

9-6-2016

9-6-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "9-6-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2016). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 13.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/13>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Faculty Senate Minutes
September 6, 2016
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Lisa Abbott, Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Mete Akcaoglu, Rocio Alba-Flores, Moya Alfonso, Dragos Amarie, Dustin Anderson, Kelly Berry, (Elizabeth Butterfield for Sarah Bielski), Ted Brimeyer, Gavin Colquitt, Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, David Dudley, Mark Edwards, Larisa Elisha, Richard Flynn, Alice Hall, Eric Hall, Ellen Hamilton, Ming Fang He, Jonathan Hilpert, Yi Hu, Bob Jackson, (Karelle Aiken for Scott Kersey), Mujibur Khan, Barbara King, Hsiang-Jui Kung, Eric Landers, Alisa Leckie, Lili Li, Jim LoBue, (Lisa Denmark for Lawrence Locker), Alan Mackelprang, Ron MacKinnon, Leticia McGrath, Ed Mondor, Lowell Mooney, Eudia Ochieng, Rob Pirro, Peter Rogers, Fred Smith, Chasen Smith, (Matthew Flynn and Jennifer Kowalewski (2nd hour) for Janice Steirn), Sam Todd, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi, Meca Williams-Johnson

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman

Voting Members Not in Attendance; Sam Adeyeye, Adam Bossler, Tim Giles, Alina Iacob, Li Ma, Santanu Majumdar, Constantin Ogloblin, Jake Simons, Valentin Soloiu, James Stephens, Linda L.Thompson, Shijun Zheng

Administrators in Attendance: Jaimie Hebert, Jean Bartels, Diana Cone, Don McLemore, Rob Whitaker, Martha Abell, Greg Evans, Barry Joyner, Thomas Koballa, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker

Visitors: Richard Cleveland, Eunbae Lee, Hans-Jorge Schanz, Candace Griffith, Olga Amarie, Charles H. Wilson, D. Jason Slone, Delena Bell Gatch, Beth Durodoye, Christine Ludowise

Secretary's Note: Beginning after Provost Bartels' report, occasional problems with the recording crop up due to incorrect operation of the microphones by some Senators and Others. At times, speakers cannot be heard or cannot be clearly heard.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the September 6, 2016 meeting.

Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the June 7, 2016 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

Cyr noted minor typos on pages 2, 3, and 6, and on page 3 an unrevised section that was posted along with the revision of that section. With the typos corrected and that unrevised section omitted, he moved for approval. The minutes were Approved.

3. Librarian's Report for September, 2016, Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian. (Marc Cyr [CLASS], Senate Secretary, reported for Mark Welford [COSM], Senate Librarian)

Cyr noted that he had questions, which he had emailed to the Senate list prior to the meeting, about the Academic Standards Committee report. He said that the numbers regarding total appeals and approved appeals did not add up: In the June 17th meeting, it was reported that there were 14 appeals denied by the committee, 3 appeals approved, but this was reported as adding up to 16. For May 16th, 9 were denied, 6 were approved, for a reported total of 13. Then on May 12th, 58 were automatically approved, 17 denied, and 7 approved, for a reported total of 79.

Mark Edwards (COSM) noted a technical definition of total appeals below each table, thought that might account for Cyr's arithmetical difficulties, but said he couldn't figure it out either.

There being no one from the committee present to address the issues, Cyr moved that the Librarian's report be approved with the exception of the Academic Standards Committee report, which would be sent back for clarification. The motion was Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report – None. Committee first meets September 13

Graduate Committee Report – None. Committee first meets September 8

General Education and Core Curriculum Committee, Michelle Cawthorn (COSM), Chair: Nothing new to report.

4. President's Report (Jaimie Hebert):

President Hebert had no formal report since he is still in the listen and learn part of his tenure. He noted his oft-repeated statement that a major part of the honor of being President of GSU is the honor of working with our faculty, and that he always considers himself to be, first, a member of the faculty, and always keeps in mind that academics is

our first mission. He called himself “a fervent believer in self-governance, and faculty governance.” He said our senate operates differently than those of his previous institutions, where administrators were not active participants in faculty senate, but he was delighted to be a participant here, seeing this “as a joint venture, working with my colleagues to ensure that we provide the higher educational experience that we promise to our students when they come here.” He urged everyone to participate in the survey he sent out some time ago so that “as we move forward in a collected visioning process we have that data to base the early stages of our visioning process on.” He opened himself up for questions, but there were none.

