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Georgia Southern University  
Faculty Senate Minutes  
February 17, 2011  
4:00 – 6:00 p.m.  
Russell Union Ballroom


**Voting Members Absent:** Barry Balleck, Marie Botkin, Amy Boyett, Dena Hale, Sonya Huber, Youakim Kalaani, Sze-man Ngai, Patricia Price, Steve Rossi, Donna Saye, Norman Schmidt, Debra Sinclair, Don Stallings, Caren Town, Theresa Welford, Patrick Wheaton, Bill Yang, Jonathan Zhang, Chunshan Zhao

**Administrators in Attendance:** Brooks Keel, Jean Bartels, Marilyn Bruce, Ron Core, William Griffis, Bede Mitchell, Charles Patterson

**Visitors:** Tomero Hubbard, Curtis Ricker, John Weaver

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the February 17, 2011, Meeting:** Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS), Faculty Senate Moderator, opened the meeting. The Senate approved the agenda.

2. **Approval of the November 15, 2010, Minutes:** Michelle Haberland (CLASS), Senate Secretary moved that the minutes be approved. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved.

3. **Librarian’s Report of February 17, 2011:** Pat Humphrey (COST), Senate Librarian moved that the Senate Librarian’s Report for February 17, 2011 be approved. The motion was seconded and the report was approved.

   a. **Report from the Undergraduate Committee: Ron MacKinnon (CIT):** The report reflected the Undergraduate Committee meetings in November and January, both of which were busy meetings.

   - A new course in Economics for COBA’s School of Economic Development was approved.
   - A new course for CIT’s Department of Information Systems was approved.
The Undergraduate Committee approved a variety of course revisions, and a new program from COST, Environmental Sustainability Concentration.

- For the Music Department, a new course was approved.
- For the Center for International Studies, two new courses were approved, Global Citizens and Global Citizens 1410-H.
- In the CHHS, the committee approved new courses in Cultural Foods, and International Studies Abroad.
- In COST, Department of Biology, a new course in Flora of Georgia was approved.
- In Geology and Geography, a new course in Population Geography was approved.
- In the Department of Mathematical Sciences, new courses in Game Theory, Honors Research, and Honors Thesis were approved.
- In addition to these course additions, there were many course deletions.
- Several new and significant programs were revised and approved: the Bachelor of Science and Mechanical Engineering Technology, the Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering Technology (Emphasis in Mechatronics), the Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering Technology, and the Bachelor of Science Electrical Engineering Technology.
- For the Department of Military Science, a new revised program in Military Science Minor, Military Science Minor (Non-Degree) was approved.

The committee and Dr. Greg Chamblee congratulated the COST departments involved with the Engineering Program for their hard work and success. The Undergraduate Committee report and recommendations were approved by the Senate.

b. Report from the Graduate Committee: Bob Fernekes (LIB)
The Librarian’s Report includes the approved Graduate Committee minutes from November 11th and the January 20th meetings. Both meetings began with a Dean’s Update. For the November 11th meeting, the committee approved one course and one program revision from CLASS, one course revision from the College of Public Health, and three new courses, three course revisions, one program revision, and two revised program forms from the College of Education. For the January 20th meeting, the committee approved four new courses, two course revisions, two program revisions, and one program endorsement from COST; two new courses and two program revisions from CLASS; two new courses, five course revisions, seven program revisions, and a revised policy from the College of Education; three program revisions and one new course from COBA; and two new courses and one course revision from the College of Health and Human Sciences. At that meeting, the Graduate
Committee also created a sub-committee on awarding scholarships and four committee members volunteered and were approved.

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

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

**Good News**

President Keel noted that although the year has just started, Georgia Southern already has significant good news to report. *US News and World Report* ranked Georgia Southern University the fourth most popular university in the country, putting us in the league of Brigham Young, Stanford and Harvard. *Forbes Magazine* ranked Georgia Southern 10th in the country for the number of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) degrees awarded to minorities. These rankings have done much to strengthen the public’s perception of our university. President Keel commended the faculty for their work in the STEM areas.

Georgia Southern University’s Museum recently received national accreditation. Calling the Museum “a jewel in the crown of Georgia Southern,” President Keel commended the Museum for its accomplishments, especially in the area of community outreach.

**Provost Ted Moore**

President Keel announced that Dr. William Ted Moore from the University of South Carolina has accepted the position of Provost. Dr. Moore is in the process of moving his family to Statesboro in time for an official start date of 1 April. President Keel said, “We are really excited to have Dr. Moore on board with us as our Provost. ...[H]e’s going to do a tremendous job helping us continue to move forward.”

**Dean Searches**

President Keel announced that, “[M]y distinguished colleague, Dr. [Jean] Bartels, who has been serving in the role of Interim Provost..., has been appointed the Dean of College of Health and Human Sciences.” Dr. Bartels will begin that position formally on April 1st. President Keel explained that, “[T]his was a bit of an unusual process in terms of appointing a Dean without going through a national search. There were lots of reasons why I made the decision to do that, not the least of which is that I can’t think of anyone more qualified, more capable, and more appropriate to serve the role of Dean of this particular college than Jean Bartels. I’ve had the opportunity over the last... eight months now of working extremely closely with her in her role as Provost, and have not only had an opportunity to interact with her personally, but professionally. I have seen the way in which she carries on her job, her administrative skills and expertise, which has certainly given me a tremendous confidence in realizing that she is the appropriate person for the Dean of this college to move us forward..... We wanted to give the college an opportunity to move forward as quickly as they could and since we already had
someone of her calibre on the Faculty here I could think of no one better to serve in that particular role. I can assure you this is not the normal way in which to go about searching for deans.”

President Keel explained that there are dean searches underway, all of which are using the more formalized process of a national search. The search committee for the Dean of Public Health has already been formed and is moving forward. The committee will meet with the national search firm in the next several weeks.

There is also a national search for the replacement of Billy Griffis, who has served an incredibly well in the role of Vice President for University Advancement here at Georgia Southern for a better part of a decade. President Keel thanked Vice President Griffis for his service. Dean Ron Shiffler will chair the search committee for a new Vice President of University Advancement. That search will be national in scope.

President Keel reported that Provost Moore will initiate a national search for the Dean of the College of Information Technology shortly after he begins his position.

**Spring General Assembly**

President Keel announced that the Spring General Assembly will take place on April 6th at 4:00pm and all faculty are encouraged to attend. This year’s Spring General Assembly will feature a State of the University address by President Keel. There will also be an opportunity for Provost Ted Moore to provide a snapshot of his vision for the upcoming year.

**Budget**

President Keel explained that, “The Governor has recommended an 8% budget cut for the coming fiscal year 2012. We are well-positioned to absorb that budget cut due to the incredible work of the previous administration and all the work that you have done as faculty around this table. So, the good news is I don’t anticipate any major disruption of services as you know it today to meet this particular budget cut.”

He continued, “The Governor also decided not to fund the increase in formula that we typically get due to the increase in headcount. That’s the bad news, in addition to making this budget cut, which means we will have to absorb more students without the associated funds that come with that. That particular topic is under a tremendous amount of discussion in Atlanta now as well as you might well imagine. All indications are this will be another extended session, so we probably won’t know what our budget is officially until well into April. The Board of Regents will make no determinations about the allocation of that budget [until after the legislature passes the budget]. So, we won’t know anything about [the university’s share of the budget] until the Board of Regents meets, probably in May. We also won’t know any indication about what tuition increase, if any, until that point in time.”
President Keel noted that among the many proposals there is “a tremendous amount of discussion going on about the future of the HOPE scholarship. That will certainly both directly and indirectly have a significant impact on us and all the universities within the University System of Georgia.” He concluded, “[T]he bottom line is the amount of money going out is greater than the amount of money coming in and the legislature is dead set on fixing this issue now, not putting it off any further, so please stay tuned to that as well. It will definitely have an impact on our students as we move forward.”

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

Clara Krug thanked Pat Humphrey (COST) for filling in as Faculty Senate Moderator at the November 15, 2010 meeting. Krug also thanked Provost Bartels for decreeing that the 2011-2012 *Faculty Handbook* will be published in a hard copy and it will include an index.

a. **SharePoint:** Moderator Krug expressed her appreciation for Steve Burrell’s help with SharePoint. Ron Stalnaker will be the liaison for the Faculty Senate’s SharePoint site as we work to make it more user-friendly. Krug reported that she and Ginger Malphrus met with Ron Stalnaker, Jason Vickers, and Eric Floyd on February 3rd, 2011 to discuss the Faculty Senate SharePoint site. As a result, the Information Technology staff made several decisions.

1) In the future, when control processes are changed, a test will be implemented. The test will include the Senate Moderator.

2) The Information Technology staff will audit security permissions on the President’s Faculty Senate site to ensure notification when changes are made.

3) The Information Technology staff will enable messages to reach Ginger Malphrus and the Senate Moderator simultaneously.

4) The Information Technology staff will allow requests made to Ginger Malphrus to be copied to the Senate Moderator.

5) The Information Technology staff will add a button to enable a “Print View” of a request at the Senate website. Krug noted that this has already been accomplished. Faculty are now able to click on “Print View” on Requests for Information and Motions. On the resulting screen, the entire motion and responses are visible, without having to scroll down.

b. **Senate Executive Committee Protocol:** Between February 1, 2011 and August 1, 2011, which is the current Senate Executive Committee’s term of office, the Senate Executive Committee Protocol will include the following.

1) Requests for Motions from Senate Ad Hoc Committees will be posted automatically to the Senate SharePoint site through the
Faculty Senate Office. Reports from the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc committees are already automatically approved.

2) Requests for Motions from faculty members will be sent to the Faculty Senate Office and the Moderator. The Moderator will verify that the faculty member submitting the RFI has tried to find an answer to his or her question as specified on the Request form. For Requests for Discussion and Requests for Motions, she will verify that the rationale explains that the issue affects at least two academic units of the University or the general welfare of the faculty then the request will be posted.

3) The Senate Secretary will take minutes of SEC meetings. Following each meeting, she will send the minutes to the Moderator, who will then forward them to members of the SEC for possible revisions. The Secretary will have the final draft posted at the Senate website where all faculty members may read it, and it will go out to everybody simultaneously.

4) There was a request for a Faculty Senator to serve on the recently formed Medical Leave Assistance Program Committee. The committee will include a Senator and a faculty at-large member. Professor Krug invited senators to let her know if they are interested in serving on the committee. She will also get back in touch with Paul Michaud and let him know that we are working on this.

c. Request for a Discussion Item: Textbook Policy
The discussion item from Professor John Weaver related to textbook policy asked the following questions:

1) Does the current university book policy undermine the university mission;
2) Does the current bookstore policy concerning the renting and buying of used books foster an intellectual and scholarly atmosphere amongst all of our students; and
3) Does the current book policy encourage treatment of books as commodity items to be rented, sold, and resold?

Professor Weaver explained in the rationale section that the scholarly process is based on the circulation of books and journal articles. These publishing houses can only afford us opportunity to publish if they are able to disseminate and sell enough books and journals.

The Senate Executive Committee declined this motion because the questions were philosophical in nature. Moderator Krug noted that “it is hard to take an action on a philosophical question.”
Ming Fang He (COE) responded that the Request for Discussion was thoughtfully written and that it concerned not only a question about the role of textbooks, but it also concerned the purpose of education. She urged fellow senators to read the Request for Discussion carefully.

