

Georgia Southern University

## Georgia Southern Commons

---

Faculty Senate Agendas

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

---

2-5-2020

### Faculty Senate Agenda

Helen Bland

*Georgia Southern University*

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Bland, Helen, "Faculty Senate Agenda" (2020). *Faculty Senate Agendas*. 19.  
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-agendas/19>

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

# Georgia Southern University

## Faculty Senate Meeting

Feb. 5th, 2020 | 4:00-6:00pm  
**Armstrong Center, Ballroom A**  
11935 Abercorn St Suite 16, Savannah, GA 31419

### Pre-Meeting Notes:

- 1) Read all reports, motions, and discussions included in this agenda *before* the meeting.
- 2) Bring printed copies of any items as needed. Copies will not be available at the meeting.
- 3) In order to allow everyone a chance to participate, and to conduct the meeting in a timely manner, please limit yourself to two talking points per item. If you feel strongly about an issue, we suggest that you prepare a statement ahead of time. No talking point should exceed two minutes.
- 4) Remember to sign in for the meeting on the sheet at your meeting location. The meeting starts promptly at 4pm, which means everyone should be signed in and seated at that time.
- 5) As a Senator, if you cannot attend, it is your responsibility to confirm a substitution with the alternates from your college.
- 6) Alternates must indicate which Senator they are present in place of. Alternates may vote *only if* they are representing another Senator.
- 7) Please follow the directions for microphone use. You must also keep your mouth close to the microphone while you are speaking. State your name and college (not abbreviation) every time you begin to speak. Please wait to be recognized before speaking. These practices are essential to keep an accurate transcript of the meeting.

### AGENDA

- 4:00**            I.    **CALL TO ORDER**
- 4:01**            II.   **APPROVAL OF AGENDA** [Pages 1-2]
- 4:05**            III. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES** | **Dec. 2, 2019** Jamison (CAH), Senate Secretary  
[Pages 3-15]
- 4:05-4:15**      IV.   **LIBRARIAN’S REPORT** | **January 24, 2020** Haberland (CAH), Senate Librarian  
[Pages 16 – 59]
- A.    General Education and Core Curriculum Committee – Finbarr Curtis (CAH)
  - B.    Undergraduate Committee – Chopak-Foss (JPHCOPH)/ Soares (COE)
  - C.    Graduate Committee – Kowalewski (CAH)

**V. SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

**4:15-4:20 UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

- A. RFI ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE STUDY'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOSTERING COMMUNITY ON ARMSTRONG CAMPUS – INFORMATION PASSED FORWARD TO FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEES – STUDENT SUCCESS, WELFARE AND FACULTY DEVELOPMENT –

BASED UPON FEEDBACK, WE HAVE MOVED THIS RFI TO A DISCUSSION ITEM

**NEW BUSINESS**

**4:20-4:45 REQUEST FOR INFORMATION – JANUARY 2020 [PAGES 60 – 76]**

- A. RFI ON PREFERRED NAMES ROLL OUT (ABBOT, CAH)
- B. RFI ON WAITLIST RESPONSE TIME (MULLENAX, COSM)
- C. RFI ON 2020 MILITARY TIMES BEST FOR VETS COLLEGE RANKINGS: GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNRANKED (GEARHART, CAH)
- D. RFI ON TRASHING OF DESKS IN UNIVERSITY HALL (RICH, WCHP)
- E. RFI ON WORKING ENVIRONMENT OVER BREAK (MULLENAX, COSM)
- F. RFI ON EFFECT OF CURRICULUM CHANGES ON DROPPING ENROLLMENT (HOLT, COE)

**4:45-5:30 DISCUSSION ITEMS – JANUARY 2020 [PAGES 77 – 88]**

- A. DI ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE STUDY'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FOSTERING COMMUNITY ON ARMSTRONG CAMPUS (DAWERS, CAH)
- B. DI ON GRADUATE ASSISTANTSHIP STIPEND CHANGES (GWINETT, UL)
- C. DI ON WHITE SUPREMACY AT GEORGIA SOUTHERN (CARTWRIGHT, CAH)
- D. DI ON UPDATE ON HONORS COLLEGE STRATEGIC PLAN (HABERLAND, CAH)

**5:30-5:40 VI. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – Dr. Kyle Marrero, President**

**5:40-5:50 VII. PROVOST'S REPORT – Dr. Carl Reiber (VPAA)**

**5:50-5:59 VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES**

**6:00PM IX. ADJOURNMENT**

*\*All Senate Meetings are recorded. Edited Minutes will be distributed.*

**Georgia Southern University**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**Minutes**  
**December 2, 2019**

**Executive Summary:** For the meeting of the Faculty Senate on December 2, 2019, several Old Business items were brought forward. New business included a motion on the Affirmation of Georgia Southern's Commitment to Inclusive Excellence, a Discussion Item on First Year Experience, and a number of new RFI's. A full account of the meeting is available below.

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. The Senate accepted the minutes of the October 27, 2019 Senate meeting. The Librarian's Report was approved, as were reports from the General Education Core Curriculum Committee, the Undergraduate Committee, and the Graduate Committee.

The Senate addressed several items of Old Business, beginning with a vote on the SECs decision not to bring to the floor a motion to reject the common form and guidelines for faculty evaluation, which were developed by an ad hoc committee. Richard Flynn (CAH), who brought forward the motion, made several clarifying points. The Senate then voted 41 to 23 to uphold the SECs decision, which means the issues concerning the form will reside in the Faculty Welfare Committee. Several questions were asked about RFIs on student names on class rolls. There was no other discussion of Old Business.

The Senate then moved to New Business. Senators approved the following motion, Affirmation of Georgia Southern's Commitment to Inclusive Excellence, in a vote that passed with 54 in favor to 3 opposed. Dustin Anderson (CAH) brought forward a Discussion Item on Clarity in Senate Representation. Amanda Konkle (CAH) brought forward a Discussion Item on FYE and SYE. Nancy Remler asked for clarification on an RFI about starting points for faculty salaries. A number of other RFIs, available on SharePoint and on the agenda, were not discussed.

President Marerro gave a brief report that focused primarily on the budget process. He was followed by Rob Whitaker (VP of Business and Finance) who briefly reviewed a slide presentation on the budget process. This presentation is available on the Performance Excellence tab of the MYGSU portal. After several announcements, the Senate adjourned at 6:03.

**MINUTES**

**Officers:** Helen Bland (President )Trish Holt (President-Elect) Carol Jamison (Secretary)  
Michelle Haberland (Librarian) Dustin Anderson (Past-President and Parliamentarian)

**Senators Present:** Leticia McGrath (CAH) Robert Costomiris (CAH) Michelle Haberland(CAH)  
Jennifer Kowalewski (CAH) James Todesca (CAH) Carol Jamison (CAH) Chris Cartright (CAH) Tony Morris (CAH) Jack Simmons (CAH) Amanda Konkle (CAH) Lisa Abbott (CAH) Richard Flynn (CAH)  
Solomon K. Smith (CAH) Grant Gearhart (CAH) Richard Flynn (CAH) Heidi Altman (CBSS)  
Christopher Brown (CBSS) Kevin Jennings (CBSS) Nick Holtzman (CBSS) P. Cary Christian (CBSS)

Addie Martindale (CBSS) Nancy McCarley (CBSS) Barbara King (CBSS) Fayth Parks (COE) Patricia Holt (COE) Daniel Chapman (COE) Lucas Jensen (COE) Nancy Remler (COE) Ionut Emil Iacob (COSM) Justin Montemarano (COSM) Shijun Zheng (COSM) Yi Lin (COSM) Hans-Joerg Schanz (COSM) Jeffery Secrest (COSM) Traci Ness (COSM) Donna Mullenax (COSM) Jennifer Zettler (COSM) (JPHCPH) Andrew Hansen (JPHCPH) Helen Bland (JPHCPH) Liberty Barbara Ross (Liberty) (LIB) Jessica Garner (LIB) Lori Gwinett (LIB) (PCB) Jake Simons (PCB) Chuck Harter (PCB) Stephanie Sipe (PCB) Bill Wells (PCB) Maliece Whatley (PCB) Cheryl Aasheim (PCEC) Rami Haddad (PCEC) Chris Kadlec (PCEC) Jim Harris (PCEC) Wayne Johnson (PCEC) Li Li (WCHP) Marian Tabi (WCHP) TimMarie Williams (WCHP) Katrina Embrey (WCHP) Jan Bradshaw (WCHP) Gina Crabb (WCHP) Susan Hendrix (WCHP) Melissa Gayan (CAH)

**Alternates Present:** Lisa Dusenberry Alternate (CAH) Ann Fuller Alternate (LIB) LeeAnn Kung Alternate (PCOB) Megan Byrd Alternate (WCHP)

**Senators Not in Attendance:** Kristi Smith (LIB) Finbarr Curtis (CAH) Jorge Suazo (CAH) Jeffery Riley (CAH) Pidi Zhang (CBSS) (COE) Delores Liston (COE) Nedra Cossa (COE) Linda Ann McCall (COE) Abid Shaikh (COSM) Cathy MacGowan (COSM) Marshall Ransom (COSM) Sungkon Chang (COSM) Dziyana Nazaruk Senator (JPHCPH) Mark Hanna (PCB) Lowell Mooney (PCB) Bill Yang (PCB) David Calamas (PCEC) Anoop Desai (PCEC) Hayden Wimmer (PCEC) Christy Moore (WCHP) Chris Hanna (WCHP)

**Administrators:** Kyle Marrero (President) Carl Reiber (Provost and VP for Academic Affairs) Diana Cone (Vice Provost) Christine Ludowise (Associate Provost) Donna Brooks (Associate Provost) Rob Whitaker (VP for Finance and Operations) Scot Lingrell (VP for Enrollment Management) Amy Ballagh (Associate VP for Enrollment Management) Ron Stalnaker (Chief Information Officer) Curtis Ricker (Dean, College of Arts and Humanities) Ryan Schroeder (Dean, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences) Ashey Walker (Dean of the Graduate College) Stuart Tedders (Dean, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health) Lisandra Carmichael (Dean of the (LIB)) Allen Amason (Dean, Parker College of Business) Mohammad Davoud (Dean, AEP College of Engineering and Computing)

**Guests:** Teresa Winterhalter (Associate Dean, CAH) Terri Flateby (OIE) Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs) John Kraft (CBSS) Alexis Stinson (Enrollment Services) Kelly Crosby Candace Griffin (Provost's Office) Beth Durodoye, Delena Bell Hatch, Amber Culpepper, Olga Amarie. Barry Balack

**I. CALL TO ORDER:** Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) called the meeting to order at 4:00.

**II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:** Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) made a motion to approve the agenda for the December 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

**III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES | October 23, 2019** Carol Jamison (CAH), Senate Secretary, made a motion to approve the minutes from the October 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Michelle Haberland (CAH) seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

**IV. LIBRARIAN'S REPORT | Dec. 2, 2019** Michelle Haberland (CAH), Senate Librarian, made a motion for approval of the Librarian's Report from October 11, 2019. Bill Wells (PCB) seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

A. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee – Finbarr Curtis (CAH)

Bill Wells (PCB) presented on behalf of Finbarr Curtis. At their last meeting, the committee discussed the review process for assessment of core courses. Michele Haberland (CAH) asked if the committee considered the revision of the core at the system level. Bill Wells (PCB) said that this discussion is just beginning and will be looked at in future meetings. Delivery of the report acts as a motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

B. Undergraduate Committee –Lina Soares (COE)

The committee met November 12, 2019 and elected two co-chairs. Soares (COE) and Chopak-Foss (JPHCOPH). They approved all new programs, course revisions, and rolled back three that needed more work. Under Other Items of Business, they decided to meet with members of the Graduate Committee to discuss CIM changes. The committee also formed a subcommittee to ensure uniform language in the GSU handbook in terms of concentration and minors. Delivery of the report acts as a motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

C. Graduate Committee – Chris Kadlec (PCEC)

This committee reported that a subcommittee had been formed to look for missing SLOs within CIM. Delivery of the report acts as a motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

## **V. SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

#### **A. Vote on SEC Decision not to Bring to Senate Floor-**

Motion: To Reject the Common Form and Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation Developed by the Ad Hoc Committee (Flynn, CAH)

#### **SEC RESPONSE:**

The SEC took up this Motion at our meeting on October 11, 2019. At this meeting, we decided not to move forward with this Motion at the Faculty Senate Meeting; this was passed by general consensus. The SEC again asked each representative from each respective college their impression of the form. Among the 9 colleges, 7 college reported having no issue/concern for the form. The University Libraries indicated that the form won't exactly fit to their faculty, put that would be true for any form brought forth. They will make adaptations as necessary. The only college reporting issue with the form was the College of Arts and Humanities. The Faculty Senate bylaws specifically state that we may not take up issues concerning just one college. Out of respect for our Fellow Senator, the SEC decided to send the form back to the Ad-Hoc Committee recommending that they take off the examples and rating scale;

and from there it will go to the Faculty Welfare. The FWC will review the form and come up with recommendations on this form.

**Discussion:** Richard Flynn (CAH) noted as a point of order that the SEC Response contained some misrepresentation. He then made the following points:

1. The rationale on page 94 of the Senate agenda is a post-hoc rationale that says SEC representatives were not concerned with the forms. He argued that this form affects several colleges.
2. Procedures reside in the Faculty Handbook 305.6
3. The committee that created the forms was not a Senate committee.
4. The point is that the form should not exist at all as each college has forms in place.
5. Departments should be directed to incorporate percentages for workload. They should not apply to 2019 evaluations as percentages were not yet in place.
6. Each college has a form, so we have no need for this form. Departments have detailed criteria for promotion and tenure.

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) commented that the form should come up for a vote. “Yes” votes are in favor of upholding the SEC decision for this issue to reside in Faculty Welfare and to be revisited in Spring. “No” means the issue will be discussed immediately.

Senators then voted. The motion passed, 41 yes and 23 no. The vote to uphold the SECs decision carried.

### **B. RFI on Implementation of the Inclusive Excellence Study’s Recommendations for Fostering Community on Armstrong Campus (Bill Dawers, CAH)**

**Discussion:** There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question and Rationale. The senate is waiting on responses.

### **C. RFI on Student Names on Class Rolls (Lisa Abbot, CAH)**

**Question:** Is there a way we can have student's names on class rolls reflect their chosen name rather than given name?

**Rationale:** This question is primarily directed to protect students who are trans-gendered and going through the transitioning process. Due to their age many have not yet filed to legally change their given names. Therefore on the first day of class they face being "outed" when their name is called to confirm attendance. While "John Smith" may be presenting as Joanna Smith, this moment of identification in class reveals that she is trans-gendered. This can put these students at risk for bullying. Faculty have no way of knowing that a student goes by another name unless that student tells them. This puts the onus completely on the shoulders of the student, who may not be comfortable speaking to the faculty member before hand. If we could have the option for students to have their preferred name on the rolls it would solve this concern for faculty and students alike. I have included some two articles that discuss the issue of Trans-gendered students on college campuses.

**Response:** Lingrell, VP of Enrollment Management, has given the following response:

IT Services has evaluated various options as well as investigated solutions provided at other institutions. We are proposing the following as a solution to meet the request:

1. A student would have the ability to indicate a preferred name via the MyGs portal "personal settings" area.
2. The "Instructor Resources" tile located in the MyGs portal would contain a link indicating "View Class Roster." This class roster would display the student's name and preferred name in parenthesis.
3. In addition, the preferred name will be updated in Folio's - Class List / Grade Book and Folio Email Address Book. You can reference an example here which shows the original name then changed to preferred name.
4. Important Note: The solution outlined would only apply to students and not faculty/staff. The reason being that the source of record for Faculty/Staff is OneUSG with no ability to change this without going through a legal name change.

The team is prepared to have this available by Monday, March 2nd.

**Discussion:** Michelle Haberland (CAH) asked if this policy would apply only to class rosters, or also on diplomas? Scott Lingrell (VP of Enrollment Management) said that the RFI referred to class rosters only, but they could examine this possibility in the future. There could be an opportunity to put preferred names on diplomas. They will look into it.

#### **D. RFI on Bookstore (Williams, CBSS)**

**Discussion:** There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

#### **E. RFI on University Closure Policy (Braselton, COSM)**

**Discussion:** There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **A. Motion on Affirmation of Georgia Southern's Commitment to Inclusive Excellence (Bland, JPHCOPH)**

“As we face special challenges at the institution, the Faculty Senate is committed to working towards the realization of Inclusive Excellence and towards the obtainment of the institutional value of Openness and Inclusion. Accordingly, we will identify ways in which each Senate standing committee will



develop, enhance, or encourage these values, acting on those opportunities accordingly, and reporting on them regularly."

**Rationale:** Georgia Southern University Strategic Plan has its center Pillar as inclusive Excellence. While the Strategic Plan was being written by the Georgia Southern community, the institution simultaneously initiated a study of Inclusive Excellence by Dr. Damon Williams. The report on the findings of the study was shared with the campus in "Three Campuses, One Heartbeat." It proposed the university as a whole follow 7 specific recommendations. This statement affirms that we as faculty leaders will take an active and demonstrable role in building a healthy and vibrant culture of inclusion.

**Discussion:** Patricia Holt (COE) asked for a motion for the Senate to adopt a statement for inclusive excellence. The Senate is committed to uphold the institutional values of inclusion. Each Senate standing committee will develop, enhance, and encourage our values. Lucas Jenson (COE) seconded the motion. Patricia Holt stated that it is our responsibility to show that we are all dedicated to commitment to inclusive excellence and to ensure our commitment to openness and inclusion. The motion passed 54 to 3.

### **B. DI on Clarity in Role of Representation** (Dustin Anderson, CAH)

What does it mean to be a "representative" of the college while serving as a faculty senator? Post-consolidation, we still seem to have very different understandings of the represented constituency, and how senators represent their colleges.

**Rationale:** Each individual member comes to some understanding of what their representation will be, but as a body it seems to vary between something akin to a Trustee (acting autonomously; voting the way they individually imagine would represent their own group) or a Delegate (seeking the authority to vote from their group), or sometimes as a kind of hybrid between the two. Given the senate's recent action on an item taken from the floor this distinct merits clarifying. The articles of the bylaws indicate that there are any items to be discussed or acted on should be shared at least two days ahead of time in writing, which implies that any item that will be discussed is something that all faculty should have the ability to read, consider, and engage with ahead of the meeting to express any concern, support, additional information, etc ... with their senate representatives. Taking items from the floor prevents this interaction. Do we trust senators to know the material and implications of items that they have spent more time reviewing than the general populace, or should there be a clear line of communication about values or goals from the general populace up to the Senators?

**Discussion:** Dustin Anderson (CAH) explained that there is some confusion about role and responsibilities of senators. There are some differences across campuses. Senators should discuss what their roles entail to avoid inconsistency. Are votes representational or based on individual understanding? We need to be transparent and clear. Also, there is some confusion about departmental versus college representation. Michele Haberland (CAH) noted that the Bill of Rights has representatives vote according to the majority of their constituents, but this did not make it into the Constitution. We are empowered by the model of the US Senate to vote our consciences and also in the interest of our constituents. Jack Simmons (CAH) asked if the fundamental question is if we represent our colleges or departments? Senators are elected to represent their colleges, Dustin Anderson (CAH) responded. However, there is some imbalance among colleges in how departments are represented. Barbara Ross (COSM) noted that she is a representative for the Liberty Campus and not her college.

Dustin Anderson (CAH) replied that apportionment led to Liberty Campus as having a representative for the campus rather than a particular college.

### **C. DI on First-Year Experience and Second-Year Experience (Konkle, CAH)**

The First-Year Experience and Second-Year Experience programs are frequently heralded as central to student retention and inclusive excellence, yet faculty are hard-pressed to justify being part of these programs due to the fact that participation is no longer compensated. It is essential for the Senate to discuss the future of these programs and especially to address how the evidence collected by a task force of faculty in Spring 2019 will be used to ensure that we not only have these programs, but also that these programs positively impact student-faculty relationships and student retention.

**Rationale:** On several occasions, the Provost has mentioned wanting feedback on the current iteration of First-Year Experience. Second-Year Experience has also undergone some of the same revisions that changes First-Year Experience, with similar results--both programs now involve fewer faculty. Many faculty expressed concerns over how FYE is currently being taught, as well as how faculty are compensated for participating in these discussions. A number of faculty have also asserted that the lack of compensation is a significant factor in their decision not to participate in the course. The incident related to Cruet's visit makes clear that faculty concerns were warranted. Nevertheless, it appears that the university intends to continue in the current approach to FYE next semester even though it contends these courses are central to the Inclusive Excellence pillar of the University's values and mission as well as student retention. The faculty fellow for this, Trisha Brown, has spoken with some departments and distributed surveys, but the surveys don't address what we see as the essential problem: lack of funding and no compensation or incentive that fits meaningfully into a tenure and promotion plan for qualified faculty to participate in the courses. The survey does not provide a genuine opportunity to reflect on what is best for our students and the future of these programs. The Senate encourages conducting the programs effectively and reminds administrators of the importance of encouraging students to form relationships with faculty and staff that contribute to the retention piece of this puzzle. These tenets are undermined by the current 'course-in-a-can' model being taught largely by staff (as recorded in the GECC minutes from October 25, Chris Ludowise recently reported that this course is taught by approximately 15% faculty, 85% staff, but it is unclear how many of these are full-time faculty rather than administrative faculty). From those minutes: "Previously, the course was taught by 60% faculty and 40% staff, which then shifted to 85% faculty and 15% staff, but the latest design flipped that proportion so that the course is taught predominantly by staff."

**Discussion:** Amanda Konkle (CAH) prefaced the discussion by saying that she hopes we can address it in the positive spirit of problem solving. She would like the Senate to discuss these courses in order to consider what is best for the multiple stakeholders involved, including faculty, staff, students, and the reputation of the university. Her intention is not to create an 'us / them' tension between faculty and staff, but to take expertise of both staff and faculty to make the most of the class. FYE-affiliated faculty recommended some changes based on best practices of peer and aspirational institutions but these recommendations were not implemented in the new version of FYE. Trisha Brown, the faculty fellow in the provost's office working on this initiative suggested that we will not roll back to the old model either in the format of the course or in terms of compensation. She seeks workable solutions as to how this program might move forward in the future.