5. Provost’s Report: (Jean Bartels)

Provost Bartels noted that the microphones could be, conveniently, locked “on.”

[Secretary’s Note: Thus, in innocence, was the seed sown from which the whirlwind of our recording problems would be reaped.]

Relocation of the Provost’s Office

Due to renovations underway to the Provost’s office suite, the Provost’s Office is now temporarily in Pittman 1002, with most of the Academic Affairs staff located on the first floor of Veazey. Renovations should be complete by January.

College of Graduate Studies

COGS is reorganizing. Several staff members have departed, and we are working to make COGS “a very service-driven, service-oriented entity for our Graduate Program,” gathering information from Graduate Committee members and program directors in particular. She welcomed any feedback that people have in terms of what COGS does that is indispensable, and what slows down processes. Diana Cone is serving as the Interim Director. All of the current functions of COGS are intact. They are doing serious thinking about how we use the College of Graduate Studies as a recruitment vehicle, with some studies showing current practices are not as effective as they could be.

Unsatisfactory Teaching Evaluation for Late Grades

Provost Bartels responded to an RFI on this subject of late grade submissions by faculty. Her office has noticed over the last couple of semesters in particular a substantial increase in the number of faculty who have not recorded their final grades by the time that they are required to by virtue of our timelines. She stressed the importance of doing so because it affects financial aid for students and the workings of our Registrar’s Office. Too often this failure was on the part of faculty whose reasons were along the lines of having “plans to be gone or they just didn’t kind of get to it yet, but they would be fine,

they would get to it sometime in the next week.” She therefore had asked the deans to examine their own areas and identify people who did this habitually. Different deans responded to this request in different ways, but there was no new policy established by the Provost. However, she reiterated that “it really is a critical responsibility for faculty and anyone teaching a course to make sure that they do the end part of that, which is recording their grades in a timely manner as requested.” She further noted that some faculty have perceived that they can just call the Registrar, say they’ll be late, and everything is okay, but the Registrar’s office is not in a position to make that decision, so she is moving to change the wording on our paperwork to reflect that reality.

Open Textbooks and Online Resources

She alerted us that the University System of Georgia has an ongoing request for faculty to use open textbooks and online resources that would help to defray book costs for students. There was to be, on September 9th, a webinar called [Affordable Learning Georgia](#) and USG is working with GALILEO to make educational resources more affordable. She urged faculty to think seriously about whether there are resources in that very large, free repository that could substitute very easily for a textbook.

StudySoup

StudySoup is a group that hires students to become detailed note takers in particular classes, collecting materials that faculty may have produced, along with all the faculty member’s notes and lecture materials, and then they sell that back to students so they don’t have to work quite so hard. This is an infringement of any faculty member’s materials, and also a violation of our solicitation rules. She asked faculty to report “unusual behavior” so the university can take action to block this activity. We currently have a cease and desist order against this outfit.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) said one of her Nursing students received an email and was approached by StudySoup.

Retirement

Provost Bartels will retire effective 6/30. She said her time at GSU “has been a wonderful ride” and she has loved being with the Senate “most of the time. There’s been a moment or two where it was a little more challenging, but not as a rule.” She emphasized how important faculty have been to her, and thanked all faculty.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked if Provost Bartels had data on the percentage of faculty submitting grades late, and on the increase in such submissions.

Provost Bartels did not. It was her perception that the list of names took up progressively more space on the sheets of paper in reports. She could get the data, though, if Pirro “were really interested in that.”

Pirro asked if he was correct that 48 hours is the required time for reporting. Provost Bartels thought the deadline was usually “by the Sunday by midnight or some time like that.”

Pirro found it “implausible that faculty are saying well, maybe next week I’ll get it done, or is that really the case?”

