

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

---

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

---

2010

## Faculty Senate Minutes-2010

*Georgia Southern University*

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



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

---

### Recommended Citation

"Faculty Senate Minutes-2010" (2010). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 22.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/22>

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

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**February 15, 2010**  
**4:00 to 6:00 p.m.**  
**University Union Ballroom**

**2009-2010 Senate Executive Committee:** *Michael Moore (COE) Chair, Senate Executive Committee; Moderator, Faculty Senate; Jim McMillan (CHHS); Ardian Greca (CIT); Richard Flynn (CLASS); Lowell Mooney (COBA); Teri Ann Melton (COE); Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Librarian; Jim Stephens (JPHCOPH); Fred Smith (LIB); Marilyn Bruce, Senate Liaison from the President's Office; Caren Town (CLASS) Senate Secretary.*

**NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:** *Chris Geyerman (CLASS).*

**Senate Parliamentarian:** *Bob Cook (CIT).*

**Voting Members in Attendance:** *Frank Atuahene, Barry Balleck, Thomas Buckley, Jean-Paul Carton, Adam Con, Jonathan Copeland, Windy Dees, Robert Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Ardian Greca, Michelle Haberland, Dena Hale, Greg Harwood, Sonya Huber, Pat Humphrey, Bob Jackson, Youakim Kalaani, Rebecca Kennerly, Clara Krug, Mary Marwitz, Jim McMillan, Teri Ann Melton, Lowell Mooney, Kent Murray, (Frederic Mynard for Bruce McLean), Dolores Rangel, David Rostal, Debra Sinclair, Fred Smith, Dontarie Stallings, Jim Stephens, Brenda Talley, Stuart Tedders, Laura Valeri, Mark Welford, Jim Whitworth, LeVon Wilson, Bill Yang, Samantha Young (SGA), Alton Standifer (SGA).*

**Comment [gm1]:** Correction: Rob Yarbrough did attend.

**Voting Members Absent:** *Marie Botkin, Michael Braz, Margaret LaMontagne, Allison Long, Patricia Price, Steve Rossi, Donna Saye, Lisa Schulz, Theresa Welford, Wen-Ran Zhang, Jonathan Zhang.*

**Administrative Members in Attendance:** *President Brooks Keel, Ron Core, Steve Burrell, Teresa Thompson, Billy Griffis, Marilyn Bruce, Ron Shiffler, Michael R. Smith, Stephanie Kenney, Charles Patterson, Bret Danilowicz, Bede Mitchell.*

**Visitors:** *Jill Lockwood, Jonathan Harwell, Candace Griffith, Barry Joyner, Mark Edwards, Dallas Rhodes, Charles Trupe, Steve Vives, Lisa Smith, Marc Cyr, Todd Deal, Darin Van Tassell.*

**1. Approval of the Agenda for the February 15, 2010, Meeting. Agenda Approved.**

Dr. Brooks Keel (President) accepted the presidency of the Senate and then ceded the responsibility of running the meeting to the Moderator.

**2. Approval of the November 16, 2009, Minutes: Caren Town (CLASS), Senate Secretary. Minutes Approved.**

- 3. Librarian's Report of February 15, 2010:** Pat Humphrey (COST), Senate Librarian, corrected the Undergraduate Report from January on page 27. Both CHFD 3135 and 3137 listed CHFD 3137 as pre-requisites, but the pre-requisites for both courses should be CHFD 2137.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked why the Senate was receiving minutes of the Academic Standards Committee six to twelve months after the committee meetings. David Rostal (COST) replied that the committee was meeting quite frequently, and it was in the interest of "getting things done in a timely manner." Krug asked if the Senate might anticipate that there might be a shorter turn-around time in the future. Stuart Tedders (COPH) said he was working with Wayne Smith to shorten the time frame and that "hopefully, they'll be composed and submitted in a timely manner."

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked about page 7 of the Librarians' Report concerning the Faculty Research Committee minutes. The passage reads: "Book chapters in the humanities roughly equate to 7 peer reviewed articles (consensus from last year's discussion)." Caren Town (CLASS) replied that this concerned a discussion from the previous year's committee meetings and that she would discuss it with the committee at their next meeting. Haberland commented "that those kinds of metrics can be kind of slippery and . . . they're a bit dangerous." She suggested that the committee not rely on these kinds of metrics because they "may be used beyond the purposes of awarding the Faculty Research Award." Town said the committee wasn't prescribing anything to anybody outside the committee and that the minutes were a record of the committee discussions at the time. The minutes reflected "an attempt to reach a kind of understanding about what different expectations were in other disciplines, and I don't think that they were intended to be used as a rubric at all." Bob Cook (CIT), Parliamentarian, suggested that with issues internal to the committee the minutes should say something such as: "the committee developed a grading scheme for this particular award round" and not specify a rubric "that might imply some kind of endorsement of policy in the minutes."

#### **Librarian's Report was accepted.**

- a. Report from Undergraduate Committee: Bob Jackson:** The committee met twice since the last Senate meeting. November 10<sup>th</sup>, 9 selected topics were announced; the committee approved 6 new courses, 3 course revisions, 6 course deletions, and 3 program revisions; and tabled 2 program revisions. On January 19<sup>th</sup>, thirteen selected topics were announced; the committee approved 28 new courses, 107 course revisions, 47 course deletions, 67 program revisions, 1 Core curriculum revision; tabled a program revision; and had one item withdrawn.
- b. Report from Graduate Committee: Bob Fernekes:** The Librarian's Report includes the Graduate Committee Minutes from the November 12<sup>th</sup> and January 21<sup>st</sup> meetings. After approving the agenda for the November 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Graduate Committee approved course revisions and a deletion from CLASS, course revisions and new courses from COST,

course and program revisions from the College of Public Health, new courses and a program change from the College of Health and Human Sciences. Under old business, the committee discussed the Vision for Graduate Education and made changes. After approving the agenda for the January 21<sup>st</sup> meeting, the meeting began with opening remarks by Dr. Charles Patterson, new Dean for the College of Graduate Studies. Under new business, the committee approved a course revision from the Vice President from Academic Affairs, course and program revisions from the College of Education, course revisions and new courses, course deletions, and program revisions for COST and CLASS; new courses, course revisions, and program revisions from COBA. The committee offered congratulations on the new Ph.D. in Logistics and Supply Chain Management. In addition, the committee tabled the MS in Sport Management program revision from the College of Health and Human Sciences, which was subsequently approved in the February meeting. Under old business, the Graduate Committee approved the Vision for Graduate Education version 8.8, which can be seen as a separate agenda item.

#### 4. **President's Report: President Brooks Keel.**

President Keel reminded the faculty of the faculty forums coming up in March and outlined several issues ahead for the university.

- **Provost Search:** “We do want to move forward with a search for the provost; you’ll be hearing more about that as we move forward. That to me is probably, more so than the President, the more important position at the University, and this body will obviously have some definite input into that process, so you’ll be hearing more about that.”
- **Vision.** “I get asked what my vision is for the University a lot. The bottom line is my vision is not important. What is important is the vision that we all collectively craft together. I feel very strongly about that; however, having said that, if I had no thoughts at all, you’d wonder why in the world you hired me as your president. So, let me just sort of give you five or six things that I see are going to be key areas as we move forward, and as I say we will have a lot of discussion about this.
  1. “Clearly this university is now well positioned to take a significant leap forward in a number of areas. One of those areas is research and creative works. We need to, I think, help push that agenda forward in a major way, and I believe this university is poised now to do that. What that is, what that will look like, what it means, are clearly areas that we will have to have a conversation about. I have no preconceived notion or ideas of exactly what that means at this point in time. We will certainly have a conversation about that. But research and creativity is going to be major theme for us as we move forward. And, again, these are not in order of importance at all.

2. “Retention, progression, and graduation. First-year retention rates and six-year graduation rates are going to be a key thing for us all to focus on. As I’m sure you know, our first-year retention rate is about 82% now, our six-year graduation rate is about 48%, and there is a tremendous amount of room for growth, especially in the six-year graduation rate. We must focus on that. I’m sure you all agree with me, and I think this is an exciting opportunity for us to move forward in that way.
3. “Facilities and infrastructure. As you know, we are now at 19,086 students. We’ll be at 20,000 next year. This university has grown tremendously in the last several years. Certainly in the last ten years. It’s been on a linear trajectory. That has taxed the infrastructure and the facilities here to a significant degree, as I fully appreciate. We have to address that. One of those things we have to address is the number of residence halls we have on campus, and we are beginning to take a look at that, so that’s going to be something we’ll need to address down the road.
4. “And clearly along those lines are the number of faculty and the number of staff we have is not near what we need to meet the current needs that we have and certainly not near what we need to meet any future growth down the way. I am keenly aware of the sacrifices that you all have made to do a whole lot more teaching of a whole lot more students with a whole lot less. That is paramount on my radar. It is paramount on the radar of the President’s Cabinet. That is easy for me to say this, but we do feel your pain, and we are going to do everything we can to address that. But address it in a very objective and quantitative way, if you will, making sure we put resources where they are needed the most.
5. “We will be implementing a new capital campaign across campus. This is something I’m very, very excited about. This is not something that will happen overnight. It will take several months to a year or so to actually put this capital campaign in place and develop it. But I want you to know that we are going to be doing that. We are very excited about that. We will have the deans play a more key role. And by that I mean the deans and through them to the chairs, and to you as faculty in terms of a capital campaign and participation in that, so you’ll be hearing about that as we move forward.
6. “And, lastly, we are in need of a new strategic plan, as we together chart the course for the next five years or so. I am in the process of giving some thought to that now. You will clearly be heavily involved in that process. I am beginning to look at what the process will be at this point in time to make sure we have proper buy-in from you all around this table and beyond. Once we get that worked out, then we’ll start focusing on what that strategic plan should

actually be. I need to learn a little bit more about the culture here in terms of how to get that buy-in, but I wanted you to know that we will be moving carefully, but we will be moving forward with the planning of a strategic plan, and you will clearly be involved in that.

“All of those things that I just mentioned, all of those key themes will fall under a central umbrella of maintaining, fostering and enhancing a student-centered university. That has got to be the number one thing that we have in everything we do. That is what has made Georgia Southern the university that it is today. And that is what I’m convinced will insure we will become more successful as we move forward. I think the biggest challenge we have right now is how we grow this university in strategic ways and make sure we maintain that student-centered approach. So those are just some of my preliminary thoughts, and again, with the moderator’s permission, I’ll stop now and I’ll be happy to answer any questions that you may have, and I’ll rely on the moderator to determine the best time to make that happen.”

**5. Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:**

Geyerman announced Southern Conference Graduate Scholarship nominees Christy Gregarus, Jessica Geiger, Rachel Self, and Laura Smith and urged faculty to congratulate those students. He reported that at the NCAA Convention in Atlanta the sport of women’s sand volleyball has been added to the NCAA list of emerging sports. If 40 institutions sponsor women’s sand volleyball, it will be instituted as an NCAA Championship Sport. He added that the men’s baseball season—not the number of games—has been extended by one week. Geyerman also circulated the GPA Comparison Report for Student-Athletes and the Graduate Success Rate Reports.

Finally, Geyerman reported on the basketball academic scandal. Dr. Keel received a letter from the NCAA dated January 19<sup>th</sup>. A public announcement was set to come out on January 20<sup>th</sup> at 3:00 p.m., and the committee asked that nothing be said publicly until after the announcement. In December, Georgia Southern received notification that the Committee on Infractions had tacked on an additional charge called “failure to monitor.” Georgia Southern elected to appeal in writing on the grounds that the actions that the university took constituted monitoring in the case. The minute Georgia Southern knew of allegations of academic fraud, the university contacted the NCAA, formed an internal investigation committee, and went from there. The NCAA enforcement staff did the joint interviews and investigation with our internal committee, consisting of Scott Pierce and Keith Roughton. Although they didn’t recommend a failure to monitor charge at that time, the Committee on Infractions leveled that charge anyway. Georgia Southern appealed in writing, lost the appeal, met and decided to appeal no further.

The basis of the case was a basketball coach doing online work for student-athletes, posing as them in chat rooms, and turning in assignments. Geyerman commented that “all of the academic fraud took place in online courses, which I

think as academicians should give us all room for pause.” In response to the charges, he said, Georgia Southern has instituted a series of corrective actions. Geyerman acknowledged the frustration felt by many about the process, but said that “there was a faculty member implicated, not charged by anything with the NCAA, so there were some very serious due process rights there to consider.” Georgia Southern suspended three basketball players, one of whom was later exonerated. Geyerman said, “The kid lost out on a third of the season because it is better to be safe than sorry, so he ended up paying a price basically for nothing.”

Penalties in the case are “public reprimand, censure, two years of probation (ending on January 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012); a five year show-cause order for the former assistant coach who engaged in the academic fraud; a two-year show-cause order for the former director of basketball operations; a reduction of basketball scholarships by one for this season, next season and the 2011-2012 season; also, during this academic year, the number of official recruiting visits has been reduced by 4 from the maximum of 12; and Georgia Southern vacated all wins from the 2007-2008 and the 2008-2009 seasons in which the academically ineligible student-athletes participated.”

James Stephens (COPH) asked Geyerman about the meaning of “gray shirting.” Fred Smith (LIB) said it had to do with “shifting scholarships around and using them in a different year. It’s fairly new, maybe in the last couple of years.”

Samantha Young (SGA) said, “As a member of the University Athletic Committee, as well as a student here at Georgia Southern, I think this issue brought not only attention to the basketball program [and] our athletic programs, but also to how students in general view academic dishonesty. I think the culture of students will change as a result of some of these sanctions that have highlighted our basketball program, but also [it is important] to know that cheating isn’t just restricted to online courses. Academic dishonesty across the board is something that really needs to be looked into and taken seriously, and I just wanted you all to know that it had been brought up at the UAC meeting, and students are aware of those sanctions and how it doesn’t just happen to student-athletes.”

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked what exactly “probation” would mean. Geyerman said it means that Keith Roughton, the Director of Compliance, will be filing with the NCAA a number of reports “that are over and above what are typically required, and if we do something ‘illegal,’ another major violation, then we are subject to some very serious [program-cancelling] penalties.”

Pat Humphrey (COST) asked what the university is doing to rectify the “failure to monitor” situation. Geyerman said that Keith Roughton, the Director of Compliance’s responsibilities have been divided, and the university has interviewed three or four candidates for a newly-created position called “Academic Athletic Director.” That individual’s responsibilities will include coordinating all of the tutorial activities, reporting directly to the Vice President for Business and Finance. Furthermore, Cone Hall is going to have space for that office, which will help a lot to get the student-athletes in a separate space that is designated for study hall and academics.

Geyerman thanked everyone “for their patience and understanding during this process.”

6. **Report from Michael Moore (COE), Chair, Senate Executive Committee: Moore announced that** Faculty Senate will sponsor and moderate three faculty forums with our new President, Dr. Keel. The first one will be on Monday, March 1<sup>st</sup>, from 1:45-3:45 p.m., in the Arts Building Auditorium. the second on Tuesday, March 2<sup>nd</sup>, 4:00-6:00 p.m. in Russell Union Room 2047, and the third on Wednesday, March 3<sup>rd</sup>, 9:00-11:00 a.m. in the College Education Auditorium, Room 1115. Questions for Dr. Keel should be sent to Moore or other SEC members. Moore urged faculty “to make every effort to attend.”

### **Motion Requests**

[Vision for Graduate Education](#)

[Core Curriculum Task Force Composition.](#)

### **RFIs**

[2010 U.S. Census](#)

Gary Means (Provost) has asked Darin Van Tassell and Todd Deal to work on this. Means said, “The University has been involved for some time in working with the community on the census, so I was somewhat in error that we weren’t doing anything.” Means asked Van Tassell, from a faculty perspective, and Deal, from the student engagement perspective, to comment.

Darin Van Tassell (CLASS) reported that “a PR campaign and a real educational campaign” were underway. Jayne Perkins Brown is coordinating the efforts on campus. Van Tassell noted that “students are to be counted where they live. There’s not a question about citizenship, or legal status, quite frankly, the census is about residence. And where students go to school is where they should be counted. Their parents should not be counting them at home. In fact, our international students should be counted here. They need to fill out the census, and part of us we need to do is to help educate them.” Patrick Novotny and Van Tassell are organizing a faculty census day, or perhaps a census week, with faculty talking to students about the importance of the census. E-mails will be sent and a University website created. “Here’s why it matters,” Van Tassell said, “and it doesn’t just matter from federal dollars and, quite frankly, Georgia’s only one of five states who stands to gain congressional seats and representation, but the South is also one of those areas that’s the least likely to have a good count. We’ve lost millions of dollars in the last decade. The estimates are for every thousand people that are miscounted you lose on average about \$50,000 to \$100,000 per area. I can tell you just a quick example, a caveat—in the 2000 census the city of Statesboro showed about 22,000 people in the city limits. That includes this entire campus. There’s no way that can be accurate, and that is literally amounting to hundreds of thousands and pushing into seven digits. Now that’s a big deal.”



Todd Deal (Student Leadership and Civic Engagement) said that the best way to reach students is peer to peer. Deal is working with Perkins Brown, Dean Georj Lewis, Dean of Students, and Marketing and Communications Marla Bruner, as well as the Inspire Student Leadership Consultants, a group of twelve students who will have several different initiatives. This group will do presentations for the community leaders in the residence halls to train them to talk to the residents, make presentations for student organizations that request them, and sponsor a census fair—a big event around Georgia Southern’s Census Day. (This date is still to be decided. The National Census Day is April 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010.) There will also be t-shirts, buttons and the promotion of this Census Day. A certain percentage of the residence halls will actually receive the census forms, and there will be census staff members here in the Union for three hours a day March 22<sup>nd</sup> through April 16<sup>th</sup> to answer questions for both on-campus and off-campus students.

Dean Hale (COBA) asked if there was a campaign to contact the parents, to keep them from double-counting. Van Tassell responded that there was.

Michael Moore (COE) Chair, Senate Executive Committee, asked that the minutes serve as the additional response to this RFI.

#### [Faculty Senate Website](#)

Michael Moore (COE) Chair, Senate Executive Committee, said that the SEC is in agreement with Patrick and has been trying to remove pass protection from the Senate website. Concerns remain with someone outside the University accessing the SharePoint site. He added that someone from outside the University who wishes to participate can contact Ginger for a username and password onto the site. At this stage, Moore said he believed password protection had been removed for anyone who has a University Novell password and ID.