Moderator Krug (CLASS) agreed and pointed out that Section 3.10 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual, entitled Academic Textbooks, Item 2, required that universities, “Ensure that bookstore operations, whether managed internally or outsourced to private vendors, offer the best value to students in acquiring textbooks and actively promote alternative options to help minimize student cost.” The policy was first passed in May of 2005 and then again in February 2007.

d. **Request for Information: Eagle Alert System**

Given recent events and notifications, several faculty were concerned about the way in which the Eagle Alert System functions. Professor Ruhland’s Request for Information asked, “Will the Office of Public Safety, IT Services and the Office of Marketing and Communications, commit to jointly working with ADP to allow faculty and staff the option to house personal contact numbers on ADP’s HRIS system while at the same time not sharing those numbers with the administrators of Eagle Alert?” Professor Ruhland had tried to find an answer to this through ADP, but to no avail. He also contacted Public Safety Chief Russell who informed him that they do not manage the Eagle Alert System. The SEC approved this request, referred it to Christian Flathman, Director of Marketing and Communications, who referred it to Steve Burrell who referred it to Ron Stalnaker. The President’s Cabinet approved the proposal to allow employees to use My.GeorgiaSouthern to select if their ADP registered home or mobile numbers are used in Eagle Alert. Essentially faculty and staff will have the ability to use a web-interface via the portal to opt-out of these notifications. Work telephone numbers will be included automatically and are not subject to opt-out status. Ron Stalnaker and Steve Burrell worked with Christian Flathman to make the new service available via My.GeorgiaSouthern on Thursday, 2-17. Marketing and Communications is currently updating web content to reflect the new policy and FAQs.

President Keel noted that the change was announced on GSNews about an hour before the meeting. President Keel sympathized with those faculty disturbed by 4am phone calls, but also noted that although it could be an inconvenience, it might be important information. Chief Russell does encourage everyone to not opt-out completely.

Moderator Krug noted that a few years ago faculty were concerned that they weren’t notified about public safety concerns on campus or near campus.
Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked for clarification to ensure that faculty and staff could still include their cell phone numbers for notification.

Steve Burrell (VP of Information Technology Services) replied, “Yes, both a mobile phone and your home phone are options. You can choose to receive them in either or both places.” He also noted that text messaging was an option as well.

Moderator Krug thanked very much to Steve Burrell and Ron Stalnaker for taking care of this so quickly.

e. **Request for Motions:** Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance
   Discussion on this item was postponed until later in the meeting, when the committee would present its report.

f. **Motion from the SEC:** Endorsement of Proposed Revisions to the Bylaws of the University System of Georgia Faculty Council
   The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) made a motion that the Faculty Senate endorse proposed revisions to the Bylaws of the University System of Georgia Faculty Council. These revisions were distributed previously to senators. The changes will be voted on later in the month at the meeting of the University System of Georgia Faculty Council. Pat Humphrey (COST) will attend as our representative. Humphrey moved that the Faculty Senate accept the changes. The motion was seconded. Humphrey noted that there were two substantial changes. The first redefined a quorum, making it easier for the council to pass items. The second change requires that the chair of the USGFC be someone who has served on the USGFC for at least a year. 
   necessarily have to be the voting member for their institution. That’s generally seen as a good thing because that way you have a little bit of experience and memory with the body. The Faculty Senate voted to approve the revisions.

6. **Report from the Senate Elections Committee:**
   Pat Humphrey (COST), Chair: As Senate Librarian, Pat Humphrey (COST) helps to coordinate the elections in each college. Humphrey noted that each college has its own Elections Committee and rules. Every college should, at this point, be in the process of receiving calls for nominations. We expect to have the elections process completed by April 1st. She reported that things were going well overall and reiterated that lecturers are full-time, full members of the faculty corps of instruction so therefore are eligible to serve on committees and Senate.

   Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) asked Provost Bartels to confirm that she had consulted with the Board of Regents on the ability of lecturers to serve as senators and on Faculty Senate committees. Provost Bartels agreed, saying, “The Board of Regents’ Policy considered lecturers part of the corps of instruction, which seems to me to give them privilege.”
Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) thanked Provost Bartels and urged senators to ask their colleagues to run for the Faculty Senate.

7. **Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance: Richard Flynn (CLASS)**

Moderator Krug (CLASS) asked Richard Flynn (CLASS), Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance, to report to the Faculty Senate from the podium.

Flynn thanked the members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance, including Acting Provost Gary Means, Acting Provost Jean Bartels, Leslie Fletcher (Professor, COBA), Henry Eisenhart (Professor, Hospitality, Tourism and Family and Consumer Science, CHHS), Kenneth Clark (Professor, Leadership Technology, CIT), Michael Moore (Professor, Curriculum, Foundations, and Reading, COE); Patricia Walker, (Professor, Art, CLASS), Chair Richard Flynn (Professor, Literature and Philosophy, CLASS), Robert Vogel (Professor, JPHCOPH), Ron MacKinnon (Associate Professor, Information Systems, CIT), Fred Smith (Librarian and Associate Professor), Tom Case (Department Chair and Professor in Information Systems, CIT), and Mark Welford (Associate Professor, Geology and Geography, COST).

Flynn noted that the idea for the committee stemmed from Professor Keel’s remarks at the Faculty Forums that tenure and promotion policies should originate in the departments and then be approved on up the line. Last year, based on feedback from the Faculty Forums, Moderator Michael Moore asked the SEC to form an ad hoc committee. The committee was given the charge to find out whether or not this was the case. The committee made posted the minutes from its meetings regularly on SharePoint. Reports were also made to the Senate. Provost Bartels brought the motions to the deans for their feedback and some changes were made. Flynn reported, “More recently, in a communication with Professor Krug, who served as the conduit between me and President Keel, [the committee] received a suggestion from President Keel.” Flynn noted that he received some input from faculty, including Professor Marc Cyr (CLASS). The suggested revision from President Keel concerned the wording of Recommendation (or Motion) Four. The second sentence of Recommendation (or Motion) Four now reads:

“These criteria shall then be approved by the Department Chair, the Dean, the Provost, and the President.” Flynn noted that this was simply a clarification.

Flynn then read the entire revised motion for the record.

> We move that faculty in each department (or, in the case of a college without departments, elected faculty) create the criteria for tenure and promotion which must be approved by a two thirds vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the unit. These criteria shall then be approved by the Department Chair, the Dean, the Provost, and the President. Once the criteria have been approved they will be submitted to the faculty executive/governance committee of each college for inclusion in the bylaws of the college.
Parliamentarian Bob Cook (CIT) noted that since these motions come from a committee, they do not require a second.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked for the reasoning behind the super majority requirement, rather than just requiring a simple majority, 50% plus one. Flynn responded that the committee thought that these were important policies that should reflect the consensus of a large percentage of faculty.

Kent Murray (CLASS) inquired about the lack of specificity, lack of description as to what grounds will be used by the Dean, Provost and President to approve or not approve these policies. Flynn responded that the criteria would need to conform to the University mission. Murray agreed, but remained concerned about the lack of specificity, noting the lack of specific guidance for the decision. Flynn agreed, but noted that this reflected the governance structure of the university.

William Amponsah (COBA) asked, “What if a department decides on an idiosyncratic policy that exceeds the, what may be considered normal policy within the University, wouldn’t it tend to penalize the younger faculty?” Flynn replied that there are other recommendations that propose a governance structure with enough checks and balances to minimize such problems. Amponsah (COBA) expressed concern that if a department is top heavy with senior faculty, the potential influence of younger faculty is necessarily diminished.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Yes it does.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked if a department’s tenure criteria were not approved would it bounce back to the department and be subject to another two-thirds vote of the tenure-track and tenured faculty. Flynn replied that was the case.

President Keel noted that this process would be similar to the process for an individual’s tenure decision in that “it originates from a committee of the faculty, it goes to the Chair and then to the Dean and to the Provost and to the President.”

Tim Teeter (CLASS) expressed concern that the process could go on for some time, with the policies bouncing back and forth from department to dean and back to a department. He wondered if there was a point where the president might step in and make a final decision.

President Keel agreed that this could theoretically happen, although he would expect that the faculty at-large would not allow such a situation to persist. He noted that such discussions do not occur in a vacuum, but “at some point in time as President, the ultimate responsibility would fall on me to make sure that this happens, that I would be forced to, whether I wanted to or not – and I certainly wouldn’t want to -- but I would be forced to come in and resolve the issue in one way or another.”

Richard Flynn (CLASS) noted that if the problem happened at the Dean’s level, the Provost would resolve it. President Keel agreed. Flynn noted that the intent of the
motion was not to create adversarial situations between different levels of administration. Rather, the intent was “to give the faculty more responsibility in shaping policies.”

The motion passed unanimously.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) proceeded to Recommendation One.

The Ad Hoc Committee recommends that we must observe more carefully the Shared Governance Policies already in place. In the spirit of shared governance, the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Provost shall set up a mechanism to provide oversight in order to ensure that they are followed consistently at departmental, college, and university levels.

The committee finds that Georgia Southern already has an exemplary policy statement on Shared Governance in the Faculty Handbook. This statement was included in the charge to this committee:

Flynn noted that the motion incorporated by reference Section 110.01 Shared Governance from the Faculty Handbook.

Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) asked for discussion. Marc Cyr (CLASS) pointed out that as Faculty Senate Moderator under President Grube and Provost Bleicken, he had advocated for this kind of oversight, but he was unable to get the policy on the table. He expressed hope that the motion would pass, as” it will put in place in policy exactly the kind of necessary oversight in review and consistency top to bottom that we need to have.”

The motion passed unanimously.

For the presentation of Recommendation Two, Moderator Krug (CLASS) asked Chair Richard Flynn (CLASS) to break up the text into two distinct motions. Flynn noted that he had not been forewarned of this request from the Senate Executive Committee. Moderator Krug apologized but suggested that there were really two distinct motions in Recommendation Two. Flynn read the first part of Recommendation Two, which would be the first motion, into the record.

We move that, in order to ensure consistency in governance throughout the University, each college shall form an executive/governance committee that acts independently of the Dean’s Office or an advisory board. Such committees exist in the College of Business Administration, the College of Information Technology and in the College of Education. At a minimum, college executive/governance committees should be a liaison with the dean, administrate along with the dean by-laws changes, and facilitate along with the dean the operation of standing committees of the college.
Moderator Krug asked for discussion. President Keel asked if he could suggest a change to the language of the first part of Recommendation Two. “I apologize to my colleagues for not bringing this up ahead of time, especially to Moderator Krug and to Professor Flynn. [The Committee] has done such a tremendous job on this and I really do commend you for this. I’ve read this now numerous times and I’ve given a great deal of thought and the issue that concerns me on this particular motion is the phrase ‘acts independently of.’ [In] a situation where we are trying to put forward shared governance, it just struck me ...as being a little one-sided in terms of how this particular committee acts, especially when you go through the rest of the motion which clearly indicates that it would be working with the dean for and all these issues in the last sentence in the motion.” In order to not “tie up individual colleges who may, for their particular culture, wish to have a more independent committee versus those that wish to have a more inclusive committee,” President Keel recommended that “the wording be modified to say that the committee then acts in ‘collaboration’ with the Dean’s office. This, he felt, would be more in the spirit of shared governance. Flynn stated that while he understood the possible implications of “acts independently,” it reflected the will of the committee. In addition, Flynn pointed out that such independent governance structures exist currently in colleges. “We want a model for faculty governance [in] which the dean does not preside over the meeting of the committee.” President Keel agreed and preferred the word “collaboration” as opposed to something along the lines of serving at the pleasure of the dean. Flynn noted, “There is a College of Education committee in which...the chair of the committee is elected by the faculty. There is the COBA committee in which the dean selects a chair ...for the committee from recommendations from the faculty. Those models are acceptable to our Ad Hoc Committee. The model that we don’t approve of is a model whereby the dean calls the meeting and presides over the committee, and we want to have something in the language in the motion to insure that that will not happen.” Tim Teeter (CLASS) suggested that the motion read that committee “exists independently.”

Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) argued that “[W]e can’t rewrite the motion on the floor, even [changing what] seems like one word, because ...I don’t know if the committee would accept that. [Not] all of the committee members may be here.” She suggested that Chair Flynn take the motion back to the committee, “because we really cannot rewrite the motion on the floor of the Senate.” Fred Smith (LIB) and President Keel agreed that this was a wise way to proceed.

After pointing out that the language in the second part of the recommendation was dependent upon the first, Richard Flynn (CLASS) tabled Recommendation Two. Pat Humphrey (COST) suggested that the revised recommendation reflect the structure of the Faculty Senate, that it is advisory to the President. She also suggested greater emphasis on the fact that these are faculty governance structures and that “the faculty should be elected by their peers.”

Pat Walker (CLASS) asked President Keel if he would support a recommendation that “each college shall form an executive governance committee that meets independently of the dean?” Clara Krug (CLASS) state, “I’d like to reiterate that we’re not going to rewrite the motion on the floor of the Faculty Senate.” President Keel replied that he would
support “something that gets to the spirit of the of shared governance without boxing in any particular college which may... want to have a less independent or more independent functioning group.” He noted that there already exists some variation between colleges and that he would be disinclined to tie any college to any particular format. Chair Flynn (CLASS) noted “that it was the consensus of the committee, however, that we do not want to include an option in which the dean directs the committee.” Further, he argued, the leadership should be faculty. President Keel replied, “I’m perfectly fine with that.”

Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if “anyone sitting in the Faculty Senate now” objected to refer Recommendation Two back to the committee. There were no objections. Lowell Mooney (COBA) pointed out that there were two parts to Recommendation Two. Chair Flynn read the second part of Recommendation Two into the record.

We move further, for colleges that currently do not have by-laws for the college, we move that each of these colleges elect two members from each department or if a college does not have departments that faculty elect representation to an executive/governance committee and that the dean of each of these colleges charge this committee with writing the by-laws which would then be approved by the dean, Provost and President.

Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) asked for discussion. Michelle Haberland (CLASS) pointed out that part two depended upon part one of Recommendation Two. Chair Flynn agreed and pointed out that is why the committee included it as one recommendation/motion.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked to table part two of Recommendation Two and bring it back to the committee. Moderator Krug asked for any objections. There were none.

Both parts of Recommendation Two were tabled and Chair Flynn proceeded to Recommendation Three, which stated:

We move that all Colleges of the University must have a set of Bylaws posted for all faculty and staff on the college website.

At a minimum these Bylaws shall include:
1. Organization of the College
2. The Unit within the University
3. Committees
4. Tenure and Promotion
5. Student Organizations
6. Ratification Process and Dates
7. Amendments
8. Definitions and Classifications
9. Policy and Procedures Changes
Bylaws shall be in full force when approved by a two-thirds majority of faculty members present at a general faculty meeting.

Proposals to amend the Bylaws shall be submitted to the College faculty not later than ten days prior to any regularly scheduled faculty meeting or any special meeting called for the purpose of amending. Proposed amendments must be adopted by a two-thirds majority of faculty members present, provided the required quorum is present at the time of voting. We recommend that Bylaws be changed in concert with the dean and with two thirds of eligible faculty approval.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked for discussion of Recommendation Three. There being no discussion, a vote was taken. Recommendation Three passed unanimously. Chair Flynn thanked the Faculty Senate for its support. President Keel again thanked Chair Flynn and the committee members for their work saying, “This is a tremendous amount of work. Let me also say that what might appear to some as being a wordsmithing [will actually] be a hugely important document for our University as we move forward. I greatly appreciate your sincere effort and interest in helping us to get this right the first time around. So I am deeply appreciative to all of you for the work you’ve done.”

Applause.

Clara Krug (CLASS) also thanked Chair Flynn and the committee, noting that “there’s nothing at all unusual at having something to go back to committee to make sure that the wording is just as it should be.”

8. **Report from the Student Government Association (SGA) Liaison: Bruce McLean (COST)**

Bruce McLean (COST) reported that the SGA is looking for a few good Senators. Send your students to the new SGA website to apply. [www.georgiasouthernsga.com](http://www.georgiasouthernsga.com)

SGA continues to be involved in the search for a new Housing Director. The SGA devoted one meeting to discussion of HOPE and ways to save the program. An SGA committee drafted a GSU HOPE position paper that the President Standifer shared at the Student Advisory Council Conference. SGA awarded approximately $2,000 to campus organizations and is currently looking for places to install wireless on the campus.

9. **Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Clara Krug (CLASS) substituting for Chris Geyerman (CLASS)**

Faculty Athletic Representative Report by Chris Geyerman (CLASS) as read to the Faculty Senate for the meeting of February 17, 2011.
“First, please join me in congratulating Ms. Caroline Bevillard of our women’s swimming team. Ms. Bevillard, a Sr. Sport Management major, has been named one of thirteen winners, nationwide, of the ‘NCAA Ethnic Minority and Women’s Enhancement Postgraduate Scholarship for Careers in Athletics.’ Caroline will use the $6,000 scholarship to defer expenses as she pursues graduate study beginning Fall Semester, 2011.

Second, please join me in wishing good luck to Ms. Ali Beavers, Women’s Tennis, Mr. Jake Ware, Baseball and Men’s golf, and Mr. Chris Rogers, Football. We have nominated these students for Southern Conference Graduate Scholarships. The awards are worth $2,000 and winners will be announced in March, and recognized at the Southern Conference Honors Banquet in Charleston, South Carolina this upcoming May.

Third, please join me in congratulating the women’s volleyball team and the football team. I do not typically report on-the-field happenings, but these teams both achieved significant accomplishments:

A) the women’s volleyball team won the Southern Conference Championship and represented the SoCon and GSU in the NCAA National Championship Volleyball Tournament – the women did this during a semester in which they posted a collective 3.27 GPA;

B) the football team advanced to the national semi-finals in the NCAA “Football Championship Subdivision” tournament before losing to Delaware in freezing cold and amidst what I would describe as “interesting” fan behavior. (You witnessed that I take it.)

Fourth, I have sent to Ms. Ginger Malphrus the Fall 2009 & 2010 GPA Comparison Report (which you have in your hands), which provides a sport-by-sport GPA comparison, for inclusion in the transcript of this meeting. In summary, the GPA of our women’s sports teams declined .05, from 3.16 in the Fall 2009 to 3.11 in the Fall 2010; the GPA of our men’s sports teams declined .03, from 2.64 in the Fall 2009 to 2.61 in the Fall 2010; the GPA of all student-athletes declined .04, from 2.86 in the Fall 2009 to 2.82 in the Fall 2010.

This concludes my report. If you have any questions please send them my way. I hope each of you has something in your day that sparkles.”

9. Unfinished Business
Ming Fang He (COE) made a quick observation regarding the discussion request concerning the textbook policy. She noted that Professor John Weaver, the author of the request, was sitting in the audience but no one even acknowledged his presence or asked for his input. Further, Ming Fang He explained that when someone makes a request like that it is because they care about our University.

Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) agreed and explained that she spoke with Professor Weaver before the meeting commenced. Krug also stated that she explained to him that
if he wanted still his request for discussion to be put on the senate agenda for today, he
would just need to find a senator to make that motion. If two-thirds of the senators
present voted in favor of the motion, then the topic would be open for discussion. Teri
Ann Melton (COE) also spoke with Professor Weaver and learned that he intends to put
forth a motion for our next meeting.

10. New Business
No new business.

11. Announcements: Vice Presidents
Provost Jean Bartels provided the Faculty Senate with two updates, one on SACS and
the other on the Quality Enhancement Plan. “As of March 15th, we will be submitting
our Fifth-Year Report to the SACS Accreditation Team. We have had a very active and
very engaged and very productive SACS Leadership Team, which has taken
responsibility for the writing of that document, the collecting of data, and the analysis of
things that we need to report on. We are in very good stead, we believe, in terms of what
we have accomplished and what we are going to be reporting on the selected criteria that
one must write for the Fifth-Year Report. The one challenge we continue to have is that
of [section] 3.3.1, which requires us to look at the assessment of student learning
outcomes, [particularly] the analysis of results of those outcomes and how we use those
results to feedback into the revision and improvement of programs and courses and
classes.” She noted that we are in the process of implementing WEAVE, our new
assessment system, to ensure that we have outcomes written for each of our programs.
Provost Bartels explained that the University is not where it would like to be on this
point. But, she notes, “We were farther behind a few months ago. We’ve made
remarkable progress, and I’d like to recognize Dr. Stephen Zerwas, our new [Associate]
Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness for the phenomenal work he has done in
actually moving us from 0 to 60 in a couple of months.” At the last site visit, SACS
noted that we were out of compliance for that particular 3.3.1 standard. While we don’t
have the five years of data that we should, we now have processes for compliance in
place. So, it’s likely that SACS will respond on that point. “The good news is that we are
already in the process of collecting the report materials and [performing] the activities
that we will need to have in place” even before the report is issued.

As part of the SACS Report, Bartels announced that “we also have to report on our
Quality Enhancement Plan, the QEP.” She explained, “Georgia Southern is among one
of the first institutions that actually had a plan out there, approved by SACS and actually
put into motion, so we’re on the front curve of this particular activity. We have done a
lot of things to address our QEP which [focused on] encouraging a culture of student
engagement.” Many of the activities that the University put forward were approved by
SACS, including the First-Year Experience activities and other efforts to engage
freshman and improve retention and progression. That said, Provost Bartels explained,
there is a need for more oversight for the whole QEP planning process. She noted that
“most institutions had spent upwards of $5 million dollars to create a system in their
institution to oversee their QEP, to make sure that it was being assessed and moved
forward, hiring directors and whole offices worth of people.” We did not do that.
Provost Bartels announced that she had charged a group of faculty representing all of
the colleges, [staff from] Student Affairs, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and student representatives with providing oversight of the QEP process. Provost Bartels explained that this group will work towards the 2015 SACS reaccreditation and ensure that the QEP is brought forward and that interested parties have an opportunity to contribute to the QEP process. Provost Bartels recognized Chris Caplinger for the “fabulous work” he has done in moving forward many of the QEP initiatives. He has also agreed to chair the QEP committee. Provost Bartels emphasized that “We want to make this the sort of thing that will engage everyone and make sure that people understand the importance of what we are doing and that they are helping to contribute to it.”

12. **Announcements from the Floor**
Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) announced that she is again soliciting a volunteer to serve on the Medical Leave Assistance Plan Committee

14. **Adjournment: 5:30 p.m.**
1. Approval of the Agenda for the March 22, 2011, Meeting:

Clara Krug (CLASS), Faculty Senate Moderator, opened the meeting. The Senate approved the agenda.

2. Approval of the February 17, 2011, Minutes:

Faculty Senate Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) noted a correction to pages 12 and 13 of the February 17, 2011 Minutes. Michelle Haberland (CLASS), Senate Secretary, stated that the minutes refer to a motion when, in fact, it was actually a recommendation from the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance. The recommendation was referred back to the committee. Noting the correction, Michelle Haberland moved that the minutes be approved. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved.

3. Librarian’s Report of March 22, 2011: Pat Humphrey (COST), Senate Librarian:

Noting that approval of the Librarian's Report does not indicate approval of any of the committees’ actions, Pat Humphrey (COST) moved that Faculty Senate
accept the Librarian’s Report for March 22, 2011. The motion passed and the Librarian’s Report was approved.

a. **Report from the Undergraduate Committee: Bruce Mclean (COST) for Ron MacKinnon (CIT):**

Bruce McLean (COST) reported on behalf of the Chair of the Undergraduate Committee, Ron MacKinnon (CIT). The Undergraduate Committee met on February 8, 2011. McLean provided a brief overview to the Faculty Senate, noting that the complete minutes from that meeting are online.