Jack Simmons (CAH) questioned whether, with core curriculum revision coming, it makes sense to commit 10% of our core education hours to these two courses. Michele Haberland (CAH) responded that we should shift the percentage back to the faculty and have them teach it in load. Chris Cartright (CAH) emphasized the significance of the course. He was on the task force that worked on revisions and was disappointed to see the work sidelined and the program streamlined. The programs are very effective at helping students find direction and succeed, he argued. Because it is so important and because it takes up 10% of our load, we need to invest our resources to be sure students have the correct expertise. Modules and asynchronous activities might help us engage more thoughtfully with these issues. He sees the book burning as a result of the defunding of these programs. Melissa Gayan (CAH) noted that if it comes back to faculty teaching loads, we could incorporate learning communities, attaching FYE to other classes. Lisa Abbott (CAH) asked why the program that did exist was streamlined as it was successful. Jack Simmons (CAH) expressed his concern that we may have to choose between FYE and other important core courses. Lisa Abbott (CAH) asked again why the program was redesigned. Chris Ludowise (Provost's Office) responded that we had gone through a cyclical process of redesign. She claimed that FYE was new to the Armstrong campus. It was redesigned to add in inclusion and diversity. Robert Costomiris (CAH) assumed that FYE is to help students succeed. It is a one-size fits all course and possibly shouldn't be. Chris Ludowise noted that this had been part of the conversation but it is an ongoing conversation. Carol Jamison (CAH) asked as a point of clarification if Chris Ludowise had stated that FYE was new to the Armstrong campus. In fact, she pointed out, the program had been at Armstrong for over seven years. Lisa Abbott (CAH) asked about training for faculty and staff. Michele Haberland (CAH) asked about the role of budget in redesign of FYE course. Chris Ludowise noted that these issues were discussed before the current budget crisis. Changes were made to ensure staff equity.

Carl Reiber (Provost) noted that Chris Ludowise headed up the redesign. The central pool of money used for faculty stipends was available. That pool of money would have to be cut, or the administration would have to identify colleagues to find other jobs. We chose to protect the integrity of faculty, he explained. Stephanie Sipe (COB) noted that revisions to programs should improve the program. Had there been more transparency about the circumstances related to budget, maybe more faculty would have been willing to take this on as part of an overload. Many of us on the faculty side felt that this was done as an ambush at the last minute, she stated. Revisions need to improve the curriculum and not paste together a half version of the course that we can afford. Chris Ludowise responded that evaluations of the FYE class and in discussions with students revealed that learning outcomes were not being met. The redirection was intended to address this. In the future, she will try to make sure faculty are aware of FYE decisions.

Wayne Johnson (PCEC) asked Chris Ludowise if we have statistics to show impact of FYE on retention. Melissa Gayan (CAH) asked about tracking students in the future. Barbara King (CBSS) asked about data to compare Learning Communities with other FYE courses. Chris Ludowise responded that the LC were small numbers but could be tracked. Leticia McGrath (CAH) noted that the number of students in FYE classes had increased dramatically, making it difficult to discuss controversial issues. It was originally designed to be a seminar. The removal of themes from the course takes away the significance of the course as a seminar. We are trying to engage students on difficult topics and need to include faculty, she maintained. Chris Ludowise replied that we experimented with class size this year but hope to work with all of us to develop curriculum and make class size smaller. She would welcome team teaching.

Amanda Konkle (CAH) concluded this discussion by thanking everyone for their thoughtful comments. It is an ongoing conversation, she noted. She hopes Chris Ludowise will ensure that this conversation moves forward, especially as to whether it is the best place to teach diversity.

Before moving on, Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) asked for any points of clarification on the remaining RFIs. See individual RFIs below.

**D. RFI ON Senate Motions for the Floor** (Abbot, CAH)

When did it become Senate protocol to not allow motions from the floor? In looking at senate minutes it appears that last year was the first year in which senators were not allowed to make motions from the floor. How was this decision established as protocol?

**Discussion:** There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

**E. FI on Inaccessibility of Official Student Group Status on Armstrong Campus** (Rago, CAH)

**Discussion:** There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

**F. RFI on University Statements & Policies on White Supremacy, Hate Speech, and Terrorism** (Cartwright, CAH)

**Question:** How does the university administration define 'white supremacy'? Either as Armstrong State or Georgia Southern, what public communications and/or policy guidelines has the university published regarding white supremacy? How does the administration define 'hate speech' and/or 'unprotected speech'? Either as Armstrong State or Georgia Southern, what public communications and/or policy documents has the university published regarding hate speech? What are the relevant university policies and/or federal regulations for identifying and responding to terrorism or extremist threats? How should faculty and students respond to speech which makes them feel discriminated against, harassed, or threatened, even when that speech is protected?

**Rationale:** GSU's Inclusive Excellence initiatives were instigated by multiple instances of anti-black language, one of which included a call to violence. FBI director Christopher Wray testified before Congress in July that most domestic terrorism cases this year involve white supremacist motives. FBI data indicates that hate crimes related to race/ethnicity have risen since 2012, and the Department of Homeland Security issued a strategy document in September which lists white supremacist violent extremists as a particular threat. Research from the National Institute of Justice indicates that radicalization to ideologically motivated violence occurs along an escalating trajectory of behavior. As a formerly segregated, historically white institution in the Southeast, GSU must respond to the published scholarship demonstrating that historically white institutions' failure to address white supremacy results in the exclusion and attrition of students and faculty of color. As a public institution, GSU has a responsibility to proactively address the potential threats of ideologically motivated violence. Understanding our institution's previous statements and policies on white supremacy, hate speech, and

terrorism will help the GSU community promote inclusion in an evidence-based, historically situated manner.

**Response:** from Maura Copeland, Chief Legal Affairs Officer

The President's Diversity Advisory Council ("PDAC"), under the leadership of Chair Dr. Maxine Bryant (Interim Chief Diversity Officer), has developed and issued Georgia Southern University's Inclusive Excellence Statement:

"Inclusive Excellence is a strategic pillar and a core value at Georgia Southern University. We recognize that our success as an institution of higher learning depends on our ability to embrace, value, and appreciate the diversity of students, staff, faculty, administrators, and alumni across our campuses. Inclusive excellence is continuous and comprehensive; intentional and dynamic; transformational and innovative and is embedded in all aspects of our culture and actions. Inclusive excellence speaks to sustaining a campus climate that honors, respects, and is inclusive of all elements of diversity that makes each of us unique: culture, race, ethnicity, color, national origin, sex, age, (dis)ability, creed, religious or spiritual beliefs, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, class, gender identify, gender expression, veteran status, political philosophy, etc. We uphold that all of our individual differences enrich our university."

**Discussion:** Robert Costomiris (CAH) asked about the response from Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs). Her response indicated that based on consultation with legal office, the issue was reviewed and students did not violate the code of conduct. How much of an investigation occurred? How was the determination made? Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs) replied that the response was to the Resolution and not the RFI. The investigation looked at all information coming in and sought to verify truth. Robert Costomiris then asked if any students were interviewed. Maura Copeland responded no. Chris Cartright (CAH) clarified that he wanted to ask these questions because the incidents on this campus could culminate in violence. We need a robust response to behaviors and expressions that are historically linked to acts of violence. Is it correct to assume that the university has no statement on hate speech or terrorism? Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs) noted that those are not the legal terms: unprotected and protected speech are the terms that must be used. There is a crime of terroristic threats. There is no policy unless there is a crime. Chris Cartright (CAH) responded that he was not aware that hate speech doesn't have much of a legal force in the United States. It is important that we build on these questions beyond legal and punitive description. We should consider the cultural and social dimensions of what effects these behaviors could have and how we respond to speech that is protected yet harmful. Michele Haberland (CAH) asked Maura Copeland if the administration is aware of recent incidents of white supremacy on the GSU campuses. Is the university monitoring campus climate and social media for evidence of organized white supremacy on campus? Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs) stated that she is aware of one incident. If organizations and individuals don't cross the detailed in her response to this RFI, there is no action the university can take.

**G. RFI on Filming on Campus by Non-USG Affiliated Entities** (Johnson, PCEC)

**Discussion:** There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

## **H. RFI on FYE Faculty Compensation and the use of Academic Advisors and Peer Mentors to teach FYE in Fall 2019 (Johnson, PCEC)**

**Discussion:** There was no direct discussion of this item, although it was addressed indirectly through the previous Discussion Item on FYE. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

## **I. RFI on Transparency in the Selection of Provost Fellows (Holt, COE)**

**Discussion:** There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

## **J. RFI on Definitions of Starting Points on Salary Positions (Remler, COE)**

**Question:** Will the Faculty Welfare Committee's subcommittee assigned to write the policy for faculty promotions also define the minimum requirements for employing (as opposed to promoting) faculty in tenure-track and non-tenure track positions?

**Rationale:** As a result of consolidation, the university finds itself with multiple tracks of faculty positions which render inconsistencies in the minimum qualifications required to acquire full-time roles. The three different tracks at Georgia Southern are as follows: Tenure-track full-time lines ranging from assistant professor, associate professor and professor. Non-tenure track full-time lines ranging from instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor. Non-tenure track lecturer lines, ranging from lecturer, senior lecturer and principal lecturer. Consequently, many faculty members hold similar credentials but different positions. The conversion of limited-term faculty to permanent lecturer positions adds a layer to such inconsistencies, which can eventually lead to more inconsistency and therefore inequity as faculty apply for promotions. Consider the clauses in existing policy manuals: Although section 311 of Georgia Southern's faculty handbook outlines qualifications for promotion, the handbook does not articulate minimum qualifications for initial employment as an instructor or assistant professor. Neither do USG policies articulate a specific description of the starting point for any of the above faculty lines. USG Policy Manual Section 8.3.1.2 (Minimum Qualifications for Employment) outline credentials "at all academic ranks" as follows: Consisten[cy] with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)'s requirements for institutional accreditation Evidence of ability as a teacher Evidence of activity as a scholar and ability in all other duties assigned Successful experience (which will necessarily be waived for those just entering the academic profession who meet all other requirements) Desirable personal qualities judged on the basis of the personal interview, complete biographical data and recommendations The above listed criteria are understandably general , with the most salient qualification being the first--alignment with SACSCOC requirements. The SACSCOC Faculty Credentials Guidelines clarify standard 6.2a of the SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation as follows: "When an institution defines faculty qualifications using faculty credentials, institutions should use the following as credential guidelines: a) Faculty teaching general education courses at the undergraduate level: doctorate or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline)." However, these guidelines do not differentiate between an instructor, a lecturer or an assistant professor. The absence of specific criteria in our governing bodies' policy manuals exacerbates the absence of clarity in our own faculty handbook. In order for the university to move forward with a consistent , fair procedure for faculty professional advancement , it stands to reason that

the institution begin with a clear, concrete set of criteria for each starting point--instructor, associate professor and lecturer--followed by a clarification of the already-existing policies and procedures for advancement.

**Response:** Provost Carl Reiber appointed the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) to create guidelines for Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty evaluations. A subcommittee (NTT Subcommittee) within the FWC has been formed to address this task. At present, the NTT Subcommittee is not reviewing the policy for promotions for faculty in tenure-track positions. The policies for tenure-track promotion are in place at all levels and the FWC has not been asked to address them. The NTT subcommittee has been tasked with creating a pathway for promotion for NTT faculty where these pathways do not exist and to make clearer the distinction between the various non-tenure track positions used throughout the university. The NTT Subcommittee has begun their review.

**Discussion:** Nancy Remler (COE) asked for clarification of this RFI. Her understanding is that a subcommittee from Faculty Welfare is looking at pathways for promotion of NTT. This subcommittee will define starting the point for NTT. Is this the case? Cary Christian (CBSS) asked what she means by 'starting point,' as that comes from departments. The goal is to come up with a university-wide standard. Nancy Remler replied that there is no defined minimum criteria for accepting employment in various lines. Cary Christian replied that these positions are not well defined by the BOR. The subcommittee will try to clarify these definitions. Carl Reiber (Provost) thanked the Faculty Welfare Committee for taking this on. He asks that the committee be considerate of the needs of various departments. We need some latitude to suit the needs of various colleges and departments, he explained.

#### **K. RFI on Transparent Budget Process (Bland, JPHCOPH)**

**Discussion:** There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

#### **VI. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – Dr. Kyle Marrero**

Dr. Marrero gave an enrollment update for Fall 2019 in comparison to 2018: enrollment is 1.3% down in headcount but credit hours are down only 1%. Spring shows good retention of students. We are down in the number of undergraduate students by 490; the GSU freshman class of 2018 had record numbers, but is now down 6.8%. Kennesaw and GSU both had significant growth that captured much of the freshman market and partly accounts for our lower numbers. We need to find new avenues for recruitment. We had growth in the following areas: fully online students is up 12.1% growth, graduate student enrollment is up 1.8%, and dual enrollment is up 23.67%. The number of transfer students is also rising.

Dr. Marrero then spoke to the importance of Inclusive Excellence in creating an environment that reflects our value. We are a large institution and have those around us who don't align with our values. This statement about values only makes sense if we declare our values, he explained. Thus, we must move them forward. The President Student Advisory Committee is an important initiative in working towards establishing values. Courageous Conversations will begin on both campuses. The first topic is privilege and respect. These initiatives advance our values. Our diversity chief officer search is

underway. Faculty Staff development days will be held soon (January 10 for faculty) and the topic is inclusive excellence. The Leadership Development Institute will be in February. Employee Excellence awards will be in April. Dr. Marrero reminded Senators that an email has been distributed about budget process as part of transparency. He then briefly reviewed the budget process.

**VII. FY 2020-2021 BUDGET PRESENTATION** – Rob Whitaker, VP for  
Business & Finance

Rob Whitaker noted that this presentation is available on the MYGS portal in the Performance Excellence window. There, one can find the following: 1. Budget narrative; 2. Budget data sheets, and 3. New funding requests for FY2021.

**Questions:** Michele Haberland (CAH) asked about Student Affairs on page 2 of the budget report; the first line on this page says “counseling eliminate operating funds for savings of 95K. Are we eliminating counseling? Dr. Marrero replied that we provided new funding for Student Affairs to add counselors. Dr. Marrero also stated that we won’t have a finalized budget until April, 2020. Each year, an increase in health benefits is requested. For GSU employers, the increased projection is 1.6 million recurring. We will assume it is not funded by USG. Any projected reductions will have to be incorporated.

**VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES**

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) concluded the meeting with the following announcements:

1. Nominations for University Awards of Excellence open tomorrow. See the Agenda for information package.
- B. We are working on replacing Ginger and will do better at maintaining the Senate Website.
- C. The next Senate meeting is February 5 and will be here at Armstrong, on one campus only.
- D. Check the website for RFI deadlines.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

**A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 6:03.**

**Respectfully Submitted,  
Carol Jamison (CAH and Senate Secretary)**



# Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate

## Librarian's Report

January 24, 2020

<b><u>Standing Committees:</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Faculty Research Committee	2
Faculty Welfare Committee	6
General Education and Core Curriculum Committee	8
Graduate Committee	12
NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative Report	27
Undergraduate Committee Meeting Minutes	29
Undergraduate Committee Report	42

Submitted respectfully by Michelle Haberland, Faculty Senate Librarian, in preparation for the February 5, 2020 meeting of the Georgia Southern Faculty Senate.

# FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE MINUTES

December 6 , 2019 - 12:00 – 2:00 PM

Veazey Hall 2001C

## Present:

Amanda Glaze, Senate Representative, Chair (2020)

Lei Chen, College of Engineering and Computing (2021)

Chad Posick, College of Behavioral and Social Science (2020)

David Sikora, Parker College of Business (2021)

Jamie Roberts, College of Science and Mathematics (2020))

Li Li, Waters College of Public Health (2021)

Lucas Jensen, College of Education (2020)

Marina Eremeeva, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health (2020)

Richard Flynn, College of Arts and Humanities (2021)

Beth Burrnett, University Libraries (2020)

Lance McBrayer, Provost's Representative (Ex Officio)

Ele Haynes, VPR Representative (Ex Officio)

**I.** CALL TO ORDER -The meeting was called to order at 12:02pm by the chair, Dr. Amanda Glaze.

**II.** APPROVAL OF AGENDA- The agenda was approved by a full vote of the committee.

**III.** APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 10/18/19 - Completed by email and submitted to Librarian's report 11/1/2019

#### IV. CHAIR'S UPDATE

- a. Dr. Glaze welcomed everyone and reminded the committee of its charge as documented in the Faculty Handbook, Article IV Section 23. The Committee has 4 primary charges:
  - i. recommend policy and procedures covering all aspects of the University's support of faculty research and creative projects;
  - ii. review and evaluate proposals for faculty research funding and allocate funds budgeted for that purpose;
  - iii. review and evaluate nominations for awards and prizes in the area of faculty research; and
  - iv. address other specific questions in this area that may be requested by the Senate Executive Committee.
- b. Charge to committee: As a committee, we have the task of representing a unified front on the importance of research and scholarly activity across our three campuses. While there is a great range of definition in what this means in each college and department, excellence is the unifying factor. As such, I want to modify our challenge from last year, which asked us each to advocate vocally for our separate colleges to a charge of unification, whereby each of us, as members of this committee take an active role in our colleges to ensure that the candidates for award are empowered to voice the strengths and excellence of their contributions. It is the responsibility of those applications presented to convince the committee of their excellence and ours as a unified body to evaluate their narrative to draw our conclusions.
- c. Report on 11/21 awards process informational meeting with Dr. Curtis and Dr. Bland
  - i. Committee has autonomy to develop materials for evaluation of the new awards and should do so by the end of this year (January)
  - ii. This year we are allowed to use existing evaluation/submission process and both awards will come to single location
  - iii. Will need to discuss how to align with the new university level submissions
  - iv. Questions:
    - a. RF-Did this process go through faculty senate?; Answer: No, per email from Dr. Bland re process, re-read the email message regarding the ad-hoc committee (see attachment A) and development of new awards.
      - i. RF-Motion brought to floor to submit a letter from the committee to the provost and senate regarding the process undertaken to develop the new awards. (Passed unanimously, RF will draft, committee will review and vote again by email.)
    - b. ME-If we look at nomination side it is not clear what is required or what the definitions are for the awards. What information is provided for submissions? Answer: The rubric and other information has been removed from the website, committee members should reach out to their colleges to share key information about the process and focus shift to the narrative.
    - c. RF-So this year the candidates cannot see what they are being measured on? Answer-in the past only FRC had this information online but now none of it will be online for continuity across awards.
    - d. EH & AG-The process this year is that we will get a single pool but they will note which of the two awards a person has been nominated for, as they can only be nominated for one award. We will have to define what "innovation" looks like for the purpose of the new award, we will plan on using our January meeting times to host this discussion.

- d. Due to the shift in the timeline for the new awards, it is recommended that the internal funding reviews not take place until after the award reviews are completed in February. Committee unanimously agreed by vote to hold the review of the internal funding applications until March-April.
- e. In light of the agreement to hold the reviews of the internal funding proposal, a motion was made to adjust the submission deadline on those proposals to give more time for completion. Committee unanimously agreed by vote to move the deadline for the submission of internal funding proposals from 1/27 to 2/28 at 5pm.

## V. NEW BUSINESS

- a. Excellence Awards: Beginning this year the FRC will be tasked with review and selection of a winner for two awards, the Excellence in Research and the Innovation and Discovery Award.
  - i. University Schedule for awards
    - a. Nominations close 1/31
    - b. Committee has 2/1-28 to review
    - c. Recommendations due 3/1
    - d. Ceremony in April to honor awardees
  - ii. Committee Process
    - a. Process will be modified from prior process. Division of application reviews among members of the committee with three members assigned to each submission
    - b. Meet to discuss first round of reviews, evaluation based on peer committee ranking of proposals (Feb 7)
    - c. All members evaluate selected second round proposals
    - d. Meet to discuss and select winners (Feb 21)
    - e. We will discuss what excellence might look like across fields before evaluation to help us all conceptualize excellence in many disciplines. Start thinking about how your field/college would define excellence, innovation, and discovery to have defining conversations in January.
  
- b. Internal Funding Applications –
  - i. Posted Schedule
    - a. Call has already been sent
    - b. Materials are presently due 1/27 at 5pm but deadline will be adjusted to reflect 2/28 and sent immediately.
    - c. Evaluation of proposals will begin in March following award reviews.
  - ii. Committee Process
    - a. Process will remain unchanged. Division of application reviews among members of the committee with three members assigned to each submission
    - b. Meet to discuss first round of reviews, evaluation based on average scores of proposals (Mar 6)
    - c. All members evaluate selected second round proposals
    - d. Meet to discuss and select winners (Mar 20)
    - e. Depending on number of submissions, this process might last through April.
  
- c. Guidelines and planned process- Ele reviewed the websites with the committee for both the awards and internal funding as well as the process by which materials will be submitted.

- i. In the interest of transparency, each member will return information to their college via listserv or other mass comm in an effort to share how the evaluation process works, how the narrative is key to nominees demonstrating their own excellence.

## VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**-The meeting was adjourned at 1:27pm by the chair, Dr. Amanda Glaze with thanks to the committee for their work and patience in the process.

**\*<<Faculty Research Committee>> meetings are not recorded.**

12/5/2019

Georgia Southern University Mail - [GSNEWS] Announcing the University Awards of Excellence



Eleanor Haynes <ehaynes@georgiasouthern.edu>

---

### [GSNEWS] Announcing the University Awards of Excellence

1 message

**Communications and Marketing** <communications@georgiasouthern.edu>  
To: GS-FacStaff <gs-facstaff@georgiasouthern.edu>

Tue, Dec 3, 2019 at 10:59 AM

**Nominations** are now open! The University Awards of Excellence for Faculty and Staff are designed to identify and reward individuals who make outstanding contributions to the success of Georgia Southern University.

Through this awards process, Georgia Southern will recognize individuals who demonstrate excellence in performance and contributions to one area of the University's pillars and values. Each recipient will receive a monetary award along with a newly created medallion.

