

3-23-2016

## 3-23-2016 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, "3-23-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2016). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 16.  
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/16>

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](mailto:digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu).

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**March 23, 2016**  
**4:00 to 6:00 P.M.**  
**\*\*Nessmith-Lane Ballroom\*\***

**Voting members in Attendance:** Cheryl Aasheim, Lisa Abbott, Samuel Adeyeye, Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Hani Samawi for Moya Alfonso, Olga Amarie, William Amponsah, Kelly Berry, Chad Posick for Sarah Bielski, Sally Ann Brown, Finbarr Curtis, Jennifer Kowalewski for Marc Cyr, Steven Elisha, Larisa Elisha, Richard Flynn, Leigh Ann Williams for Tim Giles, Marian Tabi for Alice Hall, Ellen Hamilton, Jim Harris, Ming Fang He, Jonathan Hilpert, Yi Hu, Alina Iacob, Barbara King, Shainaz Landge, Alisa Leckie, Li Li, Jim LoBue, Nan LoBue, Lawrence Locker, Ron MacKinnon, Chung-Yean Chian for Alan Mackelprang, Santanu Majumdar, Leticia McGrath, Jessica Minihan, Lowell Mooney, Shahnam Navaee, Constantin Ogloblin, Marshall Ransom, Jim Stephens, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi,

**Senate Moderator and Chair Senate Executive Committee:** Patricia Humphrey

**Parliamentarian:** Karen McCurdy

**Student Government Association:** Errol Spence

**Voting members not in Attendance:** Adam Bossler, Gavin Colquitt, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Scott Kersey, Mujibur Kahn, Lili Li, Li Ma, Bryan Miller, Joe Ruhland, Jake Simons, Lina Soares, Valentin Soloiu, Tiffanie Townsend

**Administrators:** Jean Bartels, Rob Whitaker, Martha Abell, Barry Joyner, Thomas Koballa, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker, Devon Jensen

**Visitors:** David Dylan John, Cathy Beene, Janet Dale, Dustin Anderson, Beth Durodoye, Christine Ludowise, Candace Griffith, Leah Edwards, Jose E. Londen, Anna Battestello, D. Jason Slone, Barry Balleck, Michael Murphy, Breanna Jones, Brenda Blackwell, Robert Farber, LaRodrick Harris, Meca Williams-Johnson (*Some visitors' names were illegible.*)

## **Approval of the Agenda for the March 23, 2016 meeting.**

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: The agenda was moved, seconded, and approved. Lisa Abbott (CLASS) asked to amend the agenda to add a resolution regarding House Bill 859, to be discussed and voted on. Parliamentarian Karen McCurdy said this was Moderator Humphrey's call. Humphrey moved the amended agenda, it was seconded, and approved with this resolution becoming agenda item #9.

Moderator Humphrey noted that Secretary Marc Cyr was out with a very bad tooth, so Richard Flynn would do the minutes in his place.

## Approval of the February 15, 2016 Minutes:

### **Richard Flynn (CLASS) substituting for Secretary Cyr:**

Flynn (CLASS) moved approval of the February 15, 2016, minutes. Ming Fang He (COE) noted one mistake, that Li Ma was in attendance. Li Ma (COSM) confirmed this and noted that she had not signed in. The minutes were Approved.

## Librarian's Report for March 2016:

In the absence of Senate Librarian Jessica Minihan (LIB), Moderator Humphrey moved approval of the report. It was Approved.

Cheryl Aasheim had not arrived, so Undergraduate committee Report was postponed.

## Graduate Committee Report

**Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair:** On February 11, 2016, the committee reviewed and discussed their upcoming comprehensive program reviews. Candace Griffith from the Provost's Office provided an overview for the CPR requirements and the new orientation provided for programs under review this year. Also, Anderson introduced CPR reporting and review procedures. The only item of new business was an open discussion of degree descriptions because the committee had expressed some concern and confusion over degree programs creating different tracks that might appear to contain differing workloads. The committee chair agreed to work with the concerned faculty to build a request for data from the College of Graduate Studies on peer and institutional practices in that area. The Interim Associate Dean of COGS along with Wayne Smith from the Registrar's Office provided an update for CourseLeaf. The committee revisited two old business items: The first was a prior learning assessment subcommittee update that's an ongoing project. The second was an untabling of the graduate faculty graduate status revision form and policy that was an item from the January meeting. After discussion, the Interim Associate Dean of COGS suggested submitting a revision of that proposal at one of the upcoming meetings and the item would remain tabled as old business until that time. The final item remained on the table, which was a new READ course, while those departments affected discussed revising that proposal. The report was Approved.