Steve Burrell (IT Services) said that all requested restrictions had been removed. Pat Humphrey (COST) commented that when she tried to print the agenda today, it asked for a username and password. Burrell said that IT Services would look into it.

Gary Means (Provost) asked that the Senate consider the implications of opening the Senate blog to public scrutiny, in terms of the need “to exercise some constraint” in blog postings. Burrell said the blog was still under password protection, but IT Services would remove it if it was the wish of the Senate. Moore said he would contact Senate Executive Committee for a vote on the matter.

#### [Curriculum Core Task Force Composition](#)

Gary Means (Provost) said the Core Curriculum “belongs to the University. It doesn’t belong to any one department or one college. Because everyone and every major is impacted significantly by what’s in the Core Curriculum, I wasn’t specifically looking at membership in terms of making sure each of the present areas in the Core curriculum had representation. What I was looking for was a sense of input from a variety of different sources.” He added that the Board of

Regents has mandated a “rigorous assessment of system for the Core curriculum.” Also, since SACS accreditation is coming up, Means said he “looked at membership on the committee as also being people that had a good assessment capability.” Means also mentioned the short time frame from the BOR for an initial response on assessment and the Core Curriculum. Means stressed that he “needed to have a working committee that, in fact, could work” and that “once you get about 12 people the effectiveness, the timely effectiveness of task groups starts diminishing significantly,” so he intended to keep the Task Force small.

Barry Joyner (CHHS) reminded the Senate that the charge of the Task Force was to:

- Identify at least one student learning outcome for each area of the Core Areas A-E. Those outcomes must be approved by the University System of Georgia (USG).
- Identify at least one student learning outcome for US perspectives and global perspectives, approved by the USG.
- Establish a plan that insures critical thinking skills or developed in Areas A-E. Also must be approved by the USG.
- Establish an assessment plan to assess and evaluate the student learning outcomes and critical thinking.
- Delineate how many hours are built into each area and the courses to be included in those areas.

Joyner said, “it is a pretty ambitious time line that we’ve got to stick to, and that’s one of the reason that we’ve been working, even though there were some concerns about the makeup of the committee.” The Task Force’s goal for this semester, he said, is “to come up with these student learning outcomes and submit them through the approval process” by the Undergraduate Committee and the Faculty Senate.

The learning outcomes must approved before the assessment plan, so after the learning outcomes are submitted to the Council on General Education in Fall 2010, the Task Force will start working on the assessment plan for the student learning outcomes and determining the organization of and courses to be included in the Core, which will also have to go through the approval process here at the University and at the University System. The assessment plan will be submitted for USG approval in Spring 2011. Implementation will take place in Fall 2011. The goal of the Task Force is to have much of the work done by Fall 2010, because schedules are usually built for the following fall at the end of the previous fall semester.

The Task Force has been meeting regularly, reviewing student learning outcomes from three sources: the current General Education Outcomes for Georgia Southern; the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that Georgia Southern submitted

to SACS, and sample student learning outcomes from the USG . The Task Force plans to put sample student learning outcomes on a SharePoint site this week. “These are starting points for discussion,” Joyner said. “We want input from faculty about the ones we are going to put out there. We also want faculty to submit other student outcomes for consideration.” Subcommittees will also be created to look at student learning outcomes. The Task Force’s goal is to make the April Undergraduate Committee meeting, which means a late March deadline for the Task Force.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) said he finds it “troubling” that there’s not a person who teaches in Area C on the committee. Barry Joyner said there was a committee member from CLASS and that the committee would seek input from others teaching in the Core. Joyner added that the Core belongs to the entire university. Flynn responded that “having people who actually teach in the Core might better be able to assess what goes on in them than somebody who has never taught in that area of the Core.” Gary Means (Provost) agreed to add two more faculty members, one from COST and one from CLASS, and one student member.

Clara Krug (CLASS) raised concerns about the short turnaround time for the committee, especially for the Faculty Senate and the assessment plan for the various disciplines. She also asked about changes in course requirements. Joyner (CHHS) said the Core does not have to be changed. Krug it is “a frightfully short time frame for what we’re supposed to be doing.”

Gary Means (Provost) commented that the Board of Regents has mandated the short time frame. He added that “one of the things that we have failed to do institutionally over the last five years is a Core Curriculum assessment and outcomes.” He continued that at this point “we are not going into the assessment and we are not saying necessarily that we are going forward with any kind of institutional Core Curriculum revision, but we do have to have our objectives identified, and we’re going to need them for next year’s SACS report, too.”

Brenda Talley (CHHS) said that faculty who teach upper-division courses outside the Core build on the Core and that the Task Force should “seek output not only from people who teach that, but for people who teach *from* that. . . . [W]e need the expertise throughout all of the spectrum.”

Mark Welford (COST) asked for the justification for having “a non-tenured track, first-year temporary professor who has no long-term commitment to this University” on the committee. Means said that if he had known her status, he would not have assigned her, but that she “is a very conscientious, bright and capable person and anybody that would suggest that she can’t do a good job, I would certainly question that.” He said he wanted to keep her on the committee.

Pat Humphrey (COST) asked about the timing of the Undergraduate Committee meeting in terms of Senate meetings to discuss this issue. Humphrey said she thought this might have to be taken up in the June meeting of the Senate. Bob Cook (CIT), Parliamentarian, said that “The Senate as a body at any time can

suspend any rule that is has except those that it has that are written into the Constitution to take up items that may require a timely response.”

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked for and received confirmation that all of the changes to the curriculum need to be made by Fall 2011. He added, “Since the current Core satisfies the requirements of the Board of Regents, I see no reason to rush into messing with the Core on that kind of timeline and, frankly, I resent having to do it.”

Don Stallings (COST) said the non-tenured faculty member on the committee has “a very strong history of assessment.” Mark Welford (COST) said he was concerned about “her long-term commitment to the University seeing that she’s a temporary.” Stallings said she “is on a contract that gets renewed yearly, but she’s under a contract that essentially will let her be here for six years and then get renewed again.”

Greg Harwood (CLASS) passed out information from the Library Committee, which was also included in the Librarian’s Report.

**7. Report from Michael Braz (CLASS), SPC Representative: No Report.**

**8. Motion Request: [Vision for Graduate Education](#) submitted by Jonathan Harwell (LIB).**

Jill Lockwood (COBA ) gave a brief history of the creation of the Vision.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) raised concerns about resources (in particular library resources) in light of the vision. She said that “achieving this vision will be very difficult given the current situation with the Library.” Lockwood said the document is “not an implementation or resource document.” Harwell said a subcommittee has “drafted some notes for the secondary document to operationalize these statements, and the Library is one of these things that we will address there.”

Richard Flynn (CLASS) moved that the Senate endorse the Vision for Graduate Education. Motion seconded.

Samantha Young (SGA) asked if graduate students were on the committee and if it was brought to the Graduate Student Association. Harwell said that, as a faculty member and a graduate student, he represented both perspectives. He said he was the only graduate student member.

Motion passed.

Moore asked for a motion to extend the 6:00 Senate deadline as long as there was a quorum to complete business. Motion passed.

**9. Motion Request: [Core Curriculum Task Force Composition](#) submitted by Pat Humphrey. Seconded.**

Samantha Young (SGA) thanked Dr. Means, Dr. Joyner, and the Senate for including a student representative on the Task Force.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked why no faculty members from American History or American Government were on the Task Force “given the prominence of that desired learning outcome.” She added that faculty [know best] how to assess their particular disciplines. Means responded that the “external community is assessing us and they are telling us now that we must have assessment tools, and we must have these very explicitly stated.” He continued that it is important that “we identify how we are going to be assessed and what those criteria are before someone else does it for us.” The Task Force must also follow the guidance of the Board of Regents. Haberland reiterated that specialists in the various fields should be on the Task Force.

Rebecca Kennerly (CLASS) asked if the committee’s membership was fixed or whether the membership could be changed over time. Means said the committee will change and grow over time.

Pat Humphrey (COST) read the motion again: “That the Provost reconstitute the Task Force so that it more accurately reflects the colleges that teach the Core Curriculum and includes at least one student.”

Brenda Talley (CHHS) asked whether the assessment was focused on individual classes or more summative in nature (such as the Regent’s Exam).

Richard Flynn (CLASS) said he was not so concerned about the colleges being represented as in areas of the Core being represented on that committee. Michelle Haberland (CLASS) added “We all want it to be the best Core possible. We want to leave our students ready for their upper division work, and to have them graduate from Georgia Southern fulfilling our mission statement, and creating well-equipped global citizens.” She also stressed the need to “focus on the expertise [of faculty]. . . . It’s an impressive faculty. We should use them.”

Sonya Huber (CLASS) asked if Provost Means was addressing that specific expertise question with the possible appointment of the additional faculty. Means said that he was. He reminded the faculty that the Task Force is involved in a “two-step process.” One is setting up what the outcomes are, which cuts across all areas of the university and the second, which is the assessment. “Right now,” Means said, “we’re looking at what those outcomes ought to be like in a more generic kind of way.”

Considerable discussion ensued about how many new members would be added to the committee as a result of the motion passing. Means said he was committed to adding two faculty members and one student representative to the committee. Questions were raised about the phrase “proportionate to the Core” and what that might mean for the re-constitution of the Task Force. Discussion then centered on how many faculty needed to be added. Means urged that the committee remain workable in size. Pat Humphrey (COST) asked for a representative from Math in Area A, in addition to the representative from Writing and Linguistics.

Other faculty argued for adding representatives from Area B and Area C of the Core.

Brooks Keel (President) suggested at this point that the Senate might be in agreement as to the addition of members. Richard Flynn (CLASS) offered a substitute motion that proposed adding two faculty members from Area B and C and a student member to the Task Force. The amendment passed.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked if Pat Humphrey approved of the changes to her motion. Humphrey said she did. The motion passed.

## **10. Unfinished Business**

Clara Krug (CLASS) reported that, as a Doctoral University in Georgia, Georgia Southern has only 4 peers: Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia State, the University of Georgia, and Emory. Georgia Southern has 1.24 Librarians and professional staff per 1,000 students; Georgia State has 1.91, Georgia Tech has 2.4, University of Georgia has 2.45. Examples from the twelve [peer/aspirational](#) institutions, which do not appear on the list of Doctoral Research Universities, are: Appalachian State University, 2.95, and James Madison University, 1.63. Krug asked, “How will we develop a realistic timeframe during the current economic crisis as we try to position ourselves to conduct research as a Doctoral Research University and then as we expect production at that level?”

Brooks Keel (President) said, “I think we are positioned to move in that direction is basically what I said, and we need to also understand that in the Carnegie designation of Doctoral Research University that the four Universities that you mentioned are not doctoral universities, they are very high research universities.”

Krug said that 10 out of the 12 peer/aspirational universities have more library funding and do not have faculty expectations to publish at the doctoral research level. “We’re expecting people here now to do more than James Madison, Appalachian State, and the ten other peer/aspirational institutions, with less money,” Krug said. Keel said this was going to be part of the strategic planning process and that this would be a slow process “with a great deal of consideration at the department level . . . . No one can expect this University—any University—that has an annual external funding level of \$6 million, to make a significant quantum leap without a great deal of conversation and thought.”

Krug then asked if faculty might now be expected to publish one peer-reviewed article a year, as was mentioned at a department meeting in CLASS on the 5<sup>th</sup> of February. Keel responded that this would depend on the individual colleges and departments.

Michael Moore (COE), Senate Moderator, suggested that this was not unfinished business and that Krug should consider submitting an RFI on this issue.

## **11. New Business**

Rebecca Kennerly (CLASS) asked about making a motion request to discuss changing the April Senate meeting date to follow the Undergraduate Committee meeting on the Task Force's recommendations. Bob Cook (CIT), who is on the Core Curriculum Committee, said that the committee has discussed "alerting the Undergraduate Committee, and possibly the Faculty Senate, to get the meetings aligned so that we can move the business forward, but also have the maximum time for people to discuss it." He added that it is important "to create a process by which we would use the assessments to adjust the outcomes, to adjust the assessment, to adjust the courses in the Core, so that [it becomes] a living process." The process will, he added, "go on for decades, and this first step is just something that we've been told to do by a certain timeline." Michael Moore recommended that the Committee come to the Senate Executive Committee with its recommendations, and the SEC will put out information on the Senate list serve and decide about meetings then.

**12. Announcements: Vice Presidents: No announcements.**

**13. Announcements from the Floor:**

Cliffton Price announced that the next AAUP meeting will be March 5<sup>th</sup>, at 3:30 in COBA, Room 1124. For questions about the local AAUP chapter, contact Cliffton Price or Vice President Michelle Haberland.

**14. Adjournment.**

**The next Senate meeting is scheduled for March 22, 2010, 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., in the Russell Union Ballroom.**

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**March 22, 2010**  
**4:00 to 6:00 p.m.**  
**Russell Union Ballroom**

**2009-2010 Senate Executive Committee:** *Michael Moore (COE) Chair, Senate Executive Committee; Moderator, Faculty Senate; Jim McMillan (CHHS); Ardian Greca (CIT); Richard Flynn (CLASS); Lowell Mooney (COBA); Teri Ann Melton (COE); Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Librarian; Jim Stephens (JPHCOPH); Fred Smith (LIB); Marilyn Bruce, Senate Liaison from the President's Office; Caren Town (CLASS) Senate Secretary.*

**NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:** *Chris Geyerman (CLASS).*

**Senate Parliamentarian:** *Bob Cook (CIT).*

**Voting Members in Attendance:** *Frank Atuahene, Barry Balleck, Michael Braz, Thomas Buckley, Jean-Paul Carton, Jonathan Copeland, Windy Dees, Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Michelle Haberland, Dena Hale, Greg Harwood, Pat Humphrey, Bob Jackson, Clara Krug, Barbara Mallory, Mary Marwitz, Jim McMillan, Teri Ann Melton, Lowell Mooney, Michael Moore, Patricia Price, (Dolores Rangel for Theresa Welford), Stephen Rossi, (Joseph Ruhland for Debra Sinclair), Fred Smith, Alton Standifer (SGA), Jim Stephens, Brenda Talley, Caren Town, Patricia Walker, Mark Welford, LeVon Wilson, Rob Yarbrough.*

**Voting Members Absent:** *Marie Botkin, Adam Con, Ardian Greca, Ming Fang He, Sonya Huber, Youakim Al-Kalaani, Rebecca Kennerly, Margaret LaMontagne, Jun Liu, Allison Long, Bruce McLean, Kent Murray, David Rostal, Donna Saye, Lisa Schulz, Dontarie Stallings, Stuart Tedders, Laura Valeri, Jim Whitworth, Bill Yang, Wen-Ran Zhang, Xialong Jonathan Zhang.*

**Administrative Members in Attendance:** *Brooks Keel, Gary Means, Ron Core, Steve Burrell, Teresa Thompson, Billy Griffis, Marilyn Bruce, Jean Bartels, Ron Shiffler, Michael Smith, Stephanie Kenney, Charles Patterson, Bret Danilowicz, Bede Mitchell, Tony Bretti.*

**Visitors:** *Jenny Kondo, Patrick Novotny, Candace Griffith, Amy Heaston, Dick Diebolt.*

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the March 22, 2010, Meeting: Michael Moore (COE), Senate Moderator. Agenda Approved.**
2. **Approval of the February 15, 2010, Minutes: Caren Town (CLASS), Senate Secretary. Minutes Approved.**
3. **Librarian's Report of March 22, 2010: Pat Humphrey (COST), Senate Librarian.** Minutes from the Undergraduate Committee were not included in the Librarian's report. Some course revision/deletion forms in the Graduate Committee forms were blank. **Librarian's Report Accepted.**
  - a. **Report from Undergraduate Committee: Bob Jackson (COBA).** The committee approved one selected topic, 49 course revisions, 3 program revisions, and 2 course deletions. Since the minutes for this meeting were not



available, two sets of minutes will be approved at the next Senate meeting.

- b. **Report from Graduate Committee: Bob Fernekes (LIB).** A complete report of the meeting has now been sent to the Senate. After approving the agenda, the Graduate Committee approved new courses and course revisions from CLASS, a course deletion from the Department of Writing and Linguistics, course revisions from COST, and course deletions from the College of Information Technology. Under old business, the committee approved the Sport Management Masters Program revision. **Minutes Accepted.**

#### **4. President's Report: President Brooks Keel.**

##### **Faculty Forum**

"As many of you know, I held three faculty forums on March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup>, which gave an overview of where we were with the budget. I won't call it my vision because, as I've said before; what I would hope that all of us will be able to do over the next several months is to create our vision of what the University future will look like, but I was able to give at least an overview with you of what some of my thinking is at the moment, and things that are really on my mind as we start moving forward."

##### **Student Forum**

"About a week or so after that, I had a student forum as well in the Union. It was very well attended. I had a great time with the students. It gave them a chance to ask the President some questions, too, so I hope that we can continue that format. If you think that's a format that serves a purpose, and is useful, and however often we do this we will decide as we go forward, but I think that's a great opportunity. It is a great opportunity for me, at least, to hear what's on your mind through questions and answers, also to give you a chance to hear what's on my mind, so we'll try to continue that."

##### **Budget Situation**

"Obviously, the thing that's on everyone's mind, and certainly is on my mind, is the budget situation we find ourselves in. I guess either, fortunately or unfortunately, depending on whether you are an optimist or a pessimist, there's not a whole lot to tell you at this point. As you know, the legislature is still working through their various scenarios. We do know now, at least, that ordinarily the legislative session is over with around the first of April, around April Fool's Day, which is probably an interesting time to have the session come to an end. It will in fact be stretching out further into the month. We do know that for a fact. It will probably in fact extend a little beyond the 15<sup>th</sup> of April, so it will be some time between the middle and end of April before we actually know what the budget will be, and there are a lot of reasons for that. It probably shouldn't come as a big surprise to you, there is some disagreement between the Governor's Office and the legislature with regard to the severity of the budget cuts, as well as with regard as to how one might meet the budget cuts from a revenue generating point of view. [R]ight now it's just too early to be able to know what the situation is going to be, and, in fact, it may very well be all the way down to the very last day of the session before we know for sure. In the meantime, we will try to keep you up-to-date as much as we possibly can. The [georgiasouthern.edu/budget\\_website](http://georgiasouthern.edu/budget_website), we try to keep that up-to-date with news that comes across. Please continue to use that as a site."