A total of 25 awards will be given annually: 12 Strategic Pillar Awards (1 Faculty, 1 Staff), 12 Institutional Values Award (1 Faculty, 1 Staff) and (1) Team Award. The five strategic pillars have 6 award categories (Student Success; Teaching; Research; Inclusive Excellence; Operational Efficiency, Effectiveness & Sustainability; and Community Engagement) while our values also have 6 award categories (Integrity, Academic Excellence, Discovery & Innovation, Openness & Inclusion, Sustainability, and Collaboration).

Award winners will be announced at a new University Awards of Excellence ceremony that will bring together all the previous university-wide awards and ceremonies into one event that will celebrate excellence among faculty and staff. Additionally, this ceremony will honor years of service (5 years increments) with a certificate and award for both faculty and staff.

The University Awards of Excellence for faculty will be very similar to previously awarded honors. There will still be two awards each for teaching, research, and service, but they will be branded according to the pillars and values above. The Faculty Senate Committees in charge of choosing those awards will still follow their processes (Faculty Development, Faculty Research and Faculty Service). Traditionally, Staff would receive Awards of Merit, selected by Staff Council. The University Awards of Excellence will now take the place of those awards.

The University Awards of Excellence Process was developed by Faculty Senate and Staff Council leaders. Since August, a joint committee has engaged individuals, groups, Faculty Senate committees, the University Strategic Planning Committee, College Assemblies, and hosted listening sessions on both campuses. The Faculty Senate Welfare Committee and the Staff Council has reviewed and voted their support for this new University Awards of Excellence Program. The administration has pledged to financially support this program.

Nomination for the awards is a simple process. Just click on the [University Awards of Excellence homepage](#) and nominate a staff, faculty or team that you feel exemplifies excellence in one of the areas above. Application submission has also been simplified, streamlined and is entirely online.

More information and/or to nominate someone, please go to [www.georgiasouthern.edu/gsawards/](http://www.georgiasouthern.edu/gsawards/)

Nominations/applications close Jan. 31, 2020.

**Attachment A: Email**

# FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Faculty Welfare Committee January 15, 2020

Present: Wayne Johnson, COEP; Wendy Wolfe, CBSS; Alex Collier, COSM; Kristi Smith, LIB; Glenda Ogletree, COE; Helen Bland, COPH; Laura Valeri, CAH; Leticia McGrath, CAH; Jeff Riley, CAH; John Barkoulas, COB; Jeff Jones, COPH;; P. Cary Christian, CBSS; Mark Hanna, COB; Jim LoBue, COSM; Susan Hendrix, WCHP; Rebecca Hunnicutt, LIB

Guests: N/A

Absent: Linda Ann McCall, COE; Diana Cone, Provost's Office; Clinton Martin, COEP; Jan Bradshaw, COPH

## I. CALL TO ORDER

Alex Collier called the meeting to order on Wednesday, January 15 at 1pm.

## II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The committee met quorum. The November's meeting's minutes were seconded and approved. There was no meeting in December.

## III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The January meeting agenda was seconded and approved.

## IV. CHAIRS' UPDATE

Co-Chair Alex Collier offered his apologies to the larger committee for the lack of feedback and communication following the elections of late last semester.

## V. FACULTY WELFARE ACTION ITEMS

*A. RFI: Implementation of the Inclusive Excellence Study's Recommendation for Fostering Community on the Armstrong Campus – time sensitive.*

Discussion: This RFI was submitted a few months ago and would need to be resolved by January 17, 2020 to be discussed at the next Faculty Senate meeting; this turnaround is not possible. Helen Bland said the man who submitted this RFI made recommendations (bullet points in RFI) based on the Inclusive Excellence Study's findings report. However, several FWC members felt this charge was beyond the FWC's purview. Mark Hanna agreed with and is sympathetic to the recommendations. Laura Valeri questioned if faculty could be involved with the implementation of these recommendations. Wendy Wolfe suggested Faculty Senate create an ad-hoc committee to work on this RFI (together with Student Government Association and Armstrong faculty). Wayne Johnson said he is on the search committee for the university's AVP of Inclusive Excellence and this person, once hired, may be involved with implementing these recommendations. Perhaps FWC could ask Dr. Maxine Bryant, Interim AVP of Inclusive Excellence, to speak at Faculty Senate and give an update on the Inclusive Excellence Study's findings report and its recommendations.

*B. Other: A faculty member from the Armstrong campus questioned if he could continue to shower in the locker rooms in the old Pirate Athletic Center (PAC) building.*

Discussion: Leticia McGrath suggested the faculty member contact Facilities Department, as this is not in FWC's purview.

*C. Other: Laura would like to be added to the FWC's NTT subcommittee. Wendy would also like to be added to a subcommittee since her work with the Awards of Excellence subcommittee is finished.*

Discussion: Both members will be added to FWC subcommittees.

## VI. FACULTY WELFARE CURRENT BUSINESS

*A. FWC Subcommittee: Non-Tenure Track Faculty Review Process*

1. Diana Cone was unable to attend this meeting but did submit an update from the Provost's office regarding the workload expectations between various NTT faculty members. The committee had additional questions and she will be invited to attend a future NTT subcommittee meeting.

2. Jim LoBue mentioned he emailed updates regarding NTT policies at other universities before this meeting. These documents are in FWC's shared Google folder and will be discussed at the next subcommittee meeting. Kristi will email Doodle Poll for scheduling this meeting.

*B. FWC Subcommittee: Lecturer Promotion/Reviews*

1. No updates. Per Alex, can this group meet again within the next few weeks? Jeff Jones will email Doodle Poll for scheduling this meeting.

*C. FWC Subcommittee: Chair Evaluations*

1. Wayne has been leading this committee. He is still gathering information from each college, and has three or four left. He will email a Doodle Poll to schedule a meeting for the last week of January.

2. If 30% of faculty in a department want its Chair evaluated, one will be performed, outside of the regular five-year evaluation period set forth by the Board of Regents (BOR). BOR website lists evaluation guidelines.

3. Wendy remarked this subcommittee may overlap with concerns over the annual administration review some people received last spring. She asked how those responses were anonymized so that specific employees weren't identified. She also asked what the process is for those surveys and what happens with the compiled data.

## **VII. FACULTY WELFARE CONCERNS**

*A. "The Chronicle of Higher Education" article*

Discussion: Leti suggested asking the AVP of Inclusive Excellence, once hired, to consider letting FYE teachers addressing issues of diversity and inclusion. Helen suggested inviting FYE staff teachers to Faculty Development Day to attend diversity and inclusion workshops. Leti shared details of an upcoming performance on the Statesboro and Armstrong campuses on February 5 and 6. Javier Avila will be sharing his American Latino experience through storytelling and dance.

*B. Increased Class Size in Online Classes - to be discussed at next month's meeting*

*C. Increased Insurance Costs/Health Care Coverage – to be discussed at next month's meeting*

## **VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

*A. Annual Faculty Evaluation Forms*

Discussion: Wayne asked if there was a section for professional development on this new form since it is now the BOR's new, fourth criteria for promotion. Helen said that each college can add that section to the form if it's not listed. If we revise the form we need to present the revisions to Faculty Senate. Laura asked if the university could use one standardized form if each faculty member's discipline is unique. Perhaps we could develop a baseline form for each college to use and customize. Wayne asked if each department's evaluation form is in line with its college's requirements. Leti questioned if revising this form is beyond the FWC's purview.

## **IX. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on January 15, 2020 at 2:57pm.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kristi Smith, Co-Secretary  
Jan Bradshaw, Co-Secretary

Minutes were approved January 22, 2020 by electronic vote of Committee Members



# GENERAL EDUCATION AND CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Meeting Date – Friday, November 22, 2019

- Present: Rocio Alba-Flores, Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering and Computing/Electrical and Computing Engineering; Amy Ballagh, Enrollment Management; Mary (Estelle) Bester, Waters College of Health Professions/Nursing; Suzy Carpenter, College of Science and Mathematics/Chemistry and Biochemistry; Daniel Chapman, College of Education/Curriculum Foundations and Reading; Michael Cuellar, Parker College of Business/Enterprise Systems and Analytics; Terri Fleteby, Institutional Effectiveness; Autumn Johnson, University Libraries; Barb King, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences/Criminal Justice and Criminology; Amanda Konkle, College of Arts and Humanities/Literature; Chris Ludowise, Office of the Provost; Jeffrey Mortimore, University Libraries; Dzyyana Nazaruk, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health/Health Policy and Community Health; Hans-Joerg Schanz, College of Science and Mathematics/Chemistry and Biochemistry; Marian Tabi, Waters College of Health Professions/Nursing; Bill Wells, Parker College of Business/Finance
- Guests: Delena Gatch, Institutional Effectiveness; Candace Griffith, Office of the Provost; Jaime O'Connor, Institutional Effectiveness; Brad Sturz, Institutional Effectiveness
- Absent: Cheryl Aasheim, Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering and Computing/Information Technology; Donna Brooks, Office of the Provost; Finbarr Curtis, College of Arts and Humanities/Philosophy and Religious Studies; Marla Morris, College of Education/Curriculum Foundations and Reading; Amy Smith, Enrollment Management; Juwan Smith, Student Government Association; James Thomas, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health/Health Policy and Community Health;

## I. CALL TO ORDER

Bill Wells, serving as chair in Finbarr Curtis's absence, called the meeting to order on Friday, November 22 at 2:37 p.m.

## II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Barb King motioned to approve the agenda; seconded by Jeff Mortimore and passed unanimously.

## III. NEW BUSINESS

### A. Course proposals

#### i. CHEM 1030 Chemistry and Your World – deactivation

- Bill Wells described the proposal to deactivate the course since it has not been taught in decades
- Candice Griffith clarified that the deactivation is the final step in the process of removing the course; it can be reactivated later

**MOTION: Bill Wells motioned for the course proposal to be passed. Unanimously approved.**

#### ii. SCIE 1212 Chemical Environment

- Bill Wells explained this deactivation proposal for a redundant course that will no longer be taught.

**MOTION: Bill Wells motioned for the course proposal to be passed. Unanimously approved.**

#### iii. SCIE 1212L Chemical Environment Lab

- Bill Wells explained this deactivation proposal for a redundant course that will no longer be

taught.

**MOTION: Bill Wells motioned for the course proposal to be passed. Unanimously approved.**

**iv. ECON 2105 Macroeconomics**

- Bill Wells mentioned the emails exchanged by the committee regarding this course proposal. Bill Wells spoke with Rand Ressler for additional background information. Prior to consolidation, the course was part of global perspectives and was a required course. It is no longer a required course. There was some debate between Statesboro and Armstrong campus about the wording of the course description. The department ultimately elected to use the BOR approved course description. The course is now an elective in the course under area E. It is only required for business majors, but other students can take it as an elective course.
- Candace Griffith clarified that there was a global perspectives overlay for core courses and faculty adapted their courses to fit that overlay. That is no longer a requirement. Chris Ludowise added that the BOR has become more liberal in what they will accept in the core.
- Daniel Chapman asked for clarification on how courses could be updated if they were prescribed by the BOR, mentioning debates about Macroeconomics courses on other campuses due to the rapid evolution of the field and the need for higher education to keep pace with these changes.
- Chris Ludowise explained that the majority of courses can change their course descriptions with the exception of a select group of core courses that have universal numbers, titles and course descriptions for ease of transferability. Chris Ludowise stated that not all of our courses are in compliance with the universal guidelines, but that the BOR does not examine them unless they are presented for a proposed change, which was the case with ECON 2105.
- Bill Wells added that the way the course is taught will not change. The adjustments to the course description are only to satisfy BOR requirements. Chris Ludowise agreed and added that none of the course content or learning outcomes are determined by the BOR.

**MOTION: Michael Cuellar called the question. Suzy Carpenter seconded. Unanimously approved.**

**B. Core assessment document review results**

- Jaime O'Connor presented two documents to the committee providing an overview of the results of the recent core course assessment document review. She noted that one document showed a comparison of scores from the assessment plans submitted in Spring 2019 to the same areas rated in the current plans. The committee hoped these scores would improve based on feedback provided in the initial review. That was true in the majority of cases, but for some courses the scores dropped. Jaime O'Connor has been doing a close review of these cases to try to determine the reason for the lower scores and to determine some categorization to prioritize a response from the committee and OIE. Delena Gatch, Jaime O'Connor, and Finbarr Curtis met prior to this meeting to discuss the results and potential next steps.
  - Bill Wells asked if the same committee members rated the initial plans and the completed reports. Jaime O'Connor had not analyzed the results based on reviewer. Delena Gatch interjected that consistency in scoring can be challenging for this committee because of the two-year appointment and resulting turnover in membership. She mentioned that this was also brought to Finbarr Curtis's attention.
  - Delena Gatch asked if the committee would allow OIE to conduct an additional review of the results for the purpose of providing additional context to specific courses where necessary. She stated that Finbarr Curtis had been in support of that strategy.
  - Bill Wells suggested that in cases where scores went down across a department, a group of volunteers from the committee could review the results and have a preliminary discussion with the department. Delena Gatch responded that the previous committee chair had often attended meetings like this with her to represent the committee.

- Marian Tabi asked if the same rubric was used for both reviews. Delena Gatch responded that it was the same rubric and that OIE had intentionally postponed some changes requested by the committee for the reason of consistency in scoring. Marian Tabi noted that she had clear reasons for scoring lower than an initial review and that her scoring was tied to the language in the rubric. She noted that reviewers do make mistakes. Bill Wells agreed that factors like scoring fatigue could affect scores either positively or negatively.
- Delena Gatch agreed that there are number of factors that could account for scores being higher or lower than expected and that was the reason OIE did not want to send feedback that might be discouraging without careful consideration.
- Estelle Bester stated that she approved of the idea of OIE reviewing scores since they would be responsible for answering any questions and that it would create more consistency in the feedback.
- Michael Cuellar added that this was not dissimilar to the NSF approach in which a program officer would review to justify a rating. Jeff Mortimore offered the comparison of a journal editor who would oversee consistency of content. Delena Gatch stated that OIE is happy to serve in that capacity and that it also provides an opportunity for the office to encourage departments to continue working with OIE to make further improvements.

**MOTION: Amanda Konkle motioned for approval for OIE to initiate feedback to the departments including any summary statements necessary with committee support in meetings to address any follow up questions. Jeff Mortimore seconded the motion. Unanimously approved.**

- Several committee members expressed concerns about inconsistency of reporting across campuses, modes of delivery, and sections.
  - Michael Cuellar noted that the rubric is set up for reporting on a single, unified course rather than accounting for differences among sections. Jeff Mortimore stated that he looked for evidence of how departments ensure learning objectives are met across all faculty and all sections. Bill Wells added that sampling strategies were not consistently applied to all sections. Michael Cuellar raised concerns about the degree of consistency required relevant to prescribing teaching strategies.
  - Chris Ludowise pointed out that this has been an ongoing discussion in this committee and as part of academic program assessment. Modalities and methodologies can be more individual as long as key points are held in common, such as learning outcomes and the mechanisms in place to help students achieve those outcomes.
  - Jeff Mortimore mentioned that the language in the rubric was broad enough to allow for those variations but that departments needed to be much more explicit in justifying the variations in teaching methods in their courses. Bill Wells interjected that some departments write very clear descriptions of how learning outcomes are addressed in large or small sections, online and on ground, etc.
  - Delena Gatch added that the courses must have the same assessment method in place across campuses, modes of delivery, and sections. The report narrative should be broken out by campus, but we had not anticipated so much variation in section size. OIE addresses these issues individually with core courses, especially concerning questions like appropriate sampling strategies.
  - Bill Wells noted that some courses seemed to be collecting only very small samples. Michael Cuellar added that some courses using a pre/post-test had made the post-test optional which was not a reliable way to collect final assessment data.
  - Delena Gatch shared an idea proposed by Finbarr Curtis to develop a “study guide” for completing the assessment documents which would provide more explicit guidelines to departments and may help to resolve some of these issues. Jaime O’Connor added that OIE was also planning to create annotated examples to share with core course coordinators, particularly those new to the role.

### **C. Schedule for GECC meetings in spring semester**

- Bill Wells asked committee members about consensus regarding a meeting time in the Spring semester. Chris Ludowise stated that Faculty Senate had already published a meeting time for Spring. Jaime O'Connor will verify the proposed time and send a poll to committee members regarding their availability at the assigned time.

## **IV. Old Business**

### **A. Update on core course assessment documents outstanding**

- Suzy Carpenter asked about strategies for preventing late report submissions in the future. Delena Gatch shared that OIE had recently held some open forums and the schedule for submission and review deadlines had been raised. OIE is open to suggestions and is considering solutions.
  - Bill Wells asked about courses that had not yet submitted reports. Jaime O'Connor reviewed the status of these courses, pointing out that some reports were not anticipated due to leadership or other changes and some were still expected. OIE has been in communication with those core course coordinators and department administrators.
  - Michael Cuellar asked about the implementation of the reports and feedback following this process. Delena Gatch explained that OIE follows up with the courses and then the reports are included as part of SACSCOC documentation for accreditation.
  - Bill Wells asked if courses not in compliance with reporting requirements could be removed from the core. Candace Griffith replied that the committee could make a recommendation for removal to the undergraduate committee. Chris Ludowise added that adjustments to the CIM software would be required to allow for the logic of a course proposal initiating from GECC.
  - Bill Wells stated that there has been hesitation to remove courses in the past because of the difficult process of restoring them later. Jeff Mortimore suggested a probationary period for courses to meet their assessment requirements. Jaime O'Connor pointed out that OIE had followed that procedure already and had contacted departments that had not submitted assessment plans asking them to submit a plan or initiate deactivation of the course. This resulted in the deactivations voted on in the committee today.
  - Candace Griffith stated that it is better to deactivate courses that are not active because we do not want to mislead students about courses in the core.

## **V. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned on November 22, 2019 at 3:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jaime O'Connor, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved December 11, 2019 by electronic vote of Committee Members
--

# GRADUATE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Graduate Committee Meeting Date – November 14, 2019

Present: Dr. Chris Kadlec, CEC; Dr. Marcel Ilie, CEC; Dr. Jennifer Kowalewski, CAH; Dr. Nicholas Holtzman, CBSS; Dr. Chuck Harter, Parker COB; Dr. Constantin Ogloblin, Parker COB; Dr. Kristen Dickens, COE; Dr. Alma Stevenson, COE; Dr. Sarah Zingales, COSM; Dr. Andrew Hansen, JPHCOPH; Dr. Jessica Schwind, JPHCOPH; Dr. Gina Crabb, WCHP; Dr. Linda Tuck, WCHP; Ms. Caroline Hopkinson, Univ. Libraries; Ms. Nikki Cannon-Rech, Univ. Libraries

Guests: Ms. Candace Griffith, VPAA; Dr. Ashley Walker, COGS; Mrs. Audie Graham, COGS; Mrs. Wendy Sikora, COGS; Mrs. Naronda Wright, COGS; Ms. Randi Sykora, COGS; Mr. Wayne Smith, Registrar's Office; Ms. Doris Mack, Registrar's Office; Mrs. Kathryn Stewart, Registrar's Office; Ms. Maggie Kuhn, GSO Representative; Dr. Deborah Thomas, COE; Dr. Lance McBrayer, COSM; Dr. John Kraft, CBSS; Mr. Norton Pease, CAH; Dr. David Williams, CEC; Dr. Sara Plaspohl, WCHP; Dr. Scott Beck, COE; Dr. Jonathan Grubb

Absent: Dr. Richard Flynn, CAH; Dr. Chad Posick, CBSS; Dr. Shijun Zheng, COSM

## I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Jennifer Kowalewski called the meeting to order on Thursday, November 14, 2019 at 9:03 AM.

## II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Alma Stevenson made a motion to approve the agenda as written. A second was made by Dr. Kristen Dickens and the motion to approve the agenda was passed.

## III. CHAIR'S UPDATE

Dr. Kowalewski will be assigning committee members to six teams for the graduate Comprehensive Program Reviews (CPRs). She hopes to send this information out via email by December 1.

Ms. Candace Griffith said this year they are recommending not to use alternates to score the CPRs, which means some members may have to score two CPRs. In January they will begin to schedule training. The norming sessions and additional training will take place in February in preparation for the scoring in March.

Dr. Kowalewski stated she will not be in attendance during the first hour of the December 2 Faculty Senate meeting. She asked one of the committee members to volunteer to give the Graduate Committee update to the Faculty Senate. Dr. Chris Kadlec volunteered to provide the update. Dr. Kowalewski said she would let Dr. Kadlec know if anything changes and if she will be able to present the information.

## IV. DIRECTOR'S UPDATE

Dr. Ashley Walker shared the following updates:

- The College of Graduate Studies (COGS) newsletter, The Grad Post, was sent out Tuesday to graduate students, Graduate Program Directors, Department Chairs, and Administrators. Please feel free to forward the message to your colleagues or students you are recruiting.
- The Graduate Student Organization (GSO) on the Armstrong campus is hosting Bingo Night for graduate students tonight from 8-10 PM. The event will be held in the Student Union Ballroom A on the Armstrong campus. COGS has sent emails out to students with details. The last fall deadline to submit GSO travel and research grant proposals is tomorrow, November 15, by 5 PM. The spring deadlines are February 17 and April 1. COGS will be sending emails reminders to students. Please encourage your students to apply.
- The Graduate Writer's Boot Camps have been well attended during the fall semester. COGS and the GSO will continue to offer these events during the spring semester. COGS will send emails to graduate students once the dates have been selected.
- During the January meeting Dr. Walker will present some language change on some institutional level policies. The purpose will be to provide clarification to students. Dr. Walker asked the

Registrar's Office if this should be entered as a miscellaneous item in CIM or if it should be a handout to the committee during the next meeting. Ms. Doris Mack requesting the information be entered into CIM so that there is a record.

## V. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Revising CIM Forms – Candace Griffith or OIE Representative** – Ms. Griffith stated last year the Undergraduate Committee had a lot of discussion regarding the CIM forms. One of the discussions was how the campus was not included on the forms so the committee agreed there needed to be some kind of campus designation. There was also confusion on program learning outcomes, student learning outcomes and assessments. The Undergraduate Committee formed a sub-committee that worked during the summer who made suggestions for the CIM forms. Ms. Griffith provided a brief review of the sub-committee's matrix of ideas. Ms. Griffith stated the sub-committee would like the Graduate Committee's okay to move forward with the suggested changes. Ms. Griffith explained that the next step would be to meet with the Registrar's Office to find out what can and cannot be done in CIM under our current contract. They would like to have changes made in time for the 2020-2021 academic year. The sub-committee is hoping CIM will be more user friendly for the users and reviewers.