## Undergraduate Committee Report

**Cheryl Aasheim (CEIT), Chair:** for the meeting on February 9<sup>th</sup> there was only one curriculum item on the agenda, a program in Graphic Communications deleted due to low enrollment. It was Graphic Communication Management. And there was one information item, that Georgia Southern seeks to become an affiliate member of the E-Core Program. They also discussed comprehensive program reviews. The report was Approved.

## General Education Committee Report

There was no report from General Education Committee.

## President's Report: Jean Bartels

### Budget

Full funding for the 3% merit increase was approved by the legislature. The usual caveat to that is that there is a formula by which an institution receives money that never gets to the 3%, so it's going to be somewhere in the neighborhood 2.6 or 2.7 % that will actually come to Georgia Southern and Georgia Southern will use funds to supplement that percentage up to 3% for merit raises. The merit raises this year though are under a restriction. The amounts that can be awarded can be anywhere from between zero and 4% for merit, both on the faculty and the staff side. That's normally how we do it. What's happened this year is that the Board of Regents has determined that we will not be allowed to request anything beyond the 4%. In the past we've had the opportunity to request that we could have a slightly larger increase for an individual faculty member or staff member, up to 6% before you had to go to the Board of Regents to get approval for that. This year they said they're not entertaining that.

### Salary Compression

There was no additional money that was allocated either by the legislature or by the Board of Regents for compression. So we do not have any additional new money coming in to address compression issues this year.

## Tuition

The Board of Regents determined that we would not have a tuition increase any place in the System this year, and that coupled with our own flat enrollment, means that we can anticipate that there will be literally no new money that is coming to campus for the 2017 fiscal year. So this will be a year where we will be reconsidering the reallocation of what existing resources we have and what is necessary perhaps to assist in selective growth areas through reallocation.

## Capital Projects

There was a real cutback in minor and major capital projects at the legislative level, but we did have two minor capital projects approved. One is to do some upgrades to our network operations center. That affects what happens with our internet services and those kind of things, bandwidth, and where all that is housed. The other project is some minor infrastructure additions to the new property across 301, the south campus, to ready it for potential down the road activities.

## End-of-Year Money

End-of-year money is also going to be relatively conservative this year. We have a need to use some of our resources to do infrastructure renovations to ready some of our existing properties to house the areas that will have to be overflow areas for units that are misplaced because of the building of the new multidisciplinary classroom building.

## HB 859, Campus Carry Legislation

The USG supports the current law and has been very vocal from the Chancellor's level down. It was currently on the Governor's desk. He did ask for some recommendations for amendments to the legislation. The legislative body said that they didn't have time and they were not making them, so it remained on his desk. The Board of Regents did finally contact President Bartels and ask that as a President she submit a letter to the Governor, which she did in strong protest of signing of that legislation.

## Sexual Harassment on Campus

The Board of Regents approved several new policies and procedures for addressing sexual harassment on campus, partly in response to Georgia Tech and their President coming under real fire for what was perceived as due process violations for an accused party from an event that happened at the Georgia Tech campus. That kind of started a firestorm of activity with a legislative committee, and some of the backlash to that was threats to hold any of the USG's projects back and budgets back. The good news is that

Georgia Southern has already been doing what the BOR is now making standard system-wide; actually, we were probably a model for how due process is to be followed in those kinds of situations. The new policies, for us, will change only a couple of small procedural items. These changes will be reflected in the Faculty Handbook and in our Policies and Procedures manuals.

## Searches

In the Presidential search, the Board of Regents was interviewing the top three candidates. We also were just starting a search process for a new Chief of the University Police Department.

## Provost's Report: (Diana Cone):

### New Buildings

Military Science Building is on schedule for completion for end of next Fall. The interdisciplinary academic building design team took the preliminary drafts to the System office about a month ago and got approval to move forward with the schematics, looking at either a three-story or what they're calling a three-and-one-half to four story building. Deans have been actively involved with that and having regular meetings with our Facilities folks to make sure that they incorporate all of the things that faculty need and want for those buildings.