"I will tell you that there has been a tremendous amount of outpouring of concern from all of you, from our students, from our parents, our students' parents, from the alumni, and supporters, and our legislators have heard you loud and clear. We've got some fantastic legislative support in Atlanta. I've had an opportunity to meet with them

several times now. I know that, without question, they all care deeply about Georgia Southern. Jack Hill, our Senator, Representative Jon Burns, Representative Butch Parrish, Representative Bob Lane, care deeply about this place, and they really have heard all that you have said, and they are working very hard on our behalf. So I hopefully will have an opportunity to officially thank them for the hard work that they have done, but just won't know when that will be. In the meantime, I do think it is still in our best interest to prepare for the worst case scenario, realizing that it is a worst case scenario as you've heard me say many times now, but I think we need to at least prepare for that, hoping for the best, and moving forward when we finally know what that is. I have asked the Faculty Senate for suggestions for individuals from each college to sit on a President's Task Force who will look at our programs. As you know, one of the line items, if you will, that we put as to how we would meet the \$14.7 million budget cut was to eliminate, consolidate, combine, re-evaluate, etc., the academic programs. I am putting together a task force to help me do that. The Faculty Senate has presented suggested names. I've asked the Deans to present suggested names, and from that we have compiled a list of individuals we will be sending out invitations as early as tomorrow to those individuals asking them to serve on this panel as well as three deans, a student representative, and a graduate student representative to try to help evaluate all of our programs to see if there's some efficiencies that could be made in terms of that. As I've said before, we shouldn't let a good budget crisis go to waste. I think every University should on a periodic basis evaluate their programs to see if there are efficiencies or ways in which we could improve. I would see this as a positive step regardless, but I do think we need to do this as we march forward, again, planning on a worst case scenario. So, you will be hearing more about that very soon, and hopefully get that committee to start meeting as soon as possible."

### **Provost Search**

"We are going to be moving forward with a Provost search. I've already made contact with a search firm to help us with that, and so they are already beginning to start thinking about that. I will be putting together a search committee very soon. I will be seeking input from this group in terms of who you think would be appropriate representation to that committee. I'm very excited about this. I think it is a great opportunity to chart the course of the future for this University by choosing a very strong Provost. And I think many of you have also heard me say that the Provost is at least as important, if not more important than the President in many ways because that individual is the academic leader of the University. So, I'm looking forward to having your participation in that."

### **Capital Campaign**

"And just another piece of update information. You've also heard me say that we are going forward with a capital campaign. There are a lot of ways to think about revenue generation for a university — tuition is certainly one of those — but philanthropy and capital campaign is another. We are in the process of interviewing three different consulting groups that we will hopefully engage to try to help us determine, based on their evaluation of our alumni base, what is the proper goal for us. And how we might split that goal up among the various colleges to give all of us, all of you, an opportunity to participate in that capital campaign process — so very early stages at this point in time. But I will try to keep you up-to-date on how we go with that, and we'll be bringing you more information as we move forward. So I think that's the main topics; I'd be happy to try to answer or address anything that I may have overlooked."

An unidentified faculty member asked why the university needed a search firm for the

Provost's Search. President Keel responded, "It's hard for those folks to just come across an advertisement that they may see in a journal or the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and just apply for a position. Many of the outstanding candidates for positions, especially when you get to Provost, and even if you're a dean, but especially Provost, and even for President, it's difficult for a sitting Provost, for example, to express an interest to a blind ad. They will, however, express an interest to somebody who picks up a phone and calls them and says, have you considered Georgia Southern? Let me talk to you about Georgia Southern, where they are, where they are going to be going, let us talk about this, in a very unofficial capacity to get them to apply for the position. Search firms have an opportunity when they do searches, like when they searched for this President position, for example; they scour the Georgia Southern countryside to see about potential candidates who may be available for positions elsewhere. And they do that for every position that they search for. So every PrOvost/President position across the country that they are searching for they interact with the faculty there, they see the candidates that are coming up, they have opportunities in an informal way of getting people to express an interest into a position, and it just helps make a much broader candidate pool than just putting an ad out there and hoping someone sees it, and applies for it."

**5. Report from Michael Moore (COE), Chair, Senate Executive Committee.**

**No RFIs.**

**Faculty Forums**

Moore noted the participation at the recent Faculty Senate-sponsored faculty forums: 75 participants at the first one, 85 at each of the other two forums. The forums lasted two hours each and "allowed for vigorous discussion." Moore thanked Pat Humphrey and Fred Smith for providing summaries of the forums on SharePoint. Moore said he "thought they were very inclusive, and captured the spirit of the discussion really well."

**Motion Requests**

[Resolution on the Budget.](#)

[Ad Hoc Committee appointed by the Senate on Faculty Governance.](#)

**Elections**

Moore encouraged faculty to run for Senate offices and committees. "There's a longstanding belief echoed by many faculty that such service isn't valued," Moore said. "In fact, I received an email yesterday from a senior faculty member when asked if the person would run for office, said, 'I have been told to back off from service that it does not carry any weight in the new world order. I have to now turn all my attention to scholarship.' I trust that this isn't the case, and this was simply a miscommunication. Right now, faculty governance is at an important crossroad. President Keel will soon announce a special committee to examine the budget, and where, if needed, additional cuts might be made. Those cuts affecting instruction must go through the appropriate Senate standing committees, and we need committed faculty to properly vet each of these recommendations. Core Curriculum Task Force will be making recommendations that also must go through committees, and ultimately the Senate. Hopefully, today we will approve a motion to approve an ad hoc faculty governance/tenure and promotion procedures committee that will make recommendations that could affect all of us. Not only do we need faculty to run for these positions, we really need our best faculty, and I'm appealing to three groups today. The first is to you the Senate, Senate standing committee members, to go back to your respective colleges and departments and nominate and persuade the best faculty you know to undertake this important service.

Also it is incumbent on you in your annual evaluations to make a strong case for your service. Deans and chairs, I am asking you to help us dispel this notion that such service is not valued at review time. Please help us by making it clear that you support faculty governance. Every dean and every chair is a faculty member and you are the leaders of the University, encourage, please, your best and brightest faculty [to undertake] University service work, and finally, Provost Means and President Keel, we've discussed this before, and I already know that you both support this essential faculty service, please help us by maintaining your commitment to faculty governance. Provost Means was also a Senate Moderator, so I know he especially values such service, and if our leadership makes it clear that this service will be valued and rewarded faculty governance will follow your leadership."

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked if the period for nominations had passed.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Chair, Senate Elections Committee, said the CLASS nominations were being reopened.

- 6. Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative.** Geyerman reported Georgia Southern Student Athletes were awarded two of the eight annual graduate scholarships by the Southern Conference. Kristi Kegerreis, women's tennis, was awarded the Camp Champs Graduate Scholarship by the Southern Conference to pursue a Doctor of Physical Education Degree at Old Dominion beginning this Fall. She was also accepted at Virginia Commonwealth. Jessica Geiger, women's basketball, was awarded the William V. Moore Graduate Scholarship by the Southern Conference to pursue Graduate Study in International Marketing beginning this fall. Each award is worth \$2,000. Southern Conference Commissioner John Iamarino noted with respect to each that "the committee was very impressed with your achievements, and your leadership in the areas of academics, extra curricular activities, and athletics." These two students will be formally recognized at the Southern Conference Honors Awards banquet during the Conference Spring Meeting on June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010. Geyerman asked faculty to join in congratulating these student-athletes.

**7. Motion Request: [Resolution on the Budget](#) – Patricia Humphrey (COST):**

"The SEC asks the Senate to approve the following resolution to be sent to the chancellor, BOR, and State Legislature:

"The Faculty Senate of Georgia Southern University fully supports its own administration and the chancellor in their efforts to prevent the legislature of Georgia from eviscerating the university system. Already, drastic cuts have gone to the bone. Further cuts totaling \$565 million, if they occur, will prevent Georgia Southern University and the rest of the system from accomplishing their core mission of educating students and providing the well-trained professionals needed for Georgia's future. In addition, cuts of this magnitude will render GSU and the USG system unable to attract and retain qualified faculty and serve the communities where we are located.

The Faculty Senate of Georgia Southern University will support the efforts of our legislature to write an equitable budget for FY 2011. However, legislators should recall they were elected to serve the present

and future people of Georgia. Cuts of this magnitude will not only fail to serve the present students, but those of the future as well.”

**Pat Humphrey (COST) moved that the Senate approve this resolution. Second by Clara Krug. Motion passed.**

**8. Motion Request: [Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance](#) – Richard Flynn (CLASS).**

“That the Senate Executive Committee appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate the extent to which colleges and departments practice shared governance as outlined in the Faculty Handbook section 110.01, with special attention to the development and revision of promotion, tenure, and post tenure review policies. The committee will be charged with gathering and evaluating data on shared governance and with making recommendations to ensure that faculty in all colleges and departments have the structure and mechanisms that allow them to play a meaningful role in the development and implementation of the policies delineated in section 110.01.”

**Flynn moved that the Senate approve this motion. Pat Humphrey second.**

Bob Cook (CIT) Senate Parliamentarian: “According to the *Bylaws*, each ad hoc committee has a specific charge, which you just read, that outlines measurable objectives and appropriate time constraints. I just wanted the Executive Committee to be aware that there should be a time constraint, but that can be determined by the Executive Committee at the appointment of the committee, as approved.”

Clara Krug (CLASS): “I have a friendly amendment which I have discussed with Richard Flynn. In the motion which he just read, ‘with special attention to the development and revision of,’ and add third-year review to the promotion, tenure, and post tenure review policies. So the sentence would read, ‘That the Senate Executive Committee appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate the extent to which colleges and departments practice shared government as outlined in the Faculty Handbook section 110.01, with special attention to the development and revision of third-year review, promotion, tenure, and post tenure review policies.’”

Discussion ensued about whether the motion should read “third-review review” or “pre-tenure review” or both. The decision was made to include both terms. Flynn pointed out that the language in the motion doesn’t restrict the duties of the committees to these, but instead [calls for] “special attention” to them.

Gary Means (Provost) asked if the word “investigate” could be changed to “study or examine.”

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) made a friendly amendment to change the language from “investigate” to “examine.”

Gary Means (Provost) asked if the third-year review should be placed in a separate section from the tenure and promotion section in the motion. Richard Flynn (CLASS) said, “the section in the Faculty Handbook that this refers to is called Shared Governance, under the heading Faculty Governance, so it’s not particular to the section of the handbook that’s mentioned is not particular to tenure and promotion. The motion asks that special attention be paid to these matters; it seeks to examine faculty governance overall in addition to those particular matters.”

Lowell Mooney (COBA) asked if a deadline should be set for the committee. Moore said that

when the SEC appoints the committee and charges it, the SEC will set a deadline. At the next Senate meeting the Senate can approve that deadline.

Bob Cook (CIT), Parliamentarian, pointed out that, according to the *Bylaws*, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee can appoint an ad hoc committee independent of the Faculty Senate, so in essence this is a courtesy on their part as well as judging the mindset of the Senate in terms of the formation of this committee, so the setting of a deadline can be done by the Executive Committee without coming back to the full body.

**The motion passed.**

Brooks Keel (President) commended the Senate for creating the committee.”Having gone through the promotion and tenure packets just this past time,” Keel said, “it seemed to me that there were some differences in the way things are done across campus. perhaps, and I think now is a great opportunity to take a look at that to make sure that the form and format and structure of the review is done with some consistency from one college to the next, but at the same time keeping in mind that the actual metrics that are to be used for determining if an individual has met a certain bar of scholarship is to be extremely discipline specific.”

Gary Means (Provost) asked the committee to consider clarifying the procedures in the Faculty Handbook.

Michael Moore (COE) Senate Moderator asked the Senate to send him nominations for this committee.

- 9. Report from Michael Braz (CLASS), SPC Representative:** No report.
- 10. Unfinished Business:** None.
- 11. New Business**

Clara Krug (CLASS): “A question about an article in yesterday’s Exchange Section of the *Savannah Morning News*. It’s about ‘[Diplomats to tour Coastal Georgia](#).’ And it mentions 63 representatives from Albania, Argentina, Bahamas, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Israel, Japan, Korea, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Mali, Philippines, Quebec Swedish Chamber of Commerce, Switzerland, Taiwan and the United Kingdom. And they are going to be here this week and in the last little paragraph, ‘on Friday the tour will spend the first part of the morning at Georgia Southern University and go from there to Fort Stewart.’ I was just curious as a teacher of one of the languages, and speaker of several, what they’re going to be doing here, and if there’s any way anybody can help you entertain them.”

Gary Means (Provost) said that the country representatives that will be here as guests of the Governor and his International Council and are going to be here for a very short period of time on the 26<sup>th</sup>. “They will be here the first thing in the morning and will have breakfast with a number of our International faculty and students, so they get to see the students and faculty that we bring here internationally, and we’ve tried to match those individuals up with the countries that are being represented on the council. After they have breakfast and pictures at the Nessmith-Lane Building, they will move to the College of Science and Technology where they will take a tour of our Renewable Energy

Lab, which is something we think is pretty unique. What we're trying to do is think of things that would be unique and would grab them so they would remember Georgia Southern. After that, they will go down to the Wildlife Center where they will have one of our outstanding presentations of Freedom and the other animals there, and then they'll be on their way. So it is a very short visit, but I think what we are trying to do is make a big impact quickly, and, of course, as they go across the campus they'll see what a beautiful campus this is. So it's really an important public relations event for us."

Brooks Keel (President): "As I understand it this was done by the Governor's Office of Economic Development, so it really is aimed at trying to promote economic development in the state of Georgia."

**12. Announcements: Vice Presidents**

Michelle Haberland (CLASS): "The Student Government Association and the American Association of University Professors stand firm in their commitment to your academic freedom and invite you and your students to join them in a forum on academic freedom at Georgia Southern University. On [Thursday, March 25<sup>th</sup>, at 4:00 p.m.](#), George Shriver, Professor Emeritus of History, will speak on academic freedom. Shriver will provide a history of the AAUP and offer a perspective on the definition and history of academic freedom, particularly its importance for students and faculty and its role in protecting expression on our campus, from interference by church, state, and campus authorities. Afterward, the Georgia Southern Chapter will host a reception and an informal discussion on academic freedom here at our University, so I hope that you all will be there. Thursday, March 25<sup>th</sup>, 4:00 p.m., COBA Room 1124."

**13. Announcements from the Floor**

**14. Adjournment**

**The next Senate meeting is scheduled for April 14, 2010, 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., in the Russell Union Ballroom.**

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**April 15, 2010**  
**4:00 to 6:00 p.m.**  
**University Union Ballroom**

**Voting Members in Attendance:** Frank Atuahene, Barry Balleck, Michael Braz, Tom Buckley, Adam Con, Windy Dees, Bob Fernekes, Michelle Haberland, Dena Hale, Greg Harwood, Ming Fang He, Sonya Huber, Bob Jackson, Youakim Kalaani, Clara Krug, Justin Little (SGA), Samantha Young (SGA), Barbara Mallory, Mary Marwitz, Bruce McLean, Jim McMillan, Kent Murray, (Frederic Mynard for Mark Welford), Patricia Price, Stephen Rossi, Lisa Schulz, Stuart Tedders, Pat Walker, Theresa Welford.

**Voting Members Absent:** Marie Botkin.

**Senate Officers in Attendance:** Michael Moore, Pat Humphrey, Jim McMillan, Richard Flynn, Ardian Greca, Fred Smith, Teri Ann Melton, Lowell Mooney.

**Administrators:** Brooks Keel, Gary Means, Ron Core, Steve Burrell, Teresa Thompson, Billy Griffis, Marilyn Bruce, Jean Bartels, Ron Shiffler, Michael Smith, Bret Danilowicz, Charlie Hardy, Tony Bretti.

**Visitors:** Maria Aviles, Susan P. Wehring, Dick Diebolt, Lee Davis, Heather Jo Harralson, Camelia Sanderlin, Christina Wiley, Issac Taylor, JoEllen Broome, Amy Heaston. Michael Thomas.

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the April 15, 2010, Meeting. Michael Moore (COE) Senate Moderator:** Ginger Malphrus, Faculty Senate Office, and Samantha Young, Senate SGA Representative, were recognized for their work this year.  
**Agenda approved.**
2. **Approval of the March 22, 2010, Minutes: Caren Town (CLASS), Senate Secretary (Pat Humphrey, COST, substituted for Caren who had class):**  
**Senate minutes approved.**
3. **Librarian's Report of April 15, 2010: Pat Humphrey (COST), Senate Librarian,** moved that the Senate accept the Librarian's Report for April 15, 2010, recognizing that accepting the report does not indicate approval of the actions of the committees reported therein, but accepting that they are truthful record of the committees' meetings.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked that responses to two questions be read into the minutes. The first question was about Section V of the Minutes: Discussion of Graduate Education Initiatives. Jonathan Harwell responded that the second version of the Initiatives document would have "more specific items which were outside the scope of the vision statement, and would be passed along as recommendations to the College of Graduate Studies, Graduate Admissions, and other stakeholders." In response to a question about the projected timeline or deadline: "The College of Graduate Studies and



the Office of Graduate Admissions within Student Affairs and Enrollment Management are completing Graduate Stakeholder meetings with each of the academic colleges. This information, including additional information provided by the Graduate Committee and other sources, is being assimilated into strategic initiatives to be addressed by the College of Graduate Studies and associated stakeholders. This is an ongoing process and is only limited by the number of personnel hours required to complete this process, in addition to all other duties of the College of Graduate Studies.”

The second question was again on Section V about financing and discipline specificity in the preparation of teaching assistants. The answer was: “One of the College’s top priorities is to migrate away from the homogenized graduate assistant model towards an improve teaching assistant (TA), research assistant (RA), and graduate assistant (GA) model that will permit the University to not only support our current needs, but allow us to grow as a Doctoral Research University. Towards this end, the College of Graduate Studies is convening a Graduate Assistantship Task Force to assess the needs of the units and graduate programs under a revised graduate assistantship model. This initiative will include not only the academic units, but also many stakeholders across campus. The participation and contribution of the CET towards this important initiative, as well as the participation of other units on campus, are simply part of a preliminary discussion.” These answers were provided by Dr. Charles Patterson, Vice President for Research and Dean of the College of Graduate Studies.