Provost Bartels said, “That is really, actually the case,” but noted that sometimes late grades are the result of uncontrollable circumstances, such as online malfunctions, and the school makes provisions for such cases. Also, new and adjunct faculty might not be familiar with the deadlines, but the increase is mostly among “more general faculty who we thought probably knew the expectation a little better.”

Pirro then asked about the Open-Source online resources, wondering if besides advantages, thought had been given to the disadvantages, such as students not graduating with a personal library to mark their own education and encourage reading in their children, and not having the joys of holding and smelling books. He asked if this online resource is only envisioned for the very expensive textbooks, or all books.

Provost Bartels said it’s not designed to be mandatory for anybody, but the repository is quite extensive, with everything from core materials that could substitute for textbooks students are unlikely to keep anyway, up to “more extensive texts.” She added that, like Pirro, she likes “to read a book and hold it in my hands and smell it and touch it. I suspect if I had surveyed most of our population of students that it is never an experience they have at this point had, nor ever wanted in their life because they are on their device, and I think we’re unfortunately . . . seeing a shift, you know, in what students, how students take in information.” But she noted the critical issue is cost, and that many students don’t buy assigned texts because they can’t afford them, and sometimes such costs lead to students leaving school. She also noted that materials in many expensive textbooks become quickly outdated so that it is useless and, in some cases such as her own field of Nursing, actually dangerous.

Pirro next asked if there was a timeline for the new Provost search. President Hebert said they will be putting that together quickly.

Mark Edwards (COSM) asked what a student sees in WINGS when grades are submitted late. Provost Bartels said they see nothing except that no grade has been put there.

Edwards recalled it used to tell the student “Professor Grade Late” and the professor then had to submit a change of grade form. Provost Bartels said a professor still has to fill out a change of grade form for each student. Edwards suggested they be required to fill it out in triplicate. Provost Bartels would go along with that only if carbon copies were also required. Seriously, she noted that the Provost’s office and the deans work to contact faculty who appear on the verge of late submission to remind them and to find out if some uncontrollable problem has arisen. Still, they frequently get frustrating responses from some faculty.

Hans Schanz (COSM) [*inaudible, but this seems to be about StudySoup*] suggested that the university draft a copyright statement to go into class syllabi. Provost Bartels would look into that, but also noted that faculty can just put the copyright sign on the bottom.

Lisa Leckie (COE) noted her personal experience with the USG Open Source initiative is that they are looking at courses such as Biology and Chemistry, which tend to be extremely expensive. If desired, material can be printed out, so it is not leaving the textbook altogether, just finding a more affordable means to provide materials for students.

[*Someone unidentifiable*] said faculty in some colleges were told late grade submissions would now earn a faculty member an automatic unsatisfactory teaching evaluation for the year. Should we understand that that’s not policy or can Deans still do that at the college level?

Provost Bartels said that is not official university policy. She noted that teaching evaluations consider many factors, and she believed “persistent failure” to turn in grades on time should result in some kind of at least comment and perhaps consequences, but should not as a sole cause result in a negative evaluation.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: (Richard Flynn [CLASS], Chair.)

There were no agenda motion requests, but three RFIs which had all been answered: One was on the new Tasers on Campus law which was answered by Maura Copeland; one about the Summer Study Abroad Salary Model, which was answered by Dr. Bartels; and the one about Unsatisfactory Teaching Evaluation for Late Grades, which was answered in writing that morning and just reported on by Dr. Bartels. He noted some elections upcoming later in the meeting.

7. Report on NCAA Sanctions: Chris Geyerman (CLASS), Faculty Athletic Representative

Geyerman discussed the case that was publicly announced on July 7, 2016. This case originated on September 16, 2013 and it concluded on July 7, 2016. It involved two separate incidents, which is one of the reasons it dragged on. Until now, he had been prohibited from discussing the matter except in vague terms by NCAA policies, specifically Bylaw 19, which prohibit individuals with knowledge of a case from talking about it publicly until the case is determined by the NCAA.

Geyerman said that in each of the two incidents involved the institution initiated the investigations, and self-reported the violations to the NCAA.