### Student Ratings of Instruction

We are moving to a new software that will read the new student ratings of instruction forms. Currently we have ScanTron machines at various locations on campus that have a software on them that reads those forms so department staff assistants have to go to those locations and run those ScanTron forms through there, and then have to do some analysis to get the reports. Those machines are old, difficult to maintain, and we pay a fairly high maintenance contract on those each year. With the idea that the committee has brought forward, those machines cannot read that new student ratings of instruction format. The IT folks have been working already with a company called RemarkSoftware to enable the new forms to be read on any scanner or on department copy machines if they have the scanning function. And the pilot went very well. Secretaries will not have to type the comments off of those student forms if there are comments; it will automatically read those into the reports. The new forms will be printing on just regular copy paper that can be run through xerox machines to scan them. So it should be a much quicker process. Office staff will all have to be trained on how to do this and get the software loaded, so our CATS team will be working with each

department rigorously during April and early May. The SRI committee likely will put off piloting the new SRI until Fall so all of this will be in place.

Marshall Ransom (COSM) asked about use of ScanTrons for exams. Provost Cone noted the new format and process is for SRIs only.

Mark Welford (COSM) is on the committee and saw the form and noted that that it is on back to back sheets and wondered how the quantitative and discursive sections would be formatted in the report received by faculty.

Provost Cone said the report will have the same type of scale that he's been seeing in the past, and then at the bottom will have strengths and areas for improvement. Also, it will just scan in what the students wrote, and combine all of those together.

Welford thought the comments should be separate from the numerical values.

Provost Cone they will still be listed separate in the form and we will still be able to run our report for promotion/tenure packets.

Nan LoBue (CLASS) noted that she is on the committee and confirmed that the official pilot is going to be next fall.

## **Senate Executive Committee Report: (Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair.)**

### **Presidential Search Update**

Basically the top choices were a consensus of all campus and community groups. So those names did forth to the Board of Regents the morning of March 14<sup>th</sup>. Moderator Humphrey had talked with Lori Durden, who's the chair of the Regents Committee, and they are holding the Regents interviews the next day. When the announcement would be made was anybody's guess.

### **Campus Police Chief**

Moderator Humphrey and Lisa Abbott (CLASS) had participated that morning in the first of five on campus interviews for the campus police chief. There were four more upcoming in the following week.

## Requests for Information

- One from Nan LoBue (CLASS) about Handicapped Access of Older Buildings: Older buildings are grandfathered in in terms of handicapped access. There is a threshold of 50% of the building's value in terms of any major renovations, at which point then that building would be brought up to current standards for handicapped access. However, if you see real needs please tell your department chairs, or tell Rob Whitaker, because they do have special money for just such items that comes down from the state.
- One RFI from Tomasz Warchol and a follow-up from Aimao Zhang on using sick days toward retirement for ORP faculty, and other things which are in all honesty an unfairness between ORP and TRS people, including vesting time and so on. Unfortunately, that cannot be addressed on this campus. That requires legislative action. University System Faculty Council meets with the Chancellor twice a year. They regularly talk about such items. The Chancellor, after the last issue about two years ago with allowing people to switch from ORP to TRS, has stated categorically he's rather unwilling to bring such items forward because they will cost the state money and the state legislature is not in such a good mood for that sort of thing. But if faculty really want to push for such, talk to our local state representatives and state senators: Jon Burns, Jack Hill, Jan Tankersley and so on. They're the ones who are going to act on that one.
- One from Robert Costomiris on salary increases for promotion and professorial rank. Humphrey discussed this one with Dr. Bartels and these raises have not been really looked at since about 2005 (*Correction: 2006*), when they were raised to \$3750 and \$5,000, because basically there hasn't been money. The last several years what money we did get through the state and the BOR towards merit raises and so on had to be supplemented through on campus money to try and reach those 2% raises, which left no money for other things. And this year with flat enrollment there's not a lot of hope for other money to address those either. She suggested that's something that we bring up with the new president when that individual gets here.
- Have there been any plans for communication in terms of the campus carry legislation? In short, no, because everyone was waiting to find out what actually came down in terms of final legislation. When the BOR does know what's actually there, it will be publicized. Board of Regents will have to make their initial policies and then we'll have to make our own.
- Then there was the one from Marc Cyr on Athletic Budget Increases. Yes, the Athletics budget did go up from 2013, \$8.3 million to 2014, \$13.5 million, and the numbers were correct. Most of that, in fact, essentially all of that is due to the move to the FBS, but it's not just football moving to FBS; it's also new sports that were added, like women's shooting and women's golf and so on. A lot of the increase was due to increased numbers of scholarships, increased salaries, and so forth. Humphrey noted that the students taxed themselves in terms of the increase for student fees both through the money for expanding the stadium, and for moving to the FBS, and that does come under the category of institutional