#### **Librarian’s Report accepted.**

**a. Report from Undergraduate Committee: Bob Jackson (COBA):** The Undergraduate Committee met on February 9<sup>th</sup>, and the minutes were included in the Librarian’s Report. The committee approved 48 course revisions, 2 course deletions, 3 program revisions, and there was one selected topic announcement. During the March 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, the committee approved 2 new courses, 90 course revisions, 7 program revisions, and one special topic announcement.

**Undergraduate Committee Report approved.**

**b. Report from Graduate Committee: Bob Fernekes (LIB):** At the March 11<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Committee approved a program revision from the College of Science and Technology under new business. The Committee also tabled the Art Department’s submission. The submissions were subsequently approved in the April 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. There were no old business items, and the remainder of the meeting was devoted to the discussion of the Graduate Education Initiatives.

**Graduate Committee Report approved.**

#### **4. President’s Report: President Brooks Keel:**

##### ***President’s Task Force on Program Review***

“If you recall, in response to what was presented as a potential worst case scenario in terms of budget crises, we proposed eliminating \$2.7 million out of programs to help meet a \$14.7 million total budget cut. I have put together a President’s Task Force to evaluate our programs across campus to see where there might be opportunities for efficiencies, gain, opportunities for everything from cutting programs to merging programs, to merging colleges, and departments, etc. As I’ve said before, I think this sort of review is healthy for a major university of this size regardless if we are in the middle of a budget crisis, and I’m looking forward to this Task Force report that,

hopefully, will serve to guide us as we move forward down the road. An email was sent out campus-wide on the 8<sup>th</sup> of this month in which this Task Force, and the representation of the Task Force was identified. Fred Rich from the College of Science and Technology has agreed to chair that committee. The Provost and myself had asked this body to provide us with three names that represent appropriate faculty from each of the colleges. We also asked the Deans to provide us with recommendations of three faculty from each college, and from that list the Provost and I chose the committee make up. I think this does represent a very good cross section of the entire University. I appreciate the opportunity to work with the Faculty Senate toward putting this committee together. We are in the process of calling the first meeting of that committee at which point I will present a charge to the committee. The charge was sent in the email as well. If you didn't receive that email, please let me or Marilyn know and we will make sure that you get it."

### ***Provost Search***

"Also on that same day, we sent an email regarding the Provost Search. I am delighted that Dean Michael Smith from CLASS has agreed to chair the Provost Search. We could not have chosen a better individual to lead that search. He has requested through this email suggestions for individuals who might be appropriate representatives of your various colleges to serve on the Provost Search Committee. I strongly encourage you to please let Dean Smith know of your recommendations of individuals who not only would represent your college, but other individuals that you feel represent the whole culture of the University. Dean Smith and I will be meeting probably the latter part of next week or so, roughly two weeks after this email was sent out, to take those suggestions and to form the Search Committee, being mindful of representation across the entire campus: representation of faculty, representation of students, and some representation of administration. I say 'some representation' because I want faculty more than administration on this committee, obviously. We hope to have this committee put in place within the next week or so. I would like to see if we could get that committee to meet with the Search Firm, which we should have identified very shortly, by the end of the semester, or certainly before summer starts. And then I think during the summer the committee can do a lot of its work online through a secure website, through email, and that sort of thing. That's the part of the search where, as you know, we seek candidates and information that doesn't really require the committee to meet in person very often. Then the committee will take action full speed ahead at the beginning of the fall semester; the hope is that we could identify three to five candidates to be on campus for interviews sometime in the mid semester, if things go right. If we could potentially identify the Provost finalist before Thanksgiving, then I think that would put us well on track to have the individual here by the first of January. That's not an unreasonable schedule, I think. It is an aggressive schedule, but I think it is doable, and one that we can have proper vetting at the same time to stay on track. We'll move forward until we get the best candidate, clearly, but we will try to move forward expeditiously."

### ***Budget***

"We received information yesterday in terms of when the legislative session will end. As you know, by statute, the Georgia legislature has to complete their business within 40 days of session. That's not 40 calendar days--that's 40 days of session depending on how often they recess. The last four days of the session have been outlined, and they will complete their work by April 29<sup>th</sup>. The session will end at that time, and at that time we will know what the final budget for the state of Georgia is. The Board of Regents will

then receive that information, and, by their board meeting on May 11<sup>th</sup>, the Board of Regents will approve the USG (University System of Georgia) budget and will indicate to each of the campuses what the allocations will be and what the potential increase (if there is one) in tuition and fees will be. So, by around the close of business on May 11<sup>th</sup>, all of the campuses will know what the actual budget for their own campus will be. We have until the 27<sup>th</sup> of May to then take that information and determine how we will implement our budget on campus. That's not a lot of time, but we will move ahead with that expeditiously. We are required to submit our budget plans to the USG on May 27<sup>th</sup>. So by the end of May, we will pretty much know exactly what the budget is and how it will be translated across the campus. Certainly, we will keep you informed as best we possibly can. The budget website is still up. You can access it through the home page of the University's website. And I want to encourage you to stay tuned to what is going on with that."

### ***Retention, Progression, and Graduation Rates***

"Retention, progression, and graduation rates are becoming a huge issue across the entire country, as you know. It certainly is a large issue for us as well. The Board of Regents are taking a very serious look at this on each of the campuses and have formed a Task Force led by Regent Potts that is requiring each University President to come and make a one-hour presentation on where they are currently are with RPG, what their three-year goals are. This has been a very grueling process for most of the Presidents, including this one. We had our turn in the barrel, if you would, yesterday afternoon. And we had a very good discussion with the Regents. Fortunately, we were not required to come back for a second visit. Some universities are going back for a second visit. So I think we can feel very proud that although we are not where we want to be with regard to RPG, clearly we have a very well laid out plan in place that deals with this and an aggressive plan to try to address this. Much of the credit goes to our Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment and to our Provost and their staff for helping us put together the report that we had to give. So I just wanted to let you know that I think we are in good standing with the Regents, and we'll continue to make that a University priority."

Michael Moore (COE) Senate Moderator asked if the President had heard anything about the University System of Georgia Faculty Governance group benefits update, including establishing a \$100 a month spousal benefits fee. President Keel said he had not heard anything further about this, although at the quarterly Presidents' meeting with the Chancellor the topic did come up in terms of health and retirement benefits for faculty, and a presentation was made of suggested possible ways to cut the budget by eliminating or reducing some of those benefits. The presentation "was not met with a warm welcome, I can assure you, by the Presidents, because it was like changing our promise to our employees long after they've accepted the terms. So my guess is the Board of Regents will be doing a lot more study on this before they make recommendations."

Ming Fang He (COE) asked if the Provost Search Committee had "set up any mechanism to maintain the recruitment of a woman, and people of color, or minority, as a Provost." President Keel responded: "One of the reasons that we are using a search firm is to address that very issue. A search firm can make contact with a number of individuals, aggressively, assertively, contacting individuals as opposed to us waiting for candidates to express an interest to us. That allows us to do a couple of things. It allows us to pique the interest of sitting Provosts and Deans who may not be looking for a job. It also

allows us to aggressively target, if you will, women and people of color to try to make sure that the pool of candidates that actually does express an interest is as diverse as we possibly can make it. So I think that using a search firm has a lot of advantages, and that certainly is one of them.” He asked if the campus search committee would have an affirmative action officer on it. President Keel replied that the committee hasn’t yet been formed, but “we certainly will keep that suggestion in mind. I think it’s a very good suggestion. We have an affirmative action officer through Human Resources that monitors all the searches that we do across campus. And certainly will be monitoring this one as well. But I will make sure that Dean Smith receives that recommendation, and we’ll just give that very serious consideration.”

**5. Report from Michael Moore (COE), Chair, Senate Executive Committee:**

***RFI***

[Using Accumulated Sick Days Towards Retirement for Faculty Under ORP](#)

“[A]ny changes to the ORP/TRS must come through the Georgia legislature, and the attempt last year failed and any new attempts must wait another year, so it wouldn’t be again until next year that we might see something. We also, when this was on the agenda in 2006, we, as a Senate, approved a resolution in which we encouraged the legislature to consider the use of sick days for ORP in the same way that they were used for TRS. So we have that on record. That’s been ongoing, and again we have to wait for the legislature to act on that.”

Moore also reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance has been formed, and its first meeting is scheduled for Monday. The charge has been sent around to the committee, and the following faculty members have agreed to serve on this committee: Tom Case from CIT, Ken Clark from the College of Education, Henry Eisenhart from CHHS, Leslie Fletcher from COBA, Richard Flynn is chair from CLASS, Ron MacKinnon from CIT, Dr. Means is serving on the committee as ex officio member. Moore is also serving on it as an ex-officio member, Fred Smith from the Senate Executive Committee and the Library, Robert Vogel from the College of Public Health, Pat Walker from CLASS, and Mark Welford from COST have all accepted their appointment to be on this committee. Part of the committee’s charge, Moore said, comes from the Georgia Southern Faculty Handbook:

“The faculty and administration of Georgia Southern University affirm their belief in the process of shared governance both as a principle and an animating spirit of our institution. Shared governance involves faculty and administration participating mutually in the development of policies at the departmental, college, and university levels. Faculty therefore have a role in developing policies including, at the appropriate levels, strategic planning; academic and curricular policies; committee establishment and appointments; selection and retention of academic unit leaders; review and revision of the shared governance process; and faculty personnel actions, including hiring and evaluation of faculty (annual evaluation, pre-tenure, tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion).”

“In pursuit of clarity and to provide ready access for faculty and administrators, these policies shall appear on the respective departmental, college, and university web sites and be available in print in the respective departmental, college, and university offices. In consultation with the chair and full-time faculty in each department, each dean should verify the existence of, review, and when necessary, initiate revision of departmental policies to confirm their consistency with college and university policies.”

Thus, the intent of this ad hoc committee is to review the faculty governance process and procedures in all colleges. The committee is to pay particular attention to academic and curricular policies, annual evaluation, pre-tenure, tenure, post-tenure review and promotion and governing principles and any applicable procedures, instructions, or forms developed along with the principles.

---

Also added in to the charge was the Section on Ad Hoc Committees, which is Section 29 in the *Faculty Handbook*. The committee already has assignments and tasks to bring the college representatives are to bring already to the first meeting what’s up and posted and what actually exists in the various colleges

**Election of 2010-2011 Senate Secretary:** Michelle Haberland was nominated and accepted as Secretary.

**Election of 2010-2011 Librarian:** Pat Humphrey, who has agreed to stand for the election, was accepted as Librarian.

**Election of NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative**

Senate Executive Committee, with concurrent agreement from the Provost, wishes to nominate Chris Geyerman as Faculty Athletic Representative for an additional term of six years.

7. **Motion Request:** [Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Policy](#) – Sonya Huber, Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee, said that suggestions from the Senate, Former President Grube, the SEC, and Dr. Amy Heaston have been incorporated into the motion. Huber added that in Section 8.1.1.1 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual says that “The Corps of Instruction consists of the ranks of lecturer, senior lecturer, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor.”

**Motion approved.**

8. **Unfinished Business:** None.

9 **New Business:**

Pat Humphrey (COST) asked about online evaluations in face-to-face courses.

Gary Means (Provost) said that there was a pilot program of online evaluations in Writing and Linguistics to “look at what affect it had, what the response rate was, try to

relate to some of the issues that had been raised, historically, by this body and because I do believe that we need to as we move into the online degrees and we're going to need to readdress that issue. I thought this would give us some evidence at least on a pilot basis, with a few samples, to see what kind of effect, what's the response rate, as we start to look at it as a body next year."

Humphrey expressed concern about "extremely low response rates" in online evaluations. Means said that online evaluations had "generally been graduate level courses and we were trying to get a better handle on what effect it had for the undergraduate courses." Means said the University needs "to look at the evaluation mechanisms we have," and "put together a task force or ad hoc group to really look at the whole evaluation process and instrumentation."

Michael Moore (COE), Senate Moderator, asked if online class evaluations were going to be sent by way of Georgia Southern email this term. Means responded that he didn't know but would look into it. Another senator asked if would be available to students after exams and posting of grades. Means said the policy that students can do the evaluation up until the last day of finals.

Pat Humphrey (COST) asked about students who have dropped the course being able to access the evaluations. Means said he would look into this.

Sonya Huber (CLASS) advocated having an online instrument that matches offline course, with evaluations done before finals. Means said that "the policy in place for the online is exactly the same as the in-residence requirement."

Ming Fang He (COE) asked about air conditioning being cut off in the College of Education Office Building by 6 o'clock every day. She noted that faculty have online classes and supervise doctoral students at night, which creates problems (such as allergic reactions to mold) when the air conditioning is cut off. President Keel said he would ask Vice President Core to address that issue. Moore and Keel suggested that He submit a request for information on the subject.

**10. Announcements: Vice Presidents: None.**

**11. Announcements from the Floor:**

Samantha Young (SGA) thanked the faculty and administration for their support. Samantha will be pursuing a M.A. in higher education/students affairs personnel next fall at the University of South Carolina in Columbia.

**12. Adjournment.**

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**June 9, 2010**  
**4:00 to 6:00 p.m.**  
**Nessmith-Lane Multipurpose Room**

Voting Members in Attendance: Barry Balleck, Thomas Buckley, Robert Fernekes, Dena Hale, Greg Harwood, Pat Humphrey, Bob Jackson, Clara Krug, Barbara Mallory, Bruce McLean, Jim McMillan, Teri Ann Melton, Lowell Mooney, Michael Moore, (Amy Boyett for Steve Rossi), Debra Sinclair, Fred Smith, Alton Standifer (SGA), Jim Stephens, Stuart Tedders, Pat Walker, Mark Welford, LeVon Wilson, Rob Yarbrough

Voting Members Absent: Marie Botkin, Jonathan Copeland, Windy Dees, Richard Flynn, Ardian Greca, Michelle Haberland, Ming Fang He, Sonya Huber, Youakim Kalaani, Rebecca Kennerly, Margaret LaMontagne, Jun Liu, Alison Long, Mary Marwitz, Kent Murray, Patricia Price, David Rostal, Donna Saye, Lisa Schulz, Don Stallings, Brenda Talley, Caren Town, Laura Valeri, Theresa Welford, Jim Whitworth, Bill Yang, Wen-Ran Zhang, Xialong Jonathan Zhang

Administrators in Attendance: Brooks Keel, Jean Bartels, Marilyn Bruce, Ron Core, Billy Griffis, Stephanie Kenney, Gary Means, Bede Mitchell, Charles Patterson, Michael Smith, Teresa Thompson

Visitors: Wayne Smith, Marc Cyr

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the June 9, 2010, Meeting: Michael Moore (COE). Agenda approved.**
2. **Approval of the [April 15, 2010](#), Minutes: (Pat Humphrey (COST) in the absence of Caren Town (CLASS), Senate Secretary). Minutes approved.**
3. **Librarian's Report of [June 9, 2010](#): Pat Humphrey (COST), Senate Librarian.** Humphrey moved that the Senate approve the Librarian's report for June of 2010, recognizing that approving the report does not mean approving or endorsing any of the actions of the committees that are reported therein but accepting those reports as true and factual.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked when Faculty Development Committee's new form would be available. Fred Smith (LIB) said he would try get Anne Marshall, who designed the form, and Yasar Bodur, the new chair, to meet together and put this in place, but he added that it will be up to the CET web personnel to make sure that it actually happens.

**Librarian's Report approved.**

- a. **Report from Undergraduate Committee: Bob Jackson (COBA):** The Undergraduate Committee met on April 13<sup>th</sup>. approved five new courses, 43 course revisions, and 17 program revisions. Seven select topics were announced, and the committee also approved the Core Student Learning Outcomes

forwarded on through the process to the Board of Regents.

Michael Moore (COE), Senate Moderator, added that when the Senate approves the Undergraduate Committee report it is approving those Core Outcomes as well, which will then move on from the Senate to the Board of Regents.

- b. Report from Graduate Committee: Bob Fernekes (LIB):** The Librarian's Report includes the Graduate Committee minutes from the April 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. Under new business, the Graduate Committee approved curriculum items from the College of Science and Technology, the College of Education, the College of Health and Human Sciences, a course revision from the College of Public Health, and the 18-credit-hour graduate certificate in Applied Economics from the School of Economic Development-COBA. Under old business, the committee untabled the Art Department's course revisions. The meeting concluded with a letter from Dr. Patterson to the Graduate Committee as highlighted in the minutes.

### **Undergraduate and Graduate Committee reports accepted.**

#### **4. President's Report: President Brooks Keel:**

##### ***Budget***

"The Governor signed yesterday the FY 2011 budget. There weren't any major surprises, certainly not for us in that particular budget. We had already had a very good idea what the budget was going to be like once it was passed to the Board of Regents, and they passed it on down to the individual campuses. The actual budget reductions were not nearly as severe as we thought they were going to be. It still will require us to be ever-vigilant in terms of how we spend our resources, but the cuts, although significant, were not nearly as bad as we thought they were going to be."

##### ***Tuition Increase***

"The Board of Regents approved the equivalent of a \$300 per semester or 15% tuition increase for Georgia Southern. All of the 35 campus had an increase in tuition. It was graded depending on the comprehensive nature of those universities. For us it was \$300 a semester. That is going to have a huge impact, as you might well imagine, in terms of the financial position the University finds itself in, in a very, very positive way. This put us in a position where we can begin to start hiring more faculty; as I've told you all along, the number of faculty we have is of critical importance of everything that we all propose to do at this University. Everything from keeping that small-fee environment that has made Georgia Southern so famous all the way to it advancing our agenda as a national comprehensive university and a research university. So I think we will be seeing some relief in terms of the pressure that you all have been under in terms of providing classroom education. We have to get our class sizes down. This will go a long way to do that. It will also give us an opportunity to find some creative, targeted, and strategic ways of increasing the research faculty that we have on campus through cluster hires. You should all have seen or heard from your respective chairs a call for applications that is coming out of Vice President Patterson's Office (the research office) in terms of cluster hires. If you've not seen that please let me or Dr. Patterson know; we'll make sure you get that information. I think this will give us very unique, targeted, and strategic ways to not only increase tenured faculty on campus, but also to increase the research opportunities that we have for faculty and for undergraduate and graduate students as well."