The first case happened in September 2013. A professor notified our head football coach that a student-athlete had submitted a paper on folio that had been previously submitted. The football coach notified the appropriate person in Compliance Student-Athlete Services and the Athletic Director. Georgia Southern initiated an internal investigation and found that the Assistant Director of Compliance took the class three years prior that the student-athlete was enrolled in. It was a graduate class, and the student-athlete transferred from another institution with eligibility still remaining. The employee gave the student-athlete her USB Port with the information from the class on it and said it might be helpful to him. The student-athlete turned it in as his own. The institutional staff member's employment was terminated within a matter of three or four days, and GSU wrote up and self-reported the incident to the NCAA in February of 2014. Geyerman said that, as a faculty member, his biggest concern when academic misconduct arises, is how far-reaching it is, and in this particular incident he wasn't too worried because the likelihood of a graduate transfer coming in and registering for the class that the person suggesting their course schedule has already had is pretty minimal.

Another incident emerged in Fall 2014: The Assistant Director of Student Services wrote and submitted ten extra credit assignments for two football student-athletes. This came to the program's notice when some of the individual's colleagues notified their superior that they thought something wasn't quite right with this employee's conduct in a couple of different ways. An internal investigation started to gather evidence and the student-athletes were declared ineligible. The employee initially denied wrongdoing, but computer searches indicated that she had submitted, for example, "keycards into Cone Hall happening at 6:30 a.m." and one of the papers was submitted while the student was playing a football game. It became apparent that this employee "went to great lengths to cover her tracks." Geyerman also noted that in the first incident the employee encouraged the student-athlete to cook up a story and lie.

In both cases, then, there was clear evidence that the employees were aware of their wrongdoing, and, Geyerman noted, “that’s a positive thing when you are working with the NCAA because of the notion that there is a culture of compliance and that it’s not a systemic kind of thing over in that office.”

The professor in the second case was notified that cheating was going on in his class in the form of the Assistant Director of Student-Athlete Services submitting these papers, but that all the interviews and other evidence made them confident that the student-athletes had nothing to do with the cheating: Both had failed the course, had quit turning in work and were not showing up for exams, all of which indicate a student who has given up on the course. Meanwhile, those extra credit papers were still coming in.

Geyerman said this case was more concerning given that it was an employee submitting papers, ten of them, and that raised questions of how wide this problem might be. They hired independent counsel, a compliance group out of Kansas who specialize in this sort of thing. This group came in behind the internal investigation to conduct interviews to validate or invalidate GSU’s findings. That internal investigation included representatives from Georgia Southern from Information Technology Services, Compliance, Student-Athlete Services, the Provost’s office, Vice President for Legal Affairs, Athletic Director, FAR, Vice President for Business and Finance, and the Associate Vice President for Human Resources. 21 student-athletes were interviewed. GSU self-reported these additional violations on May 28, 2015.

At that point the NCAA bundled this incident with the first one, and it took about a year for the whole thing to be processed. On July 7, 2016, the NCAA announced their finding. On June 9, 2016, the NCAA Committee on Enforcement panel, and an institutional panel conducted a hearing via videoconference. GSU is on probation for two years; that expires July 6, 2018. We were fined \$5,000 plus \$43,000, given two scholarship reductions this year in football, and 10% recruiting restrictions this academic year, so rather than our average of 48 we will have 44 or 43. We also have 10% off-campus recruiting restrictions, so “That’s going to fall this year from 42 to 38%.”

Geyerman felt confident because all of the violations were characterized standard or mitigated level 1 by the NCAA. The most serious NCAA charge is for what is called “lack of institutional control,” and that was never on the table. There was no failure to monitor either, and that’s the second most serious penalty that the NCAA can level, and there wasn’t a failure to monitor because we caught all of this stuff before any fraudulent academic credit was ever generated.