**MOTION: Dr. Kadlec made a motion to indorse the CIM form revisions submitted by the Undergraduate Committee Sub-Committee. A second was made by Dr. Chuck Harter, and the motion to approve the request was passed.**

**The sub-committee's proposed CIM form revisions are below.**

Review of CIM Forms—Summer 2019

### Process Revision Recommendations

1. *"Motion to approve that the Registrar's Office may process and complete any course or program revision, without need for approval from the Undergraduate Committee, when the only revision submitted is to update the course outcomes, assessment methods, and/or alignment with program learning outcomes."*

**[Approved at March 2019 UGC Meeting]**

2. Forms must be COMPLETE before reaching the Graduate or Undergraduate Committee in Workflow or will be returned to the previous stage (Associate Dean) by the Registrar's Office for completion of missing elements
3. *"Motion that certain editorial changes may be made to programs and courses and may be processed by the Registrar without need for review by the entire UGC/GC faculty body, after confirmation by the Chair of the UGC/GC that the changes adhere to one of the allowable exceptions outlined below. A list of such revisions approved by the Chair each cycle will be submitted as an FYI to the UGC/GC at the next monthly meeting"*

#### Program Forms

- Updating references to other courses that have changed course number or title
- Formatting/layout changes requested by the Registrar for clarity and/or consistency that do not alter the required courses of the program.
- Program code
- Program Student Learning Outcomes [\[and other assessment changes if those fields are added to form\]](#)

#### Course Forms

- o Spelling corrections and small grammatical changes to course descriptions that do not alter the content of the course
  - o Updating references to other courses that have changed course number or title
  - o Updating variable hours of lecture-lab combo courses to allow for behind-the-scenes BANNER programming of multiple lab sections per lecture
  - o General course goals/outcomes, Specific Course Learning Outcomes, assessment methods and alignment with Program Learning Outcomes
4. The chair must submit the agenda to the committee one week (7 business days) before the UGC meeting. Therefore, items should be submitted to the Registrar’s Office 10 days before the meeting to allow time to review forms for minor issues like completeness and grammar and spelling errors.

### New Program Proposal / Program Revisions CIM Forms

Item	Information Blurb	Notes/Comments
Catalog Pages Using this Program <i>*appears top of Program Revision CIM Form</i>		
Contact(s)	Please list the name, email address, and phone number of the individual to whom questions should be addressed.	
Effective catalog/Effective semester	Please note that programs (program requirements/catalog page) need to be published in the catalog before students may be eligible to receive financial aid. Consequently, it is generally recommended that spring or summer “effective semester” be avoided.	<b>Confirm with Financial Aid</b>
<del>Meeting month</del> <i>rename “UGC/GC Meeting Month”</i>	Please check meeting dates of approvers in WorkFlow to make sure the proposal has sufficient time to receive all necessary approvals before the University Curriculum Committee meeting for which this proposal is intended to be presented.	
Proposal type	Brand new degree programs have the option of submitting a Concept Paper for New Academic Programs (one-page) which is reviewed by the Board of Regents before a full proposal is developed OR programs can submit a Full Proposal for a one-step approval process. For additional information on the process, please see the Academic Program Development and Approval Process in the Digital Commons Policy Repository.	<b>Replace existing information button; change “New Preliminary Proposal” to “Concept Paper (one-page)”;</b> <b>change “Formal Proposal” to “Full Proposal”;</b> <b>change “Other Program Proposals or Revisions that do not require Regents’ approval” to “Substantive Changes and/or Program Revisions”</b>
Department code/name		<b>Move Dept below College as it needs college to filter dept choices</b>
College		
Academic level		
Program type		<b>Program types need to be defined. We tend not to distinguish between Concentrations and Emphasis within programs across campus as a whole.</b>

CIP code	The Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) provides a taxonomic scheme that supports the accurate tracking and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity. CIP was originally developed by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in 1980, with revisions occurring in 1985, 1990, and 2000. Use the <a href="#">Find...</a> link to identify the appropriate CIP code.	
Name of Program		
Program Code <i>*appears on Program Revision CIM Form</i>		
Consistent with the goals of		Eliminate this section?
?Accreditation/Licensure		replace above with Accreditation text box
Delivery method		
Proposed tuition type		
Total credit hours required		
Target group of students		Eliminate this section?
?Program description and fit with institutional mission	Provide the rationale for developing the program and connection to the institutional strategic plan.	replace above with Accreditation text box
Program Requirements/Catalog Page	<i>Ask the Registrar's Office to enter catalog format template to enter new data within.</i>	
Program's Student learning outcomes	<i>Defer to Delena on defining for information blurb</i>	<i>adjust the name</i>
?Program Assessment Methods		<i>can we add a box for this</i>
Additional resources needed		While I understand why this section was added, I'm not sure anyone pays attention to it. Remove???
Is it possible this change.....  And  Does this proposal....		Can we make these so they need to check and not default to "no"?
Will a new program code be needed? <i>*appears on Program Revision CIM Form</i>	<i>Registrar: provide info button instructions so faculty may understand situations when a new program code will be needed</i>	
Justification for this request	Please provide a <b>clear</b> and <b>detailed</b> justification for the request. Language written in this section is frequently used in communications to the University System of Georgia and SACSCOC explaining the change.	
Additional information	Are there future impending changes that the program plans to make which might be helpful to know at this point in time? If so, please include here.	
Supporting documentation	For example, one-page Concept Paper; Full Proposal; Substantive Change Document, etc.	



## New Course / Course Revisions CIM Forms

Item	Information Blurb	Notes/Comments
Catalog Pages referencing this course <b>*appears top of Course Revision CIM Form</b>		
Other Courses referencing this course <b>*appears top of Course Revision CIM Form</b>		
Contact(s)	Please list the name, email address, and phone number of the individual to whom questions should be addressed.	
Course Change(s) <b>*appears on Course Revision CIM Form</b>		
Effective semester	<p>Currently reads: For an effective semester other than those available in the drop-down, please include a request and justification as an Additional Information item at the bottom of the form.</p> <p>Change to: Please note that programs (program requirements/catalog page) need to be published in the catalog before students may be eligible to receive financial aid. Consequently, it is generally recommended that spring or summer “effective semester” be avoided.</p>	Confirm with Financial Aid
<del>Meeting Month</del> rename “UGC/GC Meeting Month”	<p>Currently reads: Please choose the month that corresponds with the University Curriculum Committee meeting for which this proposal is intended to be presented.</p> <p>Change to: Please check meeting dates of approvers in WorkFlow to make sure the proposal has sufficient time to receive all necessary approvals before the University Curriculum Committee meeting for which this proposal is intended to be presented.</p>	
Academic level		Recommend change to drop down menu to be consistent with New Program CIM Form.
CIP code	The Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) provides a taxonomic scheme that supports the accurate tracking and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity. CIP was originally developed by the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) in 1980, with revisions occurring in 1985, 1990, and 2000. Use the <a href="#">Find...</a> link to identify the appropriate CIP code.	
Subject	<p>Currently reads: In the event that a new course number is needed (for a new course or course number change), please specify a course number request as an “Additional information” item at the bottom of the form. For more information on the course numbering system, please refer to the</p>	

	University Undergraduate or Graduate Catalogs at <a href="http://catalog.georgiasouthern.edu/">http://catalog.georgiasouthern.edu/</a> .	
Department code/name		Move Dept below College as forms needs college first to populate this field
College		
Course Number	<p>Currently reads: Please propose a course number based on the institutional course numbering system: The first digit corresponds to the level of the class. (1- Freshman, 2 - Sophomore, 3 - Junior, 4 - Senior, 5 - dual Undergraduate/Graduate, 6 - Lower Division Graduate, 7 - Upper Division Graduate, 8 - Upper Division Graduate, 9 - Doctoral Level Graduate.) The second digit indicates the course type. (1-5 - Traditional course format/Example: Lecture and Lab, 6 - Seminar, 7 - Internships and Practica, 8 - Independent Study/Directed Study, 9 - Research, 0 - Topics courses) The third and fourth digits are "free" and indicate the sequence of the course.</p> <p><b>Change to:</b> If a new course number is needed (for a new course or course number change), please specify a course number request as an "Additional information" item at the bottom of the form. Recommend checking with the Registrar before-hand to make sure the course number is available.</p>	
Catalog Title (Appears only in catalog)	<p>Currently reads: Do not include Prerequisites, Corequisites or Cross Listings in the catalog description. Be sure to end the Catalog Description with a period.</p>	
Banner Title (Appears on transcripts and schedules)	<p>Currently reads: Please note that abbreviated titles are displayed on official transcripts and in the University Course Search. Also, please refrain from using symbols (with the exception of an ampersand).</p> <p><b>Change to:</b> For course titles longer than 30 characters. Please note that abbreviated titles are displayed on official transcripts and the University Course Search. Please refrain from using symbols (with the exception of an ampersand).</p>	
Catalog description	<p>Currently reads: Do not include Prerequisites, Corequisites or Cross Listings in the catalog description. Be sure to end the Catalog Description with a period.</p>	
Prerequisites	<p>Currently reads: Format should be as follows: A minimum grade of "X" in SUBJ XXXX. For multiple prerequisites, please use the following format: A minimum grade of "X" in all of the following: SUBJ XXXX, SUBJ XXXX and SUBJ XXXX. Undergraduate: prerequisite grade will automatically default to D if no grade is selected. Graduate: prerequisite grade will automatically default to C if no grade is selected.</p>	

	<p><b>Change to:</b>  Format should be as follows: A minimum grade of “X” in SUBJ XXXX.  For multiple prerequisites, please use the following format: A minimum grade of “X” in all of the following: SUBJ XXXX, SUBJ XXXX and SUBJ XXXX. Note that undergraduate prerequisite grade will automatically default to D if no minimum grade is indicated, and graduate prerequisites will automatically default to C if no minimum grade is indicated</p>	
Corequisites	<p><b>Currently reads:</b>  Please note the following: 1. An “or” cannot be used in a coreq listing. 2. Use the following format: SUBJ XXXX, SUBJ XXXX. 3. A new course form or course revision form must be submitted for each corequisite modification in order for all courses to reflect the corequisite link for registration purposes.</p> <p><b>Change to:</b>  All listed co-requisite courses must be taken simultaneously (“or” cannot be used in a coreq listings in BANNER). Use the following format: SUBJ XXXX, SUBJ XXXX. Note that co-requisite courses must ALWAYS be taken together (use a prerequisite “concurrent allowed” for corequisite course where one course may be retaken alone if not passed).</p>	
Cross Listing(s)	<p><b>Currently reads:</b>  Please note the following: 1. Use the following format: SUBJ XXXX, SUBJ XXXX. 2. A new course form or course revision form must be submitted for each cross listing modification in order for all courses to reflect the appropriate cross listing links.</p> <p><b>Change to:</b>  Use the following format: SUBJ XXXX, SUBJ XXXX. A new course or course revision form must also be submitted for each cross listed course (to list this course in its cross listing). Note that 5000-level courses must always include a 5000G equivalent cross listing</p>	
Is this a Core Curriculum course, or proposed as such? *only appears on Course Revision Form	<p><b>Change to:</b>  If Yes, select UGC Meeting Month that will also allow time for this proposal to route through the GSU Gen Ed Committee before reaching the UGC for review.</p> <p>If there is still a core proposal form also add:  Be certain to upload and attach Core Proposal Form in the Supporting Documentation at bottom of form.</p>	<b>This question needs to also be included on New Course Proposal Form</b>
Will this course be listed on a program page in the catalog? *only appears on New Course Proposal Form	<p><b>Currently reads:</b>  Please note the following: 1. List all programs that will reference this course on the program page of the catalog (this is for FYI purposes only for reviewers and approvers). 2. A new program form or program revision form must be submitted for each program that will reference this course.</p>	
Does this course affect another Department or College?	<p><b>Currently reads:</b>  For NEW courses, please choose the appropriate departments and/or colleges that should be alerted of this new course proposal. For course REVISIONS, only list those departments/colleges that should be notified of these changes that are outside of those that are part of the Ecosystem. (Note: Any programs and/or courses that already reference this course are part of the Ecosystem at the top of the form.</p>	

	Each department associated with these programs/courses will be notified of the course revisions. If departments/colleges are chosen in THIS question, a Department Chair FYI alert will be generated, if colleges are chosen, this will generate a College Dean FYI alert as part of the workflow).	
Does this course impact educator preparation? (Contact the College of Education)	Currently reads: Please note: If “Yes” is selected, this proposal will require approval by the EPC Curriculum Chair as part of the workflow.	
Is this a variable credit hour course?	Currently reads: For example: Use 1-3 to indicate 1 TO 3 credit hours. Use 1,3 to indicate 1 OR 3 credit hours.	
Credit hours	Currently reads: Credit Hours and Contact Hours must be whole numbers. For more information on approved contact hour combinations, please refer to the University Undergraduate or Graduate Catalogs at <a href="http://catalog.georgiasouthern.edu/">http://catalog.georgiasouthern.edu/</a> .	
Weekly contact hours:		
Is this course repeatable for credit that can count towards graduation?	Currently reads: In order to select “Yes” the following must apply: (1) A student can take this course more than once and (2) each time it will count towards the total required credit hours for the student’s program of study.	
Will the course topic vary? <b>*only on Course Revision Form</b>		
Course fees:		
Primary Grade Mode		
Other Grading Mode(s) (check all that apply)		
Schedule type	Currently reads: Lecture - Must have class hours but no lab hours. Lecture/Supervised Lab - Must have lecture hours AND supervised lab/clinic hours. Lecture/Unsupervised Lab - Must have lecture hours AND minimally supervised lab/clinic hours. Seminar - Small group of upper division, graduate and/or honors students studying and interacting with faculty member(s). Supervised Laboratory - Students in a lab or clinic under the supervision of a faculty member. Must have lab hours but no lecture hours. Unsupervised Laboratory - Students in a lab or clinic under minimal supervision. Must have lab hours but no lecture hours. Independent Study - Approved study topic with periodic faculty guidance and no lecture, lab or clinic contact hours (code correspondence courses here).	

	<p>Directed Study (one-to-one) - A one-to-one teaching situation, e.g., private piano lessons.</p> <p>Asynchronous Instruction - Instruction that normally occurs without assigned space and with timing and duration that varies among students. This would include internet, print-based correspondence, and some types of satellite courses.</p> <p>Practice Teaching - Teacher education field experience</p> <p>Internship/Practicum - Minimally supervised practical or field experience related to the program of study.</p> <p>Thesis - Student working on master's thesis with minimal supervision.</p> <p>Dissertation - Student working on doctoral dissertation with minimal supervision.</p>	
Justification for this request	<p>Currently reads:</p> <p>Please provide a brief justification for this request; for example, required for the major, for certification, elective, etc.</p>	
Similarity with existing course	<p>Currently reads:</p> <p>Include a clear statement indicating that a thorough examination has been made of other departments/units/colleges and discuss to what extent this course duplicates or overlaps existing course(s). If course duplication occurs, provide a justification for a similar course and a description of dialogues that have occurred with the department(s) where the duplication exists.</p>	
Accreditation/Licensure approval	<p>Currently reads:</p> <p>Does this course meet the desired requirements for the appropriate accreditation bodies? Has the proposing unit secured the appropriate approval of all on-campus governing bodies {(e.g., Educator Preparation Committee (EPC))}?</p>	
General course goals/outcomes	<p>Currently reads:</p> <p>List the broad goals of the proposed course.</p>	
Specific Course Learning Outcomes, assessment methods and alignment with Program Learning Outcomes	<p>Currently reads:</p> <p>List the specific and measurable student learning outcomes of this course. Link each of the student learning outcomes to both the specific assessment method that will be used to measure the outcome and the program requirement that the outcome addresses.</p>	
Course content outline	<p>Currently reads:</p> <p>Provide a list of topics covered by the course, methodology used to deliver material, and typical materials (e.g., texts) used within the course.</p>	
Additional resources needed	<p>Currently reads:</p> <p>Provide information concerning what university resources will be required for this course.</p>	
Additional information		
Supporting documentation		

**B. College of Arts and Humanities**

*Dr. Jennifer Kowalewski presented the agenda item for the College of Arts and Humanities*

**Department of Communication Arts**

Revised Course:

[COMM 5333G: Theories of Mass Communication](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

COMM 2332 was inappropriately listed as pre-requisite for this course. COMM 2332 is a pre-requisite for undergraduates taking COMM 5333, but it should not be listed as a pre-requisite for the graduate student course.

**MOTION: Dr. Dickens made a motion to approve the agenda item submitted by the College of Arts and Humanities. A second was made by Dr. Constantin Ogloblin, and the motion to approve the Revised Course was passed.**

**C. Waters College of Health Professions**

*Dr. Sara Plaspohl presented the agenda item for the Waters College of Health Professions.*

**Department of Rehabilitation Sciences**

Revised Course:

[PHTH 8491: Clinical Education Synthesis 1](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

Credit hour change more accurately reflects the actual contact hours needed for the content

**MOTION: Dr. Nicholas Holtzman made a motion to approve the agenda item submitted by the Waters College of Health Professions. A second was made by Dr. Kadlec, and the motion to approve the Revised Course was passed.**

**D. College of Engineering and Computing**

*Dr. David Williams presented the agenda items for the College of Engineering and Computing.*

**Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering**

Revised Course:

[EENG 5540G: Communication Systems with Lab](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

The title was changed to resolve an out of sync error.

We changed the prerequisite by adding EENG 3341.

**MOTION: Dr. Harter made a motion to approve the course agenda item submitted by the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering. A second was made by Dr. Stevenson, and the motion to approve the Revised Course was passed.**

Revised Programs:

[MSEE-EE: Electrical Engineering M.S.E.E. \(Thesis\)](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

Fixed a few typos in the text.

We changed the Mathematics core course that was inherited from our old MSAE program to Advanced

Power Systems (EENG 7333). The reason for that change is that the MATH course was used to provide the required math content to our previous Technology students to be able to obtain a graduate degree. However, since we are now an engineering program we have the required math preparation in the undergraduate program and there is no need for this course anymore. The advanced power system course is added to the graduate core to provide the needed background to satisfy the growing demand in graduate research in the area of power systems. The MSEE is being

expanded to be offered on the Armstrong, Statesboro Armstrong and Liberty campuses and for delivery at a new off-campus location at the Georgia Veterans Education Career Transition (VECTR) Center in Warner Robins, GA.

We added the accelerated bachelors to MSEE (ABM) option.

[MSEE-EE/NT: Electrical Engineering M.S.E.E. \(Non-Thesis\)](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Fixed a few typos in the text.

We changed the Mathematics core course that was inherited from our old MSAE program to Advanced Power Systems (EENG 7333). The reason for that change is that the MATH course was used to provide the required math content to our previous Technology students to be able to obtain a graduate degree. However, since we are now an engineering program we have the required math preparation in the undergraduate program and there is no need for this course anymore. The advanced power system course is added to the graduate core to provide the needed background to satisfy the growing demand in graduate research in the area of power systems. The MSEE is being expanded to be offered on the Armstrong, Statesboro Armstrong and Liberty campuses and for delivery at a new off-campus location at the Georgia Veterans Education Career Transition (VECTR) Center in Warner Robins, GA.

We added the accelerated bachelors to MSEE (ABM) option.

**MOTION: Dr. Andrew Hansen made a motion to approve the program agenda item submitted by the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering. A second was made by Dr. Ogloblin, and the motion to approve the Revised Programs was passed.**

**Department of Information Technology**

Deleted Course:

[IT 7360: Intgrt Tech School Learn Envir](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

This is not an "IT" course. We have no idea where it came from and it was never proposed by our department. We suspect it is a typo of a proposed "Instructional Technology" course that was entered under the "IT" designation, but never taught.

**MOTION: Dr. Dickens made a motion to approve the agenda item submitted by the Department of Information Technology. A second was made by Dr. Stevenson, and the motion to approve the Deleted Course was passed.**

**E. College of Education**

*Dr. Deborah Thomas presented the agenda items for the College of Education.*

**Department of Curriculum, Foundations, and Reading**

Revised Programs:

[EDD-CURS: Curriculum Studies Ed.D.](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

GRE is not a good indicator of student success in Ed. D. in Curriculum Studies program. Writing sample is a better indicator. We have enhanced the Writing Sample and developed a grading matrix for the Writing Sample. This suggested change was approved by the curriculum studies unit, the Ed.D. in Curriculum Studies program committee and the CFR department.

See attached grading matrix for the Writing Sample for details.

The following sentence from the third point under “Admission Requirements” has been eliminated--  
“Present current official report from the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) or the Miller’s Analogies Test (MAT) showing competitive scores.”

This hybrid program will be offered on the Statesboro campus. This program will not be offered on the Armstrong or the Liberty campuses.

[EDS-READED: Reading Education \(K-12\) Ed.S. \(Online\)](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

READ 8431 is being removed as a prerequisite for EDUR 8434. In consultation between READ and EDUR faculty, it was decided that students can take these two courses in the same semester. This adjustment was made in the interest of students. It will ensure that students can complete their POS in 6 semesters. The course sequence was a challenge to work out since many courses are only offered once per year.

This program is 100% online.

**MOTION: Dr. Stevenson made a motion to approve the agenda items submitted by the Department of Curriculum, Foundations, and Reading. A second was made by Dr. Kadlec, and the motion to approve the Revised Programs was passed.**

**Department of Middle Grades and Secondary Education**

Revised Courses:

[TCLD 7334: Language Policy and Politics in Education](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

Changes made: Removal of all prerequisites and elective restrictions to allow enrollment by Ed.S. & Doctoral students

[TCLD 7336: Globalization, Immigration, and Teaching ELLs](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

Removal of all prerequisites and elective restrictions to allow enrollment by Ed.S. & Doctoral students  
We opened the course to Ed.S. and Ed.D. level students in order that they can use this course as an elective.

