

Chicago State University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, November 4, 2025, 12:30 p.m.
[Nov 2025 - Zoom Link](#)

Present: William Jason Raynovich (President), Leslie Baker-Kimmons (Vice President), Sarah Buck (Recording Secretary), Yashika Watkins (Corresponding Secretary), Anser Azim, Carlette Bailey, Brandle Blakely, Eddie Gaytan, John Smith, Liefu Jiang, Soo Kang, Bernard Rowan, Nadeem Fazal, Elaina Khasawneh, Austin Harton, Brent In, Tatjana Petrova, Michael Wannah, Jennifer Doucet, Jubilee Dickson, Ehab Yamani, Tekleab Gala, Karen Witherspoon, Olanipekun Laosebikan, Gayle Porter, Saleem Abuleil, Gabriel Gomez

- A. Call to order 12:31
- B. Agenda
 - a. Approval of Agenda
 - b. Rules of the Day (**Appendix A**)
 - i. Watkins moved to approve agenda and rules, Azim seconded > approved by unanimous consent
- C. Elections results
 - a. Parliamentarian (Prof. John Smith)
 - b. Rules and Operations Committee (Dr. Natalie Szabo)
- D. Approval of Minutes ([October 2025](#)) (Recording Sec.)
 - a. Watkins moved to approve the minutes, Wannah seconded > approved unanimously
- E. Senator Comments/Speeches
 - a. None
- F. Provost Report (Provost) (Rowan)
 - a. Proposal from Senators for flexibility around instructor absences (modality change)- not ready to report, although a draft is under consideration
 - b. 360 Evaluations- Provost office doing research. Three firms are being considered to run the evaluations: Echospans, AASCU, HigherEd360
 - c. More information to be shared at a future meeting
 - d. All Senators (and departments) should encourage students to register
 - e. 12% increase in enrollment this semester, plus increase in retention
 - f. Cougar Completion- Provost concerned that current graduation rate is 16% (first time full time Freshmen are those who are counted in this percentage). A small subcommittee will be convened to create a plan to raise this rate, especially in those over 120 CH. Ask is for the Senate to propose to the Provost a member of this subcommittee. Note that this project has been undertaken previously during President Pogue's tenure. First meeting to occur

this week or early next week. Rowan will send an email to Raynovich with further details about the meetings.

G. Old Business

- a. Grants proposing Gen Ed requirements (**Appendix B**)
- b. 360 Evaluations update
 - i. This was part of the Provost report

H. Standing Committee Reports`

- a. Executive Committee
 - i. Make sure any action items are sent prior to the Tuesday before the regularly scheduled Senate meeting

I. New Business

- a. Standardization of Student Evaluation Forms
 - i. Introduction and history (**Appendix C**)
 1. Dr. Dickson response (**Appendix D**)
 2. Dr. Kang response (**Appendix E**)
 3. Dr. Harton Response (**Appendix F**)
 - ii. Small Group Breakout Discussions
 1. Each Executive Committee member led a small group discussion
 - iii. Summary
 1. Each group leader shared out a summary of their discussion
 - iv. Actions
 1. Watkins moved to have new student evaluations in place for fall 2026, Khasawneh seconded > motion approved 16 yes, 5 no, 1 abstention
 2. Kang moved to form a committee with representatives from different colleges to work with Blakely on the redesign, Gomez seconded > motion carried 17 yes, 5 no
 3. Buck moved to have three questions from each main group to yield 12 questions total on student evaluations, Gomez seconded > motion carried 21 yes, 9 no
 4. Kimmons moved to share changes with their department colleagues in student evaluations based on changes and suggestions from today's Faculty Senate meeting, Watkins seconded > Dickson spoke in opposition as the faculty have already been polled > motion approved 12 yes, 9 no, 1 abstention
- b. Request a University Calendar for all Upcoming Changes and Updates (**Appendix G**)
 - i. Gomez seconded the action > Dickson rose in support of the action item > motion carried by unanimous consent

J. Adjournment

- a. Gomez moved to adjourn, Watkins seconded > approved by unanimous consent at 1:57

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

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: Standardizing Faculty Evaluation Forms

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 11/4/2025

Action from September 2025:

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.