Geyerman felt confident that there’s a culture of compliance that is in place in Student-Athlete Services in the Athletics Department. The mitigating factors for the institution

were instrumental in helping us. They were, in the NCAA's words, "prompt self-detection and self-disclosure of the violations, prompt acknowledgement of the violations, acceptance of responsibility, and the imposition of meaningful corrective measures and/or penalties, affirmative steps to expedite final resolution of the matter, and the implementation of a system of compliance methods designed to insure rules compliance and satisfaction of the institution coaches control standards." Geyerman felt very confident that the problems were not systemic in this particular investigation, and in his opinion the way that all of the personnel involved at Georgia Southern handled it was text book, exactly what a university should do when something wrong happens in the Athletics Department. Since we're on probation for two years, we do not need any more violations at all, particularly serious ones. Geyerman attended the Athletics Department staff meeting at the start of the year and the Athletics Director made it abundantly clear that everything has to be done by the book.

Geyerman then opened up for questions.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said that before Geyerman began his report, he had had

25 questions to ask

him. He still had 24. He suggested that he submit them to Geyerman in writing for a later response, and said he would send them to the Senate as well. Moderator Flynn agreed that was the best course to take.

Geyerman noted that he and Cyr used to be very, very good friends. Cyr asked, "What are friends for?"

[*Someone unidentifiable*] (COSM) asked if these students went through the Office of Student Conduct like any other student would for such academic infractions.

Geyerman said yes. In the first case, the professor reported the student, the student met with the professor, followed the conduct code, took the route, had no record, and elected to have the faculty member adjudicate the case. In the second case, the professor declined to file academic misconduct charges because the professor was also quite sure that the students had no knowledge that the papers were submitted. And that's one that it took the NCAA a little bit of a moment to understand.

8. Unfinished Business

Moderator Flynn (CLASS) noted that at the June meeting of the Faculty Senate two parts of the Graduate Committee Report were pulled from the Graduate Report for further consideration, one of which was now on the agenda as a Discussion Item.

Discussion Item: [COGS Prior Learning Assessment Policy](#)

Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Graduate Committee chair, noted that the committee had been working on this for an extended period of time and felt confident that this was ready to come before the Faculty Senate as a proposal, then opened to questions to be answered by himself or other committee members present.

Alan Mackelprang (COBA) asked what the expected number of requests might be.

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) said they do not initially expect a large number of students to make this request. The committee wanted to make sure that every department had control over how many were accepted. Students can request up to 9 credit hours, but a prior learning experience would have to be very specific and unique in order to satisfy the requirements of the course.

Lowell Mooney (COBA) [*partly inaudible*] asked if the fees will go to the department that takes the time to do the evaluations. He also thought giving three hours of credit for one hour of tuition, and releasing the student from 15 weeks in class, is a big incentive to have these requests coming out of the woodwork and would be a substantial hit to faculty service load as time progresses. He liked the 9-hour provision, but wondered if we need to leave the cost out of our ads until we see how many requests we get, and he wanted fees to go to the departments conducting the reviews.

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) believed that the student should pay for the one credit hour before a committee even begins its evaluation, and believed that would make students think carefully about making such requests. However, the committee would be willing to reconsider the fees and deferring them to departments. She added that departments would control “how much and how many people we’ll be evaluating.”

Anderson agreed with Williams-Johnson, and added that he didn’t think there will be university-level marketing for this. This is a uniform approach that every program would have to undertake and market, which marketing would impact the number of requests. Departments could choose not to offer this, or to “market 9 hours at a 3 hour rate,” though he didn’t believe that was the spirit of the proposal. Nevertheless, all would be decided at the program level for each of the programs in the university.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) thought one issue needing clarification is the fees, and shared Mooney’s concerns as well, though he thought the up-front payment would help alleviate the situation. But he noted that who gets that money is unclear. He thought the proposal needed to be tweaked.

Moderator Flynn noted that neither was it clear that program faculty could decide whether the plan was appropriate or not for them.

Mackelprang thought that requests would grow in number and increasingly make for heavy service loads for faculty in those programs doing this. The proposal did not seem to address this variability in service loads.

Mooney wondered, if the requests grew to a point where the chair decided they were taking too much faculty time and “decides to take care of themselves, so does that then take the curriculum so to speak out of the hands of the faculty . . . would that be a concern if a department chair decided to just take care of that himself?”

Williams-Johnson said the committee wants departments to have control and the ability, should requests become overwhelming, to stop participation.