### ***Task Force for Program Review***

“As you know, one of the things that I did create very soon after we knew we were going to be in a potentially serious budget crisis was a task force on program review. That task force, chaired by Fred Rich, is meeting. I’ve seen a little bit of the email traffic back and forth. I’ve been very impressed with the seriousness that this committee has taken its charge. Even though I don’t believe we’re going to be in the position of having to make the type of cuts that we thought we may have to make, it’s always a good idea for universities, especially of this magnitude, to periodically review their programs and to see where we can make budgetary efficiency determinations. Also, we need to make sure that the curriculum that we’re providing for all of our students is up-to-date, vibrant, and positions us where we can move forward in a very positive way. So that committee is functioning; it’s moving ahead. The pressure, I think, has been taken off of them to make critical decisions in a very timely manner, which could have been translated into budgetary decisions, but they are moving forward nonetheless, and I am very excited with the way that’s going to go, and you will certainly be hearing more about that as we move along.”

### ***Provost Search***

“The Provost search is going on. I believe the Moderator will have some comments about that a little bit later on, and I’m very excited about how that’s progressing as well.”

### ***Board of Regents***

“We just got back from the Board of Regents meeting, and if you want information about that, I’m happy to provide that to you. One topic that that did come up during that meeting has to do with the Dependent Verification; we may be able to provide you with some more information along those lines, if you need that. Also, the issue of undocumented aliens on our campus arose and whether or not they are entitled to receive in-state tuition. At this particular meeting, Chairman Hatcher did create a subcommittee of Regents that will be looking into this in more detail in terms of documentation verification of student residency, whether it’s in-state, out-of-state, in-country or out-of-country. You will be seeing much more about that as you move ahead, but they made it emphatically clear that both federal law and state law does not, *will* not allow us to provide undocumented aliens with in-state tuition or a waiver of out-of-state tuition. So that was made pretty clear to us at this point in time; that is where the state of Georgia and the Board of Regents fall in on that particular issue.”

Stuart Tedders (JPHCOPH) asked if there were any word on furloughs for next year.

President Keel said he had “not heard anything about furloughs at all – both at the Regent’s level – or at our dealings we have with the legislative level.” Keel said he “certainly has no plans to implement furloughs on this campus at all. I don’t believe we’re positioned budgetarily where that’s a necessity at this fiscal year. Now, if the Governor were to decide to do that and the Board of Regents were to decide to implement those system-wide, we may have a different story, but I’m hearing absolutely nothing about that whatsoever.”

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if there might be any possibility of raises next year.

President Keel said that “raises are something we have obviously discussed. However, we are hearing absolutely nothing at the state or Board of Regents level. As emphatically

as I can say that we're not going to have furloughs, I think I can emphatically say we're not going to have merit increases this year either. I'm disappointed about that. I know that staff and faculty have gone [without raises] for a couple of years. And we weren't exactly leading the country in terms of faculty salaries to start off with, as you would well know. But no, I'm not hearing anything along those lines, and my prediction would be that we would not see that especially after all of the budget discussion we saw at the legislative level. And there's a great deal of uncertainty about what FY '12 will look like. The stimulus money, as you know, will probably be drawn back, and we don't know what revenue estimates are going to do for the state of Georgia so my guess is that we certainly won't see pay increases this year and we may not see them again next year."

Jim Stephens (JPHCOPH) asked if Dr. Keel had any estimates of how the new federal health care law will affect Georgia Southern's health care plan.

President Keel said that the only change knew of was that dependents can stay a faculty/staff member's health insurance policy until they turn 26 and that the dependent needn't be enrolled in a college in order to maintain that coverage.

Stephens also expressed concern that there "would be no limit on the cap anymore." Keel said that he didn't know. "I do know that the Board of Regents, like everyone," Keel said, "has spent a great deal of time looking at health insurance coverage for all USG, University System of Georgia employees to determine how we can maintain the benefits and at the same time cut costs. That speaks to the dependent verification business that's been going on and we've all been exposed to as well."

Michael Moore (COE), Senate Moderator, said that the Board of Regents has met to discuss benefits and that the next step is to involve the Presidents of the colleges and universities. The University System Faculty Senate had some representatives at the meeting, who took some notes, and sent those along. Moore sent the notes to the Senate Executive Committee, but he wanted to wait to vet them through the Senate. "Some of the items that they are considering but which haven't brought up as motions or passed," Moore said, "were such things as no health benefits for retirees whom we hire new; if they were in the TRS system, health benefits would not be available for them if they retire. Another one was a fee for enrolling a spouse." Moore asked when the faculty might hear of such potential changes.

President Keel said that a Regents Committee has been formed to look into these issues. After the President's Meeting next month, he said, he should know more. Keel added, "I don't think we're going to see as draconian and dramatic dips into the benefits as once proposed."

## **5. Report from Michael Moore (COE), Chair, Senate Executive Committee:**

Motion Requests:

- [Faculty Observer](#). (There is an attachment attached to the Motion Request.)
- [Rescinding Paragraph 1 of Section 312 of the Faculty Handbook Requiring Final Examinations in All Courses](#).
- [The Academic Standards Committee requests a change to the undergraduate Academic Standing Policy](#). (There are attachments attached to the Motion)

Request.)

A motion entitled “Rescinding Paragraph 1 of Section 312 of the Faculty Handbook Requiring Final Examinations in All Courses” did not go forward. The motion was submitted by Robert Costomiris and said, “I move that the Faculty Senate rescind the policy adopted by the Faculty Senate in 1975 that requires final examinations in all classes and replace it with a policy that leaves the decision to give or not to give final exams to the judgment of the faculty.” Moore said that the Senate Executive Committee decided not to put this motion forward, citing page 57 of the *Faculty Handbook* Section 312, Paragraph 1: “The only exceptions are courses that the appropriate dean has determined do not fall under the college regulation requiring a final to be given . . . . University policy also requires that examinations must be held as scheduled unless authorized by the department or school chair/director and the dean.” If there are reasons why a faculty member might not wish to give a final exam, the exemption as quoted provides the protocol for this not to happen. Also, the SEC noted if finals were left up to the judgment of faculty, it may be, Moore said, “a doorway to widespread abuse. Faculty may require a host of projects, papers, tests, performance, exhibits, and so on, all in the last week of class, which could put students at a distinct disadvantage.” The Senate Executive Committee was unanimous in not putting forward this motion.

Requests for Information:

- [Cost and Value of Dependent Verification](#) from Robert Costomiris. President Keel added that The dependent verification “will probably save somewhere around \$4.6 million in just the USG alone. \$4.6 million, so it is a significant amount of savings that they are projecting will be reaped from this exercise they are making us all go through.”
- [Dependent Verification Assistance](#) from Robert Costomiris.
- [Practice that Locks Down Academic Buildings During University Breaks](#) from Debra Sabia.
- [Parking entrance that serves the parking lot in front of the Center for Art and Theatre](#) from Debra Sabia.
- [Blue Cross/Blue Shield Dependent Coverage](#) from Patricia Price.

Clara Krug (CLASS) expressed concern about dependent verification, Digital Measures and ADP being an “infliction of clerical work on faculty.”

Pat Walker (CLASS) asked when the information on the parking lot at the Center for Arts and Theatre would be available. Moore said the faculty will post it on gsfac and on SharePoint and the Senate may take it up in September.

Report on the Provost Search Committee:

Dean Michael Smith, Chair: “The Provost’s Search Committee met by telephone today with the Search firm, Parker Executive Search in Atlanta, for our first official update on where the search stands. Executive Search receives nominations and applications in any form and then posts those nominations and applications on a candidate log that is

available to the search committee to view on a secure website. They update that log on a fairly regular basis, and it was updated again last night prior to our telephone meeting this morning. So as of this morning, we have 44 people who have been contacted or nominated or have applied in some fashion or another, 18 of whom expressed some level of interest, and seven of whom have actually submitted their materials. The application and nomination process will continue through the summer, and on the 25<sup>th</sup> of August, all of the candidate materials will be available to the search committee for review. The search committee will meet on September 8<sup>th</sup> to actually begin the process of whittling down that list of candidates to a number that we will recommend to be interviewed, probably at the airport initially, and then on campus later following that.”

Pat Humphrey (COST) asked when the candidates might be coming on campus. Smith said the committee was “looking at the last two weeks of October.” Clara Krug (CLASS) asked how colleagues could nominate someone. Smith said that the Parker Executive Search information was in the campus-wide email that he sent out, or faculty can simply send nominations to him.

President Keel encouraged faculty to nominate people either publically or confidentially. The Parker Executive Search Firm contact information is on the [Provost’s Search website](#).

- a. **Election of Senate Representative to the Strategic Planning Council:**  
Marc Cyr was elected.
- b. **Election of Parking & Transportation Reps. (one-year term) and (two-year term):**  
Todd Hall was elected to the one-year term.  
Frederic Mynard was elected to the two-year term.
- c. **Election of Student Government Association Advisor:**  
No nominations. Election tabled.
- d. **Election of Senate Representative to the Athletics Committee:**  
Pat Humphrey elected.

**6. Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:**

***APR***

Geyerman said he would make copies of the report available to anyone who is interested. He also noted that there was a [story](#) in the paper about it.

One of our men’s teams scored 1,000 for the 2008-2009 year. Women’s cross country, swimming tennis, and volleyball also scored 1,000. This means is for that year everybody stayed eligible and everybody was retained. All of our sports programs are in good shape with the exception of men’s basketball, which is in the process of change. Football is at 920, which means they’re down this year on a contemporaneous penalty of about five-and-a-half scholarships. Men’s soccer was docked about a scholarship.

### ***Coleman Lew Award***

Logan Blondell (golfer) and Caroline Bevillard, (swimmer) were selected as recipients of the Coleman Lew Award. This means is that the Coleman Lew firm helps them get their resume out, opens their doors to them in terms of career opportunities, and invites them to come up to the business and help them however they can.

### ***Southern Conference Spring meeting***

The Southern Conference Spring Meeting was “pretty quiet” this year. Two student-athletes were recognized at the awards banquet.

### ***Faculty Athletics Rep***

The two big sports nationwide that are taking the biggest hits with regard to APR are football and men’s basketball. So the NCAA has established working groups for each of those. We have a representative on the NCAA football working group, where the data strongly indicate that freshman football players who do not successfully pass at least 9 hours their first semester on campus cause problems for the program that they’re in with regard to APR scores. They have problems staying eligible; they have problems staying retained. What is likely to be proposed is for those students to sit out the first four games of the following season. It can be reduced to the first two if they complete 27 hours successfully during the course of their freshman year, which would include summer school.

### ***New Director of Student-Athlete Academic Services***

Dr. Jaccie Irwin will be new Director of Student-Athlete Academic Services. She will be coming later this month.

Michael Moore, (COE) Senate Moderator, asked about a newspaper article concerning the Southern Conference’s Commissioner’s Award and Georgia Southern’s rankings for that award. Geyerman said that awards in the Southern Conference are given to the “best athletic programs” based on points for participating in various sports. Since other schools participate in more sports than Georgia Southern does, they will accrue more points toward that award. Moore suggested getting the word out about the way points for this award are calculated.

## **7. Motion Request: [Faculty Observer](#)**

Clara Krug (CLASS): “We move that the University establish a policy regarding the ability of faculty to request and bring another faculty member of their choosing as an observer to be present during any meetings of a disciplinary nature. Whenever a faculty member is requested to attend a meeting of a disciplinary nature, the faculty should be informed of the purpose of the meeting so that she/he can arrange for a faculty observer.”

President Keel responded that there are various reasons why the Senate should “think very seriously about a motion of this nature.” He listed the following reasons:

1. “In some cases of research misconduct, for example, we are required by the NIH or the NSF to confiscate data, to confiscate computers, to confiscate data notebooks, and materials. If an employee had warning that he or she was being brought forth for this type of situation, it would give them an unusual

opportunity to destroy information that could and should be used. I speak from experience on this, not having been accused myself, but of having been the person responsible for doing this sort of investigation. If I were required to notify the faculty member that they are being brought forward because of scientific misconduct and give [him or her] an opportunity to have an observer present, it would negate the opportunity to collect information needed to determine if the person was in fact guilty of scientific misconduct. You could extend this to legal situations in which evidence needs to be collected. I know I'm sounding very melodramatic, but having dealt with situations such as this at previous institutions, I can assure you that that would be a most difficult position for the university to be put in of having to give someone warning that they were being reprimanded for a particular issue and given an opportunity to bring an observer in."

2. "[T]here are certain situations in which a supervisor needs to confront an employee with an issue. [T]he supervisor might very well want to give the employee a graceful way out in terms of evidence that has been collected, or information that has been gathered and presented to an employee. [T]his could run the gamut from just a letter of reprimand to resigning and moving on. Having a faculty observer present would completely negate the ability to do that sort of thing."
3. "[T]here are situations in which it would be a distinct disadvantage for a faculty member to have an observer present, especially if that faculty member [didn't] want anybody else to know why they were being reprimanded. [I]f you have an observer present, again, it would put the faculty member or the employee in a disadvantage, and certainly it would put the employer at a disadvantage in terms of being able to offer situations."
4. "I can assure you that if an employer was placed into a situation—whether it was a department chair, a vice president, a provost, or whatever—that every time he or she needed to have a meeting with an employee that had some serious repercussions associated with it that the faculty member or employee was going to bring an observer, I can assure you every single meeting that you had would involve an attorney. I don't think we want to go down that particular road."

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if the Senate Executive Committee should look at the motion and refine it. President Keel said the idea "bears further thought," but he reiterated that the Senate should "exercise caution going down this road at all."

Fred Smith (LIB) asked if the Faculty Welfare Committee had been asked to look further at the issue. Michael Moore (COE) Senate Moderator, said the motion could be tabled, sent to the Executive Committee, or to Faculty Welfare and to look at how other institutions handle this issue.

Jim Stephens (JPHCOPH) asked about the legal exposure for the observer in such a meeting. President Keel said that in extreme circumstances the observer would certainly be deposed, would certainly be held as a witness, if things went to trial. He added that "it certainly puts the observer into a role that goes well beyond just a companion."

Jim McMillan (CHHS) moved that the motion be tabled, moved back to the SEC for further discussion, and potentially moved to the Grievance Committee for resolution.

Motion tabled and sent to the SEC.

8. Motion Request: [The Academic Standards Committee requests a change to the undergraduate Academic Standing Policy.](#)

Stuart Tedders (JPHCOPH): “The Academic Standards Committee moves that the University Undergraduate Academic Standing Policy be amended to improve ease of understanding, efficient use of university resources, and improve student accountability.”

Tedders acknowledged the work of some of the committee members: David Rostal (former chair of the committee), Bill Levernier, Mark Yanochik, and Reed Smith. He also acknowledged the help of Wayne Smith and Laura Pallini from the Registrar’s Office. Then, he offered background information. The committee was constituted in Fall, 2008. It’s charge was to streamline the Academic Standing Policy and to consider ethical issues associated with the current policy. Under the current policy, students “can be re-admitted after sitting out a maximum of one-year by completing a former student application, and they can be re-admitted with little or no possibility or chance of ever graduating. Essentially, they are placed back into the system where they were, to pick up where they left off.” Tedders added that the consensus of the committee that this situation creates “an ethical dilemma.” The committee also reviewed policies of approximately eight four-year institutions in the state of Georgia, four or five two-year institutions in Georgia, and approximately eight to ten peer institutions throughout the country before it formulated its recommendation. The differences between the current and proposed policies are outlined below:

Exclusions	
Under the current policy, after a student is excluded the first time they are required to sit out one semester. Many times this semester is the summer semester, and while students are notified, they may not fully understand that they are excluded.	The proposed policy requires that after the first exclusion students must sit out for a calendar year (three semesters).
Under the current policy, after the second exclusion, students are required to sit out for a calendar year. They can complete a former student application and be re-admitted into the system after that one year.	The proposed policy states that after the second exclusion students are required to sit out five years, with the option of re-entering the USG System under the policy of Academic Renewal, which allows students to re-enter the system (after sitting out) with a clean slate. The current policy does not do that.
Appeals	
Currently, the policy allows for two approved appeals through the Academic Standards Committee, and one approved appeal through the Dean of the College.	The proposed policy requires that this be limited to only one approved appeal, either through the Academic Standards Committee or through the Dean of the College.

## Academic Intervention Policy

Currently, students are referred to Academic Intervention once their GPA falls at or falls below 1.5. Students eligible for this must have less than 30 hours.

Under the proposed policy, students with less than 30 hours are referred for Academic Intervention when their GPA drops below 2.0.

The committee recommends that this policy be implemented in fall 2011, with it being phased in, as the adjusted GPA was phased out several years ago. Tedders said the new policy would be more “streamlined and would hold students to a higher academic standard. It also would address ethical issues by removing students from a system who really have no chance or very little chance of being successful at Georgia Southern.” The committee has also presented this material to the Deans Council and to the Georgia Southern University Enrollment Management Council.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) asked for an example that would lead to a student’s first exclusion. Tedders answered that it would be a GPA dropping below 2.0. Pat Humphrey (COST) said that the new policy would make sure that the exclusion would “sink in.”

Tedders (JPHCOPH) said that the committee thinks that the new policy “strikes a nice balance between institutions that are [very] strict and institutions that are not strict at all.”

Fred Smith (LIB) asked about the reaction of the other two bodies to the proposed policy. Teresa Thompson (VPSA) responded that the reaction was favorable. She clarified that if students who fall below a 2.0 are referred to the Academic Success Center it would “almost double” the number of people that would be coming to the Academic Success Center, which would have a “budget impact.” She added that if a student is excluded for five years, it was her understanding that they cannot go to any other USG institution.

Pat Walker (CLASS) commented that “it’s painful to see students coming back to that committee over and over and, you can see from their record that they’re not going to be able to be successful here.” Also, since any student who goes to any of the community colleges and maintains a C average is automatically accepted at any University in the Georgia System, some students have low SAT scores and are having real trouble. “Nobody is really intervening and telling them that maybe they need to re-think what they’re doing – that coming to a University isn’t the best option for them,” she said.