subsidy. She noted that things like the new Astorturf being installed at the stadium is being paid for by Auxiliary Services basically.

Jim Harris (CEIT) asked what year the FBS fees were voted on.

Moderator Humphrey thought it was 2013, and that they took effect for the 13-14 school year.

Harris felt that these fees should be voted on every year by the students so that those actually paying them got to decide to do so, rather than having the expense imposed on them by former students who were no longer liable to the charges.

Moderator Humphrey said she couldn't speak to that. That would probably be a matter for SGA to think about. Errol Spence (SGA Representative) said he could take that back to the Student Government Association for comment.

### SGA Motion on Absences – Errol Spence, SGA Vice President of Academic Affairs:

Spence said that as the current policy for attendance reads in the *Faculty Handbook* there is no safeguard for students who attend and represent Georgia Southern University at University related or sponsored events. Under Section 308 in the *Faculty Handbook*, “The University does not issue an excuse to students for class absences. In case of absences as a result of illness, representation of the University in athletic and other activities, or special situations, instructors may be informed of reasons for absences, but these are not excuses.”

The SGA recommended that the Faculty Senate move to amend the *Faculty Handbook* to remove the phrase “representation of the University in athletic and other activities,” from Section 308 and add a new paragraph under paragraph 3, section 308 to read, “**Students participating in authorized activities as an official representative of the university (i.e. athletic events, delegate to regional or national meetings or conferences, participation in university-sponsored performances) will not receive academic penalties and, in consultation with the instructor of record, will be given reasonable opportunities to complete assignments and exams or given compensatory assignment(s) if needed. The student must provide written confirmation from a faculty or staff advisor to the course instructor(s) not fewer than 10 days prior to the date for which the student will be absent from the class. The student is responsible for all material presented in class and for all announcements and assignments. When possible, students are expected to complete these assignments before their absences. In the event of a disagreement regarding this policy, an appeal may be made by either the student or instructor of record to the corresponding College Dean.**”

The purpose of this amendment was to provide students who have officially represented the University through their participation in university-related or sponsored activities with an official policy to prevent them from being penalized for not physically being in the classroom as a result of their participation in said events. Spence said the proposed motion did not seek to prioritize extracurricular activities over academics, as students are responsible for all material presented in class and expected to complete all assignments. Additionally, the motion included academic activities outside the classroom, such as national association meetings and academic conferences. He said the proposal in no way excused students from their academic responsibilities. He noted that many universities have policies such as this, including our aspirational peers, other USG institutions, and Sun Belt conference schools. He was happy to provide a list of those schools if needed.

He added that among the things that make our university attractive to prospective students are opportunities for additional learning opportunities outside of the traditional classroom environment, and such activities should not be academically penalized, since he believed that we all agreed that learning is not simply defined by a grade. In order for students to be competitive in the workplace today, it is expected that they be able to demonstrate to an employer that they are involved in experiences outside of the classroom where they can apply personal, social, and intellectual skills in new contexts as well as demonstrate the ability to manage academic responsibilities. He believed that the students who mainly stand to benefit from this policy are those students who work extremely hard both in the classroom and beyond to achieve academic excellence, while also representing the brand of our University on the regional, national, or even international stage. The SGA respected faculty discretion within the classroom, but also believed that there should be reasonable compromise on matters where there are value added benefits for both the students and the University. He called this proposed policy that compromise. They understood that this policy may be a change, but in order to allow our students to maintain a competitive advantage, our University must meet the demands of our changing environment. He noted that the first paragraph of our "About Us" Webpage states that "*Since 1906, the University's hallmark has been a culture of engagement that bridges theory with practice, extends the learning environment beyond the classroom, and promotes student growth and life success.*" The SGA believed that this proposed amendment better supports that mission of the University.