Provost Bartels had a couple of points: Starting the program sets a precedent, so suddenly ceasing it could create the problem of students arguing about the cessation. Also, regarding the money, she suspected that tuition dollars couldn't just be sent somewhere other than the institution. She thought some compensation plan for faculty going above and beyond teaching and service requirements could be developed, but wasn't sure about that.

Anderson agreed the money issue needed more investigation. He thought Wayne Smith, who worked with the subcommittee on this, might have some answers as to how tuition is handled in other areas like CLEP or IB or AP at the undergraduate level, or in the program where we have military personnel coming off of active service who get some credits. As for opting out, the spirit of this was to have individual programs come up with policies of their own, and any changes that would have to happen thereafter would be done with the approval of the College of Graduate Studies to make sure that there was continuity and consistency in the policies; he said that was marked out in the proposal itself. He emphasized that the spirit of this is not to cheat programs out of student face time or one-on-one time, but to recognize that some students come in with the kind of knowledge that would make them exciting candidates for a program, but often we lose those students because they would have to re-take things that they may have already taken. So part of this initiative is recruitment.

Mackelprang suggested that the one-credit upfront be framed as a fee, with students then paying the standard tuition rate for any credits granted.

Moderator Flynn did not want to limit discussion, but said it sounded to him like this needed to go back to the committee for revision.

Anderson noted it was on their upcoming agenda and he would take with him the information from this meeting. He asked, for clarity's sake, for a list of concerns. Moderator Flynn said the two of them would sit down and work that out. Discussion raised a further concern: Whether students could make such requests only when entering a program, or after they had been here for some time.

Cyr noted that he had not heard much opposition to what Anderson called the "spirit" of the program, but much concern with the mechanics of the policy as proposed.

9. New Business

Parking and Transportation Representative Election:

Jake Simons (COBA) had volunteered. There were no more nominees and Simons was elected by acclamation.

Senate Representative to the Faculty Athletics Committee

There were three nominees: Kelly Berry (CLASS), who served on the committee last year; Ed Mondor (COSM); and Eric Landers (COE). Moderator Flynn asked them for statements.

Berry said he wanted to finish his second year of two-years; Landers said it sounded more exciting than Parking, but he was not married to it; Mondor said he had served on the committee before, knew NCAA representative Chris Geyerman really well, and opined that "They don't like having me on there because I ask a lot of questions about [*inaudible*] and where the money goes."

The candidates left the room and a vote was conducted by counting hands: Berry = 13, Landers = 4; and Mondor = 18. So Mondor was elected.

SGA Liaison

Current SGA Liaison Ellen Hamilton had volunteered to serve a second year. No other nominees came forward, and Teresa Thompson (Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) said she believed students would revolt if they could not have Hamilton. Hamilton was elected by acclamation.

Parliamentarian:

Karen McCurdy offered to serve as Parliamentarian again. There were no other nominees. McCurdy was elected by acclamation.

10. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Moderator Flynn announced the meeting had moved on to announcements from vice-presidents, but Ming Fang He (COE) said she had a lot of questions, in three major groups, under New Business:

Question 1): Is Georgia Southern still an [Affirmative Action/Equity University](#)? If so, she believed our current work permit requirements exclude people of different nationalities; had they been in place 17 years ago, many international faculty, including herself, would not have been able to work here.

She offered to submit a formal Request for Discussion. Moderator Flynn suggested that would be a good idea. Ming Fang He said she would, but wanted to ask the questions and then submit a formal request for the next meeting.

Question 2): Do we have a [Title IX](#) officer at Georgia Southern? Who is she or he? What are the responsibilities of a Title IX officer? She was not clear at all what this person did.

Question 3): Does Georgia Southern deal with gun violence off campus involving Georgia Southern students? Could we use that kind of an incident as a teachable moment to continue to create safe environments for Georgia Southern and the surrounding communities?

Ming Fan He said she would submit a formal agenda request, but wanted the questions on the record.

There were no announcements from Vice-Presidents.

11. Announcements from the Floor

None

12. Adjournment

Moved and Approved.

Minutes submitted by Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.