

Chicago State University Faculty Senate
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, December 2, 2025, 12:30 p.m.
[Dec 2025 - Zoom Link](#)

Present: William Jason Raynovich (President), Leslie Baker-Kimmons (Vice President), Sarah Buck (Recording Secretary), Yashika Watkins (Corresponding Secretary), Eddie Gaytan, John Smith, Elaina Khasawneh, Anser Azim, Jubilee Dickson, Jennifer Doucet, Carlette Bailey, Gabriel Gomez, Austin Harton, Liefu Jiang, Ehab Yamani, Tatjana Petrova, Soo Kang, Michael Wannah, Charlene Snelling, Olanipekun Laosebikan, Sonja Feist-Price, Brent In

- A. Call to order 12:33
- B. Agenda
 - a. Approval of Agenda
 - b. Rules of the Day (**Appendix A**)
 - c. Watkins moved to approve agenda and rules, Gomez seconded > approved by unanimous consent
- C. Approval of Minutes ([November 2025](#)) (Recording Sec.)
 - a. Watkins moved to approve, Khasawneh seconded > motion carried with 16 yes and 1 abstention
- D. Senator Comments/Speeches
 - a. None
- E. Provost Report (Provost)
 - a. Focus on getting students to register for spring. More students are pre-registering (36% higher than this time last year). Number of credit hours students have registered for has increased from last year. Identify what struggles students are having in order to find solutions
 - b. 6 year graduation rate currently is 16%. New Cougar Completion Campaign looks at students with 105 credit hours or more and working with them intentionally to support their matriculation and graduation
 - c. Each unit being analyzed at ways student success being impacted to explore if there are untapped opportunities to help (e.g., high DFW rates in certain courses)
 - d. Rowan will present information on data he has gathered regarding 360 evaluations companies at next Senate meeting
- F. Old Business
 - a. Grants proposing Gen Ed requirements (**Appendix B**)
 - i. Statement was sent to Raynovich
 - b. 360 Evaluations update (Senators Watkins/Austin)
 - i. Provost Office taking the lead. Researching 3 firms to carry out evaluations, but there has not yet been an update

- c. Request a University Calendar for all Upcoming Changes and Updates **(Appendix C)**
 - i. Raynovich spoke to President Scott and provided examples from other institutions of calendars that include events happening on campus
- G. Standing Committee Reports`
 - a. Executive Committee
 - i. Standardization of Student Evaluation Forms **(Appendix D)**
 - 1. Actions
 - a. Email sent on Tue, Nov. 11, 2025 to provide recommendations of faculty willing to be on committee. No responses.
 - b. Ad hoc Committee formation guidance
 - i. Petrova suggested that each Senator serve on a committee and an ad-hoc committee. By rules (bylaws), each Senator shall serve on a committee.
 - ii. Petrova, Bailey, Watkins, Snelling, Khasawneh agreed to join committee (3 are needed for an ad-hoc committee).
 - iii. Smith suggested an email to Deans requesting representation on committee or to give this as a charge to one of the standing committees (except Senate voted to have an ad-hoc committee)
 - 2. Next steps
 - a. Raynovich will email the charge to the ad-hoc committee
 - ii. Other Announcements
 - 1. Parking Lots
 - a. Snow removal poor. Parking representative was invited to meeting
 - 2. Moodle Imports before end of 2025
 - a. Upload Moodle shells into Brightspace by December 31, 2025, for spring semester. CTRE staff will not be working over the break
 - 3. Elections (Brightspace)
 - a. 2 positions up for elections on Brightspace: Honorary Degree Committee (one semester appointment) and Strategic Planning Steering Committee co-Chair. Nominations close 12/5/25, ballot open through finals week
 - 4. Medical Insurance

- a. Some faculty have not been paying enough into medical insurance. University now working to recoup the money. Relates to summer school being off contract
 - b. It is not clear how large the scope of the problem is, but the concern is it is large
 - 5. Google Drive transition to Sharepoint
 - a. Faculty Senate Google Drive no longer exists. Raynovich temporarily lost access to Senate email
 - b. New permissions are being granted for the FS Sharepoint
 - c. New action item submission form
 - 6. Chats with President Scott
 - a. 5 faculty were present at the last chat. President Scott wants a strong focus on what is needed at a PBI, wants critical thinking skills and practical life skills, “strong faculty” (promote what we do)
 - b. It was suggested to have these type of sessions with the Provost, as well
- b. Shared Governance Committee
 - i. Report
 - 1. Met in October to create a form to support shared governance. This form is designed to express concerns around shared governance
 - ii. CSU Faculty Senate Shared Governance Submission Form (**Appendix E**)
 - 1. Snelling suggested making the phrasing positive (remove “lack of”).
 - 2. Form is anonymous. Form currently states submitter name and email address will be shown. Watkins will correct this
 - 3. Committee will be the ones to see the information
 - 4. Raynovich suggested a line for name/email as optional
 - 5. Motion carried with 16 yes, 1 abstention
- H. New Business
 - a. Faculty Senate Representation Option (**Appendix F**)
 - i. Motion carried with 15 yes, 1 no, 1 abstention
 - b. Strengthening Financial and Administrative Support for Faculty Research and Dissemination (**Appendix G**)
 - i. Motion carried with 12 yes, 1 no
- I. Open business
 - a. Christmas tree lighting tonight with CSU choir