- For the College of Information Technology, one new course, two course revisions, 5 new or revised programs were approved. The new course is Information and Storage Management.
- For the College of Business Administration, one course revision, one new or revised program were approved.
- For the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, the committee approved six new courses, including Psychology of Language and Linguistic Anthropology. In addition, there were 25 course revisions, 25 new or revised programs, and six course deletions approved by the committee.
- For the Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology, the committee approved three new and significant programs: the Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering; the Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering, and the Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering. For these new programs the committee approved 68 new engineering classes, 2 new or revised programs, and 3 course deletions.

The Report from the Undergraduate Committee was approved.

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

Bob Fernekes (LIB) noted that the Librarian’s Report includes the approved Graduate Committee minutes from the February 10th meeting. The meeting began with an update from the Dean.

- Under new business the committee approved one course revision from the College of Public Health and eleven new elective courses for both the Electrical Engineering and the Mechanical Engineering programs. The committee approved two course revisions, four new courses and seven course revisions and corresponding program changes for the Ph.D. in Logistics and Supply Chain Management.
- Under old business, Dr. Diebolt gave a scholarship subcommittee report.
- Under announcements, Dr. Patterson announced the Graduate Research Symposium scheduled for March 31st, next week, and other events taking place next week.
• The meeting adjourned at 8:25 a.m.

The Report from the Graduate Committee was approved.

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

**General Faculty Meeting**
President Keel announced that the 2011 Spring General Faculty Meeting will be held on April 6th at 4:00 p.m. in the Nessmith-Lane Ballroom. Noting a new format, President Keel stated that the meeting would be similar to the faculty forums from last year and will include a report on the state of the university and an opportunity for questions and answers. President Keel will provide updates on the budget, the SACS Five-Year Report, and the Strategic Vision process. The new Provost, Dr. Ted Moore, will be introduced as well. President Keel noted that an announcement on the GSFAC listserv was forthcoming and asked senators to share this information with colleagues.

**Budget**
President Keel spent several days in Atlanta and provided the Faculty Senate with an update on activity in the state legislature. The biggest issue on the table for Georgia Southern is the funding for the new Biology Building. From the last legislative session, the University received $15 million for Phase I of the Biology Building with the intent of getting another $21.2 million in this fiscal year for Phase II to allow completion of the facility. The House did put half of that funding in their budget with the intention that the Senate would make up the rest. Noting Georgia Southern’s “tremendous representation” in both the House and the Senate, “We have every confidence that the Senate will in fact put the remaining half funding for the Biology Building in the budget.” After passing the legislature, the proposed funding would go to the Governor. President Keel stated that he was “about as confident as you can get” that the funding will go through. President Keel reported that negations regarding the overall budget will likely extend into April. Thus, the Board of Regents will not act on any budget activity until that process is completed in the legislature. Like last year, we likely won’t know the affect of the budget on state funds or tuition until the Board of Regents meeting in May. President Keel stated that he would keep faculty abreast of changes as they developed.

**Dr. Jean Bartels**
President Keel praised Dr. Jean Bartels for her service as Interim Provost, noting that her service has taken her away from her research and other duties. Dr. Bartels will step down as Provost on March 31st. Dr. Keel expressed his appreciation for Dr. Bartels saying, “I can’t think of anyone who could have or would have or has done a better job in this role and I’m eternally grateful for all the things that you have done for this University.” The members of the Faculty Senate agreed and thanked Dr. Bartels with a round of applause.
**Guns on Campus**
Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked President Keel if he had heard anything regarding the bill that might permit guns on campus. President Keel replied that he hadn’t heard anything more specific on the subject. President Keel also noted that this “is a great concern. ...[Several] other states have implemented such [policies]. We are adamantly opposed to [policies] that allow anyone to carry a gun on campus.”

**Immigration**
President Keel identified the debate concerning undocumented students as another issue being considered by the state legislature that could affect our campus. Currently, the State of Georgia permits undocumented residents of Georgia to enroll in state universities. Under the current rules, undocumented students pay out-of-state tuition. Some legislators would like to enact laws similar to those in South Carolina that prohibit undocumented students from enrolling in a state university at all.

**Hope Scholarship**
President Keel praised the governor for his courage in tackling the insufficient funding for the HOPE Scholarship head-on. The simple economics of the HOPE scholarship fund are that the income cannot exceed the expenditures. “Something had to be done or [HOPE] was going to be in serious trouble.” This will likely have an impact on our campus. Vice President Thompson is looking into the matter “to see what impact it will potentially have on our enrollment. So that will have an impact on us. ....I think it does offer us opportunities...from a fund-raising point of view for scholarships to ...fill that gap.”

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

   a. **Approval of Actions Taken at the February 17, 2011, Meeting:**
      Clara Krug (CLASS), Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, stated that President Keel approved the actions of the Graduate Committee and the Undergraduate Committee, as reported in the minutes presented in the Librarian’s Report at the last meeting. President Keel also approved the motions and recommendations #1, 3, and 4 presented to the Senate by Dr. Richard Flynn and the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance and the Senate’s recommendation for endorsement of the proposed revisions to the Bylaws of the University System of Georgia’s Faculty Council.

   b. **SharePoint:** Clara Krug (CLASS) reported that difficulties with SharePoint persist. Ron Stalnaker and Eric Floyd are working to solve this problem.

   c. **Meeting with Members of the Behavior Assessment Team:**
      Clara Krug (CLASS) noted that on March 1st, the members of the Senate Executive Committee met with members of the Behavior
Assessment Team (BAT). The BAT includes Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, Teresa Thompson; Dean of Students, Georj Lewis; and Director of Student Affairs, David Matthews. There was a brief presentation and discussion which included the following information.

i. The BAT has been in place for more than three years;

ii. The BAT includes members from the following offices: Counseling & Career Development Center; Dean of Students; Housing; Judicial Affairs; Legal Affairs; Provost Office; Public Safety; and the Student Disability Resource Center.

iii. Additional information about BAT and a form for referring a student are available at the BAT web site.

iv. When the BAT meets, subsequent to a referral, its members make a recommendation.

v. A BAT brochure which details the referral process will soon be available on the web site. Dean Georj Lewis distributed copies to the members of the Faculty Senate.

vi. David Matthews has produced a nineteen page pamphlet related to this issue. It includes such information as guidelines for intervention and characteristics of troubled students. A link to the Counseling Center is also available.

vii. The administration is considering installing a computer with a panic button in all classrooms.

Given the situation at University of Alabama – Huntsville, the SEC asked about what to do if other faculty members posed a threat. The BAT responded that in such cases it is appropriate to contact the Office of Human Resources. Pat Humphrey (COST) emphasized the necessity of informing faculty members who submit a referral from of the outcome of that referral. Chris Geyerman (CLASS) recommended that each new faculty forum include a plenary session about the Behavior Assessment Team.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) said that one of the things she learned from the meeting was what to do if a student acts in a way that raises concern. If there is an immediate threat from a faculty member, student, or staff, one should call Public Safety. If there isn’t an immediate threat, then you should contact the Counseling Center. The Counseling Center can reach out to the student based on your request.

d. **Request for Information: Space Occupancy Issues:** Clara Krug (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee, read the Request for Information (RFI) from Professor Reed Smith of College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences. “Does a procedure exist for the displacement of the majority of a campus academic unit’s primary classroom space by the campus administration, without addressing the impact of such displacement on the academic unit, and without
consulting the affected unit before the decision is made?” He gave the following rationale, “The concern involves CLASS, the Office of Research Services, and the Center for Rural Health, all of which desire to occupy the same space on the first floor of Veazey Hall. The first floor contains six classrooms, including three specially-designed computer labs, which were renovated only three and 1/2 years ago for occupancy by Communication Arts at a cost of tens of thousands of dollars to GSU. A new plan now calls for re-renovation of the classrooms into office space at an additional cost. Neither the Dean of CLASS nor the Communication Arts Department Chairperson were consulted nor informed of this decision before it was made. Nor did the administration offer a plan for alternative classroom space for Comm. Arts as part of this decision. Communication Arts is faced with attempting to locate alternate classroom space on campus within CLASS buildings (meaning Liberal Arts and Social Sciences buildings as CLASS) after the fall schedule and classrooms were already designated. The whole scenario sends a clear message that research is now more important at GSU then undergraduate instruction and that the collegial decision making process, formerly a hallmark of GSU, has been abandoned. My department has already asked the CLASS Dean about this.”

The Senate Executive Committee approved this Request for Information and submitted it to both Vice President Charles Patterson and Vice President Provost Jean Bartels. Dr. Bartels responded: “The allocation of space on campus is a complex issue which is impacted significantly by our increasing enrollments and expanding programs, our limited existing facility space, the severe reductions in state support for any new buildings in the foreseeable future, and our commitment to expanding graduate education and scholarship as elements of our strategic vision. The renovation and repurposing of existing space is currently our only avenue to expansion that can support our current strategic initiatives. Given our current limitations and expansions, the entire University community must come to understand that space can no longer be understood as forever promised or owned by any one entity on campus. The innovative, collaborative, and cooperative use of space will increasingly become an expectation. University decisions related to building renovations, and the subsequent assignment of space, are the responsibility of the President’s Cabinet reflecting their role in creating, monitoring, and adjusting the master plan for the University’s development. The President’s Cabinet always welcomes innovative suggestions regarding the use of space on campus, particularly as they continue to investigate strategic locations to meet student, faculty, and program needs.”

Kent Murray (CLASS) asked, in the event of a planned move, shouldn’t there be some sort of plan as to where to relocate classrooms and office space? This situation underscores the importance of strategic
planning. In addition, problems with communication are evident. “Our impression is from our Dean-level down that okay, we’re getting cut six classrooms and losing office space for faculty, but there has been no strategic plan as to where they’re going to go. We have to opt for whatever might be available some place even though the fall schedule is already in. There hasn’t been a direct answer to the impact of this shift on strategic planning.”

Jean Bartels (Provost) responded that “plans are underway to find not only space, but significant space for the relocation of several of the labs. We’re working right now on looking at some strategic usage patterns in a couple of areas to assure that that would be a good place to relocate the labs areas, classroom lab areas, which are the biggest concern, I believe. There is no plan to relocate anything else. Everybody else will be staying in that facility for this moment.”

Kent Murray (CLASS) asked if the moves would be to temporary classrooms and if Provost Bartels could confirm that Communication Arts would lose some faculty offices on the second floor as well

Jean Bartels (Provost) emphasized that this is “a process that will happen over time. It will not happen imminently. It will happen as the growth of the College of Graduate Studies and primarily the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs grow, so I don’t anticipate that happening for a period of time.”

Kent Murray (CLASS) asked if there was any long-range planning taking place that would give Communication Arts a permanent location. Jean Bartels (Provost) responded, “[T]hat planning is being considered at the moment.”

Kent Murray (CLASS) requested that the Department Chair and faculty be more involved in the process, particularly with the logistics of moving.