The motion was seconded by Richard Flynn (CLASS).

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) liked the proposal, with its encompassment of an all-around fulfilling education for our students.

Jim Harris (CEIT) noted that currently the decision on whether students should miss a class is given to the instructor. He wanted to know who was best qualified to make this decision, the instructor in the class, or somebody outside the class. He believed it was

the instructor, but that this proposal put the decision in the hands of someone outside the class. He had looked at the list of schools in the proposal and downloaded their attendance policies. Georgia Tech has a 4-page document illustrating how they're going to handle this through a committee of nine people. So they review each case individually in front of a committee of nine people. The current SGA proposal is just a few sentences added on that says that they're going to give this out to somebody, don't know who, but somebody other than the instructor in the class is going to make the decision whether or not a student can be absent from a class. In his opinion, the proposal needed to be much more finely tuned, and that the instructor had to be part of the process.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) did not entirely agree or disagree with Jim. She believed the proposal had come forward because there are a few professors who are unwilling to work with students in such situations, and so we need to have this policy in place. She agreed there were some problems with the policy and wanted to offer an amendment.

Moderator Humphrey asked if she was making a motion to amend the policy. Abbott said she wanted to make a "friendly amendment," so was unsure if that required a formal motion. She didn't think it addressed all of Harris's issues, and called it "a clarification more than anything else," taking the section that says "will not receive academic penalties and will be given reasonable opportunities to complete assignments and exams or given compensatory assignment(s) if needed" and changing that to read "will not receive academic penalties and in consultation with the instructor of record will be given reasonable opportunities to complete assignments and exams or given compensatory assignments." She thought this clarified that it is in consultation with the instructor and so put the faculty member back in the conversation.

Errol Spence (SGA) accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Karen McCurdy (Parliamentarian) reminded people that a "friendly" amendment is not anything that is in *Robert's Rules*. An amendment is an amendment, period, so it does take a motion and a second.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) seconded Abbott's motion to amend. The motion was Approved.

Abbott offered another amendment, to change the final statement "In the event of a disagreement regarding this policy, an appeal may be made by either the student or instructor of record to the corresponding College Dean." Her amendment would read, "by either the student or the instructor of record to the corresponding College

Dean.” *(Secretary’s Note: I cannot see the difference between the two wordings here.)*  
Errol Spence (SGA) agreed to that amendment.

Jim Harris (CEIT) still had a problem with who makes the initial decision that a student should be able to miss a class, noting it isn’t stated anywhere in this document.

Moderator Humphrey noted that there is initially a written confirmation from a faculty or staff advisor, which is then presented to the instructor so that then the instructor would be making the decision.

Spence (SGA) confirmed this. The purpose was not to take away faculty discretion, but to prevent academic penalizing of students absent while representing Georgia Southern, and to show that there’s value to students gaining learning opportunities outside of the classroom. He admitted there is a small percentage of students who may go on a lot of opportunities to represent the University, but said they don’t unreasonably do that. They didn’t want to give a limited definition of what could fall under the policy, but only that three things would encompass a university-sponsored activity: if the student is accompanied by a faculty member, or the event is paid for by the University, or the student is representing GSU.

Moderator Humphrey noted that sometimes missing a class means missing something really vital, like a performance or something similar. She asked Spence how this policy would deal with such a situation.

Spence (SGA) said they couldn’t build a policy around those specific instances that may be anomalies, and in the case that they do happen, an appeal to the Dean allows for that to be debated; it may be that a student will just have to sacrifice the experience because other arrangements to do this assignment or group project or whatever cannot be made.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) agreed with Spence, noted that “incompletes” are sometimes an option, and further noted that this proposal is not about students who may want to be absent for frivolous reasons, such as hangovers.

Hani Samawi (JPHCOPH) noted that there was no limit on such absences, that depending on the class missing a certain amount of time would constitute an inability to pass the class whether given an incomplete or not. The policy needed revision to set a limit on missed classes.

Moderator Humphrey noted that a low limit would be unworkable for most athletic teams, and suggested that this was an area covered by the provision for consulting with the instructor and/or dean.

Spence (SGA) agreed, noting some other schools' policies have numbers, while others do not. He noted that many faculty syllabi already have an absence limit stated. He said the policy required students to still get class work done, and said the kinds of students this policy will affect are the type that know they have to do that or not do the activity.

Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) wanted clarification on what was meant by "penalty." For example, Curtis gives a number of pop quizzes, but drops a certain number of those. What happens if someone misses more than the allowed number of drops because of official university activities. Are they then allowed even more dropped quizzes than other students?

Spence (SGA) said such a quiz dispute could be taken to the dean. Broadly, the policy applied only to not being in class, so that if, for example, there is a three absence maximum or a student fails the class, an official absence should not count as one of those three.

Curtis believed there needed to be greater clarity about what "penalty" means.

Jim Harris (CEIT) thought such issues were why Georgia Tech has a four-page document for this, and a committee of nine people to make such decisions, because such special cases do come along. He could see, for example, an instructor having a five absence limit prior to an F, a student using up four of them and then going off for two weeks, so they've missed eight classes, and how are they going to make that up?

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) thought the Georgia Tech set-up also took the decision out of the instructor's hands. She thought the appeal process in the proposal still gave discretion to the instructor.

James Stephens (JPHCOPH) said he had had requests from students for excused absences during midterms and finals, and he was unsure that this was fair to the other students. He didn't see anything addressing that problem in the proposal. He also wanted to know whether absences had to somehow be related to the class, or if the nature of the event was immaterial under this proposal.

Addressing the Stephens' second question, Spence (SGA) said there is no limit due to class context because a valid absence may not have to do with a specific class. He gave a

Chemistry major participating in the Model U.N. as an example, in which the goal is overall development of the student. As for Stephens' first question, he noted the policy states students could take midterms ahead of time, and he thought this eliminated the issue of unfairness to other students. Anything outside that provision could be appealed to the Dean.

Marshal Ransom (COSM) said the appeal process in the proposal would give Deans a lot of power, and he wondered if the Deans wanted that power. He thought the nine-person committee at Georgia Tech was better because it did not load extra responsibility on one person, the Dean.

Moderator Humphrey opined that there would be no need for a policy like this if everybody was willing to work with the students, but we have a few faculty members who are making life tough.

Spence (SGA) said the power first would lie with the faculty member and the student to come to a reasonable agreement. The Dean would become involved only as a last stop.

Ransom agreed, but noted that the Dean still therefore has final responsibility. Spence said that was already the case for Deans in all sorts of situation.

Lowell Mooney (COBA) thought there were very few faculty "hardasses" on this issue. He thought the policy was dealing with a small number of issues, and that Deans could earn their money by making such decisions already: "We love our students. We love them to represent Georgia Southern around the world. We want to support them in any way we can. We know that it enriches their educational experience. Gives them fond memories of Georgia Southern, so one day they might give lots of money to us. But I just don't think we need a policy . . . when we are already doing that."

Spence called the policy "a safeguard for students" that obviates the need for students to have a perhaps acrimonious negotiation with an instructor.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) called the question. This motion was seconded and Approved.

Moderator Humphrey then read the twice-amended motion for amending Section 308: **"Students participating in authorized activities as an official representative of the university (i.e. athletic events, delegate to regional or national meetings or conferences, participation in university-sponsored performances) will not receive academic penalties and, in consultation with the instructor of record, will be given reasonable opportunities to complete**

**assignments and exams or given compensatory assignment(s) if needed. The student must provide written confirmation from a faculty or staff advisor to the course instructor(s) not fewer than 10 days prior to the date for which the student will be absent from the class. The student is responsible for all material presented in class and for all announcements and assignments. When possible, students are expected to complete these assignments before their absences. In the event of a disagreement regarding this policy, an appeal may be made by either the student or instructor of record to the corresponding College Dean.”** The vote required a counting of hands. The motion was Approved 31-9.

## HB 859 Resolution

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) moved this resolution: **“The Faculty Senate of Georgia Southern University stands with University System of Georgia Chancellor Hank Huckaby and the Board of Regents in opposing Georgia House Bill 859 (the “campus conceal and carry bill”) and asks Governor Nathan Deal to veto it.”** She noted that Faculty Senates across the System were voting on this resolution to get it to Governor Deal so that he would, it was hoped, veto “this insanity.”

The motion was Approved unanimously.

Unfinished Business

None

New Business

None

Announcements: Vice Presidents

None

Announcements from the Floor

None

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn, seconded and passed