responsive to concerns and feedback.	The CSU Faculty Senate President models respect for diverse viewpoints	The CSU Faculty Senate President actively facilitates communication between the faculty and the CSU administration.	Average
Average	3.00	2.80	2.60	2.80
Rating	75.00%	70.00%	65.00%	70.00%

Please note small sample sizes

Appendix E

Title: Standardized Faculty Evaluation Forms

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 9/2/2025

Sponsor: Jubilee Dickson

Co-Sponsor:

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

The Director of the Center for Teaching and Research Excellence presented the three different sets of questions that are used for evaluations of faculty which differ significantly. The three sets are in-person, synchronous, asynchronous, and pharmacy. This creates difficulties in assessing faculty teaching.

Only one question is similar between the in-person and asynchronous

Link to questions: [Faculty Survey Redesign.docx](#)

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

The Summer Committee recommends a single standardized evaluation for all modalities (asynchronous, synchronous, and in-person) and set an internal deadline of October 15, 2025 for finalizing proposed survey language.

Document provided by Dr. Brandle Blakely with collaboration by Dr. William Jason Raynovich with the unified questions at the bottom of the appendix.

Link to document: [CourseEval New Items -10-6.docx](#)

Source: Arreola RA. *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System: A Guide to Designing, Building, and Operating Large-Scale Faculty Evaluation Systems*. 3rd ed. Anker Pub. Co; 2007.

Course-Evaluation Redesign

Questions kept to the course itself and course management and delivery with self reflection of students at the end.

For course and instructor purposes, the mean can be calculated only for the first three categories: Instructional Design, Instructional Delivery, Instructional Assessment and Course Management.

Per research, it's a good idea to include a few negative items that measure in the same dimension or category as other positively stated items to provide a check on whether student have fallen into a response set, but of course this is optional. These will weigh on the reverse scale in the system to accurately show

Scale: 5 point scale: SA= Strongly Agree, A=Agree N= Neither Agree nor Disagree, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree, NA= Not applicable

Proposed 27 Question Evaluation Items:

Instructional Design

1. The class demonstrations were effective in helping me learn.
2. The course was well organized.
3. The course assignments were clearly specified.
4. The course objectives were clear.
5. The assignments were challenging.
6. The amount of material covered in the course was reasonable.
7. The assignments were of definite instructional value.
8. Regular class attendance/participation was necessary for understanding course material.

Instructional Delivery

9. The instructor's use of examples helped to get points across in the class.
10. The instructor was enthusiastic about the course material.
11. The instructor clarified complex sections of the course.
12. The instructor encouraged independent thought.
13. The instructor adequately prepared me for exams.
14. The instructor was concerned with whether or not the students learned the material.
15. The instructor recognized individual differences in students' abilities.
16. The instructor treated students with respect.

Instructional Assessment

17. The instructor's methods of evaluating me were fair.
18. The instructor's evaluation of students performances was constructive.

19. The instructor returns assignments quickly enough to benefit me.
20. The instructor informed students of their progress.
21. Course objectives were reflected in the exams.
22. The exams were returned promptly.
23. The procedure for grading was fair.

Course Management

24. The instructor provided discussion material that supplemented lecture content.
25. The instructor is available during office hours.
26. The office hours were scheduled at times that were convenient for me to attend.
27. Assistance from the instructor outside of class was readily available.

Appendix F

Wi-Fi Survey Results - [Faculty Senate: Wi-Fi survey \(Responses\)](#)

Appendix G

Faculty Needs Results - [Faculty Senate: UNIT A Faculty Survey - 09/2025 \(Responses\)](#)

Summary provided by Executive Committee:

Unit A Faculty Survey – Summary

Unit A faculty were asked to identify 3 specific needs as faculty. There was a total of 34 responses from faculty listing specific needs. The survey was divided into needs #1, needs #2, and needs #3. 33 respondents listed needs under #1; 32 respondents listed needs under #2; 29 respondents listed needs under #3; and 9 respondents listed additional comments.

Out of the 34 responses there were 4 common themes: financial support for professional development; faculty/academic support; communications; facilities.

Most unit A responses (24) listed the need of financial support for research. The remaining responses included needs of faculty/academic support; improvements in communications across CSU; and an overall need in improvement in classrooms, bathrooms, and technology.

Draft analysis: [Unit A Survey.xlsx](#)

Appendix H

Faculty Senate President's Report – October 7, 2025 College of Education Survey

The Executive Committee conducted a survey of faculty and staff in the College of Education following our September 16, 2025 Special Session with President Scott. The survey was open from September 22–29, 2025, and responses were collected anonymously.

The Executive Committee met on September 30, 2025 to read and review the results. Because of the seriousness of the responses, we agreed they should be shared with both the Union and University Legal Counsel. After the Executive Committee meeting, I contacted Dr. Dickson, President of UPI Local 4100, to make her aware of the concerns emanating from the survey. On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I then emailed Mr. Jason Carter, Legal Counsel, on Wednesday, October 1, 2025, asking the Legal Counsel to respond to the concerns raised.

While the Executive Committee welcomes and encourages questions and comments regarding the process and/or results of the survey, we will not share the full results with Senators nor other faculty, given the serious nature of the responses. Portions of the submissions have been redacted when sent to the Administration to retain anonymity as best as possible while delivering the content.

As stated in Article I, Section 1, Point 13 of the Faculty Senate Constitution, the Senate is charged to “participate in discussion and make recommendations on any subject which affects the welfare of the University.” The Executive Committee believes that the issues raised by this survey fall squarely within the responsibilities of the Faculty Senate.