Action from October 2025:

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**

Appendix D

Dr. Blakely,

I shared the new evaluation items with my students and asked them to identify the questions that they thought were the most important for a course evaluation and I got 22 responses. I know that's a small number, but I think it's maybe more helpful to hear from students than from faculty. I attached the spreadsheet with all the data, and also a summary here.

The average number of items selected by the students was 12. So I think we should keep the evaluation items to that number or fewer. They have to complete this for all of their classes, so that ends of being a lot of questions! I highlighted the items that 50% or more of the students identified as the most important ones, and there are 11 of those.

I'm not sure what to do with this now, but I wanted to bring it to you first before I do anything else. And I CC'd Faculty Senate because I don't know the proper procedure for next steps. What do you want to do?

Looking forward to hearing from you!

Dr. Dickson

Possible Evaluation Items:	
Instructional Design	Percent selected
1. The class demonstrations were effective in helping me learn.	59%
2. The course was well organized.	33%
3. The course assignments were clearly specified.	33%
4. The course objectives were clear.	42%
5. The assignments were challenging.	18%
6. The amount of material covered in the course was reasonable.	45%
7. The assignments were of definite instructional value.	18%
8. Regular class attendance/participation was necessary for understanding course material.	36%
Instructional Delivery	
9. The instructor's use of examples helped to get points across in the class.	68%
10. The instructor was enthusiastic about the course material.	32%
11. The instructor clarified complex sections of the course.	59%
12. The instructor encouraged independent thought.	36%
13. The instructor adequately prepared me for exams.	55%
14. The instructor was concerned with whether or not the students learned the material.	41%
15. The instructor recognized individual differences in students' abilities.	36%
16. The instructor treated students with respect.	50%
Instructional Assessment	
17. The instructor's methods of evaluating me were fair.	34%
18. The instructor's evaluation of students' performances was constructive.	34%
19. The instructor returns assignments quickly enough to benefit me.	55%
20. The instructor informed students of their progress.	41%
21. Course objectives were reflected in the exams.	55%
22. The exams were returned promptly.	27%
23. The procedure for grading was fair.	50%
Course Management	
24. The instructor provided discussion material that supplemented lecture content.	59%
25. The instructor is available during office hours.	55%
26. The office hours were scheduled at times that were convenient for me to attend.	23%
27. Assistance from the instructor outside of class was readily available.	64%

Average number of items selected per student
12

Appendix E

Hello

Combining the two sets of evaluations is fine, but it is too long.

Below are additional comments.

Soo

From: John Smith <john.smith@csu.edu>

Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 8:36 AM

To: Soo Y Kang <skang@csu.edu>; Thomas Lucas <tlucas22@csu.edu>; Michelle Weintraub <mweintra@csu.edu>; Chad Gunderson <cgunders@csu.edu>; Michelle Collazo-Anderson <mcollazo@csu.edu>

Subject: Re: New student evaluations

Hi Soo,

Thanks for sharing this.

I think it makes sense to have one combined survey, and I also agree with you that it is too many questions.

Some of the questions seem repetitive, asking the same information about either the course or the instructor. Could those be combined?

I also recommend removing the question: "Was the format and design of the course content page easy to navigate?" because this is more about the Brightspace interface (or whatever CMS we're using) than it is about the course or instructor. Also, it doesn't apply to face to face courses that don't use online CMS as much.