Dena Hale (COBA) asked about students that are “stuck in the middle” between East Georgia College and Georgia Southern. Teresa Thompson (VPSA) said she thought there were “some conversations going on as to how we can help East Georgia do some of those support systems with their students.” She said this would be clarified.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked what students thought about the proposed policy changes. Alton Standifer (SGA) said he hadn’t been a part of the discussions, but that he was concerned about the five-year exclusion. Michael Moore (COE) Senate Moderator said there hadn’t been time to bring this up with the SGA. Alton Standifer (SGA) confirmed the SGA had not seen the new policy recommendations.



Gary Means (Provost) said the Deans were unanimous in their support for the policy changes and that he thought “the general intent of the policy is valid.”

Mark Welford (COST) asked for clarification about the academic renewal policy and the five-year wait. Pat Humphrey (COST) moved to table the motion to give SGA a chance to evaluate and give their input as well as to clarify the ramifications of the five-year wait. The Senate could bring this forward again, perhaps in September.

Motion tabled.

**9. Unfinished Business**

None

**10. New Business**

None

**11. Announcements: Vice Presidents**

Michael Moore (COE) Senate Moderator welcomed Jean Bartels to the Senate in her role as Acting Provost. Moore also thanked Dr. Means for the “transparency” and “openness” of in his relationship with the Senate.

**12. Announcements from the Floor**

President Brooks Keel thanked Dr. Means for his service as Provost and announced a reception for him on June 17<sup>th</sup> at 3:30 at the Georgia Southern Center for Art and Theatre Gallery.

He also thanked Michael Moore for his work as Faculty Senate Moderator and presented with a plaque that reads:

For dedicated service to Georgia Southern University  
Moderator of the Faculty Senate  
2009-2010

Michael Moore (COE) turned over the Moderator’s gavel to Clara Krug (CLASS), 2010-2011 Senate Moderator.

**13. Adjournment**

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**September 20, 2010**  
**4:00 to 6:00 P.M.**  
**Russell Union Ballroom**

**Voting Members in Attendance:** (William Amponsah for Michael Reksulak), Barry Balleck, Yasar Bodur, Marie Botkin, Tom Buckley, Mary Cyr, Jennie Dilworth, Olivia Carr Edenfield, Bob Fernekes, Chris Geyerman, Christian Gibson (SGA), Michelle Haberland, Dena Hale, Todd Hall, (Hsiu-Lien Lu for Ming Fang He), Pat Humphrey, Bob Jackson, Clara Krug, Ron MacKinnon, Brenda Marina, Mary Marwitz, (Julie Maudlin for Barbara Mallory), Bruce McLean, Teri Ann Melton, Lowell Mooney, Kent Murray, (Hua Wang for Frederic Mynard), Sze-man Ngai, Patricia Price, Michelle Reidel, Steve Rossi, Debra Sinclair, Debra Skinner, Don Stallings, Alton Standifer (SGA), Jim Stephens, Stuart Tedders, Timothy Teeter, Caren Town, Laura Valeri, Mark Welford, Patrick Wheaton, Rob Yarbrough

**Voting Members Absent:** Amy Boyett, Ardian Greca, Sonya Huber, Youakim Kaalani, Donna Saye, Norman Schmidt, Pat Walker, Theresa Welford, Bill Yang, Xialong “Jonathan” Zhang, Chunshan Zhao

**Administrators in Attendance:** Brooks Keel, President; Jean Bartels, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Marilyn Bruce, Executive Associate to the President, Senate Liaison; Steve Burrell, Vice President for Information Technology; Diana Cone, Interim Dean, CHHS; Ron Core, Vice President for Business and Finance; Bret Danilowicz, Dean, COST; Thomas Koballa, Jr., Dean, COE; Bede Mitchell, Dean, Henderson Library; Charles Patterson, Vice President for Research and Dean for Graduate Studies; Ron Shiffler, Dean, COBA, and Acting Dean, CIT; Michael Smith, Dean, CLASS; Teresa Thompson, Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management

**Visitors:** Simone Charles (Alt), Amy Hackney (Alt), Elaine Marshall (Alt), James Woods (Alt), Candace Griffith, Barry Joyner, Kathy Albertson, Lee Davis, Wayne Smith, Dick Diebolt, Shahnam Navaee, Christine Ludowise, Patrick Novotny, Katerina Wilkerson.

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the September 20, 2010, Meeting: Agenda approved.**
2. **Introductions:** For the benefit of new senators, members introduced themselves.
3. **Approval of the [June 9, 2010](#), Minutes:** The minutes were approved.

4. **Librarian's Report of [September 20, 2010](#): Pat Humphrey (COST), Senate Librarian:** Humphrey moved that the Senate approve the Librarian's report of September 20, 2010, recognizing that approving the report does not mean approving or endorsing any of the actions of the committees that are reported therein but accepting those reports as true and factual.

- a. **Report from the Undergraduate Committee, Ron MacKinnon (CIT):** The Undergraduate Committee met on August 24<sup>th</sup>. For COBA, the committee approved a few changes of name and number from the School of Accountancy, a program justification in the Fraud Examination minor, and a new Bank Management course for the Department of Finance. There were also several course revisions in Business Statistics and Quantitative Analysis.

In the report, it was noted that there are several committee members that have class conflicts at the usual meeting time for the Undergraduate Committee. Those unable to attend need to arrange for alternates to attend, particularly for the November meeting.

**Undergraduate Committee Report accepted.**

- b. **Report from the Graduate Committee, Bob Fernekes (LIB):** The Librarian's Report includes the Graduate Committee minutes from the August 19<sup>th</sup> meeting. The meeting included a discussion of the Graduate Education Initiatives by Dr. Patterson, followed by the election of the chair and approval of the 2010-2011 Graduate meeting schedule. Under new business, the committee approved a new course and program revision from the Department of Literature and Philosophy; course deletions, a course and program revision from the Department of Music; and course revisions from the College of Education. There was no old business.

**Graduate Committee Report accepted.**

5. **President's Report: President Brooks Keel:**

***Enrollment***

"As I checked this morning, I think Teresa will correct me if I'm wrong, we had 19,656 students. That will... go up and down a little bit as we go through the process of drop-adds and those sorts of things. So we're tantalizingly close to 20,000. I think that is a real tribute to all of you around this table: the faculty, the advisors, the staff and the entire citizens of this state to have a student body that large and it creates some interesting opportunities, and as you know much better than I do, some interesting challenges as well. So as we go into this next year, I think it is a real exciting opportunity for us. "

### ***Faculty Lunches***

“You, as faculty, may be getting invitations from my office to join me for lunch. The Provost and I are hosting lunches once a week for a random selected group of faculty with the hopes of an opportunity, for not only myself and the Provost to get to know the faculty better, but to give the faculty an opportunity in a very informal way, to have dialogue with us and say what is on your mind, and help us better serve you as an institution. Again, ...there is no agenda other than what’s on your mind. The faculty are chosen completely, I shouldn’t say completely at random [We] try to choose faculty that represent the breadth of the University and Marilyn Bruce in my office has been handling that. We’ve had one so far, and I think it’s been a lot of fun for us. I hope it will be a lot of fun for you. Obviously, [there will be some challenges] as we are approaching 700 or 800 faculty. I’d like to be able to have lunch with every single one of you this year. We’ll see how that goes. But at any rate, I hope to see you there.”

### ***Strategic Agenda***

“I want to bring you up-to-date on the strategic agenda process that we’re beginning to put in place. We have hired a group of consultants called Martz and Lundy... that will be helping us with our capital campaign. As part of any capital campaign, those consultants look to a strategic agenda, or a strategic plan to help craft what it is we’re going to be selling, if you will, when we go to raise money across the state and indeed across the country. The strategic plan that you have all worked very hard on in the past, is in place, I think it served this University quite well. But with a new president coming on board, ...I think it’s time to take another look at that. We’re in the process of using those same consultants are trying to put together a strategic agenda, which is not quite as detailed as the plan that you currently have in place. We are going to be doing this a little bit differently than you’ve experienced strategic planning exercises in the past. My hope is for us to come up with a specific agenda that will help not only move us forward, but also help us as we go across this country and raise money for this University.

The strategic agenda will be centered around, or will focus around 4 primary themes. You’ve heard me talk on these themes at length throughout this past year, but essentially those are very broad themes would be to:

- insure academic excellence at all levels which of course gets at the heart of the faculty and the curriculum that we have at this University;
- insure continuation of student success, everything from retention, progression, graduation rates to insuring the students graduate from this University and have successful careers beyond that;
- to increase research and creativity; that’s going to be a major thrust for us as we move the University forward;

- And then the fourth, of course, is how to pay for all of this. Maintaining fiscal stability will be a primary objective we have here. A large piece of fiscal stability will not only be trying to find ways to do our business here more efficiently, but also how do we become more entrepreneurial in terms of raising resources for this University, of which the capital campaign will be a major piece of that.

All four of these themes will have as an umbrella the student-centered University. You all know this very well. It's one of the reasons you came to this University. It is certainly one of the reasons we have 19,656 students here—it's because the students appreciate what you have done in creating a true student-centered University. They come here because they wanted interaction with the faculty, because we care deeply about those students, and whatever we do as a University as we move forward we'll have to find ways to maintain that.”

### ***Workshops***

“The consultants that we have brought in place will be holding workshops [half-day workshops with the individual colleges] from October 6-8. We've asked the college Deans to bring together a relatively small group of faculty, students, and in some cases alumni and supporters, to...help determine ways that the individual colleges can address these four overarching themes, some of the strategies or tactics that the colleges will use to try to address this. The Deans will then bring that information together to a large committee that the Provost will lead. ...We will obviously need to have representation from the rest of the University including the Faculty Senate, Student Government Association and the Staff Council. The Provost and I are still working out exactly what the structure will look like, but my guess is that you will have the Moderator to represent the Faculty Senate, and the Student Government President, and the Staff Council President, as an example, to represent the other entities across campus. That process is still a work-in-progress. Now, we are working with the consultants to find the best mechanism to try to bring this into sharper focus and the hope is that by the spring semester we will have a fairly good idea of how this agenda will look. That will allow your president, as well as the colleges to go out and try to raise the money we are going to need to make this University the University that we hope it will be. So that's a very brief overview of that process. As I say, it's still a work-in-progress and I am very excited about what this will look like because I think it will, hopefully, set the stage for what our next five years will look like in terms of a capital campaign.”

### ***Capital Campaign***

“In terms of the capital campaign, those same consultants will also help us put together that campaign; they will help determine what the individual college goals are going to be. We are going to be holding the Deans a lot more accountable for helping us raise the resources through capital campaigns and the Deans will play a much more aggressive role than I think they have in the past

and every Dean that we've talked to views this as a very exciting opportunity because the Deans, the Chairs and you, the faculty, are the ones who can tell the story of Georgia Southern better than anybody, and those are the folks we need out helping us raise the money. There is no real secret to fundraising. It's just telling the story. We have an absolutely marvelous story here at Georgia Southern to tell and we want to give you the opportunity to be able to tell that."

***President's Task Force on Program Review***

"The last thing I wanted to mention is [the Task Force on Program Review, which was established last semester]. Fred Rich is chairing this task force. This is a committee of faculty [from] across the University is beginning to look at the curriculum that we have in place, and will be making recommendations to me and to the Provost in terms of how this curriculum might be changed as we move this University forward. This is not only aimed at helping us become more fiscally efficient, but I think it will also help us become more entrepreneurial in terms of the courses that we offer[and help] us determine if we have the curriculum that best places our students in the position where they can be successful once they graduate. [This will also allow us to] take advantage of new and emerging fields of study that we should be looking at as we move forward. That committee is in the process of working at some very difficult tasks, as you might well imagine, and I'm sure will be working throughout the semester as we move forward."

**6. Report from the Senate Executive Committee, Clara Krug (CLASS), Chair:**

**a. Election of Senate Parliamentarian**

Mark Welford (COST) nominated Bob Cook. Mary Marwitz (CLASS) seconded the motion and Bob Cook was unanimously elected to the position of Senate Parliamentarian for the next year.

**b. Election of Student Government Association Liaison**

Tim Teeter (CLASS) nominated Bruce McLean to be the SGA Liaison. The motion was seconded and Bruce McLean was unanimously elected to the position of Student Government Association Liaison.

**c. Concerns related to nominations to the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees**

Clara Krug (CLASS), Chair, Senate Executive Committee expressed some concern related to the scheduling conflicts for nominees to the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees. Nominees are being elected who have class schedules that conflict with the standard meeting times of the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees. From now on, the Senate Executive Committee will review the schedules of all of the people who

might be nominated to serve on the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees, and ensure that people who schedule conflicts not be nominated. The Senate Election Committee member in the various colleges will assist in the process.

**d. Concerns related to the submission of Requests for Information (RFI'S):**

Clara Krug (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee explained that as a result of a programming error with SharePoint, some motions were sent out to the general listservs without being pre-screened by the Senate Executive Committee. That problem has been fixed.

**e. RFI's:**

- [Parking Lot Entrances at the Fine Arts and Performing Arts Center.](#) Professor Sabia expressed concern about congestion in the parking lot at the Fine Arts and Performing Arts Centers. In his response, Bob Chambers explained that it has to be gateless so that people from the community can access the areas for various performances, exhibits and receptions.
- [The University Store's Policy on Book Returns:](#) Eddie Mills responded and explained the policy for returning books that had not been read, the policy for returning books in the middle of the semester, and the policy for returning books at the end of the semester. There is a proportional loss of revenue to the student as the semester progresses.
- [The University Store's "For Rent" Signs for Books:](#) Eddie Mills and Connie Palfy responded. Eddie Mills explained that the University Store was taking a creative approach to marketing. Connie Palfy indicated and quoted the Campus Advertising, Sales, and Solicitation Policy states, "Nothing herein shall prohibit university departments from advertising and promoting their own services or programs on the university campus". Palfy also pointed out that the Regent's Task Force in 2005 encouraged universities to find creative ways to reduce the cost of books on campuses.
- [Faculty Handbook Revisions](#) and the [Faculty Handbook Index:](#) Frederic Mynard initiated these two RFIs. Provost Bartels provided a list of the revisions entitled, [Changes to Faculty Handbook, 2010-2011.](#) There will also be an index included in the hard copies of the [Faculty Handbook](#) next year.
- [Changes to Spring 2011 Calendar:](#) The SGA Vice President initiated the RFI and was directed to the Registrar's office for information.

7. **Report on the Provost Search Committee, Dean Mike Smith (CLASS):** Dean Smith reported that the Provost Search Committee met on September 8<sup>th</sup> and identified a slate of semi-finalists to be interviewed at the Atlanta airport. Following those interviews, the committee will recommend to President Keel to be invited to campus. The committee expects those visits will occur during the last couple of weeks of October.

Clara Krug (CLASS) Senate Moderator, asked if Dean Smith anticipated that there will be forums for people to ask questions of the candidates. Dean Smith responded that the committee will work with the President's Office to develop a program for the candidates and that there will "certainly be opportunities for public forums and campus forums."

Dean Smith stated that the committee received over 60 applications for the Provost's position. In response to a question from Tim Teeter (CLASS), Dean Smith stated that he anticipated that eight people will be interviewed in Atlanta. He also thanked the committee for their efforts, saying "the committee has done tremendous work so far."

8. **Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS):** Chris Geyerman submitted the 2009-2010 [GPA Comparison](#) for the record and discussion. Overall, Georgia Southern student-athletes had a GPA of 2.84 compared with the student body's GPA of 2.73. On the men's side all of the teams were above the male average with the exception of football and men's basketball. On the women's side, all of the teams were above the women's average for Georgia Southern across the board.

Geyerman also informed faculty that they would be receiving progress report requests from the Coordinator for Academic Services in Athletics. He explained that these reports provide important feedback, saying, "that we would very much appreciate any feedback on any special population, student-athletes included, with regard to [their] academic progress..." Faculty should consult with Geyerman should they have any concerns about the legality or implications of such reports.

9. **Report from the Task Force on the Curriculum, Barry Joyner (CHHS), Chair:** This past spring, the Core Curriculum Task Force met to approve objectives for the revised core curriculum. Those objectives were approved by Faculty Senate at the June meeting and then submitted to the USG this summer. In August, the Provost's Office received feedback from the USG that three outcomes had been approved, while the others were not. There was no explanation as to why some objectives were not approved. The chair and some committee members attended a workshop in Savannah where some feedback was offered. Joyner expressed frustration that some of the committee's work wasn't approved, but pointed out that the committee has moved on. They met on September 20<sup>th</sup> and are now ready to submit revised objectives to the



Undergraduate Committee. Pending the approval of the Undergraduate Committee, the revised objectives will get to Faculty Senate at the November or December meeting. Joyner emphasized the need to have the objectives approved this semester, as next semester will be focused on the development of an assessment plan for those outcomes. Joyner expressed optimism about the potential for the revised outcomes to be approved.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked if all of the relevant documents related to the changes to the Core Curriculum were on SharePoint. Joyner responded that they were and that the most recent outcomes voted on today would be put on SharePoint as well. In response to a question from Clara Krug (CLASS), Ron MacKinnon (CIT) announced that the Undergraduate Committee is scheduled to meet on October 12<sup>th</sup>. Based on that information, Krug and Joyner agreed that the Faculty Senate could expect to consider these revised outcomes at the November meeting of the Faculty Senate.

10. **Report from the Task Force on Governance, Marc Cyr for Richard Flynn (CLASS), Chair:** Marc Cyr (CLASS) read a report from the chair of the Task Force on Governance, Richard Flynn (CLASS). “The Task Force met in the spring and collected tenure and promotion policies from the colleges and departments. I, Richard Flynn, created a document about these policies on our SharePoint site. We are meeting again on Thursday the 23<sup>rd</sup> to discuss ways of finding out how such policies are put into practice. One thing I can tell you is that this project is complicated, and we will need to meet several more times before we can issue our findings.”
11. **Unfinished Business**
  - (a) [The Academic Standards Committee Requests a Change to the Undergraduate Academic Standing Policy \(Tabled\)](#): Stuart Tedders, Chair moved that the motion be untabled. The motion was seconded and the Senate voted to remove the motion from the table. After reading the motion, Stuart Tedders (JPHCOPH), reviewed what had been discussed at the June meeting of the Faculty Senate. He thanked Wayne Smith and Reed Smith for getting the motion to this point. The committee was charged in 2008 to streamline the Academic Standing Policy and make it less confusing. The committee was also concerned that the current policy allows students to be readmitted indefinitely, even though there’s little or no chance of them actually ever being able to get a degree from Georgia Southern. The committee completed an environmental scan of institutions both in Georgia and outside of Georgia to get some sense of what others were doing. The recommendations contained in the motion reflect that work.