Clara Krug (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee asked if faculty members had suggestions about the usage of space, to whom they should submit them. President Keel responded that suggestions should go to department chairs, who would move these suggestions up the line.

e. **Request for Information: Using Education & General (E&G) Funds to Pay for Faculty Meals during a Job Candidate’s Visit:** Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) submitted this request. “What is the origin of the rule that E&G funds cannot be used to pay for faculty meals during a job candidate visit? Is this rule a Georgia Southern rule? Is this rule a BOR rule?” And the rationale for the RFI was: “When a department conducts a faculty search we routinely ask faculty
members to accompany the candidate to meals as part of the interview process. It seems to me in those circumstances the faculty are acting on behalf of the university. However, E&G funds cannot be used to reimburse the faculty for their meals. Departments are supposed to pay for these meals using foundation money. (Of course a good alternative would be to take the candidate to lunch in Orlando. In that case we can pay for the mileage and meals with E&G funds.) As it turns out, the rule that faculty meals cannot be paid from E&G funds is the result of another rule. That one states that faculty cannot be reimbursed for meals unless they are absent from campus for 8 hours. I hope someone has a really fantastic explanation why these are the rules and who made them.”

The Senate Executive Committee approved the Request for Information and sent it to Vice President Ron Core. Vice President Ron Core sent it to Kim Brown, Controller, Georgia Southern University, who responded: “Dr. Gibbison, Sorry for the delay in responding to your question forwarded to me by Dr. Ron Core. In response to your specific questions, see below: What is the origin of the rule that E&G funds cannot be used to pay for faculty meals during a job candidate visit? Reply: The rule is based on State policy managed by the State Accounting Office (SAO). This basic policy is required of all State agencies of which the University System of Georgia is included. It basically states the requirements when on travel status that employees may be reimbursed for meals. The down side of this state wide policy is that it does not address the more unique operating environment of higher education. This is an issue that we struggle with frequently. No this is not a Georgia Southern rule. It is a State wide policy of which the [Board of Regents] BOR is required to comply, as is Georgia Southern. However, given the fact that some of our operations are unique to higher education the BOR has been granted approval by the SAO for a few variances. One exception is an additional policy when employee food can be paid when not on travel status. Unfortunately, this exception was designed for paying employee meals for certain situations, but faculty/employee interviews is not one of the exceptions. These policies may be found on the BOR web site at http://www.usg.edu/business_procedures_manual/. Unfortunately, there is no one policy covering all. You can find applicable policies in the sections on travel and miscellaneous. Let me know if you have other questions.”

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked the deans and President Keel if there was a way to include the reasonable costs of dining with candidates in the overall budgeting process for searches. Pointing out that she spent $171 of her own money on a recent successful search, she expressed concern about the discrepancies in the way reimbursements are handled, with some faculty on campus getting reimbursed and others not.
Brooks Keel (President) acknowledged the problem with state law and stated that this is the purpose of college and departmental Foundation Accounts. He explained that this is why he is eager to launch “a capital campaign, to try and help provide those funds.” A capital campaign would not only provide funds for scholarships and endowed professorships, but it could also be used for operating expenses and things not funded by state funds. “Unfortunately, the Foundation just does not have the resources at this point in time to be able to set aside funds like that. We’d love to be able to do so. We’d love to be able to provide Deans with a fairly large amount of flexible money that they could use for a number of things that the state of Georgia just won’t allow us to pay for.” He pointed out that it’s important to understand “that some of these arcane rules are not ours – meaning Georgia Southern’s – and in many cases not the Board of Regents. They are [from] the State of Georgia ...and that’s the beast we have to live with.” President Keel expressed sympathy for the difficult situation, saying it was the best we can do.

f. **Response to an SEC Inquiry about the Absence of an Eagle Alert during an Incident at the Russell Union**: Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) noted that during the last week in February, there was an incident involving threatening behavior at the Russell Union. Krug asked Christian Flathman, Director of Marketing and Communications, why faculty members did not receive an Eagle Alert. He responded that 1) typically an Eagle Alert is issued because of “an immediate threat,” 2) Public Safety Officers had investigated the incident and had determined that there was no immediate threat, 3) if we would like we may contact Mike Russell, head of Public Safety, for additional information.

g. **Election of a Senator to the Medical Leave Assistance Plan Committee**: After consulting with Parliamentarian Bob Cook, to determine that no election was required for a senator to serve on the Medical Leave Assistance Plan Committee, Moderator Krug (CLASS) met with the SEC to discuss the nomination of Senator Michelle Reidel (COE) to serve on the committee. Moderator Krug (CLASS) contacted Senator Reidel (COE) to confirm her willingness to serve. The SEC expressed appreciation to Senator Reidel for volunteering to serve.

h. **Nomination of Senate Secretary and Senate Librarian**: Moderator Krug (CLASS) announced that the Senate Secretary and Senate Librarian will nominations and elections will take place next month. She asked senators to consult the *Faculty Handbook* about the responsibilities of each position. She asked senators to spread the word and let her know of any potential candidates.
Moderator Clara Krug, Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, (CLASS) asked if anyone had questions concerning the SEC Report. Hearing none, the Faculty Senate moved on to the next agenda item.

6. **Report from the Senate Elections Committee: Pat Humphrey (COST):**
Pat Humphrey reported that only the Library has completed its election process, while the other colleges are still in the elections phase. She asked members of the Faculty Senate to persuade their colleagues to volunteer to serve on the Faculty Senate and Senate committees.

Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) added that the personal touch often works. “[I]f you know of somebody in your college who seems to have a special interest and concern for faculty issues, ….ask them if they would let you put their names in nomination.” This has worked in the past.

7. **Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance: Richard Flynn (CLASS):**
Richard Flynn (CLASS), Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance, reported that committee members met again to revise the wording of the second recommendation in order that it might be presented as a motion today. Near the end of Spring break, he met with Provost Bartels and President Keel to discuss the motion as well. The revised motion states:

“For colleges that currently do not have bylaws for the college, we move that each of these colleges elect two members from each department or if a college does not have departments that faculty elect representation to an executive/governance committee and that the dean of each of these colleges charge this committee with writing the bylaws which would then be approved by the Dean, Provost and President. These bylaws must then be ratified by the faculty of the college in accordance with the existing procedures for implementing new bylaws or bylaws changes.

In order to ensure consistency in governance throughout the University, these bylaws shall include the establishment of a faculty-elected executive/governance committee within each college that will work in a spirit of consultation and cooperation with the Dean. Such committees exist in the College of Business Administration, the College of Information Technology and in the College of Education. At a minimum, college executive/governance committees shall be elected by the faculty, chaired by a faculty member, and conduct its meetings according to Robert’s Rules of Order. The committee shall serve as a liaison with the dean, administrate along with the dean bylaws changes, and facilitate along with the dean the operation of standing committees of the college.”

Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) asked for discussion. Pat Humphrey (COST) asked about colleges that already have bylaws that don’t provide for such an executive governance committee. This is the case in COST.
Senate Parliamentarian Bob Cook (CIT) Senate Parliamentarian responded that, as he understands it, the COST faculty voted to have a research proposal submission guideline as part of tenure and promotion. “That then trumps the departmental guidelines in essence because it was passed by the faculty of the college. So my interpretation would be that if the Faculty Senate voted that the colleges would have such and such a provision as part of their bylaws that would have the same effect and would require the college to add that provision, but where you added it and you know how the language works would be within the spirit of what was recommended.”

Tim Teeter (CLASS) made several recommendations as a self-confessed “grammar fanatic.” The language of the motion should read: “and conduct its their meetings according to Roberts Rules of Order.” The following sentence should read, “The Each ... rather than the committee.” Chair Richard Flynn (CLASS) agreed to those changes.

Hearing no further discussion, Moderator Krug (CLASS) called for a vote. Motion #2, as revised and approved by the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance, passed unanimously. Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked if the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance could be discharged from its duties. Moderator Krug agreed and discharged the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance.

President Keel expressed “great appreciation” for the committee’s hard work in putting these motions together. Saying this was neither “an easy nor [a] trivial task,” President Keel stated that the motions reflect the committee members’ dedication. “It shows not only a great deal of patience, but a great deal of respect for the office which I’m greatly appreciative.”

Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) noted that the “Senate Executive Committee will work together to decide where to insert all four motions in the Faculty Handbook. That will appear as a motion at the April meeting.”

8. Report from the SGA Liaison: Bruce McLean (COST): Bruce McLean (COST) reported that the SGA met three times since the last meeting of the Faculty Senate. In that time, the SGA swore in fourteen new Senators, studied the HOPE changes, discussed a Green Fee for students, approved student fund requests for approximately $7200. The sixth Jack Nolen Scholarship winners were announced and Councilman John Riggs met with President Standifer to discuss holding town hall meetings on campus for his constituents. Ten senators volunteered to work with Campus Life Enrichment Committee. All faculty and staff were invited to lunch during Alpha week before spring break.
9. Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS):
Chris Geyerman (CLASS) noted that there were three students from Georgia Southern nominated for the Southern Conference Scholarships. One of the three, Jake Ware, won and he will be recognized at the Honors Banquet in May. Jake Ware has been accepted to graduate school at Denver and Texas A&M. Please congratulate Jake if you see him.

10. Unfinished Business
Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked if there was a way to change the reimbursement rules pertaining to faculty expenses incurred during searches. President Keel responded that these rules were not from the BOR, but really come from the state, most likely the Office of Budget and Finance. This would be most difficult to change. Moderator Krug (CLASS) noted that Kim Thompson’s response made reference to this several times.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) responded that it is curious that the IRS will recognize receipts from dinners with candidates as a valid business expense, but the State of Georgia won’t. Moderator Krug (CLASS) suggested that Dr. Haberland contact the State Accounting Office.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) responded that this was an issue that had a significant impact on faculty, particularly those who earn smaller salaries. She noted that some colleges have bigger Foundation Accounts than others, resulting in a situation where some faculty get reimbursed and others do not. “Faculty [pay these out-of-pocket] expenses out …their dedication to Georgia Southern University. It’s really unfortunate that this continues to happen” and that the disparity among colleges persists.”

11. New Business:

SACS
Provost Jean Bartels discussed the status of the SACS Fifth-Year Report. The report is in the very final stages and will be sent off soon. Provost Bartels thanked the folks in Information Technology for their help. She expects to have a very positive result, noting the one area where Georgia Southern will designate itself as non-compliant. “We felt that it was important for us to be truthful about where we were with …[Section] 3.3.31, the area [that concerns] student learning outcomes, the assessment of same, and the use of findings to improve programs and curricula. We have done a terrific amount of work in moving the process forward, with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and through the efforts of everyone here, as well as those of your colleges and college colleagues. [Still], we are immature … in our ability to deliver results of assessments and show evidence in all cases of how that assessment has been used to create improvement in our programming.” As a result, we will likely be asked to do a one-year follow up report for SACS. If that follow-up report isn’t strong, we could “be looking at the potential for probation by SACS which, of course, no one wants to see happen. Again, I would like to just say that we have made gigantic steps forward; we still
Provost Bartels also announced that the Quality Enhancement Program (QEP) is back on the table. This is part of the SACS review process. Provost Bartels noted that Georgia Southern was on the cutting edge in creating QEPs. Our QEP was called Student Engagement and included the First Year Experience initiative as well as other elements. “We are at the fifth-year report; we are obligated to give what’s essentially our final report on this particular QEP. ....We have had good evidence for what we’ve accomplished and the promise of moving forward with maintaining those efforts.” Oversight for the QEP process was required and Provost Bartels assembled a QEP Oversight Committee that will be charged with discussing the QEP with faculty and staff and others. The committee will also create identify future directions for the QEP. Additional information will be forthcoming at the Spring General Faculty Meeting.

**General Education**

Provost Bartels also discussed the need to reconsider the role of General Education. In conjunction with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, the Academic Affairs Committee is “in the process of creating a [General Education] Council that will oversee and look and study what we’re doing with General Education. The committee will have representation from each of the colleges, with additional people from places that play a large role in General Education Courses. Provost Bartels noted that this group would work closely with the Faculty Senate. She stressed the need to look at General Education in a systematic way, paying particular attention to the learning outcomes. She added, “What makes this a priority for right now is that we are going to have some requirement to report on this for our next SACS visit, [specifically identifying] what we are doing with General Education, how we assess it, how we have used outcomes... to actually make improvements in General Education.” The composition of the committee is not complete, but at this time it is comprised entirely of faculty and represents faculty across the university. She noted that it is important to include faculty who may not teach in the core, for they “receive the products of our General Education” in their upper-division courses.