[TCLD 7338: Special Education-ELL Interface Assessment](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

Removal of all prerequisites and elective restrictions to allow enrollment by Ed.S. & Doctoral students  
We opened the course to Ed.S. and Ed.D. level students in order that they can use this course as an elective.

[TCLD 8538: Advanced ELL Bilingual Teaching Methods](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

We removed the prerequisites to allow for greater flexibility in individual students' programs of study.  
We opened the course to Ed.S. and Ed.D. level students in order that they can use this course as an elective.

**MOTION: Dr. Harter made a motion to approve the course agenda items submitted by the Department of Middle Grades and Secondary Education. A second was made by Dr. Stevenson, and the motion to approve the Revised Courses was passed.**

Revised Program:

[MED-TCLAD: Teaching Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students \(TCLD\) M.Ed. \(Online\)](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*



We moved TCLD 6231 Cultural Diversity from a Admissions Prerequisite to a Program Prerequisite Coursework. We added an alternative course for EDUF 7235.

This program is 100% online.

**MOTION: Dr. Dickens made a motion to approve the program agenda item submitted by the Department of Middle Grades and Secondary Education. A second was made by Dr. Hansen, and the motion to approve the Revised Program was passed.**

**F. College of Behavior and Social Sciences**

*Dr. Jonathan Grubb and Dr. John Kraft presented the agenda items for the College of Behavior and Social Sciences.*

**Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology**

Revised Courses:

[CRJU 5003G: Cyber Forensics](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

This class can be taught online/asynchronously

[CRJU 6801: Proseminar in Ethics and Criminal Justice](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

This class can be taught asynchronously/online

[CRJU 6811: Criminal Justice Systems: Leadership, Management, and Policy](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

This course can be taught online/asynchronously

[CRJU 7631: Criminological Theory](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

This course can be taught online/asynchronously

[CRJU 7632: Seminar in Criminal Justice](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

This course can be taught online/asynchronously

[CRJU 7633: Seminar in Criminology](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

This course can be taught online/asynchronously

[CRJU 7867: Cyber Ethics and Internet Culture](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

This course can be taught online/asynchronously

[CRJU 7868: Cyber Criminology](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

This course can be taught online/asynchronously

**MOTION: Dr. Kadlec made a motion to approve the agenda items submitted by the College of Behavior and Social Sciences. A second was made by Dr. Harter, and the motion to approve the Revised Courses was passed.**

**G. College of Science and Mathematics**

*Dr. Lance McBrayer presented the agenda items for the College of Science and Mathematics.*

**Department of Biology**

Revised Programs:

[MS-BIOL: Biology M.S. \(Thesis\)](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

There are no actual changes to the requirements of this program. It had always been intended during Consolidation to expand the MS in Biology to the Armstrong campus. This request is to formally announce that the program is offered on both the Statesboro campus as well as the Armstrong campus.

[MS-BIOL-NT: Biology M.S. \(Non-Thesis\)](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

There are no actual changes to the requirements of this program. It had always been intended during Consolidation to expand the MS in Biology to the Armstrong campus. This request is to formally announce that the program is offered on both the Statesboro campus as well as the Armstrong campus. This program is not offered on the Liberty Campus.

**Mrs. Naronda Wright asked Dr. McBrayer to work with her to discuss how the campus will be indicated on the application, and Dr. McBrayer agreed.**

**MOTION: Dr. Hansen made a motion to approve the agenda items submitted by the Department of Biology. A second was made by Dr. Dickens, and the motion to approve the Revised Programs was passed.**

**Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry**

Revised Programs:

[MSAPS-APS: Applied Physical Science M.S.A.P.S. \(Thesis\)](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

There are no actual changes to the requirements of this program. It had always been intended during Consolidation to expand the MS Applied Physical Science to the Armstrong campus. This request is to formally announce that the program offered on both the Statesboro campus as well as the Armstrong campus. This program is not offered on the Liberty Campus.

[MSAPS-APS/NT: Applied Physical Science M.S.A.P.S. \(Non-Thesis\)](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

There are no actual changes to the requirements of this program (other than to list the Program Learning Outcomes as they had not been entered into CIM). It had always been intended during Consolidation to expand the MS Applied Physical Science to the Armstrong campus. This request is to formally announce that the program is offered on both the Statesboro campus as well as the Armstrong campus. This program is not offered on the Liberty Campus.

[MSAPS-PSM: Applied Physical Science M.S.A.P.S. \(Professional Science Master\)](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

There are no actual changes to the requirements of this program. It had always been intended during Consolidation to expand the MS Applied Physical Science to the Armstrong campus. This request is to announce that the program is offered on both the Statesboro campus as well as the Armstrong campus. This program is not offered on the Liberty Campus.

**MOTION: Dr. Kadlec made a motion to approve the agenda items submitted by the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry. A second was made by Dr. Ogloblin and the motion to approve the Revised Programs was passed.**

**Department of Mathematical Sciences**

Revised Programs:

[MS-MATH/APL: Mathematical Sciences M.S. \(Concentration in Applied Mathematics\)](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

There are no actual changes to the requirements of this program. It had always been intended during Consolidation to expand the MS in Mathematics to the Armstrong campus. This request is to formally announce that the program will be offered on both the Statesboro campus as well as the Armstrong campus. This program is not offered on the Liberty Campus.

[MS-MATH/CPSC: Mathematical Sciences M.S. \(Concentration in Computational Science\)](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

There are no actual changes to the requirements of this program. It had always been intended during Consolidation to expand the MS in Mathematics to the Armstrong campus. This request is to formally announce that the program will be offered on both the Statesboro campus as well as the Armstrong campus. This program is not offered on the Liberty Campus.

[MS-MATH/PURE: Mathematical Sciences M.S. \(Concentration in Pure Mathematics\)](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

There are no actual changes to the requirements of this program. It had always been intended during Consolidation to expand the MS in Mathematics to the Armstrong campus. This request is to formally announce that the program will be offered on both the Statesboro campus as well as the Armstrong campus. This program is not offered on the Liberty Campus.

[MS-MATH/STAT: Mathematical Sciences M.S. \(Concentration in Statistics\)](#)

*JUSTIFICATION:*

There are no actual changes to the requirements of this program. It had always been intended during Consolidation to expand the MS in Mathematics to the Armstrong campus. This request is to formally announce that the program will be offered on both the Statesboro campus as well as the Armstrong campus. This program is not offered on the Liberty Campus.

**MOTION: Dr. Harter made a motion to approve the agenda items submitted by the Department of Mathematical Sciences. A second was made by Dr. Hansen, and the motion to approve the Revised Programs was passed.**

**VI. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Sub-Committee for SLOs/Course Objectives** – Dr. Kowalewski stated she would be reaching out to the sub-committee to schedule a meeting. Dr. Kadlec said the sub-committee has already had an initial meeting. Dr. Kowalewski said she would be assisting the sub-committee with this task. Mrs. Audie Graham stated she has contacted the Registrar's Office to request a master list of graduate level courses in CIM for the sub-committee to use as a reference.

**VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS** – Mr. Wayne Smith reminded everyone that the priority deadline for curriculum items to be submitted for the next catalog is the February meeting. He said early registration begins on March 9 and asked that colleges/departments submit their curriculum items in time for the February meeting. The Registrar's Office will then be able to enter the changes into the system in enough time to allow students to register for their courses. He said curriculum can still be submitted for the March and April meetings, but it would be better for everyone if the items were submitted earlier.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on November 14, 2019 at 9:27 AM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Audie Graham, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved December 9, 2019 by electronic vote of Committee Members
---

# NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative Report to the Faculty Senate

## Georgia Southern University

January, 2020

Submitted by

Chris Geyerman, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative

1. Below is an academic overview of Georgia Southern Student Athletes for Fall Semester, 2019:

Fall 2019 Overall GPA for Athletics=2.96

11 of the 16 teams earned a 3.0 or higher for Fall 2019

President's List (4.0)=59

Dean's List (3.50-3.99)=71

Honor Roll (3.00-3.49)=81

Total Number of Student Athletes with a 3.0 or higher=211

### Fall 2019 Team GPA Overview

- Rifle=3.54
  - Softball=3.45
  - Volleyball=3.27
  - Women's Basketball=2.87
  - Women's Golf=3.24
  - Women's Soccer=3.20
  - Swimming and Diving=3.47
  - Women's Track and Field=2.56
  - Women's Cross Country=2.89
  - Women's Tennis=3.53
  - Baseball=3.20
  - Football=2.57
  - Men's Basketball=2.22
  - Men's Golf=3.47
  - Men's Soccer=2.93
  - Men's Tennis=3.39
2. The Director of Athletics resigned effective January 21, 2020. The search for a new Athletic Director is underway.

3. Below is the link to access NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR) and Federal Graduation Rate for Georgia Southern University:  
<http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/research/graduation-success-rate>
4. Below is the link to access NCAA Academic Progress Rate (APR) for Georgia Southern University:  
<https://web3.ncaa.org/aprsearch/aprsearch>
5. Below [is a link to the “Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics,”](http://www.knightcommission.org/) the goal of which is “to ensure that intercollegiate athletics programs operate within the educational mission of their colleges and universities.”  
<http://www.knightcommission.org/>
6. [Below is a link to “The Drake Group,”](http://thedrakegroup.org/) whose mission “is to defend academic integrity in higher education from the corrosive aspects of commercialized college sports.”  
<http://thedrakegroup.org/>

**UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES**  
**November 12, 2019**  
**3:30 P.M.**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**Voting Members Present:** Dr. Maria Adamos, Dr. Chris Barnhill, Mr. Chris Cartright , Dr. Joanne Chopak- Foss, Ms. Kay Coates, Dr. Nedra Cossa, Mrs. Jamie Cromley, Ms. Autumn Johnson, Dr. Barbara King, Dr. Jun Liu, Dr. Nancy McCarley, Ms. Donna Mullenax, Dr. Amy Potter, Dr. Lina Soares, Dr. Hyunju Shin, Dr. TimMarie Williams.

**Non-Voting Members Present:** Dr. Delena Bell Gatch, Ms. Linda Covino, Ms. Candace Griffith, Ms. Doris Mack, Mr. Wayne Smith, Mrs. Kathryn Stewart, Ms. Barbara Weiss.

**Guests:** Dr. John Kraft, Dr. Brian Koehler, Mrs. Cassie Morgan, Mr. Norton Pease, Dr. John Roberts, Dr. Sara Plaspohl, Dr. Deborah Thomas, Dr. David Williams.

**Absent:** Dr. Anoop Desai, Mr. Felix Hamza-Lup, Dr. Barbara Hendry, Dr. Dziyana Nazaruk, Dr. Marion Tabi.

*Mr. Chris Cartright called the meeting to order on Tuesday, November 12, 2019 at 3:32 p.m.*

**II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

*Chris Cartright made a motion to approve the agenda. A second was made by Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss and the motion to approve the agenda was passed.*

**III. ELECTION OF UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE CHAIR**

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss and Dr. Lina Soares have been nominated to co-chair this committee. Dr. Nedra Cossa made a motion to approve their nomination. A second was made by Dr. Maria Adamos and the motion to approve the new co-chairs passed.*

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

**A . College of Education**

*Dr. Deborah Thomas presented the agenda items for the College of Education.*

**Department of Curriculum Foundations & Reading**

Revised Course(s)

[READ 3330: Content Literacy](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

We are planning to offer this course in summers in an online format to accommodate for students who are working full time or living at home in areas such as Atlanta. This also helps to accommodate for students on the Armstrong campus who have not had access to summer READ courses because of the low numbers. The regular semester courses (spring and fall) will continue to be taught face-to-face.

[READ 4233: Literacy Assessment and Instruction](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

We are planning to offer this course in summers in multiple formats to accommodate for students who are working full time or living at home in areas such as Atlanta. This also helps to accommodate for students on the Armstrong campus who have not had access to summer READ courses because of the low numbers. The regular semester courses (spring and fall) will continue to be taught face-to-face. The summer sections will be taught either face-to-face, hybrid, or fully online.

*READ 3330 and READ 4233 revised delivery options to offer as asynchronous in Summer 2020. READ 4233 had prerequisites listed as a change, but that is an error and has already been corrected by Doris Mack. Mr. Cartright asked what change needed to go through EPC and asked for clarification on EPC. Deborah Thomas explained that EPC is the Education Preparation Committee. Any change that impacts any educator preparation program has to go through EPC. This change has been approved by EPC prior to this meeting.*

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the revised courses submitted by the Department of Curriculum Foundations & Reading. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the revised courses was passed.*

**Department of Middle and Secondary Education**New Program(s)

[ENDORS-ESOLU: English for Speakers of Other Languages \(ESOL\) Education Undergraduate Endorsement](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

The ESOL Endorsement has been offered to both undergraduates and graduate students for decades via 5000-level courses. These courses have recently been split into 4000-level undergraduate and 6000-level graduate courses. There is a need for a separate catalog page for both the undergraduate and the graduate endorsement programs.

This program will be offered on the Statesboro and Armstrong campuses.

*Per Dr. Thomas, this program has never been added to the catalog and they would like to add it now. This is technically not a new program, it has been offered for many years.*

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the new program submitted by the Department of Middle and Secondary Education. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the new program was passed.*

**B. College of Arts and Humanities  
Department of Communication Arts**

*Mr. Norton Pease presented the agenda items for the College of Arts and Humanities.*

### Revised Course(s)

#### [COMM 5333: Theories of Mass Communication](#)

##### **JUSTIFICATION:**

Faculty believe that students need a firm grounding in basic knowledge of the different forms of research because they must complete a major research project/paper in this course. This foundation is covered in COMS 2330 Introduction to Communication Research, which is an Area F requirement for both the MMFP and MMJ programs. Additionally, because this course is an elective for PRCA students, who are not required to take COMS 2330, PRCA 4330 Public Relations Research is being added as an alternative to COMS 2330. COMS 2330 or PRCA 4330 is also the prerequisite for COMS 5330 Communication Theory, a similar theory and research course in the Communication Studies program. COMS 5330 and COMM 5333 are electives within the PRCA theory course requirement. Because PRCA students may choose to take either of these two courses, the two courses should have similar prerequisites.

#### [COMS 4333: General Semantics: Language Use, Meaning, Culture](#)

##### **JUSTIFICATION:**

The revision to the course title and description better reflects the actual course content and better reflects disciplinary trends on the subject (per a review of courses at peer and aspirational institutions during a recent comprehensive program review).

The removal of LING 4333 as a cross-listing is due to differences in the course content. At one time both courses (COMS 4333 and LING 4333) were simply titled Semantics. However, COMS 4333 was previously changed to General Semantics. Semantics and General Semantics, while related, are not the same. The two courses are now, and have been for years, substantively distinct and should not be cross-listed.

#### [MMFP 2331: Multi-Camera Production](#)

##### **JUSTIFICATION:**

MMFP 2335 has been part of a triumvirate group that has caused some issue with student registration, as well as limiting growth in the area of media writing. The proposed change will allow students to take the MMFP 2335 course prior to taking MMFP 2331 and MMFP 2336, where students will use the knowledge and skills learned in MMFP 2335 to continue their writing skills. However, for transfer students, to stay on course, MMFP 2335 may be taken at the same time as MMFP 2331 and MMFP 2336, thus a prerequisite.

#### [MMFP 2335: Introduction to Media Writing](#)

##### **JUSTIFICATION:**

MMFP 2335 has been part of a triumvirate group that has caused some issues with student registration, as well as limiting growth in the area of media writing. The proposed change will allow students to take the MMFP 2335 course prior to taking MMFP 2331 and MMFP 2336, where students will use the knowledge and skills learned in MMFP 2335 to continue their writing skills.

Removed period from catalog description.

#### [MMFP 2336: Audio Production and Sound Design](#)

##### **JUSTIFICATION:**

MMFP 2335 has been part of a triumvirate group that has caused some issue with student registration, as well as limiting growth in the area of media writing. The proposed change will allow students to take the MMFP 2335 course prior to taking MMFP 2331 and MMFP 2336, where students will use the knowledge and skills learned in MMFP 2335 to continue their writing skills. However, for transfer students, to stay on course, MMFP 2335 may be taken at the same time as MMFP 2331 and MMFP 2336, thus a co-requisite.

#### [MMFP 3533: Narrative Film Production](#)



**JUSTIFICATION:**

MMFP 3533, Narrative Film Production, is a senior level course and should have the numbering that reflects this, thus the change to 4233. Senior Project I is moving to a junior level course and will prepare students for planning and better quality in the senior level courses, one being Narrative Production.

[MMFP 4135: Lighting and Cinematography](#)**JUSTIFICATION:**

MMFP 4135, Lighting and Cinematography should be an upper level junior course, as opposed to senior course, that prepares students to take and succeed in senior level courses.

[MMFP 4335: Documentary Writing and Production](#)**JUSTIFICATION:**

MMFP 4431, Senior Project I, is being changed to MMFP 3532, Producing and Production Management, to provide the opportunity for students to gain skills earlier in their academic career that will prepare students for producing higher quality documentary and narrative productions.

[MMFP 4337: Digital Media Post Production](#)**JUSTIFICATION:**

MMFP 4337, Digital Media Post Production is an upper level junior course, as opposed to a senior level course and prepares students for the finer work required in the senior level production courses.

[MMFP 4431: Producing and Production Management](#)**JUSTIFICATION:**

MMFP 4431, Senior Project I has been the first course in an advanced, two-semester sequence in which each student works as part of a team in the creation of a radio documentary, corporate training or narrative film, or TV pilot or documentary. Through assessment, faculty have decided that this course in creation and planning is best served at an early point in the MMFP program. The change will aid students in all the senior level courses that are required, and give students practice in producing and managing prior to courses in Documentary, Narrative, Sports Productions, and Senior Project II. The name change indicates an upper level junior course.

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the revised courses submitted by the Department of Communication Arts. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the revised courses was passed.*

**Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies**Course Inactivation(s)[PHIL 3121: The Rise of Science in Religious Contexts](#)**JUSTIFICATION:**

Faculty member no longer works here. No others can teach the course

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the course inactivation submitted by the Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the course inactivation was passed.*

Revised Program(s)[BA-PHIL/LAW: Philosophy B.A. \(Concentration in Law\)](#)**JUSTIFICATION:**

We would like to move the critical thinking class out study of area F and into the major to let students have more flexibility in area F to complete their language requirements for the degree. Critical thinking, or

alternatively the higher level Formal logic course, will still be required. It is merely moved into the major block. This program is offered on the Statesboro campus only. It is not offered on Armstrong or Liberty campuses.

[BA-PHIL/RELS: Philosophy B.A. \(Concentration in Religious Studies\)](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Creating a more streamlined pathway for students; addressing student confusion by simplifying credit hour ranges by listing some courses in multiple categories; allowing students to take Philosophy classes that were previously not listed; placing Asian Religions courses in three possible categories to incentivize students to take an Asian Religions course; adding new RELS classes that have been added to the catalog in the past year. This program is only offered on the Statesboro campus.

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the revised programs submitted by the Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the revised programs was passed.*

**Department of Foreign Languages**

Revised Course(s)

[FORL 3431: Foreign Languages Methods: P-8](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Prereq: correct a misspelled word. Contact hours: Align with FORL 6431. Schedule type: Make available OL

[FORL 3432: Foreign Languages Methods: 9-12](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

To be able to offer this course online to meet students' needs.

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the revised courses submitted by the Department of Foreign Languages. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the revised courses was passed.*

**Department of History**

Revised Course(s)

[HUMN 4631: Capstone Project for Digital Humanities](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Cross listing will make it easier for faculty to teach capstone courses in the Digital Humanities and for students to fulfill the final requirement for the minor. The original course that the capstone was modeled on was the 5000 level digital history course. Introduction to Public History is also required for the minor and the advanced public history course involves digital projects and continues the public history theme.

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the revised course submitted by the Department of History. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the revised course was passed.*

**C. Waters College of Health Professions**

*Dr. Chris Barnhill presented the agenda items for the Waters College of Health Professionals.*

**School of Nursing**

Course Inactivation(s)

[NURS 5131: Scientific and Medical Terminology](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Course was revised and renumbered to NURS 4143 during consolidation in 2018. This course is no longer offered under this number.

I submitted this for the November meeting but it was rolled back as after the deadline for the October meeting. This is a re-submission.

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the course inactivation submitted by the School of Nursing. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the course inactivation was passed.*

**Department of Health Sciences and Kinesiology****New Program(s)**

[066B: Coaching Minor](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

The Coaching minor already exists and is currently part of the Exercise Science major. It was originally placed there simply because the conventional wisdom had been that a minor had to be part of a major. The two are actually very different types of programs, and the problem is that the current arrangement prevents Exercise Science majors from completing the Coaching minor. Therefore, we would like to remove the Coaching minor from the Exercise Science major and let it stand alone.

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the new program submitted by the Department of Health Sciences & Kinesiology. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the new program was passed.*

**Revised Program(s)**

[BHS-HSIN: Health Science B.H.S. \(Concentration in Health Informatics\)](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

IT 1430 is now a pre-req for IT 3233. This program will be offered on the following campus Armstrong. This program will not be offered on the following campuses: Statesboro and Liberty.

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the revised program submitted by the Department of Health Sciences & Kinesiology. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the revised program was passed.*

**D. College of Business**

*Dr. Jun Liu presented the agenda items for the College of Business.*

**Department of Economics****Course Inactivation(s)**

[ACCT 2106: Environment of Business](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

This course carried over from the Armstrong consolidation. LSTD 2106 is the Environment of Business course at Georgia Southern, so we need to deactivate this course.

[ACCT 3111: Inter Accounting I \(SSU\)](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

This course carried over from the Armstrong consolidation and references a Savannah State University course.

[ACCT 3112: Intermediate Accounting II-SSU](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

This course carried over from the Armstrong consolidation and references a Savannah State University course.

[ECON 4210: Internation Law Exprop/Compens](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

This course was deactivated around 20 years ago at Armstrong University. No one in the Department of Economics initiated its reactivation. We are not sure why it was reactivated and thus are correcting the mistake by making it inactive again.