There are three basic differences between the current standing, Academic Standing Policy and the proposed policy: exclusions, appeals, and academic intervention.

- **Exclusions:** under the current policy after the first exclusion students are required to sit out one semester. The new policy states that the first exclusion be extended to one calendar year, as opposed to one semester. For the second exclusion, the current policy states that students will be required to sit out one calendar year. Under the proposed policy the policy would read that students would be required to sit out for five years, with the option of re-entering through the USG Policy of Academic Renewal.
- **Appeals:** Under the current policy there are three total appeals - two approved appeals through the Academic Standards Committee, and one through the Dean of the college. The new policy limits this to just one approved appeal from either the Academic Standards Committee or the Dean of the college.
- **Academic Intervention:** Currently, students with less than thirty hours are referred for academic intervention when their GPA drops to a 1.5 or lower. The new policy requires that students with less than thirty hours be referred to academic intervention when their GPA drops below a 2.0. This policy would be phased in beginning in Fall 2011.

The committee believes that the new policy holds the students to a higher academic standard and it addresses the ethical issues by removing students who are unlikely to graduate.

An unidentified senator expressed concern that this was a “very drastic change” and that students need to be made aware of the change. The senator argued that, based on his experience, “if the students are excluded for five years, that’s not going to make it any better. ...Five years is a long time.”

Stuart Tedders (JPHCOPH) agreed that it is a significant change, but “the Registrar’s Office has a history of being student-friendly. The policy is that if students are faced with this option, they would be given an opportunity to be either re-admitted or not dismissed from Georgia Southern University.” Wayne Smith (Registrar’s Office) added, “There are three other colleges or universities in the University System that have a similar policy to this, including Valdosta State, West Georgia, and also Georgia College and State University.” Smith stated that there are concerns about students who are in this situation might decide that they do not want to sit out the five years, but possibly would like to pursue their education maybe at another school. In previous years, the Academic Standards Committee

has granted the appeal to be re-admitted by students who were on exclusion, so that they could go to another school and enter that other school. Now, most schools will not let them or take them as a student unless they've been re-admitted by their previous school.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) requested clarification on the issue of exclusion and the opportunity for an excluded student to attend University System institution. Smith responded that the other school will not take them if they are on a five-year exclusion from Georgia Southern. But if the current practice continues, where students are re-admitted to Georgia Southern with the understanding they would not come back to Georgia Southern but transfer to another school, they would be able to do that right away. This has been happening, especially for those students that might be on a year exclusion from Georgia Southern. Yarbrough expressed concern that this was not in the proposal before the Senate. Smith replied that this “has been a standing policy of the Academic Standards Committee for the last few years.”

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked Smith for additional clarification. “If a student is excluded he/she may not apply for admission to another institution in the University System of Georgia. However, if the student is excluded and then is re-admitted through the Academic Standards Committee’s procedures with the understanding that he/she will apply to another institution and not attempt to re-enroll at Georgia Southern University, then that student may apply to another institution in the University System of Georgia.” Smith agreed that a student would have to be re-admitted to Georgia Southern before being accepted at another system institution.

Teresa Thompson (VPSAEM) stressed the importance of ensuring that the proposed policy be in line with USG Policy. She pointed out that, “[A]t most institutions, you have to have at least a 2.0 to be able to transfer into those institutions. Normally, if we’re taking somebody out for this amount of time, they probably do not have a 2.0, so you’re condemning them either way [as] most [universities] are not going to take you even if it does go with USG rules, if you’re not going to have a 2.0. So, they are really out for five years.”

Marc Cyr (CLASS) pointed out that these scenarios involve a student who wishes to transfer their credits and asked about a student who might want a fresh start and did not seek to transfer credits. Smith replied that the student would be in violation of the rules for application and that they would likely be caught through the Financial Aid process. Students must transfer credits earned at a post-secondary institution?

Vice-President Teresa Thompson pointed out that not revealing attendance at a prior institution amounts to academic fraud.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) pointed out that “One way we can be student-friendly is by not eating up the time and the money for the students when we can be state and taxpayer and financial sufficiency for efficiency-friendly by not continuously letting the same people back in over and over and over again on what appears to be a 99.9% guarantee failure.” Based on his experience on that committee, “I think the best, the kindest thing you could possibly do...is to tell that student, “This isn’t for you, at least not right at this time.”

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked the Student Government Association representatives for their input. Alton Standifer (President, SGA) explained that the SGA was concerned that the five-year exclusion seemed “drastic,” although they understood that after five years, the student would have a fresh start. They were also concerned that sending a student away “that’s right there on the edge” might be too severe. He stressed the importance of these issues to students and that this “really affects the rest of someone’s life.”

Tim Teeter (CLASS) pointed out that the new policy limits the number of appeals. “Five seem[ed] to be a reasonable number” for a student to start with a clean slate.

Wayne Smith (Registrar’s Office) reminded senators of the Academic Renewal Policy. Under that policy, “If you are a student at Georgia Southern and you are excluded where you cannot return and the student sits out for five years [and] doesn’t attend another post-secondary institution during that five-year period of time. [When] they come back to Georgia Southern they are starting with a new GPA. Their “A” grades, their “B” grades, and their “C” grades are kept and can be applied toward graduation. Their “D” grades cannot be applied toward graduation.” Under the “current Academic Standing Policy, a student cannot be excluded from Georgia Southern and have to sit out four or five years, but if they are out of school four or five years whether they’ve been excluded out, or they were just on probation, they can do Academic Renewal and do just as I mentioned.” Based on the handout and explanation from the Academic Standards Committee, Krug asked if a student has six opportunities to be able to raise his/her average, so as not to be placed on warning, probation or exclusion? Smith confirmed that this was the case and that they could get on approved appeal.

Pat Humphrey (COST) explained that the policy calls for students to sit out for an entire year, rather than just a semester, because the semester

could be summer. Making it a year would help to have it “sink in.” Tedders said that this was consistent with his experience as well.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) asked Smith for clarification on the language in the policy regarding “appeals” and “approved appeals.” Smith responded that students can appeal “until they have received an approved appeal.” Yarbrough replied that it was possible that students would still have an appeal once they get to the point of the fifth exclusion. Tedders and Smith confirmed Yarbrough’s understanding of the process.

Dena Hale (COBA) asked if the policy excludes students from enrolling at : technical schools, like Ogeechee Tech. Smith responded that he did not know.

William Amponsah (COBA) expressed concern that it was unclear when students could appeal. Tedders replied that “students deserve the right to appeal at any time that they are in academic trouble. ...Students have an opportunity to explain basically what went wrong, and what they are going to do to improve. So the standard would be based on the appeal in and of itself and the information that they provided, as well as any underlying circumstances. There are instances where there is a medical [situation] that explains very clearly what went wrong. And that is certainly considered.” Smith added, “Currently, the Academic Standards Committee has in place where a student’s last two terms, if they’re last two terms were 2.0 or better, and they ended up on exclusion that the committee would automatically approve them to come back with the understanding this would be an approved appeal. The student can accept it or deny it. Also any student that is within ten quality points of a 2.0 could also appeal and get an approved appeal.”

Don Stallings (COST) asked, “if your goal is to make sure that summer isn’t a term that they use, as a term being suspended from school for basically a period of time, why don’t we just make it two semesters? It seems arbitrary that we jump from one semester to a full year.” Stallings also expressed concern that if a student “was granted an approval, had a 2.0 for two semesters before they basically got kicked out for a period of time, what if the next three semesters, his/her GPA was 3.5, but even with having a 3.5 for the next three semesters, they weren’t able to get their overall GPA above 2.0. Would we still send that student home for five years?” Smith responded to the first question and stated that the one-year suspension was based on the policies of other schools in the University System. Tedders added that “this this proposed change seeks early intervention.” Tim Teeter (CLASS) pointed out that, according to his calculations, such a scenario wasn’t possible. “If, [following] the example given, a student had two semesters of say a 1.0 and then followed that with two semesters of a 2.0 and followed that with three semesters of a

3.5, they're in no danger of... not being able to stay." He supported the concern, but stated, "if a student starts to excel for three semesters, they are almost certainly going to in fact get to a 2.0."

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if anyone wanted to move to limit the debate to an additional five minutes. James Stephens made the motion, it was seconded and approved.

In response to a request for clarification of the flow chart and tables that accompanied the motion from the Academic Standards Committee from Rob Yarbrough (COST), Wayne Smith (Registrar) explained, "In regard to the number of graduates, again, we took almost 3,000 students through this policy of the proposed policy and the number of graduates the difference was, there was going to be, if I remember correctly, about 7 or 8 students that would not be able to graduate from Georgia Southern under the proposed policy that did under the current policy. So it was not a significant number of students that would or, or would not be able to graduate under the proposed policy."

Dena Hale (COBA) stated that she would not be able to make a vote either way, "knowing what options [for attending technical school] are available during the five-year exclusion." Don Stallings added, "The number [of students in this situation] was seven. Even if the number was one, it would still have still been too many."

Brenda Marina (COE) asked if the committee had discussed a three-year exclusion. Tedders replied that they had not. Pat Humphrey (COST) stated that, based on her experience, "going from one year to three years as mentioned, wouldn't help anybody. They'd still be coming back under the same hole that they were already in under our current system." Alton Standifer expressed concern about the length of the five-year exclusion.

Stuart Tedders (JPHCOPH) read the motion again, noting the accompanying documents. "The Academic Standards Committee moves that the University Undergraduate Academic Standing Policy be amended to improve ease of understanding, efficient use of university resources, and improve student accountability."

The Faculty Senate then voted and Clara Krug (CLASS) tallied the results: 26 yeas and 10 nays. The motion passed.

(b) [Faculty Observer](#), Michelle Haberland (CLASS) moved to untable the motion. That motion was seconded and the Faculty Senate voted to untable the motion.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) expressed concern that the intent of the Faculty Observer motion had been misunderstood. It was not intended to be adversarial. Rather, the Faculty Observer motion was “intended to increase transparency.” Although she agreed to withdraw the motion, she hoped that the motion could come forward at a later date with “language [that] addressed the concerns that Dr. Keel brought up [in the June meeting.]” She then moved to withdraw the motion. The Faculty Senate then voted to withdraw the motion.

- (c) [Procedure for Dismissal for Cause: Regents Policy \(Possible New Motion, \(Attached\)\)](#): Michelle Haberland (CLASS) moved that portions of the Board of Regents Policy related to the dismissal of faculty be included in the [Faculty Handbook](#), specifically Section 8.3.9 in the [BOR Policy Manual](#), entitled Discipline and Removal of Faculty Members. The motion was seconded. Copies of the relevant policies were distributed.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) read some of the highlights and explained that there was concern that faculty and staff may have been unaware of these policies. She reported that the members of the Senate Executive Committee thought it would be useful to highlight these procedures by including them in the [Faculty Handbook](#). She noted that is “simply a repetition” of [BOR Policy](#).

Clara Krug (CLASS) Senate Moderator pointed out that would be to list of reasons for dismissal already in the Faculty Handbook, “which is also part of the Board of Regents Policy.”

Bob Jackson (COBA) asked if this policy applied to faculty on temporary assignments. Krug responded that it does not because they do not work under contracts. Rather, the policy states that, “Temporary or part-time personnel serving without a written contract hold their employment at the pleasure of the president, chief academic officer, or their immediate supervisor, any of whom may discontinue the employment of such employees without cause or advance notice.” Board of Regents Minutes 1986-1987, page 103.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) supported the insertion of the section in the Faculty Handbook, pointing out that it would allow “faculty members to easily find this material rather than having to hunt it up on the BOR site.”

The question was called and the Faculty Senate unanimously approved the substitute motion to include Section 8.3.9 of the [BOR](#)

Policy Manual, entitled Discipline and Removal of Faculty Members, in the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook.

12. **New Business**

None.

13. **Announcements: Vice Presidents**

None

14. **Announcements from the Floor**

None

15. **Adjournment**



**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**October 19, 2010**  
**4:00 to 6:00 P.M.**  
**Russell Union Ballroom**

**Voting Members in Attendance:** Barry Balleck, Yasar Bodur, Tom Buckley, Simone Charles (Alt), Marc Cyr, Jennie Dilworth, Bob Fernekes, Ming Fang He, Sonya Huber, Pat Humphrey, Clara Krug, (Hsiu-Lien Lu for Michelle Reidel), Ron MacKinnon, Brenda Marina, Mary Marwitz, Bruce McLean, Teri Ann Melton, Lowell Mooney, Kent Murray, Frederic Mynard, Patricia Price, Steve Rossi, Norman Schmidt, Debra Skinner, Alton Standifer, Jim Stephens, (James Woods for Caren Town), Stuart Tedders, Pat Walker, Mark Welford, Patricia Wheaton, Bill Yang, Rob Yarbrough.

**Voting Members Absent:** Marie Botkin, Amy Boyett, Olivia Edenfield, Michelle Haberland, Dena Hale, Todd Hall, Bob Jackson, Youakim Kalaani, Barbara Mallory, Bruce McLean, Donna Saye, Debra Sinclair, Dontarie Stallings, Timothy Teeter, Laura Valeri, Theresa Welford, Jonathan Zhang, Chunshan Zhao.

**Administrators in Attendance:** Brooks Keel, President; Jean Bartels, Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Diana Cone, Interim Dean, CHHS; Ron Core, Vice President for Business and Finance; Charles Patterson, Vice President for Research and Dean for Graduate Studies; (Curtis Ricker for Michael Smith, Dean, CLASS); Teresa Thompson, Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management

**Visitors:** Tomeca Hubbard, Candace Griffith, Richard Flynn, Lee Davis, Elaine Marshall (Alt),

**1. Approval of the Agenda for the October 19, 2010, Meeting:**

Clara Krug (CLASS) Senate Moderator convened the second meeting of the Faculty Senate of Georgia Southern University for the 2010-2011 Academic Year. A motion to approve the agenda was seconded and the agenda was approved.

**2. Approval of the September 20, 2010, Minutes: Rob Yarbrough (COST) for Michelle Haberland (CLASS), Senate Secretary:**

Standing in for Michelle Haberland (CLASS), Rob Yarbrough (COST) moved that the minutes from the Faculty Senate Meeting of September 20, 2010 be approved. The motion was seconded. Krug (CLASS), Senate Moderator, noted that the approval of the Librarian's Report was missing from the minutes, but the Faculty Senate did, in fact, approve the Librarian's Report. Noting that change, the minutes were approved.

**3. Librarian's Report of October 19, 2010, Pat Humphrey (COST), Senate Librarian:**

Humphrey moved that the Librarian's Report be accepted. The motion was seconded and the Librarian's report of October 19, 2010 was accepted.

**a. Report from the Undergraduate Committee: Ron MacKinnon (CIT):**

Ron MacKinnon (CIT) reported that he Undergraduate Committee met on September 14<sup>th</sup> and discussed two minor items from the Department of American Studies and 28 course deletions and minor revisions from the Department of Music. MacKinnon reminded Senators to arrange for alternates to stand in for them should they be unable to attend the November or January meetings of the Faculty Senate. The Undergraduate Committee will present several items at these two meetings that require a quorum. Krug (CLASS) urged Senators to note the dates of the November and January meetings and arrange for alternates well in advance.

**b. Report from the Graduate Committee: Bob Fernekes (LIB):**

The Graduate Committee's meeting for September 9<sup>th</sup> was canceled as there were no curriculum items to come before the committee.

**4. President's Report: President Brooks Keel:**

***Engineering***

President Keel explained that Georgia Southern was made aware of an opportunity to create proposal for an Engineering Technology program. The President's Office, Provost and College of Science and Technology have been working together on the proposal. He further explained that Georgia Southern has had Engineering Technology courses for nearly thirty years. Since 1986, the University has been requesting permission to move forward with a full engineering degree program, an actual B.S. in Engineering and Engineering Technology. Those energies, until recently, have met with "all sorts of resistance at the state level for a variety of reasons. ...Things are rapidly changing for the better in this arena. The University of Georgia in October submitted a proposal for a B.S. degree in Civil, Mechanical, B. S. in Civil, B.S. in Mechanical, and a B.S. in Electrical Engineering, [all of] which were to be discussed at the Board of Regents meeting. [In 48 hours], we very quickly put together a proposal for B.S. degrees in Civil, Mechanical, and Electrical Engineering." President Keel pointed out that these degrees fit well with Georgia Southern's mission as well as with the interests of industry in the region. Employers in this part of the state "have been telling us for years now that they really need...engineers that, when they graduate, not only are ready to go to work right away, but have [practical] skills

that, in many cases, a lot of other engineering students at other institutions don't get." This has "been a real strength of our program" and it's what we will continue doing. President Keel noted that this has been a "political issue because Georgia Tech has had basically a franchise in engineering degrees and there's been a huge resistance" to the idea that other schools might also offer full engineering degrees. The Board of Regents guidelines will be reviewed at the November Board meeting which is to take place November 9-10. This issue is so political that the Governor actually made an appearance at the Board of Regents meeting in October, where our proposal and others were considered. He asked the Board of Regents to postpone any decisions on engineering until further study could be done. President Keel pointed out that since Georgia Southern has been studying this issue since 1986, there really wasn't any more analysis to be done; it is clear that there is a real need in this area of the state for an engineering program. The Board of Regents followed the recommendation of the Governor and decided to table any decision on engineering until November. The Regents also moved "to consider Georgia Southern's degree at the same time they considered University of Georgia's degree." The decision to even consider these programs was the result of the diligent work of the Provost, Dean Danilowicz, chairs, faculty and staff, and the chairs within Engineering Technology. "The Chairman of the Board of Regents, who is an engineer himself, has asked us to put together additional information ...that he and the Regents will use to try to help convince the state legislature delegation that even in difficult economic times, it makes good sense for Georgia to do this." President Keel expressed optimism "that at the next Board of Regents meeting the Regents will consider engineering degrees for Georgia Southern. If approved, Georgia Southern will "march forward as quickly as we possibly can to begin offering engineering degrees." He expressed appreciation for the work of faculty on the various curriculum committees, saying that we had to move as quickly as possible to have a chance at this. He added, "[H]opefully, by the next meeting of the Faculty Senate, I will be able to bring to you exceedingly good news from the Board of Regents.