**12. Announcements: Vice Presidents**

None.

**13. Announcements from the Floor**
On behalf of the SEC, Moderator and Chair Clara Krug (CLASS) thanked Provost Jean Bartels for working with the committee so well and so openly.

14. Adjournment
Voting Members in Attendance: (William Amponsah for Michael Reksulak); Yasar Bodur; Tom Buckley; Jennie Dilworth; Olivia Edenfield; Ming Fang He; Bob Fernekes; Patricia Humphrey; Bob Jackson; Youakim Kalaani; Clara Krug; Ron MacKinnon; Brenda Marina; Mary Marwitz; (M.L. for Bruce McLean); Kent Murray; Frederic Mynard; John O’Malley; Teri Ann Melton; Lowell Mooney; Michelle Reidel; Norman Schmidt; Jim Stephens; Stuart Tedders; Timothy Teeter; Laura Valeri; Pat Walker; (Jamie Woods for Michelle Haberland); Bill Yang; Rob Yarbrough

Voting Members Absent: Barry Balleck; Marie Botkin; Amy Boyett; Marc Cyr; Christian Gibson/Alton Standifer, Dena Hale; Todd Hall; Sonya Huber; Julie Maudlin; Sze-man Ngai; Patricia Price; Steve Rossi; Donna Saye; Debra Sinclair; Debra Skinner; Don Stallings; Caren Town; Mark Welford, Theresa Welford; Patrick Wheaton; Jonathan Zhang; Chunshan Zhao

Administrators in Attendance: Brooks Keel; Billy Griffis; Ted Moore; Bede Mitchell; Tony Bretti; Charles Hardy; Jean Bartels; Michael Smith

Visitors: Simone Charles; Candace Griffith; Kathy Albertson; Jayne Perkins Brown; Dick Diebolt

1. Approval of the Agenda for the April 18, 2011, Meeting:

Clara Krug (Senate Moderator) welcomed the Faculty Senate and noted that there was an additional item to add to the agenda. There was a motion to approve the agenda, it was seconded and approved.

2. Approval of the March 22, 2011, Minutes: Rob Yarbrough (COST) for Michelle Haberland (CLASS), Secretary

Filling in for Michelle Haberland (CLASS), Rob Yarbrough (COST) moved that the Faculty Senate approve the minutes from the March 22nd meeting. The minutes were approved.

3. Librarian’s Report of April 18, 2011: Pat Humphrey (COST), Senate Librarian

Pat Humphrey (COST) made a motion to accept the Senate Librarian’s Report from April 2011, recognizing that the Senate is only accepting that the committees have reported their information truly and factually. The Librarian’s Report of April 18th was approved.

Comment [GM1]: I was there until about 4:45 when I had to leave for my 5 PM class.
a. **Report from the Undergraduate Committee**: Ron MacKinnon (CIT)
Ron MacKinnon (CIT) provided “a summary of the summary” of the Undergraduate Committee Report.
- In CLASS, the committee approved two course announcements, two selected topics from the Department of Communication Arts and two new courses from the History Department.
- In COST, the committee approved one revised program in Biology and four revised programs for Chemistry. The committee approved one new course in Construction Management and Civil Engineering.

b. **Report from the Graduate Committee**: Bob Fernekes (Library):
Bob Fernekes (Library) noted that the Librarian’s Report includes the approved Graduate Committee Minutes from the March 10th meeting. The meeting began with the Dean’s Update.

Under new business the committee approved:
- nine new courses and one course revision from the Department of Chemistry, eight new courses from the Department of Physics, and a new Master of Science in Physical Science for COST;
- one new course from the Department of History, and five new courses and a new program from the Department of Political Science for CLASS;
- a program revision, for the M.Ed. in Teaching and Learning for COE;
- and an information item pertaining to full-time/part-time enrollment classification from the MS in Applied Economics for COBA.

Dr. Patterson thanked members of the scholarship subcommittee and announced that eight additional scholarships were funded by the Averitt Foundation in the amount of $1,000 each. The meeting adjourned at 8:47 a.m.

Bob Fernekes (Library) made a motion to approve the report. The Graduate Committee Report was approved.

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

**Budget**
President Keel reported that both the House and Senate have passed their budgets, which included “full-funding for our new Biology building.” Previously, the university received $15 million for Phase I of the construction and the current bill includes $22 million for Phase II of the construction of the new Biology building. President Keel is “guardedly optimistic” that the Governor will sign the budget bill and hopes to have groundbreaking scheduled for some time this summer. Updates to follow.

President Keel noted that this success was the result of “a tremendous amount of support from our legislative delegation: Senator Jack Hill, Representative Jan Tankersley, Butch Parrish, and Jon Burns.” They deserve many thanks for their support of Georgia Southern. President Keel reported, “We had the highest, the largest amount of capital outlay in the entire University System of Georgia for the second year in a row.”
With regard to the rest of the budget, Georgia Southern will receive an 8 percent decrease of state funding across the board with no increase in formula funding. The Board of Regents will meet Tuesday and Wednesday of this week and discuss tuition and fees. President Keel expects a small increase intuition and “an increase in the fees that are assessed across the University System of Georgia.” Updates to follow.

**HOPE Scholarship**
President Keel reported that there would be “dramatic changes” to the HOPE Scholarship. These changes are necessary, given “the fact that without these changes HOPE Scholarship would be bankrupt in a matter of a couple of years.” President Keel gave the Governor “credit for having the courage to tackle that issue. And I think 90 percent of HOPE for most of our students is better than 0 percent of HOPE, and we’ll have to just see down the road what impact it has on us.”

**Chancellor Search**
President Keel reported that he believes most of the airport interviews have taken place for the Chancellor Search. The Board of Regents will meet mid-month to interview, so an announcement about the finalist(s) should be forthcoming relatively soon.

**Commencement**
President Keel discussed Commencement, stating that it is, “without question, the most exciting day we have as a University community.” This year the university will have separate commencement ceremonies for graduate and undergraduate degrees. President Keel noted that the growth of the undergraduate programs made it too unwieldy for one ceremony. Moreover, the number of graduate degrees conferred has grown as well and “warrants its own ceremony.” He announced that Dan Cathy, an alumni and President and COO of Chick-fil-A, would serve as the Commencement Speaker this year for the undergraduate ceremony. President Keel predicted that Dan Cathy will provide “great motivational benefit for our students.” President Keel explained that Dean Patterson has been working on the new graduate ceremony and that Chris Clark, President of the Georgia Chamber of Commerce and alumni of Georgia Southern, will be the commencement speaker for the Graduate ceremony.

President Keel concluded his report, saying that there are “a variety of other issues that will need to be discussed, …not the least of which are Retention, Progression, and Graduation, Research, Graduate enrollment, and space.” The Provost will discuss some of those issues in his report.

4. **Provost’s Report:** Ted Moore, Provost:
Provost Moore began his report by highlighting some of the issues we will be discussing “in the weeks and months ahead.”

- Leadership decisions for certain academic units
- Space planning
- Program and course assessment
- Graduate enrollment
- Online course tuition and fees
- Retention and graduation
• Grading policies
• Shared Governance

Provost Moore provided the Faculty Senate with an updates on “leadership decisions in the academic units.”

• The College of Public Health has a permanent Dean Search underway with the committee being led by Dr. Bede Mitchell. Provost Moore expressed appreciation for Dr. Mitchell’s efforts and praised the work of the committee. Noting that Dean Hardy will leave before the search committee can complete its work, Provost Moore expressed appreciation for Dr. Mitchell’s efforts and praised the work of the committee. Noting that Dean Hardy will leave before the search committee can complete its work, so it was necessary to appoint an interim dean. “As you may know, we’ve solicited from the faculty of the College of Public Health suggestions, recommendations for interim Dean and I have received those and I’m analyzing them now. And in the next few days I will be discussing that with the President and we will get back to the college. I will probably go and visit the college either late this week or early next week with a decision.”

• Dean Tom Koballa (COE) will head the search committee for the Dean of the College of Information Technology. “We are asking faculty to submit recommendations from the College for membership on the committee and in addition we will solicit and have solicited college staff representation, student government, and the Graduate Student Organization plus one member of the community.” As things come together, Provost Moore will provide the faculty with updates. He also noted that both searches are national in scope and “will be aided by recruiting firms.”

• Dr. Trey Denton (COBA) is heading the search committee for a new Director of the Center for International Studies. Dr. Nancy Shumaker, Assistant Vice President and Director of the Center for International Studies, is retiring and will be “difficult to replace.”

Provost Moore then discussed issues related to space, resource planning and allocation, and, as a subset, physical facilities. President Keel has asked Provost Moore to work with the President’s Cabinet, the Council of Deans, and the Senate Executive Committee to recommend the composition of a team that will have a three-fold charge:

1) they will be asked to examine and propose solutions to strategic space allocation problem, okay, strategic level questions;
2) they will be asked to draft and recommend a University policy on space and facilities planning and allocation; and
3) they will take responsibility for communicating to and from respective constituents.

Provost Moore has drafted a plan that will circulate among the Deans, the Cabinet and the Senate Executive Committee. It will then be submitted to the President for his consideration. “The principles that guide the composition of that team are, I hope, becoming familiar, and that is it will be inclusive. The activities will be transparent, and the team will be representative.”
Provost Moore reported that the “current draft calls for the team to include the Provost, the Chief Financial Officer, Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Research, the Registrar, representative of the Council of Deans, the Vice President for Information Technology, Facilities Director, Student Government, and of course the Faculty Senate.” Updates will follow “in the very near future.”

Graduate Enrollment
Graduate enrollment is “an area of strategic emphasis. As we continue to expand our research dimension, graduate enrollment must go along with it.” Provost Moore noted that the “new MS program in Physical Sciences as well as the Executive MBA will help” in that direction. As a side note, he announced that the EMBA program will go before the Regents tomorrow for approval. …We don’t expect a lot of opposition.”

In response to the President’s request for “improved tools for forecasting and management enrollments and graduate programs, …Dr. Charles Patterson, Vice President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies, has worked with the Office of Strategic Research and Analysis and Student Affairs to develop and calibrate a prediction model. A prototype is being reviewed and assessed now and the model will allow us, essentially to rely more appropriately on hard data, but at the same time remembering we need to be able to temper that with some objective judgments, and to bring in factors that are outside the model. …We’ll be using that in the very near future and I want to acknowledge the cooperation that we’ve seen from our office, Academic Affairs, also the Vice President for Research and the Vice President for Student Affairs.” Provost Moore continued, “Armed with tools like this, …we will be visiting a lot of work that has been done in the past, but this time with some more data driving the analysis.”

Program Assessment
Provost Moore began the discussion of Program Assessment by noting that is a “complex area” that gets more “interesting” as days go by. “‘Interesting’ is a euphemism, by the way, for very complicated and hard. When we say a problem is ‘interesting’ in economics that means no one in the profession knows how to solve it.” Provost Moore noted that there are two standing committees of the Senate, the Graduate and Undergraduate committees, with charges that include the “review of programs and courses.” There are also “some ad hoc committees and task forces assigned to do various aspects of program assessment, answering specific questions about programs.” Provost Moore would like to work with the faculty “to engage [these] standing committees in a systematic program assessment and, in a sense, migrate away from the ad hoc committee structure that we created, largely by necessity.” Noting that this would be complicated task requiring coordination of several offices, Provost Moore “pledged …that we will provide that coordination [and the necessary] data support.” The standing committees will be given “a very specific charge.” From Provost Moore’s perspective, “this is very clearly within the spirit of Shared Governance, as the committee members are elected to the Faculty Senate. He and Dr. Zerwas, Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness, will work with the Senate Executive Committee and the Graduate and Undergraduate Committees on the details.