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the course inactivations submitted by the Department of Economics. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the course inactivations was passed.*

**E. College of Engineering and Computing**

*Dr. David Williams presented the agenda items for the College of Engineering and Computing.*

**Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering**

Revised Course(s)

[EENG 3337: Power Systems Fundamentals](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Students taking Electric Machines (EENG 3241) and Power Systems Fundamental (EENG 3337) are confusing concepts and they are also lacking some foundation needed in the Power Systems Fundamentals.

[EENG 5540: Communication Systems with Lab](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

We changed the title to eliminate an out of sync error we had with CIM and Banner.

We also added Microelectronics as a prerequisite and took out the permission of instructor.

*Dr. Lina Soares made a motion to approve the revised courses submitted by the Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the revised courses was passed.*

Revised Program(s)

[BSCPE-CPE: Computer Engineering B.S.Cp.E.](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Additional corrections of typos and missing references for footnotes.

Also, we replaced the two (2-credit hour) senior design courses (EENG 4620 & EENG 4621) with the new (single 4- credit hour) senior capstone course (EENG 4640). Finally, we added a few courses that the Computer Engineering Course could take to as electives.

This program will be offered on the following campus: Statesboro. The first two years of this program (to satisfy the Regents Engineering Pathway Program) will be offered on the following campus: Armstrong. This program will not be offered on the following campus: Liberty.

[BSEE-ELEC: Electrical Engineering B.S.E.E.](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

The word “requirement” had a typo. The footnote referencing was corrected. We also replaced the two senior design courses (EENG 4620 & EENG 4621) with the new senior capstone course (EENG 4640). This program will be offered on the following campus: Statesboro. The first two years of this program (to satisfy the Regents Engineering Pathway Program) will be offered on the following campus: Armstrong. This program will not be offered on the following campus: Liberty

*Dr. Lina Soares made a motion to approve the revised programs submitted by the Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the revised programs was passed.*

**Department of Information Technology**

Revised Course(s)

[IT 3230: Data Visualization](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Removed IT 3233 as prerequisite, as it is not required for student success in the course. Added course outcomes.

[IT 3530: Fundamentals of Information Systems Security](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Added course outcomes. Included alternative prerequisite - IT 2531 or CSCI 2120. Added IT 2531 as a prerequisite to avoid overrides.

[ITW 1130: Introduction to Information Technology](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Typo in course title

[ITW 2140: Discrete Mathematics for Information Technology](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Typo in course title.

*Dr. Lina Soares made a motion to approve the revised courses submitted by the Department of Information Technology. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the revised courses was passed.*

Revised Program(s)

[900C: Cyber Security Minor](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

This program will be offered on the following campus(es): Statesboro, Armstrong

This program will not be offered on the following campus(es): Hinesville

Added outcomes. Removed programming course in favor of Introduction to Cybersecurity course.

[BSIT-IT: Information Technology B.S.I.T.](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

This program will be offered on the following campus(es): Statesboro, Armstrong. This program will not be offered on the following campus: Liberty. Added clarification footnote on carry-over hours from CSCI 1301 and

MATH 1441. Updated the total number of hours in Major Requirements and Electives to reflect carry-over hours. Changed CISM 4237 requirement in Info Mgmt specialization to IT 3432, now that an appropriate "IT" course is available. Updated program outcomes. Add WRIT 3220 as an alternative to WRIT 2130 STAT 1401 was listed under D2 and F. Removed STAT 1401 from Area D2. Replaced with Calculus.

#### [BSIT-IT/DS: Information Technology B.S.I.T \(Concentration in Data Science\)](#)

##### **JUSTIFICATION:**

This program will be offered on the following campus: Statesboro. This program will not be offered on the following campus(es): Armstrong, Liberty. General corrections from last round of "corrections" from consolidation, including... Fixed typo in Elective Hours comment. There was a stray "w". Added IT 2531 to Area D2 and removed it from Major Requirements. Added missing BUSA 3132 under "specific requirements." Reordered the major courses to be more logical.

#### [CERO-CYSC: Cyber Security Certificate](#)

##### **JUSTIFICATION:**

This program will be offered on the following campus(es): Statesboro, Armstrong and Liberty. Per request from Assoc. Dean, David Williams, added a footnote to explain that the Certificate cannot be earned without also completing the BSIT degree requirements.

#### [BIT-INFOTECH: Bachelors of Information Technology \(BIT\)](#)

##### **JUSTIFICATION:**

This program will be offered on the following campus(es): eMajor (Fully online). Per request from Assoc. Dean, David Williams, reorder the course listed under Area F. Also, reordered courses under major requirements.

***Dr. Lina Soares made a motion to approve the revised programs submitted by the Department of Information Technology. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the revised programs was passed.***

#### **F. College of Behavioral and Social Sciences**

***Dr. Barbara King presented the agenda items for the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences.***

#### **Department of Criminal Justice & Criminology**

##### Revised Course(s)

#### [CRJU 2210: Introduction to Policing](#)

##### **JUSTIFICATION:**

This course can be taught asynchronously

#### [CRJU 2410: Introduction to Corrections](#)

##### **JUSTIFICATION:**

This course can be taught asynchronously

#### [CRJU 3160: Corporate Crime](#)

##### **JUSTIFICATION:**

This course can be taught asynchronously

#### [CRJU 3170: Criminal Justice Admin](#)

##### **JUSTIFICATION:**

CRJU 2020 is no longer offered and was not intended to be a pre-requisite for this course for the department's consolidated curriculum for the current or future academic years. NEW EDIT: This course can also be taught asynchronously/online

[CRJU 3234: Research Methods](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Faculty discussed offering this class online (asynchronously) at faculty meeting on May 3, 2019 and unanimously agreed for the department to be able to do so to better serve students.

[CRJU 4910: Senior Seminar CRJU Crim](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

This course can be taught asynchronously

[CRJU 5003: Cyber Forensics](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

This course can be taught asynchronously

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the revised courses submitted by the Department of Criminal Justice & Criminology. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the revised courses was passed.*

Revised Program(s)

[093B: Criminal Justice and Criminology Minor](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

This program will be offered on the following campuses: Statesboro, Armstrong, Liberty and Online.

[BS-CRIM: Criminal Justice and Criminology B.S. \(Emphasis in Criminal Justice and Criminology\)](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

This program will be offered on the following campuses: Statesboro, Armstrong, Liberty and Online.

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the revised programs submitted by the Department of Criminal Justice & Criminology. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the revised programs was passed.*

**Department of Political Science & International Studies**

*Dr. John Kraft presented the agenda items for the Department of Political Sciences & International Studies.*

Revised Course(s)

[INTS 2630: Research Methods in International Studies](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

A few years ago, INTS moved the Research Methods course to a 2000-level in the hopes of providing a better research background for students prior to entering the upper-division offerings. This policy has not been successful: our students now not only lack research skills going into the 2000-level course, but they have not had sufficient coursework in INTS to be able to contextual and formulate reasonable research inquiries within the discipline. This request simply asks to move the course back into the 3000-level and is a simple corrective action for a well-intentioned, but unsuccessful curriculum change. Adding other upper-division coursework in the major as pre-requisite courses will help to better prepare the students to take advantage of methodological work in our area of study. This level of course engagement will also serve them better for completing the Senior Seminar course, which is a natural progression from this course within the program's sequence.

***Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the revised course submitted by the Department of Political Science & International Studies. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the revised course was passed.***

New Course(s)

[INTS 3133: Contemporary Latin America](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

This will be one of the courses that will support the new Caribbean concentration within the Latin America and Caribbean Area Studies Track. INTS has expanded our program offerings to include a non-language minor track for Area Studies and we need to populate these categories with regional courses offering

[INTS 3574: Making of the Modern Caribbean](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

This will be one of the courses that will support the new Caribbean concentration within the Latin America and Caribbean Area Studies Track.

[INTS 4620: Global Studies: Theories and Perspectives](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

Major requires 3 Credits in Theory Emphasis. Currently, this course is being taught outside of the program. The INTS Program should offer its own canon. Students who are taking INTS should be educated in the major theoretical debates for their discipline.

*Mr. Cartright asked if we approved new courses this month, will we look at revised programs during next meeting? Dr. John Kraft responded “yes” to Mr. Cartright.*

*Dr. Chopak-Foss asked if INTS 4620 is part of the Caribbean concentration? Dr. Kraft was not able to answer this question.*

*Dr. Chopak-Foss stated they tried to make a change this summer and request documentation from Deans to vet classes across campus to avoid duplications. Dr. Chopak-Foss stated in the past there was a committee to review International courses to make sure there was significant international content vs just regional, she is unsure if this has been done. Dr. Kraft said it has not been done. Dr. Soares suggested tabling the approval of these courses until they have had further vetting. Mr. Cartright stated these courses will need to include in the justification that they discussed these new courses with History and Geography. Dr. Chopak-Foss also stated there should be some evidence of demand included in the justification for each course.*

***Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to rollback INTS 3133, INTS 3574 and INTS 4620 to allow the department to talk with other departments impacted by these new courses. for A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to rollback the new courses was passed.***

**Department of Psychology**

Program Inactivation(s)

[CERO-ABAC: Applied Behavior Analysis Certificate](#)

**JUSTIFICATION:**

PSYC offers a Verified Course Sequence [VCS] in which students can sit for an exam to be certified. But, this program-ABAC--is not that program....(That program is described elsewhere in the catalog.) By having ABAC still listed, it is confusing students and potentially hindering the accreditation of the actual ABA VCS program.

This program will not be offered on the Armstrong campus. This program never was offered on the Liberty campus or Statesboro campus.



*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the program inactivation submitted by the Department of Psychology. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the program inactivation was passed.*

## **G. College of Science and Mathematics**

*Dr. Brian Koehler presented the agenda items for the College of Science and Mathematics.*

### **Department of Mathematical Sciences**

New Program(s)

170A: Statistics Minor

#### **JUSTIFICATION:**

Students earning a statistics minor will be more marketable for careers involving data analysis. Armstrong had a similar statistics minor that was not preserved in the consolidation, so there is precedent for offering this minor on one of our campuses. The program will be offered on the following campuses: Statesboro, Armstrong. The program will not be offered on the following campuses: Liberty.

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to approve the new program submitted by the Department of Mathematical Sciences. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to approve the new program was passed.*

## **H. Discussion of Definition of Concentration vs Emphasis**

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss made a motion to accept this additional item under new business, the discussion of emphasis vs concentration. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley and the motion to accept this additional item under new business was passed.*

*Dr. Chopak-Foss read a statement from the course catalog "a minor must contain 15-18 semester hours of coursework with at least 9 hours of upper division coursework. Courses taken to satisfy areas A-E may not be counted as coursework in the minor. Area F courses may be counted as coursework in the minor. A concentration within a degree is also 15-18 hours, specialized but within the same degree." Ms. Candace Griffith stated that concentrations are anything 18 hours or more. We have stand-alone concentrations, and the bulk, which are in degree programs. An emphasis is anything below 18 hours.*

*Ms. Griffith asked if we should also indicate that concentrations and emphasis require a certain level of upper and lower level courses? Dr. Soares stated that Middle & Secondary Education has concentrations of only 15 hours, but they are inline with the Georgia Performance Standard Commission. Ms. Griffith stated a concentration can be embedded in a degree program or stand-alone. She also stated the committee can vote to change the definition. Mr. Cartright suggested drafting a definition of each of these and recommend that one of these terms means it is embedded and the other indicate stand-alone. Ms. Griffith stated if we were to follow through with Mr. Cartright's suggestion, every single program would have to be revised.*

*Dr. Bell Gatch mentioned the minor requirements does have specifications in terms of the level of the courses. There can be some degree programs that put forward an emphasis that would be less than 18 hours but were referencing 1000 level courses. Would the committee find this acceptable? How are you defining a concentration and emphasis within a degree program beyond the number of hours? Dr. Soares stated it seems that this is very college specific. Ms. Griffith shared that there is no minimum hour definition for emphasis at this time. Dr. Chopak-Foss stated she would like to see concentrations capped at 24 hours. Ms. Griffith asked if we want concentrations*

*to be exposure to add more depth to a program in a different area? Dr. Chopak-Foss asked for volunteers to craft language in a sub-committee. Dr. Chris Barnhill, Dr. Barbara King, Ms. Donna Mullenax, Dr. Amy Potter and Dr. Delena Bell Gatch agreed to join the committee to consult what is currently in the Georgia Southern catalog regarding minors and crafting the language for concentration or having definition of an emphasis, minor and concentration with uniformed language. This sub-committee will bring their suggestions to the January meeting.*

## **V. Other Business**

### **a. CIM Form Updates**

*The sub-committee suggestions will be presented during the Graduate Committee meeting Thursday, November 14<sup>th</sup>.*

### **b. Discussion of Agenda Structure**

*Mr. Cartright suggested reorganizing the agenda to take all inactivations first and then review courses and programs. The committee voted to keep the agenda as is.*

***Dr. Soares made a motion to approve the change in agenda structure. A second was made by Dr. Nancy McCarley. The motion to approve the change in agenda structure did not pass, as all committee members did not vote in favor.***

### **c. Discussion of CourseLeaf Notifications**

*Dr. Soares asked if there is anyway for CL notifications to be sent only to our Georgia Southern emails. There is a filter each user can set in their email so that it all goes into one folder.*

### **d. Discussion of Meeting Location**

*Dr. Soares would like to change the meeting venue due to parking limitations and the Williams Center not being centrally located on campus. Dr. Soares suggested the library, the IT building, the College of Business building. Mr. Smith mentioned that we have tried this meeting in other locations and have had difficulty hearing both campuses. He suggested to Dr. Soares that parking would reserve a space if we continued in the Williams Center.*

## **IV. Adjournment**

*Mr. Smith reminded everyone of the priority deadline in February. The new Registrar, Cassie Morgan, was introduced to the committee.*

***There being no further business to come before the committee, a Cartright/King motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:59 p.m. was passed unanimously.***

## University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Report

On Tuesday, November 12, 2019, the University Undergraduate Committee met and after the approval of the Agenda, the committee elected Drs. Lina Soares and Joanne Chopak-Foss as Co-Chairs for the remainder of the 2019-2020 academic year. Under the category of New Business, the University Undergraduate Committee approved all new proposed programs, program revisions, course revisions, and courses to be inactivated:

### UGC Nov. 2019

- READ courses: **Approve**
- ENDORS: **Approve**
- COMM, COMS, MMFP: **Approve**
- PHIL3121: **Inactivate**
- PHIL BAs: **Approve**
- FORL courses: **Approve**
- HUMN 4691: **Approve**
- NURS5131: **Approve**
- 066B: Coaching Minor: **Approve**
- BHS, informatics concentration: **Approve**
- ACCT, ECON: **Inactivate**
- EENG courses: **Approve**
- Engineering programs: **Approve**
- ITW course revisions: **Approve**
- IT program revisions: **Approve**
- CRJU courses: **Approve**
- CRIM programs: **Approve**
- INTS2630: **Approve**
- New INTS courses: **Rollback**
  - detail justification; demonstrate approval from Geography, History, Literature, Foreign Languages, and/or any other courses with similar or related offerings
- Behavioral analysis cert.: **Inactivate**
- Stats minor: **Approve**

The UGCC did not approve three proposed new courses:

INTS 31311: Contemporary Latin America

INTS 3574: Making of the Modern Caribbean

INTS 4620: Global Studies: Theories and Perspectives

The University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee found that the three new courses had not been properly vetted and required a demonstrated approval from multiple departments, such as Geography, History, Foreign Languages, Literature, and/or any other departments with similar or related course offerings.

Under the category of Other Business, the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee agreed that proposed changes to CIM Forms would require a meeting with the University Graduate Curriculum Committee. A meeting has been planned with Candace Griffin, Delena Gatch, Ashley Walker, and Jennifer Kowalewski to review proposed changes.

Dr. Chopak-Foss asked for volunteers to craft language in a sub-committee. Dr. Chris Barnhill, Dr. Barbara King, Ms. Donna Mullenax, Dr. Amy Potter and Dr. Delena Bell Gatch agreed to join the committee to consult what is currently in the Georgia Southern catalog regarding minors and crafting the language for concentration or having definition of an emphasis, minor and concentration with uniformed language. This sub-committee will bring their suggestions to the January meeting.

Dr. Lina Soares  
Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss  
UGCC Co-Chairs

### Senate Executive Committee Request Form

SEC via campus mail: PO Box 8033-1

E-Mail: [fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu)

[Standard View](#)

[Close](#)

## Request for Information

1/14/2020

### SHORT TITLE:

(Please provide a short descriptive title.)

Preferred Name Roll Out

### QUESTION(s):

(Please state your request or requests in question form as concisely as possible.)

Question:

How have students been notified about the preferred name option?

### RATIONALE(s):

(Please explain why this issue is one of general concern for the Faculty Senate or for the University and not a matter concerning only an individual college or administrative area. Please note what other, if any, attempts you have made to garner this information before submitting this request to the Faculty Senate.)

I am so proud that action was taken to give students an option to have their preferred name provided to faculty. I went to day one of classes with the list of preferred names excited by the fact that this had been put together so quickly and seemingly easily. I was sadly disappointed to find most students had no idea that this was an option. The communication with the students has not been very successful. In a senior level capstone course I was joking with students I know quite well that the preferred names on the list from the registers offices were not their actual preferred names. All of them claimed they had no idea that they had that option. Far more seriously, I was contacted by a student in my freshman lecture course, a student for whom this option was specifically created for. The student contacted me after class to apologize for how they responded when I was going through the list for attendance verification. She informed me of her preferred name and self identified as transgender. I know students are not always great about reading the ton of emails sent to them from the university. But I feel that f... something as important to individual students as this is a more directed roll out is needed. Do the work beyond a single email. Perhaps contact directly to student organizations that specifically support transgendered students like the GSA; the Office of Multicultural Affairs; Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies; the counseling center; FYE classes; the advising center; etc. In addition, share with faculty how to direct students to how to make their preferred name listed, ask the Georgeanne to run an article on the option. The point is there are many ways to roll this out beyond a single email to students. The action of diversity and equity takes work, we need to strive to be better in our approach to these initiatives.

**If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form and send.**

[Click here to attach a file](#)

[Click here to attach a file](#)

[Click here to attach a file](#)

[Click here to attach a file](#)

SUBMITTED BY:

PHONE NO:

1/22/2020

Request for Information - 2020-01-14T09\_15\_01

hwbland

478-0530

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

RE-ENTER EMAIL

labbott@georgiasouthern.edu

labbott@georgiasouthern.edu

### ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY

**This site is for use exclusively by Georgia Southern University faculty, staff, and administrators. Submissions are reviewed by the SEC for relevance to the mission and business of the Faculty Senate. This site is a tool not for debate but solely for information exchange. Redundant and contentious submissions will not be accepted.**

**Note to faculty users: Double-check your data before submitting, because the data cannot be edited afterward**

### SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTION

Response:

Select...

Executive Committee Response:

Response from Cassie Morgan, Registrar

1/24/2020

Good afternoon, Helen.

As you know, the utilization of the preferred name was an initiative submitted by the faculty senate. ITS developed the portal class roster and folio solutions in response. Students who wish to indicate a preferred name have always had the opportunity to do so via the admissions application. The challenge was presenting the submitted names in a way that would allow them to be used by faculty. The automated solution permitting students to update their preferred names was a bonus, and you do have the correct link containing those steps.

Our office was asked to partner in this project given that Banner stores the preferred names. We have not been involved in totality; however, I do recall a collective decision during development regarding notifications. It was decided 1) that the project would have a "soft launch" given the quick turnaround necessary to publish before classes began and 2) that there would be no student announcements / coordinated campaign efforts due to a lack of testing and supplementary inappropriate usage filters. (What is interesting is that approximately 600 students have updated or added a preferred name thus far, even though this feature was not formally promoted.)

Our office learned of a few students that had either accidentally entered a parent's name in the preferred name field or have since decided to use a different preferred name than when they applied. If there are entire rosters or a multitude that are not displaying correctly, then it is a system defect, and we can certainly assist in troubleshooting. Also, if faculty senate and/or administrative leadership decides to move forward with a campaign initiative, we will be glad to help support it in any way we can. Please let me know if you need any further information before your meeting.

**Cassie N. Morgan**  
Registrar  
Georgia Southern University  
PO Box 8092  
Statesboro, GA 30460  
Phone 912.478.5421

A .pdf on the Office of Registrar Homepage

[file:///C:/Users/hwbland/Downloads/Student%20Preferred%20Name%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/hwbland/Downloads/Student%20Preferred%20Name%20(1).pdf)

### **Student Preferred Name**

Georgia Southern University recognizes that many of its students use a name other than their legal name. As long as the use of a preferred name is not for misrepresentation, the university acknowledges that a preferred name should be used whenever possible in the course of university business and education.

Therefore, the university will permit any student who wishes to identify themselves within the university's information systems with a preferred name in addition to their legal name. It is further understood that the student's preferred name should be used in university communications and reporting, **except where the use of the legal name is necessitated by university business or legal requirement.**

*This service may be modified, changed, altered, or rescinded at the discretion of Georgia Southern University.*

### **What is a Preferred Name?**

A preferred name is a first name (i.e., given name) that may be chosen to be used instead of the legal first name. Students may opt to go by a preferred name that is different from their legal first name. This name will appear instead of the legal name in the student's MyGeorgiaSouthern portal, Folio, and on the faculty's Attendance Verification sheet. Some records, such as paychecks or financial aid data that require the use of a legal name will not change to the preferred name. However, whenever possible, the preferred name will be used.

### **Campus Use of Preferred Name**

In public or semi-public systems where names are visible to other students, instructors, faculty, campus officials, and the general public, the preferred name may only be displayed. Specific examples are the student Folio, and the MyGeorgiaSouthern portal (including portal class roster and attendance verification modules). In systems such as these, it is important to display the preferred name.

The student's full legal name will be displayed in confidential administrative systems used by faculty, staff, and campus officials. Banner Student Forms, WINGS Class Rosters, and Final Grading Rosters are good examples of these types of administrative systems. Preferred name is also *not* displayed in DegreeWorks, EAB, or other third-party software systems such as those used in Health Services, Housing, Student Affairs, etc.