**5. Senate Executive Committee Report: Clara Krug (CLASS), Chair:**

**a. Approval of actions taken at the meeting of September 20**

Clara Krug (CLASS) thanked Provost Bartels for recommending to President Keel that he approve the Academic Standards Committee's revisions and the addition of the Board of Regents Policies about termination to the *Faculty Handbook* that were voted on at the September meeting of the Faculty Senate. She thanked President Keel for accepting and approving both of those actions.

**c. Request for Information:**

Rob Pirro (CLASS) submitted an RFI which asked two questions. 1. "Will the "potential statewide savings" information from the Dependent Audit

*Verification initiative, which, according to an August 27 email from Human Resources, "will be released at a later date in time," take into account the costs of hiring a private contractor to conduct the audit and the costs the state expects to be bear as some of the 3,690 individuals statewide who have been or will be dropped from insurance coverage seek treatment at state-subsidized hospital emergency rooms?*

*2. How many of the 3,690 individuals statewide who have been or will be dropped from insurance coverage are children?*

The response to the first question pointed out that the one-time cost was to hire Chapman Kelly was \$282,000 and initial estimates indicated that around 5% of the enrolled dependents would be found to be ineligible and would be removed. This initial estimate would have produced annual cost avoidance of \$4,600,000. The audit resulted in a significant reduction in the number of dependants. Approximately 3,349 dependents were identified to be removed, etc. These results created an additional \$2,000,000 in annual cost avoidance over the initial estimate and a Return on Investment in excess of 2,300%.

The response to the second question stated that 29.6% were non-college children or 991 of those removed were children.

### **c. Requests for Discussion**

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee received a request for discussion from John Weaver (COE). "At the beginning of the semester of the semester I submitted a request for information regarding a) textbook policy and b) the renting of textbooks. I would like to submit this discussion item request to begin the process of forming a more intellectually suitable policy concerning textbooks and books on this campus." After considerable discussion, the Senate Executive Committee decided to decline the request for the following reason: This request is related to a question of value, which has a place in academe, but not in a deliberative policy-making body. If this request were related to a specific policy question, it would be eligible for Senate consideration.

Regarding the Engineering Proposal, Krug explained that owing to the 48 hour deadline, there was no way to involve the entire Faculty Senate. She opted to contact Ron MacKinnon (CIT), who is chair of the Undergraduate Committee. MacKinnon noted that the Undergraduate Committee "had agreed at the previous meeting that if there was any kind of emergencies or any minor items that we would deal with it by email." The comprehensive explanation provided by the Provost meant that committee was able to approve the proposal very quickly. The vote was unanimous in its support for the engineering proposal.

Krug (CLASS) noted that there wasn't time to involve the Senate Executive Committee, but that she did "send a note of apology" and stated that whenever possible "we always bring things before the Senate, but this seemed like the best way to try to expedite what Dr. Keel has identified as a long-standing effort to implement an engineering program here at Georgia Southern."

President Keel noted "that this was a highly unusual situation and that this is not the way that this administration typically will do business, especially with regard to curriculum matters." He apologized for the rush and pointed out that "were it not for the factors that were totally out of our control we certainly would not have done that." He expressed appreciation for "the extraordinary work that everyone did to try to make this happen. I can assure you that we will keep emergencies to just that – true emergencies."

**6. Report from the SGA Liaison, Bruce McLean (COST):**

Since being elected last month, Bruce McLean (COST) attended three Student Government Association meetings. He noted that SGA President Alton Standifer did an excellent job representing Georgia Southern in the Governor's debate last month. The SGA elected the Homecoming Court and will be sponsoring the GSU Idol competition during Homecoming Week. Vice President Quarles oversaw the approval of \$7,300 in disbursements to 13 different organizations that requested money from SGA. Students expressed concern that all students are required to pay for a RAC fee, but cannot park there until after 4:00 p.m and that this resulted in fewer students going to the RAC. Students were also under the misimpression that faculty and faculty spouses didn't have to pay for the RAC and they received free parking. McLean (COST) noted that on a recent visit, nearly 80 percent of the spaces were open. McLean supported Vice President Quarles' suggestion to have Parking and Transportation provide a few rows of one-hour free parking before 4:00 p.m. In an effort to better understand student's complaints regarding the bus system, McLean rode the yellow route from the bookstore to the RAC. He was impressed that the trip took just about 15 minutes. He noted that everyone that wanted to get on at the bookstore was able to. Although half of the riders did have to stand for the entire trip, there was not enough room for everybody that wanted to enter the bus at the first two stops. This likely added 15 minutes to students' trip time. Students expressed concern about where the money will come from to buy the Golf Course. America Minc presented a proposal for a tobacco free campus to the SGA. Finally, President Keel made a presentation to the SGA on retention, progression, and graduation rates and then took questions from the group.

Alton Standifer (SGA) noted that students thought that faculty received free parking passes and free access to the RAC. That misconception was corrected in the meeting. Faculty they do have to purchase passes to park at their jobs and

pay a RAC fee as well. Jim Stephens (JPHCOPH) suggested to Dr. Keel that he consider allowing faculty and their spouses to have free access to the RAC and parking.

**7. Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS):**

No report.

**8. Report from the Task Force on Governance: Richard Flynn (CLASS):**

The Task Force for Governance has met twice, since last Senate meeting. The Task Force noted that the *Faculty Handbook* includes policies on shared governance, some of which are based on the recommendations found in the American Association of University Professors *Red Book*. The Task Force also noted that there were discrepancies between policy and practice in some colleges. For example, there is a requirement that promotion and tenure guidelines be posted on the website and available in print at every level, from department to college. The Task Force is in the process of formulating recommendations and will meet again on October 28<sup>th</sup>.

Clara Krug (CLASS) Senate Moderator: Thank you Richard. Are there any questions for Richard Flynn? Okay, I apologize. I totally skipped the report from the Provost Search Committee. Lowell Mooney will be reporting for Mike Smith because he is currently on I-16 between here and the Savannah Airport.

**9. Report of the Provost Search Committee, Lowell Mooney (COBA) for Dean Mike Smith (CLASS):**

Lowell Mooney (COBA) noted that the chair of the Provost Search Committee, Dean Michael Smith (CLASS) was unable to make his report because he was bringing a candidate back to the airport. After conducting airport interviews on September 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup>, with nine semi-finalists, the Provost Search Committee selected four finalists for the position of Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. These finalists are: **Nathaniel Frazer, Ph.D.** Dean, College of Natural Resources, Utah State University; **Junius Gonzales, M.D.** Dean, College of Behavioral & Community Sciences, University of South Florida; **Thomas Keon, Ph.D.** Dean, College of Business Administration, University of Central Florida; and **William (Ted) Moore, Ph.D.** Vice President for Finance and Planning University of South Carolina. The candidates' curricula vita, letters of application, and the schedule for their public forums are viewable on the Provost Search website. <http://www.georgiasouthern.edu/provostsearch/> .

The four finalists were selected by the Search Committee from a list of 60 total applicants. The applicant pool was developed by Parker Executive Search through its proactive efforts to contact and encourage appropriate candidates to apply. In

addition, a variety of candidates were nominated by Georgia Southern faculty. Some nominees chose to apply and some did not. Although, academic recruitment recently has been hampered by the economy and the severe downturn in the housing market, overall the Search Committee is pleased with the slate of finalists and is looking forward to having them on campus during these next two weeks. Thank you.

**10. Unfinished Business**

None.

**11. New Business**

Ming Fang He (COE) requested to ask a question of the Provost Search Committee. Clara Krug (CLASS) responded that Dean Smith has requested that questions be directed to him as chair. Ming Fang He (COE) expressed a desire to ask the question in such a way that the entire Faculty Senate might hear both the question and response. Krug (CLASS) pointed out that that she was free to raise her question, but that a response would have to be forthcoming from Dean Smith. Ming Fang He (COE) complimented the Provost Search Committee its hard work, noting that the candidates were “top-notch.” That said, despite the “amazing profile” of the finalists, there were no woman candidates brought to campus. She asked about the diversity of the search and inquired about the number of women and people with diverse backgrounds were in the pool of top ten candidates. She also asked if the Search Committee included an affirmative action officer.

**12. Announcements: Vice Presidents**

None.

**13. Announcements from the Floor**

Lowell Mooney (COBA) reminded Senators that the next provost candidate will be on campus this week and to please make every effort to attend and to encourage colleagues to come as well. The turnout was rather disappointing at the last public forum.

Jim Stephens (JPHCOPH) announced that College of Public Health just completed the accreditation process that they have been working towards for three years. The actual results won't be known until July, but most felt it went very well. Clara Krug (CLASS), Senate Moderator congratulated everyone at JPHCOPH for their efforts.

**14. Adjournment**

**GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**  
**November 15, 2010**  
**4:00 to 6:00 P.M.**  
**Russell Union Ballroom**

**Voting Members in Attendance:** (William Amponsah for Michael Reksulak); Barry Balleck; Yasar Bodur; Tom Buckley; Marc D. Cyr; Jennie Dilworth; Bob Fernekes; Chris Geyerman; Christian Gibson/Alton Standifer; Ardian Greca; Michelle Haberland; Todd Hall; Sonya Huber; (Pat Humphrey for Clara Krug); (Jim Lobue for Norman Schmidt); (David Lewder for Debra Sinclair); Ron MacKinnon; Barbara Mallory; Brenda Marina; Mary Marwitz; Bruce McLean; Teri Ann Melton; Lowell Mooney; Kent Murray; Michelle Reidel; Steve Rossi; Jim Stephens; Stuart Tedders; Timothy Teeter; Caren Town; Pat Walker; Mark Welford;

**Voting Members Absent:** Marie Botkin; Amy Boyett; Olivia Edenfield; Dena Hale; Youakim Kalaani; Frederic Mynard; Sze-man Ngai; Patricia Price; Donna Saye; Debra Skinner; Don Stallings; Laura Valeri; Theresa Welford; Patrick Wheaton; Bill Yang; Rob Yarbrough; Jonathan Zhang; Chunshun Zhao.

**Administrators in Attendance:** Dr. Ron Core, Dr. Teresa Thompson, Mr. Steve Burrell

**Visitors:** Simone Charles; Lee Davis; Keith Warburg; Bede Mitchell; Barry Joyner; Bret Danilowicz; Tony Bretti

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the November 15, 2010, Meeting:** Dr. Pat Humphrey (COST), substituting for Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS), opened the meeting and announced that Dr. Bartels would deliver the President's Report. The agenda was then approved.
2. **Approval of the October 19, 2010, Minutes: Michelle Haberland (CLASS), Senate Secretary:** Michelle Haberland moved that October minutes be approved. Marc Cyr seconded the motion and the minutes were approved.
3. **Librarian's Report of November 15, 2010:** Michelle Haberland (CLASS), substituting for Pat Humphrey (COST), moved that Senate approve the Librarian's Report. The Librarian's Report was then approved by the Senate.
  - a. **Report from the Undergraduate Committee: Ron MacKinnon (CIT):** The Undergraduate Committee met on October 12<sup>th</sup>, and approved program revisions for the College of Education and the Center for International Studies. The committee also approved several deletions and three revisions for the University Honors Program. The committee also



approved a number of changes for COST, including a course revision from the Department of Biology, a program revision for the Department of Chemistry had a program revision; two course revisions for the Department of Mechanical Engineering and Electrical Engineering. The College of Health and Human Sciences had a course revision; and there were four changes from the Department of Hospitality, Tourism, and Family and Consumer Sciences. Finally, the School of Nursing had two changes.

The Undergraduate Committee also approved the engineering proposal via email in order to meet the necessary deadline.

The Undergraduate Committee approved the recommended student learning outcomes for the core curriculum. Since the Area C-US Perspectives student learning outcomes had already been approved, the committee considered and approved the student learning outcomes for Area I Communication Skills, Area II-Quantitative Skills, Area B-International Institutional Options and Global Perspectives.

The Undergraduate Committee report and recommendations were approved by the Senate.

- b. Report from the Graduate Committee: Bob Fernekes (LIB):** The Graduate Committee met on October 14<sup>th</sup> with an update from the Dean. The committee approved new courses, course revisions, and program changes from the College of Education. In addition, the committee also approved new courses, new revised programs for the Executive MBA, the WebMAcc and the Enterprise Resource Planning Programs from COBA.

The report and recommendations from the Graduate Committee were approved by the Senate.

4. **President's Report: Dr. Jeane Bartels substituting for President Brooks Keel (Dr. Bartels substituting):** Noting that she did not have an official report, Dr. Bartels provided the Senate with an update on various issues.

*Football*

Dr. Bartels noted that Georgia Southern defeated Appalachian State, a short period of time ago, and we won last week, too, and I think that's actually hit the top of the record.

*Engineering*

As a result of a 25-year effort, the Board of Regents approved Georgia Southern's proposal to offer programs in civil, electrical, and mechanical engineering. The University of Georgia's request to offer an engineering program made the process considerably more political, although there was never a question about Georgia

Southern moving forward. Our change from the existing Engineering Technology program to an Engineering program requires a change in just two math courses. The laboratory space is exemplary and the addition of new faculty will bring us closer to accreditation. The program will start in the fall of 2011, which will put Georgia Southern a year ahead of UGA.

#### *Provost Search*

The Provost Search is proceeding. While President Keel has made an indication about the direction he will take, he is finalizing some details before he makes a public announcement.

5. **Senate Executive Committee Report: Pat Humphrey (COST) Substituting for Clara Krug (CLASS), Chair:** There were no requests for information within the last month.

**a. Requests for Motions**

There was one request for a motion from Michael Moore and AAUP. The motion asked the Senate to ratify AAUP's resolution about a College of Science and Technology requirement for promotion and tenure. The SEC declined to put that on the agenda this time for the following reasons:

- (1.) The motion deals with only one single college, therefore according to that criteria does not belong in the purview of the Senate;
- (2.) The statement does not include any prohibitive or narrow wording. The statement requires that by the time of tenure or promotion to associate professor, a tenure-track individual should have submitted, but not necessarily have received, one external grant proposal. The only restriction was that the grant proposal could not be for attendance at a conference or travel. Given that this would include service, curriculum development, or research, the SEC decided that the statement was neither restrictive nor prohibitive. In addition, the SEC also considered that this statement was approved by a majority of COST faculty. For these reasons, the SEC declined to put it on the agenda.

**b. Nomination and Election, Senate Moderator**

Lowell Mooney (COBA) nominated Clara Krug (CLASS) for another term as Moderator of the Faculty Senate. Pat Humphrey (COST) noted that Krug had indicated she was willing to serve again. Nominations were closed by a seconded motion and Krug was elected Moderator of the Faculty Senate by acclamation.

6. **Report from the SGA Liaison: Bruce McLean (COST):** The SGA met three times since the last meeting of the Senate. The SGA provided volunteers for the Literary Festival and held practices for and sponsored GSU Idol. McLean offered

congratulations to SGA President Standifer, who was crowned King at the Appalachian half-time show. Officers and Senators have met with the Provost candidates and provided evaluations of the candidates to the search committee. SGA President Standifer and SGA Vice President Gibson both serve as student representatives on the search committee. SGA Vice President Gibson met with Provost Bartels. The Senate is considering creating a House of Representatives composed of members from campus organizations and the students are investigating funding for a new student union based on the survey they conducted. A representative of Talon Leadership Society spoke to the senate. SGA has created a new committee, The Shuttle Gus Committee, to help students get back to the dorms safely on the weekends. SGA Vice President Quarles led the approval of approximately \$7,000 to student organizations. SGA Vice President Lumpkin provided athletic updates each week, which included the football team's defeat of Appalachian State and the success of the volleyball team. The SGA is also working with the search committee to assist in replacing Vicki Hawkins.

Pat Humphrey (COST) noted that President Keel was delighted that SGA President Standifer was selected as the sole-student on the Chancellor Search Committee .

7. **Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS):** Chris Geyerman (CLASS) presented the [Graduation Success Report](#) and the [Federal Graduation Rate](#). He noted that the difference between the two reports stems from a difference in the way in which the figures are calculated. According to the Federal Graduation Rate formula, students who initially enrolled at Georgia Southern and then transferred to another school are counted as not graduating, even if they eventually graduate from the other school. The Graduation Success Report only requires that a student transfer in good standing. Therefore, the Graduation Success Report rates will be higher than those found in the Federal Graduation Rate.

For the 2000-2003 Cohort, the Federal Graduation Rate for all students was 47%, while the Federal Graduation Rate for Student-Athletes was 48%. The four-class average was 45% for all students, and 52% for student-athletes.

<b>Georgia Southern, the 2000-2003 Cohort:</b>		
	<b>Graduation Success Report</b>	<b>Federal Graduation Rate</b>
<b>Women's Sports</b>	93%	85%
Basketball, cross-country, and track	90%	59%
Soccer	100%	74%
Softball	68%	58%

Swimming	80%	62%
Tennis	100%	56%
Volleyball	100%	67%
<b>Men's sports</b>		
Baseball	53%	31%
Basketball	63%	43%
Football	54%	49%
Golf	77%	55%
Soccer	56%	41%
Tennis	67%	25%

Geyerman also reported that the Southern Conference had its annual fall meeting and discussed the realignment of football championships, subdivision football (also known as Division I-AA). The fact that few schools make money in the playoffs resulted in much discussion.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked if this year's numbers were similar to past years. Geyerman confirmed that they looked basically the same.

Pat Humphrey (COST) noted that Georgia Southern athletes have a higher rate of graduation than the typical student graduation rate. Geyerman (CLASS) confirmed that assessment and noted that this was a national trend. As a general rule, student-athletes tend to graduate at a slightly higher rate with slightly better grades than overall student bodies.

8. **Report from the Task Force on Governance: Pat Walker (CLASS) Substituting for Richard Flynn:** Pat Walker reported that the Task Force on Governance committee is finalizing recommendations for the Senate's February meeting.

Pat Humphrey (COST) asked if the recommendations will be available before the February meeting. Pat Walker was unsure, but suggested that Richard Flynn (CLASS), the chair of the task force, would know. Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked if the committee had posted its work on sharepoint. Pat Walker explained that it was there, although it was later noted that the information is only available to committee members at this time.

9. **Unfinished Business**

None.

10. **New Business**

None.

11. **Announcements from the Vice Presidents**

None.

12. **Announcements from the Floor**

None.

13. **Adjournment:** There being no further business, the Senate moved and voted to adjourn.