Online Courses
Provost Moore noted that the President has established the Task Force on Online Learning which is developing “a policy for pricing undergraduate courses taught fully online. We do not have consistency right now, and we need an algorithm.” Steve Burrell, Vice President for Information Technology, has been working on this. “We’re now examining different scenarios and sharing rules, if you will, within the University to achieve a balance …between charging enough to support quality operations, but at the same time keeping our prices competitive and reasonable. So, we think we’ve identified some feasible solutions to this and we’ll be working on this over the next 72 hours or so.”

Grading Policy, Retention, and Graduation
Provost Moore recognized that concern has been voiced about grading policy, retention, and graduation. He emphasized that “It’s important to draw a line between using grade distributions as a diagnostic tool to determine if learning is succeeding and how well it’s succeeding versus declaring some form of quotas on grades. Clearly, [faculty] use grade distributions [themselves] as diagnostics…” He noted that, “student success is a very highly complex process …that defies simple diagnoses and simple remedies. But, of course, that doesn’t let us off the hook. The fact that it’s hard doesn’t mean I can go to the President and say well, we just can’t solve this one, sir. I don’t think he would find that acceptable. Clearly, student success is linked intimately to retention and graduation rates in a very complex way. My office is working with the Office of Student Affairs to re-examine what we already know, the data we’ve already collected about retention and graduation, [to develop] some institution-wide plans to do what we can to influence these metrics positively. Notice, I said do what we can. Clearly, there are aspects of retention over which we have little or no control, such as the economy and personal financial circumstances. But let’s work together to get a handle on those things we can influence which are many and do our best. Of course, our students and their families deserve that and so do we. And I believe I would speak for all of us in the room even without knowing you well that all of us want the best level of student success we can achieve. So, we’ll be working on this a lot in the coming weeks and months and we’ll appreciate very much the Senate’s help.”

Other Issues
Provost Moore discussed the relationship between shared governance and the development of strategic planning and budgeting. In the future, he sees “opportunities …for stronger linkage between the planning, budgeting and resource allocation. The term “resource” refers to space, people and money. Assessment will play a key role in telling us “how we’re doing on achieving our goals and objectives. …So assessment, planning and budgeting will become much more prominent in the academic sector of the University in the very near future.”

There will also be some discussion about promotion and tenure, our research agenda and how to advance the institution. “These are very, very big topics. …And all of these major issues have something in common and that is they are rich in faculty engagement. They have to be in order to succeed. And I pledge to you that you will be fully engaged. The President and I recognize absolutely that the Senate is the voice of the faculty of Georgia Southern University. And that’s very important. We will work with you always.”
Provost Moore also noted that in his first few weeks on campus, he has had a chance to “witness some of that magic that I detected when I walked the campus for the first time. The Undergraduate Research program is simply remarkable. I’ve seen it at other institutions and you have a lot to be proud of at Georgia Southern. Students are amazing. They’re charged. They’re excited. They’re filled with the spirit of inquiry, and they’ve got a faculty who are dedicated and capable, who in many cases are mentoring five and six students at a time. Remarkable.” Provost Moore praised the “superb creative achievement and accomplishment at Georgia Southern,” noting the success of the recent Evening of the Arts. Provost Moore also mentioned that he had a very productive discussion with Senate Executive Committee. Provost Moore concluded by asking for questions.

Ming Fang He (COE) brought up the search for the Director for International Education. Professor He praised Nancy Shumaker’s dedication and noted the important role of international faculty at Georgia Southern. Concerning the search for a new director, she asked Provost Moore if there was “a mechanism to affirm diversity of the search in terms of the enactment of affirmative action” that would engage “women, people of color, and cultural workers who hold international/transnational/cross national knowledge competence?” Specifically, she asked about the diversity of the search committee. Provost Moore appreciated the question. He said he would “get an answer for you. I’ll go back and find out how the committee was charged and I’ll come back to you and all of the Senate on that.”

Given the time in the semester, Tim Teeter (CLASS) asked Provost Moore if an interim director would be appointed. Provost Moore responded that he expected the search committee to bring candidates on campus in August. Dean Jean Bartels (CHHS) stated that it was her understanding that the search would conclude sooner than that, perhaps in July, “but if that isn’t the case, we were prepared to select an interim director.” Provost Moore agreed that there will “almost certainly” be an interim director.

Kent Murray (CLASS) asked for “clarification on [the] space utilization committee.” Specifically, he asked how the representation from the Faculty Senate would work” Noting that there was academic representation through the Council of Deans and the Provost’s Office, Provost Moore expects one Senator to represent the Faculty Senate.

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

   a. Approval of Actions Taken at the March 22, 2011, Meeting: Chair Clara Krug (CLASS) announced that Dr. Keel had approved the actions of the Graduate Committee as recorded in the minutes of February 10, 2011. He also approved the actions of the Undergraduate Committee as recorded in the minutes of February 8, 2011 and Resolution #2 presented to the Senate by Dr. Richard Flynn, chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance. Noting the importance of these resolutions and actions to faculty members, Chair Krug expressed appreciation to President Keel.
c. **Request for Information: The Grade of “D” in Core Classes:** Robert Costomiris (CLASS)

Professor Robert Costomiris (CLASS) requested information about the Grade of “D” in Core Classes. Specifically, “Why does the university consider that the grade of "D" indicates the successful completion of most core classes? Who established this policy? How long has this policy been in effect? Does the university think that this policy is in the best interests of students and the university?”

The rationale behind this request read as follows: “Getting a ‘D’ in any course is not usually considered a sign of success. In some core classes and in all major classes, the grade of ‘C’ is required because a ‘C’ is considered to be synonymous with ‘satisfactory,’ i.e., that the student who gets a ‘C’ has demonstrated the ‘required mastery of the material’ (to quote the old print version of the GSU catalog). The grade of ‘D’, by implication, is not satisfactory and implies that the student’s grasp of the material covered in the course is ‘minimal.’ If GSU is really trying to educate the citizens of Georgia, why do we accept unsatisfactory work in some of our core classes?” The question had already been raised during a meeting of the Liberal Arts & Social Sciences Faculty Advisory Board.

The Senate Executive Committee accepted the request for information and forwarded it to Mike Deal, who is the University Registrar. The response, dated April 14, 2011, read as follows:

Dr. Costomiris,

In response to your questions, please see below:

1. Why does the university consider that the grade of “D” indicates the successful completion of most core classes?

   Reply: Georgia Southern, as a member of the University System of Georgia, uses the grading policy described below in the Board of Regents’ Policy Manual and Board of Regents’ Academic Affairs Handbook at the following links. (The links are available at the SharePoint website, provided that SharePoint is cooperating.)

   **Board of Regents’ Policy Manual**
   All USG institutions shall be on a 4.00 grade point average system, calculated to and truncated at two significant digits.

   The following grades are approved for use in institutions in the determination of the Grade Point Average:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Grade Point Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Excellent (4.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Good (3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Satisfactory (2.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provided that native and transfer students are treated equally, institutions may impose additional reasonable expectations, such as a grade of “C” in Area A–F courses.

Georgia Southern’s core curriculum was approved by the university’s curriculum committee, Undergraduate Committee, which is a standing committee of Faculty Senate. As the core was considered for approval, minimum grades required to satisfy core curriculum were determined based on the University System policy stating that minimum grades of “C” or better may be established in Core Area A-F courses.

2. Who established this policy?

Reply: See response to question #1, basically the Board of Regents.

3. How long has this policy been in effect?

Reply: The core curriculum was revised with the conversion to the semester system in 1998 and was just recently revised to be compliant with the USG core policies effective Fall 2011.

4. Does the university think that this policy is in the best interest of students and the university?

Reply, speaking for himself: I am only able to confirm that the core curriculum requirements have been reviewed and approved by the appropriate university processes.

Clara Krug (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee, asked for questions. There being none, the meeting proceeded to the next request.

d. A Request for a Motion: Requiring Faculty to Show Evidence of Applying for External Funding for Purposes of Tenure, Promotion, Post-Tenure Review and/or Yearly Evaluations is a Violation of Academic Freedom: Georgia Southern University Chapter of the American Association of University Professors.

This request for a motion came from the Georgia Southern chapter of the AAUP. The request stated that “Requiring faculty to show evidence of applying for external funding for purposes of tenure, promotion, post-tenure review and/or yearly
evaluations is a violation of academic freedom.” Please note that the SEC revised this request to a Request for Discussion; the AAUP then withdrew its request.

**The request read as follows:** “We move that the Faculty Senate of Georgia Southern University approve the following resolution: The AAUP Resolution. Motion: We resolve the following: That requiring faculty to show evidence of applying for external funding for purposes of tenure, promotion, post tenure review and/or yearly evaluation is a violation of academic freedom. Any restriction on the kind and nature of faculty research violates the hallmark of academic inquiry, the unfettered pursuit of knowledge. Violations of Academic Freedom affect all faculty in every college.” The rationale behind the request stated that “Faculty members in all units are affected by policies for promotion and tenure.”

The SEC declined to include this as a motion, but wanted it to be included as a discussion. The President of the AAUP Chapter at Georgia Southern was informed of that decision and he indicated that the AAUP preferred that their motion be a motion and that it not be a discussion item. He then asked the SEC to withdraw the motion/discussion item from the agenda. Chair Krug stated that “the SEC had two major concerns” which would be discussed at a later point in the agenda.

1. Is it a violation of academic freedom for a college to require specific outcomes for tenure and promotion? (Please refer to The Faculty Handbook, Section 201, and to Resolutions #1–#4 presented by the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance and adopted by the Faculty Senate [on February 17 and March 22, 2011].)

2. a. When evaluating a faculty member who applies for tenure, may a department or college apply criteria other than those in place when the faculty member was hired?

   b. When evaluating a faculty member who applies for promotion, may a department or college apply criteria other than those in place when the faculty member was hired?

e. **A Resolution about Space Allocation:** The SEC

The Senate Executive Committee issued a resolution about space allocation. Chair Krug reported, “We did not intend that the Senate adopt [it]. We just wanted it to be on the record after our discussion at the previous meeting.” She expressed appreciation for Provost Moore’s attention to the issue.

The resolution reads, “The President’s Cabinet decided recently to assign to the Graduate School six classrooms in Veazey Hall that had been designated for courses offered by the Department of Communication Arts. Coming as it did after the allocation of classroom space for Fall Semester 2011 classes, this reallocation of classrooms on campus has
caused and will continue to cause problems for members of the department, students enrolled in their courses, and Dean Michael Smith:

1. They must now locate other classroom space.

2. Those classrooms may not have the special equipment currently available in Veazey Hall.

3. This situation has the potential to continue for a number of years.

As a result of this situation, the Senate Executive Committee has approved the following resolution. Be it resolved that the Senate Executive Committee requests that:

1. During Fall Semester 2011, staff of the members of the President’s Cabinet study planned use of classroom space during Spring Semester 2012, reserve six available spaces for Communication Arts classes (preferably in a single building), and provide the department chair with long-term scheduling control of these spaces.

2. At the outset, future plans regarding reallocation of classroom space and/or office space include members of the department(s) affected and their dean(s).

3. Members of those departments have time to work in a spirit of consultation and collaboration with their dean(s) and members of the President’s Cabinet to help develop and implement possible space reallocation plans.