### **Frequently Asked Questions**

#### **Will my preferred name appear or be used everywhere in university systems?**

No. Your preferred name will only be displayed in your MyGeorgiaSouthern portal, Folio, and on the faculty's portal class roster and attendance verification modules. Your legal name will always be used in business processes that require the use of the legal name, such as for payroll records, student transcripts, and financial aid.

#### **How can I set my preferred name?**

Log into the MyGeorgiaSouthern portal and go to the Personal Settings Tile. Then, click on "More Settings," "Update Preferred Name," enter your preferred first name, and click "Save."



**May I specify a preferred middle or last name?**

No. Preferred name only applies to your first name. If you would like to change your middle or last name on your university record, then you will need to change your legal name.

**Can I set my preferred name to whatever I want?**

Students may determine and designate a preferred name that they want to be known by in university systems. The University reserves the right to remove a preferred name if it contains inappropriate or offensive language, or is being used for misrepresentation.

**Do I have to provide and set a preferred name?**

No. Using a preferred name is entirely optional.

**When/why will campus departments use my legal name?**

Some campus departments interact with and send reports to federal, state, and other government agencies that verify the identity of students using the legal name and other personally identifiable information that prohibits the use of the preferred name.

**How do I correct or change my legal name for university systems?**

Students who wish to change their legal name must supply supporting legal documentation and complete the [Name Change](#) Form online web form or paper form with the Office of the Registrar.

**Can I change my login ID to better match my preferred name?**

No. This option is not available.

**Can I get a new Eagle Card with my preferred name?**

No. This option is not available.

**Why are employees not included in the use of a preferred name?**

This service is student-focused and based on a student role. Employee, as well as student employee names, are maintained in Banner SIS and OneUSG Connect, and legal name is used in this system per  
USG policy.

### Senate Executive Committee Request Form

SEC via campus mail: PO Box 8033-1

E-Mail: fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu

Standard View

Close

## Request for Information

12/17/2019

### SHORT TITLE:

(Please provide a short descriptive title.)

Waitlist response time

### QUESTION(S):

(Please state your request or requests in question form as concisely as possible.)

Question:

Why do students only have 12 hours to respond to a seat being available through a waitlist? How does 12 hour support student success?

### RATIONALE(S):

(Please explain why this issue is one of general concern for the Faculty Senate or for the University and not a matter concerning only an individual college or administrative area. Please note what other, if any, attempts you have made to garner this information before submitting this request to the Faculty Senate.)

Students that are on a waitlist have 12 hours to respond to an opening in a class before losing their position on the waitlist. This seems unrealistic and can potentially hurt student success. Many of our students work off campus and/or have families. 1) Not every student is attached to the University through email 24/7. Faculty are not expected to be, so why do we expect students. 2) Additionally, students that work 12 hour shifts can easily miss the opportunity because they are working. We should not expect them to check their GSU email right before reporting to work and then right after work. 3) Faculty are not expected to respond to emails on the weekend. Why should students? 4) If a student has a question about the respective course or other changes that adding this course may cause, who will respond to their questions within 12 hours, especially in the evening or during the weekend? 5) For students that are involved in activities such as athletics, drama, etc, 12 hours could be while they are on the road, training, etc. A more realistic time would be 24 hours during regular business days. So if an opening occurs at 7:48 PM on a Friday, the student has until 7:48 PM on Monday at the minimum to respond. I also want to know why the time was cut from 24 (from Armstrong prior to the merger) to 12. What DATA and ASSESSMENT were used to determine that 12 instead of 24 hours would help support student success. I would like for the response to cite/relate at least 3 strategic pillars as to why this decision was made. - here is a link incase whoever is answering forgot our goals <https://president.georgiasouthern.edu/performance-excellence/strategic-plan/>

If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form and send.

Click here to attach a file

Click here to attach a file

Click here to attach a file

Click here to attach a file

SUBMITTED BY:

PHONE NO:

1/22/2020

Request for Information - 2019-12-17T17\_54\_48

hwbland

344-2916

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

RE-ENTER EMAIL

dmullenax@georgiasouthern.edu

dmullenax@georgiasouthern.edu

### ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY

**This site is for use exclusively by Georgia Southern University faculty, staff, and administrators. Submissions are reviewed by the SEC for relevance to the mission and business of the Faculty Senate. This site is a tool not for debate but solely for information exchange. Redundant and contentious submissions will not be accepted.**

**Note to faculty users: Double-check your data before submitting, because the data cannot be edited afterward**

### SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTION

Response:

Select...

Executive Committee Response:

## Senate Executive Committee Request Form

SEC via campus mail: PO Box 8033-1

E-Mail: fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu

Standard View

Close

**Request for Information**

12/30/2019

**SHORT TITLE:****(Please provide a short descriptive title.)**

2020 Military Times Best for Vets College Rankings: Georgia Southern Unranked

**QUESTION(s):****(Please state your request or requests in question form as concisely as possible.)**

Question:


What has precipitated Georgia Southern's fall in rankings from Military Times from the number one university for veterans in 2019 to not being ranked in the top 134 in 2020? What factors has the university identified that caused this decline? Will the newly hired Veterans Affairs director build intentionally on Armstrong's previously successful strategies, and if so, how? On which campus will this person be based?


**RATIONALE(s):**


**(Please explain why this issue is one of general concern for the Faculty Senate or for the University and not a matter concerning only an individual college or administrative area. Please note what other, if any, attempts you have made to garner this information before submitting this request to the Faculty Senate.)**


Military Times rankings are based on data from the previous year, so rankings for 2020 are based on 2019 statistics, 2019 rankings on 2018, etc. As noted in the Fall 2019 graduation program, the Armstrong Campus has enjoyed sustained success as one of the nation's most military and veteran friendly institutions. As recently as 2016, Armstrong State University was ranked 7th in the nation for veterans in Military Times; in 2017, Armstrong State University was ranked 4th in the nation for veterans in Military Times; in 2018, Armstrong State University was ranked 3rd in the nation for veterans by Military Times. In 2019, the first year these rankings considered Georgia Southern and Armstrong State a consolidated university, Georgia Southern was ranked first in the nation for veterans in Military Times. Then, in 2020, Georgia Southern drops completely out of the Military Times rankings (consequently, eight other USG institutions were ranked by Military Times). Current students and alumnae who are veterans have expressed concern to me. Considering that enrollment is a priority, particularly on the Armstrong Campus, this drop in ranking is very concerning. The Armstrong Campus has had a documented tradition of excellence in serving our veterans, drawing both active duty and retired military personnel and their families to study here. It is part of the Armstrong Campus legacy and one of the distinguishing characteristics of our institution. Being exceptional at serving this demographic also aligns with our Strategic Pillar #3: Inclusive Excellence. It would appear that, post-consolidation, something has drastically changed that has had a negative effect on our ability to serve veterans and be recognized for it. Other than searching for (and potentially hiring) a new Military and Veterans Services Director, what other steps are being taken to reposition Georgia Southern atop the rankings as one of the premier institutions nationwide for our service people? Sources: 2016 rankings: <https://bestforvets.militarytimes.com/2016/colleges/4-year/> 2017 rankings: <https://bestforvets.militarytimes.com/2017-11-01/colleges/4-year/> 2018 rankings: <https://bestforvets.militarytimes.com/2018-11-20/colleges/4-year/> 2019 rankings: <https://charts.militarytimes.com/chart/9> 2020 rankings: <https://charts.militarytimes.com/chart/15>

**If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form and send.**

 Click here to attach a file

 Click here to attach a file

 Click here to attach a file

 Click here to attach a file

SUBMITTED BY:

hwbland

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

ggearhart@georgiasouthern.edu

PHONE NO:

9123442703

RE-ENTER EMAIL

ggearhart@georgiasouthern.edu

**ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY**

**This site is for use exclusively by Georgia Southern University faculty, staff, and administrators. Submissions are reviewed by the SEC for relevance to the mission and business of the Faculty Senate. This site is a tool not for debate but solely for information exchange. Redundant and contentious submissions will not be accepted.**

**Note to faculty users: Double-check your data before submitting, because the data cannot be edited afterward**

**SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ACTION**

Response:

Select...

Executive Committee Response:

Response from Dr. Scot Lingrell, Vice President of Enrollment Management  
Jan. 27, 2020

In response to the RFI regarding the Military Times rankings of Best for Vets, let me first say that I am also very concerned about dropping out of the rankings in 2020. To better understand the reasons behind this decline I have asked Institutional Research to review data related to the survey responses for Military Times--going back to 2015 (for both campuses) through 2019 (combined campuses). This will provide us a much clearer picture of the situation so that we can respond to the questions on the RFI. I will be happy to share our conclusions with this group once the research has been completed.

The rankings, however, are secondary to our obligation to student services and making sure that all students eligible for educational benefits are able to access those in a timely fashion. The dedicated employees of the Military and Veteran Services office work hard every day to provide such excellent service. In July 2019 the department was reorganized to combine staff from the Registrar's Office (School Certifying Officials) and staff from Student Affairs (Outreach Coordinators) and they now report to Enrollment Management. Since that time the department has been reporting directly to the Vice President for Enrollment Management, and we have recently hired a new Director. The new Director will have an office at both the Armstrong and Statesboro campuses, and will travel between all campuses weekly. Additionally, we have an Outreach Coordinator position at all three campuses (Liberty currently vacant), and three School Certifying Officials (2 at Statesboro; 1 at Armstrong). With these strategic investments of resources, we are confident that the actual student experience has improved and will continue to improve over previous years, despite what the rankings for 2020 say.

### Senate Executive Committee Request Form

SEC via campus mail: PO Box 8033-1

E-Mail: fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu

Standard View

Close

## Request for Information

12/16/2019

### SHORT TITLE:

(Please provide a short descriptive title.)

Trashing of desks in University Hall

### QUESTION(s):

(Please state your request or requests in question form as concisely as possible.)

Question:

Working desks throughout University Hall recently have been placed in dumpsters and smashed down/broken up by an earth mover; how does this uphold Strategic Pillar #4 (with regard to both financial and environmental sustainability)?

### RATIONALE(s):

(Please explain why this issue is one of general concern for the Faculty Senate or for the University and not a matter concerning only an individual college or administrative area. Please note what other, if any, attempts you have made to garner this information before submitting this request to the Faculty Senate.)

Multiple areas of the university's budget have experienced cuts, many faculty and staff have only just had salaries raised to 70% of the median in their disciplines, and students and others are concerned about the costs of higher education. One of Georgia Southern's five strategic pillars is "Pillar 4: Operational Efficiency, Effectiveness and Sustainability: Georgia Southern University will implement robust policies, procedures, and practices to ensure current and future sustainability, highlighting financial management, risk management, and employee satisfaction," while Pillar 5 speaks to "Community Engagement." What assessment was completed and by whom that determined that these desks should be thrown into dumpsters? How much has the trashing and replacement of desks cost? How old were these desks in university Hall? (How old was the furniture in the Student Union that was similarly trashed in dumpsters at the beginning of the Fall 2019 term?) Was a more environmentally sustainable approach considered before taking these actions?

If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form and send.

Click here to attach a file

Click here to attach a file

Click here to attach a file

Click here to attach a file

SUBMITTED BY:

hwbland

PHONE NO:

9123442655

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

lrich@georgiasouthern.edu

RE-ENTER EMAIL

lrich@georgiasouthern.edu

Response from Rob Whitaker, VP for Business and Finance

1/23/2020

RFI – Trashing of desks in University Hall.

Response:

The university makes strategic investments when funding is available through our end of year process to upgrade and enhance our learning environments. The University Hall project is an example of our efforts. Some of the equipment being replaced was original to the building when it was built. This investment will also create more flexible learning environments with the new furniture.

The University Surplus Property team was engaged in this project to ensure that we followed all state rules and regulations around disposal of state assets. Additionally, this group has launched a new surplus property marketplace where slightly used equipment can be shared with all university departments and offices. This is an example of how we demonstrate our goal of sustainability.

The marketplace can be viewed at the following link:

[https://touchnet.georgiasouthern.edu/C20795\\_ustores/web/store\\_main.jsp?STOREID=155&SINGLESTORE=true](https://touchnet.georgiasouthern.edu/C20795_ustores/web/store_main.jsp?STOREID=155&SINGLESTORE=true)

or

<https://finserv.georgiasouthern.edu/procurement/procurement-and-contract-services/property-control-surplus-control/surplus-property/>



## Senate Executive Committee Request Form

SEC via campus mail: PO Box 8033-1

E-Mail: [fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu)

[Standard View](#)

[Close](#)

### Request for Information

1/6/2020

#### SHORT TITLE:

(Please provide a short descriptive title.)

Working environment over break

#### QUESTION(s):

(Please state your request or requests in question form as concisely as possible.)

Question:

Why are faculty and staff expected to work in cold buildings during breaks?

#### RATIONALE(s):

(Please explain why this issue is one of general concern for the Faculty Senate or for the University and not a matter concerning only an individual college or administrative area. Please note what other, if any, attempts you have made to garner this information before submitting this request to the Faculty Senate.)

I returned to campus today to a building that was 55 degrees Fahrenheit. Two people (one faculty and one staff) told me the building (Science Center) had been like that since the end of finals. If it were warm outside, the building would warm up. Being an R2 institution where faculty and students do research during breaks and staff are working every day, how can we justify having people working inside wearing winter coats? ?

If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form and send.

[Click here to attach a file](#)

[Click here to attach a file](#)

[Click here to attach a file](#)

[Click here to attach a file](#)

SUBMITTED BY:

hwbland

PHONE NO:

344-2916

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

[dmullenax@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:dmullenax@georgiasouthern.edu)

RE-ENTER EMAIL

[dmullenax@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:dmullenax@georgiasouthern.edu)

Response from Rob Whitaker, VP for Business and Finance

1/23/2020

RFI – Working environment over break.

Response:

During the winter break, the university is officially closed to the public as well as employees. As a part of our sustainable efforts, the Facilities team sets the temperatures in buildings to a level that will help conserve energy and costs. Where appropriate for the safety of animals, equipment or research efforts the temperatures are adjusted to accommodate those requests. Each December, a reminder is sent to the campus community making them aware of these adjustments. Any requests should be routed through the appropriate Dean and/or Vice President for review and approval.

### Senate Executive Committee Request Form

SEC via campus mail: PO Box 8033-1

E-Mail: fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu

Standard View

Close

## Request for Information

1/17/2020

### SHORT TITLE:

(Please provide a short descriptive title.)

Effect of curriculum changes on dropping enrollment

### QUESTION(s):

(Please state your request or requests in question form as concisely as possible.)

Question:

Which academic programs, degrees, or majors have been discontinued, temporarily suspended, suspended, deactivated, labeled an imposition, removed, or terminated since consolidation was announced in January 2018? What was the rationale for each of these decisions? Which home campus was each of these located on? Which of these was the action taken towards only one campus and another campus still has the academic program, degree, or major operating? How many students were matriculating in each of the programs at the time which action was taken?

### RATIONALE(s):

(Please explain why this issue is one of general concern for the Faculty Senate or for the University and not a matter concerning only an individual college or administrative area. Please note what other, if any, attempts you have made to garner this information before submitting this request to the Faculty Senate.)

We are currently facing dropping enrollments, especially on the Armstrong campus. In order to turn this around we need to ascertain what is causing the decline. How much, if any of this fall in enrollment may be due to curriculum decisions?

If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form and send.

Click here to attach a file

Click here to attach a file

Click here to attach a file

Click here to attach a file

SUBMITTED BY:

hwbland

PHONE NO:

344-2684

E-MAIL ADDRESS:

PHolt@georgiasouthern.edu

RE-ENTER EMAIL

PHolt@georgiasouthern.edu

### ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY

Replies from Provost Carl Reiber, VPAA and  
Dr. Candace Griffith, Assistant Provost for Academic Programs and Policies  
Jan. 27, 2020

Regarding the RFI on which academic programs have been deactivated/terminated since consolidation, I have put together the following information.

1. The first five programs under the deactivation list were done during the consolidation process.
2. For specific rationales on program discontinuation, I refer the requestor to the department. Generally, the rationale put forward is lack of student demand. The art programs had several duplicated programs carry through during consolidation and have now eliminated redundant degrees/minors and expanded offerings to the Armstrong campus. The WebBSIT has been deactivated but the former Armstrong BIT is being reactivated to replace it. The BSAT is being deactivated because it is moving to a graduate credential (MSAT) per accreditation guidelines.
3. Programs/departments have decided all of these deactivations/terminations.
4. Finally, I do not have enrollment data for each program at time action was taken; however, the BOR and SACSCOC does not allow us to terminate a program while students are still enrolled without a teach out plan. This is why we deactivate programs first, then terminate once all students have completed their program of studies.

Also attached at the bottom is the list of USG-defined low producing programs.

Deactivated academic programs to be terminated since consolidation (individual program's have rationale):

Bachelor of Science in Business Economics (BSBE) [Armstrong]

Bachelor of Science in Education (BSEd) with a major in Secondary General Science Teacher Education [Armstrong]

Bachelor of Science (BS) with a major in Mathematical Sciences with Teacher Certification [Armstrong]

Bachelor of Arts (BA) with a major in French Language and Literature [online consortium]

Applied Associates of Science (AAS) with a major in Criminal Justice [Armstrong]

Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) with a major in Visual Arts [Armstrong]

Web Bachelor of Science in Information Technology (WebBSIT) [online consortium]—reactivating BIT [formerly Armstrong]

Bachelor of Science in Athletic Training (BSAT) [Statesboro]—per accreditation, credential moving to graduate level degree

Master of Education (MEd) with a major in Adult Education [Armstrong]

Applied Behavior Analysis Certificate [Armstrong]

Adult Education Certificate [Armstrong]

Athletic Training Minor [Statesboro]

Art Minor [Armstrong]

Marketing Minor [Statesboro]

Hospitality Management Minor [Statesboro]

Human Resource Management Minor [Statesboro]

USG low productivity degrees:

Here is the USG definition of a low producing program by type of degree.

Bachelors—below 10 degrees in each of three past years

Masters—below 5 degrees in each of three past years

Specialists—below 3 degrees in each of three past years

Doctorates—below 3 degrees in each of three past years

Here are the GaSoU low producing programs as of August 2019.

BA Geography

BS Geography

BA Philosophy

BA Physics

BS Physics

BM Music

BSEd Health and Physical Education

PhD Logistics and Supply Chain Management

MEd Educational Leadership

MFA Art

---

Dear Vice President Cone, - good afternoon

Cc: Dr. Venn, Dr. Denley, Dr. Curtis (Armstrong consolidation)

Similar to previous years, we are sharing degree productivity details for institutional vetting and to gain confirmation from you that the data points represent information submitted through Georgia Southern University's academic data collection. The three-year average degrees conferred minima criteria are the same as in previous years and are provided again for your reference: Associate's degrees at less than five (5) graduates, Bachelor's degrees at less than ten (10) graduates, Master's degrees at less than five (5) graduates, Specialist degrees at less than five (5) graduates, Doctoral degrees at less than three (3) graduates, and First Professional degrees at less than three (3) graduates.

## Senate Executive Committee Request Form

SEC via campus mail: PO Box 8033-1

E-Mail: [fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu)

Standard View

Close

### Discussion Item Request Print View

#### SHORT TITLE

(Please provide a short descriptive title that would be suitable for inclusion in the Senate Agenda.)

Implementation of the inclusive excellence study's recommendations for fostering community on the Armstrong Campus

#### SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION:

(Please state the nature of your request as concisely as possible.)

How should the university respond to the detailed recommendations in the report "3 Campuses One Heartbeat" by the Center for Strategic Diversity Leadership & Social Innovation for addressing the consolidation's ongoing negative impacts on the Armstrong Campus?


#### RATIONALE(s):


(Please explain why this issue is one of general concern for the Faculty Senate or for the University and not a matter concerning only an individual college or administrative area.)


In the report "3 Campuses One Heartbeat," the Center for Strategic Diversity Leadership & Social Innovation noted that the Armstrong Campus was rated markedly lower than the Statesboro and Liberty campus in three major categories: 1) satisfaction with the campus climate, 2) the sense of being valued and belonging, and 3) institutional commitment to diversity and inclusion. The study repeatedly links the Armstrong Campus's low scores directly to the "pain of consolidation." The report includes the following recommendations quoted in the bullets below. Quotations have been edited for clarity and brevity. The same text can be found in the attached Word document.

- Elevate the Strategic Campus Integration Journey ... More than factual communication, we feel that these leaders want to be communicated to with dignity and respect both for how things were and what they are becoming. ... [The institution] must keep communicating, even repeating things it believes people have heard already, so that those people understand that you mean it and so they know in their hearts that you value them as they witness you also listen to them as part of this communication process.
- Restart a working team that prioritizes strategic integration, picking up from the consolidation process, to determine how you can prioritize culture-building.
- Identify the top five communication pain points and gaps and then develop a series of micro-learning tools, videos, flyers and talking points for leaders to clarify and provide support towards ongoing change and cultural integration.
- Have the president, provost and other senior leaders get back into the Armstrong campus in a natural and organic way, beating the pavement as if the integration is happening for the very first time. ...
- Tap a group of Armstrong faculty ... to identify key themes that they feel are being missed in terms of the economic challenges and hardships of students. ...
- Campus leadership must discover avenues to understand what elements of the transition are impeding offices and units from carrying out their jobs effectively after consolidation. Deans could establish a space (for example, on the first Friday of the month) to connect with academic and staff leaders to analyze how the transition towards consolidation is impacting their work. ...
- The need to launch a relentless communication campaign focused on building one Georgia Southern University culture across all three campuses.
- The need to create spaces for leadership to engage in empathetic listening with the Armstrong community to engender a feeling of being heard. ...
- The need to create a training program for administrative and governance leaders on how to foster a stronger and unified approach to consolidation. ...

If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form and send.

 InclusiveExcellenceArmstrongCommunityDiscussionRequest.docx  
136.16 KB

 [Click here to attach a file](#)

 [Click here to attach a file](#)

Submitted by:

hwbland

Phone:

9125079307

Email:

[wdawers@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:wdawers@georgiasouthern.edu)

Re-Enter Email:

[wdawers@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:wdawers@georgiasouthern.edu)

ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY

In the report "3 Campuses One Heartbeat," the Center for Strategic Diversity Leadership & Social Innovation noted that the Armstrong Campus was rated markedly lower than the Statesboro and Liberty campus in three major categories: 1) satisfaction with the campus climate, 2) the sense of being valued and belonging, and 3) institutional commitment to diversity and inclusion.