Appendix G

Title: Faculty Evaluation of the President of Chicago State University

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 9/2/2025

Sponsor: Summer Committee

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

As President Scott's contract approaches renewal, the Faculty Senate has a responsibility to the welfare of the University. It is incumbent upon the Senate to convey the faculty's perception of the leadership of the institution, including the President of the University.

Many universities conduct faculty assessments of upper administration as part of shared governance. Examples of institutions with established 360 evaluations of their university presidents include the University of Kentucky, Michigan Tech, University of North Texas, University of Iowa, and the University of Michigan. At the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, a review of the Chancellor in 2022 included faculty input, though no formal evaluation was conducted. Faculty at other universities, including Northern Illinois University, have expressed interest in participating in presidential evaluations, while Western Illinois University maintains a structured, faculty-involved process.

Chicago State University, like all universities committed to excellence, should lead by example and establish robust processes to improve institutional leadership. Faculty wish for CSU to operate at its highest potential.

In accordance with the Core Governance Principles of the AAUP:

“Institutions should develop procedures for periodic review of the performance of presidents and other academic administrators. The purpose of such periodic reviews should be the improvement of the performance of the administrator during his or her term of office. This review should be conducted on behalf of the governing board for the president, or on behalf of the appointing administrator for other academic administrators. Fellow administrators, faculty, students, and others should participate in the review according to their legitimate interest in the result, with faculty of the unit accorded the primary voice in the case of academic administrators. The governing board or appointing administrator should publish a summary of the review, including a statement of actions taken as a result of the review.”

The faculty of CSU have not previously had the opportunity to formally evaluate the President. The Faculty Senate has a responsibility to lead this effort and provide the Board of Trustees with a faculty-informed evaluation.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

The Faculty Senate directs the Executive Committee to create an ad hoc committee to disseminate an evaluation of President of the University. The evaluation shall be completed by November 30, 2025 and delivered to the Board of Trustees by the President of the Faculty Senate no later than December 1, 2025.

Appendix G

Title: Syllabus Statement on Accommodations for School Related Absences

Senate Committee: Board of Athletic Directors

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 5/6/2025

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

We need standard guidelines regarding make-up assignments for when students have absences due to university related activities. This includes student-athletes or any other student who must miss class due to university activities. Both faculty members and students need to have the same expectations for what can be made up and how that should be done.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

Motion to ask Faculty Senate summer committee to work on a syllabus statement for students needing accommodations for missed classes and assignments for university related activities (e.g. marching band, athletics, etc).

Appendix H

Appendix I

Title: 360 Evaluation of the CSU Faculty Senate President and Senate

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 5/6/2025

Sponsor: Sarah Austin

Co-Sponsor: Charlene Snelling

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 who supervise them is central to the process of promoting these values. Therefore, we wish to implement a 360 evaluation process within the Faculty Senate with the dual intentions of a) promoting excellence within the faculty senate and b) to provide a model to the CSU administration of best practices in evaluation of university personnel.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

Action Item Part 1:

The Parliamentarian of the CSU Faculty Senate shall conduct a 360 evaluation of the Faculty Senate President by the end of the Spring 2025 semester. This survey will be made up of surveys of 3 distinct groups. The responses would be anonymous.

These three constituent groups would be as follows:

Group A - Members of the CSU Faculty Senate Executive Committee and chairs of subcommittees of the Faculty Senate

Group B - Members of the CSU Faculty Senate who are not included in group A

Group C - The University President, the Provost, all Vice Presidents, and Deans as members of the administration with whom the Senate President has direct interactions

This evaluation would ask the following questions, followed by a 4-point Likert scale style response format with an additional option for "Not Applicable." In addition, a comments section shall appear at the end of the survey:

Questions for Group A & B

1. The CSU Faculty Senate President is accessible and responsive to concerns and feedback.
2. The CSU Faculty Senate President models respect for diverse viewpoints.

3. Senate meetings are well-organized under the President's leadership.
4. The CSU Faculty Senate President encourages inclusive participation among Senate members.
5. The CSU Faculty Senate President fosters collaboration between CSU faculty and administration.
6. The CSU Faculty Senate President effectively represents the interests and concerns of faculty to university leadership.

Questions for Group C

1. The CSU Faculty Senate President is accessible and responsive to concerns and feedback.
2. The CSU Faculty Senate President models respect for diverse viewpoints.
3. The CSU Faculty Senate President actively facilitates communication between the faculty and the CSU administration.

Distribution of the results of this survey:

The parliamentarian shall release the results of this survey to:

The Faculty Senate President

The Provost

Further distribution of the results would be provided at the discretion of the Faculty Senate President

Action Item Part II

The Parliamentarian of the Faculty Senate will conduct an anonymous survey of the Faculty Senate that is open to all faculty members who are not senators by the end of the Fall 2025 semester. This survey shall be written by the Senate president and executive board. This survey shall include between 3 - 5 questions.

These questions may include

1. I am aware of how I can observe faculty senate meetings (yes/no).
2. I receive sufficient information about the business of the faculty senate.
3. The faculty senate effectively promotes communication and problem solving between the CSU faculty and administration.).

Appendix J

Title: Faculty Evaluation of Administrators

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 9/2/2025

Sponsor: Summer Committee

Proposed Action

Context/Rationale

Depending on the straw poll,

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

The Summer Committee recommends the Faculty Senate creates an ad hoc committee at the September 2025 session to create an evaluation survey of Chairs, Deans, and the Provost which will be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval at the October 2025 Faculty Senate Session. The results of the survey will be presented to the President of the University concluded by the end of Fall semester.