- J. Adjournment- Gomez moved to adjourn, Watkins seconded > approved by unanimous consent 1:49

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: 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.

Appendix D

Title: Standardizing Faculty Evaluation Forms

Actions from 11/4/2025 that were passed:

Watkins moved to have new student evaluations in place for fall 2026, Khasawneh seconded > motion approved 16 yes, 5 no, 1 abstention

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

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

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**

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

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

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

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 that 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:

Appendix E

Title: CSU Faculty Senate Shared Governance Submission Form

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 12/2/2025

Committee/Sponsor: Shared Governance Committee

Co-Sponsor: N/A

Context/Rationale

Senators need a form to submit areas of concern for lack of shared governance. A prompt of potential lack of shared governance topics will accompany the survey. Link for form:

<https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=ZRDrlL14YUeRYo7jUhWvv7OJ8KoySP5BsGgh8VYYB0pUNIIEN08wNzg0WVNHOUMQUdYNTdFV0UxRy4u>

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

The CSU Faculty Senate Shared Governance Committee proposes an anonymous form for Faculty to submit areas of concern for lack of shared governance.

Appendix F

Title: Faculty Senate Representation Option

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 12/2/2025

Committee/Sponsor: Dr. Elaina Khasawneh

Co-Sponsor: Dr. Gabriel Gomez

Context/Rationale

Issues brought to the administration often involve important context and nuanced details that are best conveyed by the Senator who raised them. Allowing the initiating Senator to be present helps ensure that the matter is represented accurately, fully, and in the spirit in which it was brought forward, minimizing the risk of misinterpretation. This approach also reinforces the Senate's commitment to transparency, shared responsibility, and effective advocacy. It recognizes the active role of Senators as representatives of faculty interests and strengthens the Senate's collective voice in administrative conversations. Granting this option is not only reasonable but also aligns with principles of shared governance and mutual respect between faculty and administration.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

Appendix G

Title: Strengthening Financial and Administrative Support for Faculty Research and Dissemination

Senate Meeting Date for Consideration: 12/2/2025

Committee/Sponsor: Dr. Elaina Khasawneh

Co-Sponsor: Dr. Gabriel Gomez

Context/Rationale

The University's allocation of three research CUEs is an important step toward supporting faculty scholarship. However, time alone is not sufficient to meet the expectations outlined in many DACs. Faculty are required to engage in activities such as presenting at national or international conferences, publishing in peer-reviewed journals (often with significant open-access or indexing fees), and securing external grants. Current financial support, such as the \$1,000 provided through CTRE, rarely covers even

a single conference or publication, leaving many faculty to shoulder substantial costs personally.

Requiring faculty to pay these expenses up front and wait for reimbursement places an additional and often inequitable financial burden on faculty. Not all faculty have the means to cover large expenses in advance, and the reimbursement process is unnecessarily lengthy, sometimes taking months to complete. This creates barriers that disproportionately affect those with fewer financial resources and can delay or jeopardize important scholarly activities.

Additionally, rigid internal deadlines, such as those governing vendor registration, further complicate the timely payment of legitimate academic expenses. Without case-by-case exceptions, time-sensitive research activities can be disrupted, contradicting the University's stated commitment to supporting faculty scholarship.

By ensuring that financial support meets at least the minimum DAC requirements, streamlining administrative processes, and directly covering eligible expenses whenever possible, the University can create a fairer, more efficient, and more supportive environment for faculty scholarship and professional advancement.

Exact Language of the Proposed Action

The Faculty Senate respectfully requests that the University provide guaranteed financial support that, at minimum, covers the scholarly activities required by each department's Departmental Application Criteria (DAC). Furthermore, we recommend that the University establish mechanisms to pay eligible research-related expenses directly, rather than requiring faculty to pay out of pocket and seek reimbursement. In addition, we urge the adoption of more flexible administrative procedures, including exception policies for time-sensitive expenses such as vendor registration and publication fees, to ensure that internal processes effectively support faculty research productivity.