The study repeatedly links the Armstrong Campus's low scores directly to the "pain of consolidation."

The report includes the following recommendations quoted in the bullets below. Quotations have been edited for clarity and brevity.

- Elevate the Strategic Campus Integration Journey ...More than factual communication, we feel that these leaders want to be communicated to with dignity and respect both for how things were and what they are becoming. ... [The institution] must keep communicating, even repeating things it believes people have heard already, so that those people understand that you mean it and so they know in their hearts that you value them as they witness you also listen to them as part of this communication process.
- Restart a working team that prioritizes strategic integration, picking up from the consolidation process, to determine how you can prioritize culture-building.
- Identify the top five communication pain points and gaps and then develop a series of micro-learning tools, videos, flyers and talking points for leaders to clarify and provide support towards ongoing change and cultural integration.
- Have the president, provost and other senior leaders get back into the Armstrong campus in a natural and organic way, beating the pavement as if the integration is happening for the very first time. ...
- Tap a group of Armstrong faculty ... to identify key themes that they feel are being missed in terms of the economic challenges and hardships of students.
- ...Campus leadership must discover avenues to understand what elements of the transition are impeding offices and units from carrying out their jobs effectively after consolidation. Deans could establish a space (for example, on the first Friday of the month) to connect with academic and staff leaders to analyze how the transition towards consolidation is impacting their work. ...
- The need to launch a relentless communication campaign focused on building one Georgia Southern University culture across all three campuses.
- The need to create spaces for leadership to engage in empathetic listening with the Armstrong community to engender a feeling of being heard. ...
- The need to create a training program for administrative and governance leaders on how to foster a stronger and unified approach to consolidation. ...

## Senate Executive Committee Request Form

SEC via campus mail: PO Box 8033-1

E-Mail: [fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu)

Standard View

Close

### Discussion Item Request Print View

#### SHORT TITLE

(Please provide a short descriptive title that would be suitable for inclusion in the Senate Agenda.)

Graduate Assistant Stipend Changes

#### SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION:

(Please state the nature of your request as concisely as possible.)


What is the rationale for moving Graduate Assistant stipend money to Graduate Studies from the departments responsible for the positions? Given the current university administration's claims that Georgia Southern is becoming more transparent, why were graduate assistant supervisors not notified prior to hiring GAs for fall of the impending change? Why has no one communicated these changes to anyone responsible for overseeing these GA positions, even now? What is the rationale for doing this while faculty were largely away from the institution and unable to respond to the change in a timely fashion prior to fall semester? This should have been announced/discussed in the spring in order for colleges and the library to make decisions about whether to continue employing GAs if it meant giving up \$7550 from their budgets, permanently. If intentions are good to simply centralize the funding disbursement, why is nothing in writing assuring GA supervisors that they are not going to permanently lose this sometimes significant portion of their labor force?


#### RATIONALE(s):


(Please explain why this issue is one of general concern for the Faculty Senate or for the University and not a matter concerning only an individual college or administrative area.)

The faculty are concerned about the lack of communication regarding significant changes to how Graduate Assistants are paid (where the money resides before payment). This was not explained to budget managers sufficiently that they knew what to tell GA supervisors. Some departments were previously able to decide on an annual basis whether to employ a graduate assistant with the budget line for GAs/SAs, or whether to divide the money up between more student assistants who typically work less hours and have less responsibility. This take over of significant portions of student labor funding makes it more difficult for faculty to manage their student labor, and there is great concern that Graduate Studies, now that they have everyone's GA money, will decide who gets to use the funds that were taken. Nothing has been provided to assure current supervisors that they will always have a Graduate Assistant, even though their funding seems to have been permanently taken over. In at least one instance, the department, which impacts all colleges, was double billed, when they paid the monthly stipend for the GA, then Graduate Studies took the whole semester's stipend from the account, without giving back the original amount paid to the student, even when this apparent error was pointed out. No justification for why Graduate Studies needed more than the money to cover the stipend for the student was provided.

If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form and send.

 [Click here to attach a file](#)

 [Click here to attach a file](#)

 [Click here to attach a file](#)

Submitted by:

hwbland

Phone:

9124120788

Email:

[lgwinett@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:lgwinett@georgiasouthern.edu)

Re-Enter Email:

[lgwinett@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:lgwinett@georgiasouthern.edu)

**ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY**



## Senate Executive Committee Request Form

SEC via campus mail: PO Box 8033-1

E-Mail: [fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu)

Standard View

Close

### Discussion Item Request Print View

#### SHORT TITLE

(Please provide a short descriptive title that would be suitable for inclusion in the Senate Agenda.)

White Supremacy at Georgia Southern

#### SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION:

(Please state the nature of your request as concisely as possible.)


The Inclusive Excellence initiatives at GSU began after a few specific incidents: the use of the word "n\*\*\*\*r" by professors in and outside of classrooms in a manner which offended some students, the "triggerish" incident which was picked up by national news, and the discovery of racist and sexist threats of violence in one of our public restrooms. Last semester, students burned copies of a book about the experiences of minority students at historically white institutions. Since the book burning, students and faculty have reported escalating incidents of anti-diversity backlash and discriminatory behavior. Faculty have reported the appearance of "It's Okay to Be White" leaflets on the Statesboro campus; that slogan has been used by white-supremacist organizations, including the Ku Klux Klan, in recruiting materials. In October, a student filmed a class presentation in which he promoted the "great replacement" or "white genocide" conspiracy theory, then published the video online. The student claims to be part of the "long march," a movement to normalize white nationalist ideas in academia, and has received positive feedback from white nationalist organizations like the American Identity Movement. All of these incidents reflect the history of white supremacy in the United States. White supremacy is a well-researched phenomenon known to affect the climate of college campuses. White supremacy has historically motivated individuals and groups to escalate from expressing grievances, to offensive, harassing or threatening language, and finally to violent, terrorist acts. All of these behaviors discriminate against members of our community by making them feel excluded and threatened on our campus. This violates our students' right to equal access to education. Furthermore, discriminatory and white supremacist discourses run contrary to a healthy, productive culture of learning which faculty work to foster. Finally, all of these incidents reflect our failure as an organization to respond to white supremacy, an ideology incongruous with the democratic values of the United States and its public institutions. Faculty, staff, and students need guidance on recognizing, reporting, and responding to white supremacy and its associated threats. The following questions are intended to foster a productive conversation and lead to a Faculty Senate resolution on white supremacy: What should GSU do about white supremacy? How should the university respond to the potential for white supremacist organizing on our campuses? What is the relationship between our Inclusive Excellence initiatives and the anti-diversity backlash? In general, how should faculty respond when students express white supremacist ideas in class or on campus?


#### RATIONALE(s):


(Please explain why this issue is one of general concern for the Faculty Senate or for the University and not a matter concerning only an individual college or administrative area.)

GSU's Inclusive Excellence initiatives were instigated by multiple instances of anti-black language, one which included a call to violence. FBI data and testimony indicate the real threat of white supremacy as a motivator of terrorist behavior and hate crimes. As a formerly segregated, historically white institution in the Southeast, GSU has a historical relationship with white supremacy. In the past, campus leaders like GS President Marvin Pittman have risen to the challenge of racism on campus, and we should do so now.

If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form and send.

 [Click here to attach a file](#)

 [Click here to attach a file](#)

 [Click here to attach a file](#)

Submitted by:

hwbland

Phone:

912-344-2597

Email:

[ccartright@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:ccartright@georgiasouthern.edu)

Re-Enter Email:

[ccartright@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:ccartright@georgiasouthern.edu)

**ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY**

## Senate Executive Committee Request Form

SEC via campus mail: PO Box 8033-1

E-Mail: fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu

Standard View

Close

## Discussion Item Request Print View

**SHORT TITLE****(Please provide a short descriptive title that would be suitable for inclusion in the Senate Agenda.)**

Update on Honors College Strategic Plan

**SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION:****(Please state the nature of your request as concisely as possible.)**


The Honors Council would like to provide an update to the Faculty Senate about the development of the proposal to transition the University Honors Program into an Honors College.


**RATIONALE(s):****(Please explain why this issue is one of general concern for the Faculty Senate or for the University and not a matter concerning only an individual college or administrative area.)**


Background for Honors College Strategic Plan Creating an Honors College will position Georgia Southern University to better attract and retain talented students. Due to the downward trend in the number of high school graduates in the coming years, competition for strong students will continue to intensify. Rigorous and high-impact educational experiences provided by the Honors College will contribute to the success of these students and the success of the institution. Additionally, the visibility and prestige of an Honors College creates greater potential for donors as well as a naming opportunity. Nationally, the number of honors colleges has doubled in the last 15 years. Within Georgia, four of our competitors (Georgia State, Kennesaw State, Valdosta State, and Columbus State) have created Honors Colleges in the past 10 years. This fall, Georgia College and State University will launch its new Honors College. We are the only USG comprehensive university without an honors college. In fact, Georgia Southern is now the largest non-flagship public university in the country without an honors college. In April 2019, Provost Reiber charged the Honors Council with the development of a strategic plan for the transition of the University Honors Program into an Honors College. The Council, along with the staff of the Honors Program, conducted a thorough planning process that included assessment of the current program, research on best practices, and a review from a team of two external honors professionals trained by the National Collegiate Honors Council. The resulting Honors College Strategic Plan, using the university's plan as a framework, outlines the key objectives and actions to guide the creation of the college. The initial roll-out of the Honors College will build off of the successful University Honors Program, a program that is already more developed than many honors colleges. As such, beginning the transition will be relatively low cost because, much like the College of Graduate Studies, Honors already operates as an overlay to all academic colleges. The expectation is that most of the ways faculty have engaged with honors students such as in small class settings and through mentoring undergraduate research and creative activities will continue to exist and we will expand opportunities, especially on the Armstrong Campus. Honors College Strategic Planning Task Force Members: Dr. Trey Denton Professor, Department of Marketing Dr. Francis Desiderio Associate Director, University Honors Program Dr. Steven Engel Director, University Honors Program; Associate Professor, Department of Political Science Dr. Nancy McCarley Associate Professor, Department of Psychology Dr. Jonathan Roberts Associate Director and Armstrong Campus Lead, University Honors Program; Professor, Department of Psychology Dr. Meca Williams-Johnson Professor, Department of Curriculum, Foundations, and Reading Honors Council Members: Dr. Cheryl Aasheim Professor, Department of Information Technology Dr. Elizabeth Barrow Assistant Professor, Department of Middle Grades and Secondary Education Dr. Trey Denton Professor, Department of Marketing Dr. Hans-Georg

Erney Associate Professor, Department of Literature Dr. Rose Mary Gee Associate Professor, School of Nursing Dr. Priya Goeser Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering Dr. Michelle Haberland Professor, Department of History Dr. Alan Harvey Professor, Department of Biology Dr. Nicholas Mangee Associate Professor, Department of Finance Dr. Nancy McCarley Associate Professor, Department of Psychology Dr. Britton McKay Professor, School of Accountancy Dr. John R O'Malley Assistant Professor, Department of Information Technology Dr. Glenda Ogletree Associate Professor, Department of Elementary Education Dr. Joe Pellegrino Associate Professor, Department of Literature Dr. Ria Ramoutar Senior Lecturer, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry Dr. Jamie Scalera Associate Professor, Department of Political Science Dr. Jennifer Zettler Professor, Department of Biology Dr. Meca Williams-Johnson Professor, Department of Curriculum, Foundations, and Reading Dr. Matthew Williamson Associate Professor, Department Health Science and Kinesiology Dr. Brent Wolfe Professor, School of Human Ecology ATTACHMENT: Honors Strategic Plan Submitted by Michelle Haberland (CAH) and Nancy McCarley (CBSS)

If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form and send.

 Honors College Strategic Plan.pdf  
126.85 KB

 Click here to attach a file

 Click here to attach a file

Submitted by:

hwbland

Phone:

9124781867

Email:

mah@GeorgiaSouthern.edu

Re-Enter Email:

mah@GeorgiaSouthern.edu

**ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY**

**This site is for use exclusively by Georgia Southern University faculty, staff, and administrators. Submissions are reviewed by the SEC for relevance to the mission and business of the Faculty Senate. This site is a tool not for debate but solely for information exchange. Redundant and contentious submissions will not be accepted.**

**Note to faculty users: Double-check your data before submitting, because the data cannot be edited afterward**

Approval

Response:



SEC Response:



Senate Response:

# Honors College Strategic Plan

**HONORS COLLEGE VISION:** Aspire, Inspire, Make a Difference

**HONORS COLLEGE MISSION:** The Honors College is an inclusive community of scholars that fosters intellectual and professional development through undergraduate research and creative scholarship, experiential learning, global engagement, and personalized mentorship.



## STRATEGIC PILLAR #1: STUDENT SUCCESS

### RECRUITMENT

**Honors College Objective 1.1: Grow the honors student population, incrementally and with a target of 8% of the undergraduate population, by recruiting the highest quality students from across the region, state, nation, and world.**

**Actions:**

- Partner with the Enrollment Management team to identify key student profiles and targeted populations to recruit for Honors College enrollment.
- Partner with the Enrollment Management team to develop and execute a strategic recruitment plan that leverages University-wide resources to drive Honors College enrollment.
- Partner with the Marketing team to develop and execute a strategic Honors College marketing plan.

### PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**Honors College Objective 1.2: Develop a holistic support structure that combines academic, career, and wellness counseling to support the personal and professional development needs of honors students.**

**Actions:**

- Develop a strategy that addresses students' academic, career, and wellness needs across their time in college and across different majors.
- Provide sufficient staffing to provide support to a growing number of honors students.
- Track career placement and graduate and professional school admission for honors graduates.
- Explore the potential to include digital literacy for emerging technologies in honors courses.

### GLOBAL ENGAGEMENT

**Honors College Objective 1.3: Enhance opportunities for honors students to study abroad with a goal for all honors students to have an international experience to enrich their perspective and prepare them to be competitive in the global economy.**



**Actions:**

- Develop an Honors College opportunity abroad at Georgia Southern's Wexford Campus and other international centers as they develop.
- Raise scholarship funds to enable growing numbers of honors students to study abroad.
- Explore ways to create scholarships and other incentives for students to take advantage of the variety of study abroad opportunities as well as opportunities to learn foreign languages in order to develop a more refined global perspective.

**HONORS COMMUNITY**

**Honors College Objective 1.4: Build a sense of community among honors students so that they reinforce each other's aspirations for excellence.**

**Actions:**

- Strengthen the Honors Student Organizations to enable them to facilitate community-building.
- Deepen involvement with the Honors Living Learning Communities so that opportunities exist throughout a student's time in the program.
- Identify more ways to build the sense of community across the campuses.



**STRATEGIC PILLAR #2: TEACHING AND RESEARCH**

**UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH AND CREATIVE SCHOLARSHIP**

**Honors College Objective 2.1: Enhance the analytical and communication skills of honors students by providing opportunities for undergraduate research and creative endeavors.**

**Actions:**

- Continue to strengthen the undergraduate research and creative scholarship opportunities through college and departmental honors structures.
- Secure funding to ensure a growing number of honors students can conduct research, engage in creative scholarship, and present research at professional conferences.
- Explore the potential for offering honors research-based courses in the new core curriculum.

**CURRICULUM**

**Honors College Objective 2.2: Develop an honors curriculum that provides the experiences and rigor appropriate for an Honors College.**

**Actions:**

- Aim to have 20% of a student's course credits taken in honors as is best practices recommended by the National Collegiate Honors Council.
- Identify opportunities for interdisciplinary courses in the new core curriculum.
- Continue the development of curriculum with a goal of offering honors research-based courses and honors intercultural competency courses in the new core curriculum.

## **FACULTY SUCCESS**

**Honors College Objective 2.3: Contribute to faculty success by insuring that faculty who teach in honors are appropriately supported, recognized, and rewarded for their efforts.**

### **Actions:**

- Work with colleges and departments to recognize honors efforts in promotion and tenure policies.
- Develop a long-term strategy for core faculty in the Honors College.
- Implement a program to recognize and reward Honors College faculty.
- Provide honors-centered faculty development opportunities.



## **STRATEGIC PILLAR #3: INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE**

### **INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE**

**Honors College Objective 3.1: Enroll an honors student population that is reflective of the many forms of diversity within the broader student body.**

### **Actions:**

- Develop a diversity recruitment plan that targets high-performing students from groups who are under-represented in honors.
- Build support structures to insure that the diverse needs of students are met.
- Identify routine inclusive excellence professional development opportunities for honors faculty and staff.

### **INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE**

**Honors College Objective 3.2: Develop curricular and extracurricular experiences that develop intercultural competence among students and contribute to a welcoming atmosphere for all students.**

### **Actions:**

- Develop intercultural experiences in the state and region.
- Encourage Honors College faculty to include global experiences in classes by “bringing the world to campus” through class activities, lessons, and campus lectures.
- Explore the potential for offering honors courses that address intercultural competence in the new core curriculum.

### **MILITARY FRIENDLY**

**Honors College Objective 3.3: Become known as the most “Military Friendly” Honors College in the country.**

### **Actions:**

- Develop and execute a strategic marketing and recruitment plan that leverages the University’s superior ranking as a military friendly campus.
- Create a pathway for Honorably Discharged Military personnel to have expedited entry into the Honors College.
- Account for the prior service, skills, knowledge, engagement, and leadership training of veterans within honors requirements.

3



## **STRATEGIC PILLAR #4: OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY**

### **COLLEGE RESOURCES**

**Honors College Objective 4.1: Staff and fund the Honors College at a level that allows it to properly serve its students and faculty.**

**Actions:**

- Implement a leadership structure that includes a Dean who reports to the Provost, and Associate Deans for the two campuses.
- Staff the Honors College at a ratio that will provide sufficient higher-level attention necessary to recruit and retain honors students.
- Ensure that the level of resources for the Honors College is appropriate for the services that it provides and the students that it serves.

### **SCHOLARSHIP SUPPORT**

**Honors College Objective 4.2: Provide scholarship support to recruit and retain a growing number of honors students.**

**Actions:**

- Partner with University Advancement to identify potential donors to the Honors College.
- Implement best practices to steward the gifts to honors.
- Develop strategies to distribute scholarship funds to high-need students who are also high-performing students.



## **STRATEGIC PILLAR #5: COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

### **CIVIC RESPONSIBILITY**

**Honors College Objective 5.1: Offer honors students experiential learning opportunities that engage them with the community and contribute to their personal and professional development.**

**Actions:**

- Create a plan to engage students in the community in ways that complement the curriculum.
- Develop experiential learning opportunities to facilitate personal and professional development.
- Continue to provide service-learning opportunities that allow students to demonstrate the motto, "Humility before Honor."

## KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS:



### STUDENT SUCCESS

- Honors Freshman Retention Rate
- Four-Year Honors Graduation Rate
- Six-Year Honors Graduation Rate
- Honors Enrollment
- Number of Honors Graduates
- Number and percentage of Honors Students Studying Abroad



### TEACHING AND RESEARCH

- Number of Honors Student Conference Presentations or Creative Performances and Exhibitions
- Number of Honors Student Publications
- Downloads of Honors Theses from Digital Commons
- Number of Faculty Teaching Honors Classes
- Number of Faculty Mentoring Honors Students



### INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE

- Honors Freshman Retention Rate for Underrepresented Groups
- Four-Year Honors Graduation Rate for Underrepresented Groups
- Six-Year Honors Graduation Rate for Underrepresented Groups
- Honors Enrollment for Underrepresented Groups
- Number and percent of Honors Graduates for Underrepresented Groups
- Number and percent of Military Veteran Honors Students
- Number and percent of Active Duty Military Honors Students



### OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY

- Honors Student Credit Hours per Semester
- Total Amount of Cash, Pledges, and In-kind Gifts to the Honors College
- Total Amount of Newly Created Endowments for the Honors College
- Total Value of Honors Scholarships Awarded



### COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

- Hours of Service Contributed by Honors Students
- Number and percent of Leadership Positions Held by Honors Students
- Number and percent of Internships Held by Honors Students



## HONORS COLLEGE STRATEGIC PLANNING

### Strategic Planning Task Force Members:

Dr. Trey Denton	Professor, Department of Marketing
Dr. Francis Desiderio	Associate Director, University Honors Program
Dr. Steven Engel	Director, University Honors Program; Associate Professor, Department of Political Science
Dr. Nancy McCarley	Associate Professor, Department of Psychology
Dr. Jonathan Roberts	Associate Director and Armstrong Campus Lead, University Honors Program; Professor, Department of Psychology
Dr. Meca Williams-Johnson	Professor, Department of Curriculum, Foundations, and Reading

### Honors Council Members:

Dr. Cheryl Aasheim	Professor, Department of Information Technology
Dr. Elizabeth Barrow	Assistant Professor, Department of Middle Grades and Secondary Education
Dr. Trey Denton	Professor, Department of Marketing
Dr. Hans-Georg Erney	Associate Professor, Department of Literature
Dr. Rose Mary Gee	Associate Professor, School of Nursing
Dr. Priya Goeser	Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Dr. Michelle Haberland	Professor, Department of History
Dr. Alan Harvey	Professor, Department of Biology
Dr. Nicholas Mangee	Associate Professor, Department of Finance
Dr. Nancy McCarley	Associate Professor, Department of Psychology
Dr. Britton McKay	Professor, School of Accountancy
Dr. John R O'Malley	Assistant Professor, Department of Information Technology
Dr. Glenda Ogletree	Associate Professor, Department of Elementary Education
Dr. Joe Pellegrino	Associate Professor, Department of Literature
Dr. Ria Ramoutar	Senior Lecturer, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
Dr. Jamie Scalera	Associate Professor, Department of Political Science
Dr. Jennifer Zettler	Professor, Department of Biology
Dr. Meca Williams-Johnson	Professor, Department of Curriculum, Foundations, and Reading
Dr. Matthew Williamson	Associate Professor, Department Health Science and Kinesiology
Dr. Brent Wolfe	Professor, School of Human Ecology