—

John O. Smith

Assistant Professor, Design

Department Academic Advisor

Department of Art & Design

Design Studio : BHS 302



CHICAGO STATE UNIVERSITY

9501 S. King Drive : Chicago, IL 60628

From: Soo Y Kang <skang@csu.edu>

Sent: Saturday, October 11, 2025 15:00

To: Thomas Lucas <tlucas22@csu.edu>; Michelle Weintraub <mweintra@csu.edu>; John Smith <john.smith@csu.edu>; Chad Gunderson <cgunders@csu.edu>; Michelle Collazo-Anderson <mcollazo@csu.edu>

Subject: Fw: New student evaluations

Hello

Apparently there have been two different student evaluations—one for class and for online; CTRE wants to combine them (easier to tabulate). I told them it's good, but too long. They are seeking feedback from all faculty. Let me know what you think.

Soo

Appendix F

Below are comments on the proposed student evaluations from "Chemistry and Physics." Below that are some comments from Public Health.

Best,

Austin

Has consideration been given to tutorials, research classes, etc? -----

Have you looked at what other universities have done? Likert-scale questions are actually pretty hard to write well, so they are clear and broadly applicable.

Below are comments to individual survey questions.

Instructional Design

1. The class demonstrations were effective in helping me learn.

What are class demonstrations (lab demos? board examples?) If I don't know, students won't know.

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.

Might be an issue if we're just given an average for student evaluations and they "count" for us. I have students complain about the amount of content in gen chem all the time.... but IAI and ACS say that is the content that has to be there so my hands are kind of tied.

7. The assignments were of definite instructional value.

This seems wordy. Do they mean "The assignments were useful for my learning."

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.

What is meant by "examples"? How does this fit with active learning activities or courses like lab?

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.

Lots of classes don't have exams (ex. mastery quizzes, performance based classes in CMAT, essay based classes in English, etc)

14. The instructor was concerned with whether or not the students learned the material.
The instructor recognized individual differences in students' abilities.

What does this look like and how would a student know?

15. The instructor treated students with respect.

Instructional Assessment

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

Probably need to define performance and constructive.

18. The instructor returns assignments quickly enough to benefit me.
19. The instructor informed students of their progress.

What does this mean? Grades should be in Brightspace.

20. Course objectives were reflected in the exams.

Exam issue again.

21. The exams were returned promptly.

Exam issue again.

22. The procedure for grading was fair.

How is this different than 17?

Course Management

23. The instructor provided discussion material that supplemented lecture content.

What does this mean? I mostly use small group learning activities. Lectures supplement group work. We discuss the activities but students wouldn't think of them as "discussion material." This is also confusing for online classes. Or labs.

24. The instructor is available during office hours.

25. The office hours were scheduled at times that were convenient for me to attend.

This isn't a useful question unless it is open ended. There isn't a way to schedule office hours that fit all your students schedules.

26. Assistance from the instructor outside of class was readily available.

From Public Health:

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.

George Smith
Provide examples of class demonstrations.

George Smith
Suggested revision: The course was well organized, and the course syllabus was understandable and easy to follow.

George Smith
What is the difference between statement #7 and statement #5?

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.

George Smith
Maybe use: The instructor encouraged critical thinking

George Smith
What is this statement asking or trying to access?

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.

George Smith
These two statements can be combined.

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.

George Smith
This question is very similar to question #19.

George Smith
This statement can be combined with statement #13.

George Smith
This statement is very similar to statement #17.

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.

George Smith
The statement may need to be detailed further. What are the discussion materials? Are these articles, videos, etc.?

Appendix G

Title: Request a University Calendar for all Upcoming Changes and Updates

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 11/4/2025

Sponsor: Soo Kang

Co-Sponsor: ?

Context/Rationale

Each department operates on its own schedule, hence multiple changes and upgrades that directly affect CSU community have occurred simultaneously, disrupting daily operation, particularly class instruction. A coordination of all departments from IT, CTRE, Physical Facilities and other parties that implement changes will reduce too many overlaps and can lead to a more conducive schedule that the community members can manage and prepare for, if the changes are communicated early.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

Request Administration to create a University Calendar of changes and updates that directly impact campus operation and require action from the campus community. All relevant departments must submit their planned dates for changes to the Calendar, avoiding the dates that are already taken and considering class instruction in session.