4. The President’s Cabinet inform faculty members of the accepted hierarchy for determining which unit has priority in scheduling a room at a particular time in a particular space.”

f. The Search Process for a Permanent Dean of the College of Information Technology

Chair Krug explained that in response to a request for a member of the Faculty Senate to sit on the Search Committee for the Dean of CIT from Provost Moore, the Senate Executive Committee established a procedure for such requests. First, a memo would be sent asking interested senators to notify the Faculty Senate Moderator and provide her with a summary of “relevant experience he or she would bring to the search committee that would make him or her a valuable member.” The applications will be shared with the SEC. After ranking the candidates, the members of the SEC will select one applicant and recommend him/her to the Provost. Chair Krug also noted that neither the Faculty Senate Moderator nor the Faculty Senate Secretary can vote in this process.

Chair Krug also established a procedure for situations in which a Senate Executive Committee member wanted to apply to be on a search committee. In
these cases, the SEC member and applicant would not receive any information about the applicants at all and would not be involved in the selection process.

In accordance with those procedures, Chair Krug sent “a memorandum by email on April 12th” and shared the resulting applications with membership of the SEC. The SEC selected one applicant and recommended the Senator to Provost Moore. The SEC received applications from “three very well qualified people,” including Ron MacKinnon (CIT), Bruce McLean (COST), and John O’Malley (CIT). Chair Krug announced that Ron MacKinnon (CIT) was recommended by the Faculty Senate for participation on the search committee.

6. A Request for Discussion: Requiring Faculty Members to Submit Applications for External Grants as a Criterion for Tenure and Promotion: The SEC

Clara Krug (CLASS), Senate Moderator introduced the first question by mentioning that there “was an Academic Freedom Committee composed of faculty members in 1998” that reviewed the AAUP Redbook and developed the Preamble and the Academic Freedom statement included in the beginning of the Faculty Handbook.

1. Is it a violation of academic freedom for a college to require specific outcomes for tenure and promotion, such as writing grant proposals and receiving funding?

Frederic Mynard (COST), noting that the AAUP’s motion request was withdrawn, suggested that the current question might be too vague. He said, “Of course, requiring specific outcomes is not a problem [and] it is expected that specific outcomes are going to be requested. It doesn’t mean that any outcome should be acceptable.” He noted a possible contradiction with the shared governance resolutions passed at the last meeting in which it was made clear that tenure and promotion guidelines are established at the departmental level. “At the college level, all such guidelines should not be imposed as a blanket thing on every unit within the college.”

Pat Humphrey (COST) agreed that colleges “shouldn’t be putting down requirements that supersede our new President’s clear statement and Provost’s statement that tenure and promotion decisions belong with departmental criteria because those are the people most able to evaluate somebody’s work.” However, based on her experience in COST, the policy in her college only requires that one apply for external funding, not that they necessarily receive it. She also noted that in COST, the policy “was voted on and approved by the faculty of the college. To me that’s shared governance.”

Frederic Mynard (COST) agreed, but also pointed out that the departments establish the tenure and promotion guidelines. He said, “There are disciplines where...it is not reasonable to expect [external funding] and people are going to object to [requirements to do so].” The requirements might have received a majority of the votes in the college “even though a number of departments unanimously rejected [the college requirements to apply for external funding].”
Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) asked for an example for clarification. Mynard (COST) suggested that one compare Biology, where “it is difficult to expect any research to be done without funding,” but in Mathematics, “there is absolutely no need for funding to conduct your research, …this is something you don’t need to conduct your research.” He also pointed out that the process of applying for grants is time consuming and takes faculty away from their research.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) agreed and pointed out that there situations in COST where such requirements are actually counterproductive.

Jamie Woods (CLASS) agreed that such rules were likely counterproductive and pointed out that although he had just completed his third book, he did not receive outside funding nor had he applied.

Michelle Reidel (COE) raised concerns related to academic freedom. She suggested that the process of applying for grants requires a researcher to shape the questions in a way that satisfies external evaluators. President Brooks Keel (President) asked Professor Reidel (COE) if she was “required to publish in peer review journals?” Professor Reidel said, “Yes, and I understand that what you’re saying is that there are standards, but there is a difference between having standards in a peer review journal [and an] RFP that says it must be about this topic in order to get funding.” President Keel explained that it was his understanding that it is “not a requirement to respond to a Request For Proposals (RFP), but [a requirement] to submit a grant.” He continued, “The issue of academic freedom” pertained to whether or not “requiring external reviewers to pass judgment on whether or not your grant gets funded is a violation of academic freedom.” If it is, “then the next logical extension would be to prohibit peer review publications because the exact same thing happens here as well. You are required to get external reviewers to review your publication of research to get accepted in the journals.” Professor Reidel (COE) suggested that there was a difference, as a researcher would still have to “twist and distort what [the researcher] interested in so that it fits the RFP” as a requirement for tenure. On the other hand, peer-reviewed articles allow the researcher to frame the question as she or he sees fit. President Keel disagreed.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) pointed out that the discussion was now considering ideas that were in the AAUP’s original motion. “[A}s much as I appreciate the SEC putting the issue on the agenda, I think the specific thing we seem to be discussing now is actually this very specific policy [that was included in the original motion].” Moderator Krug (CLASS) explained that the SEC put the topic on the agenda to “see if it was narrow or broad.” Professor Yarbrough (COST) argued that “The issue is not so much about an idea of external review as it is about what specific funding agencies that fall under this external category.” He noted that there are many agencies and the COST policy is not specific, except that it has to be external. He continued to point out that there are many, many more journals than there are funding agencies. In addition, it is often unnecessary for people to receive funding in some disciplines.

Laura Valeri (CLASS) pointed out that in her field, there are many journals, but only “very, very limited [external] funding opportunities and it would certainly …hijack my
research or creative activity if I were to [apply for external funding].” She added that she thought a “a little bit disingenuous to say that we only have to apply to a grant, and not expect to get it.”

Pat Walker (CLASS) echoed Professor Yarbrough’s points, saying that there are “many vehicles for [faculty] to get external reviews of the research that they do. …[T]he question is, if one has to…apply for a grant, then you have to focus your research…on what could perhaps receive a grant.” The situation is different for external reviews, a process which “doesn’t really change the content of what people are focusing their research on.”

Tim Teeter (CLASS) brought up academic freedom, making a distinction between a discussion about a specific tenure and promotion policy versus the broader dimensions of the discussion. Perhaps this is just “not a good policy?” he asked.

Fred Mynard (COST) added that the conversation has compared grant proposals and peer-reviewed journal articles, “but the grant proposal is not the actual research, so there is a fundamental difference between the actual research being reviewed and reviewing your project of potential research.” Moreover, he pointed out that faculty are in favor of externally-supported research, but “there are cases where forcing people to seek external support is not supporting the research. It is counterproductive to what is actually produced because it takes time away with no reasonable positive output to envision.” In this way, it is related to academic freedom, “because the time that is devoted to your research…[is taken away] to fill in the box, [to] push papers to produce some kind of grant proposal. …[T]he result might be that in many cases something very mediocre is produced simply for the sake of [a requirement]. This not something that we should be happy with.”

Based on his experience on the Faculty Research Committee, Norman Schmidt (COST) appreciated that the requirements for what is required for research varied greatly from department to department and college to college. While noting the concerns regarding academic freedom, he also pointed out that the Office of Research Services provides assistance to faculty who are in search of external funding. He said, “[W]e don’t want to limit academic freedom, but we want to promote research to the fullest extent here at Georgia Southern.”

2. a. When evaluating a faculty member who applies for tenure, may a department or college apply criteria other than those in place when the faculty member was hired?

James Woods (CLASS) wondered if there might be a legal problem with changing the criteria mid-stream? Moderator Krug (CLASS) replied that the SEC did not ask the question with legal questions in mind, although she did suggest that Laura Copeland might be able to shed some light on that aspect. The SEC was more concerned with issues related to fairness.
Pat Walker (CLASS) responded that it was her understanding that the “policies in place when a person is hired would be used for their next review.” She wondered what the Faculty Handbook had to say regarding changes to the criteria at post-tenure review. Moderator Krug (CLASS) replied that the departments were now looking into the issue. Pat Humphrey (COST) suggested that this lack of clarity might be “part of the problem.” She noted that with the recent changes in leadership and the increased research expectations, “a lot of people are a little bit scared that what they’ve been doing up until now… may no longer be good enough.” She expressed concern that the standards might increase without giving faculty enough time to react. In other words, the standards are going from here to here with possibly not enough time to react.

Provost Ted Moore thanked Professor Humphrey for her concerns. He noted that this “uncertainty is something that we’re keenly aware of, and this is something that we need to address.” He stressed the importance of working with the Senate and the VP of Research to “reduce as much of this uncertainty as we can.” In response to other aspects of the discussion regarding criteria and how they might change, Provost Moore noted that the some faculty handbooks state explicitly “that you would be evaluated under the criteria that were in force at the time of hire.” However, they also state that for “subsequent promotions beyond Associate Professor, …after tenure, the rules that would be applied basically were the ones that were in force at the time the application is made.” He stated that “the courts have basically ceded that to the academic community. Noting that universities across the country are wrestling with these issues, Provost Moore promised to “to have a lot of conversation on this to improve that clarity and reduce some of the uncertainty and the anxiety that exists right now.”

Moderator Krug (CLASS) asked Provost Moore if Georgia Southern could adopt such policies for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook? Provost Moore replied, “Yes, you could. I believe you could and I believe you would be on legal grounds,” assuming that due process is observed.

b. When evaluating a faculty member who applies for promotion, may a department or college apply criteria other than those in place when the faculty member was hired?

Moderator Krug (CLASS) stated that based on the conversation taking place, it seemed that the conclusion was that “the promotion criteria might change.” Is that correct, she asked.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) replied that the bulk of the conversation regarded a situation in which “a department or college apply criteria other than those in place when the faculty member was hired.” He asked if anyone could speak to the issue of whether a department or college “may” change the criteria. Dean Mike Smith (CLASS) responded that “[Y]es, the college may. In fact, perhaps our college is the most recent to have changed its college-level tenure and promotion guidelines. Having done that last year, and we actually researched this question itself before we made those changes as to whether or not they were in extant university level policy on this question, and there is
not. And so the policy that we adopted as a college in the absence of a university policy is essentially the policy that Dr. Moore just articulated.”

Ming Fang He (COE) asked if the current criteria considered the issue of “diverse modes of inquiry in different disciplines.” She noted that prominent and influential educational theorists have had a difficult time getting external grants because their work challenged educational policy. She asked President Keel and Provost Moore to keep this in mind as they considered these issues.

Moderator Krug (CLASS) closed the discussion and reminded those in attendance that according to Robert’s Rules of Order, it is not possible to make a motion related to a discussion item at the same meeting, but it was possible at subsequent meetings.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) asked Moderator Krug if she could explain “Why the SEC decided not to approve the original AAUP motion so that people that may be considering a motion along these lines would know what to avoid in the future?” Moderator Krug (CLASS) responded that there “was an awful lot of information in the rationale about the AAUP, rather than about Georgia Southern, as I remember it.” She continued, based on the additional discussion at today’s meeting, “there might be [an opportunity for] a more refined motion” to be developed.

James Woods (CLASS) noted that “Dean Mike Smith, from my own college, pointed out very succinctly and correctly that there’s no university policy regarding tenure and promotion and thus the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences did come up with one. My question to this body is should there be a policy put out by the Faculty Senate on what is tenure and promotion?”

President Keel responded that “It seems to me that that’s already been addressed. This body put together a task force that looked at Shared Governance on this very issue. I thought they did a stellar job at putting it together and essentially what they said was that to make things consistent across the University which is what I believe you’re getting at is that each college should develop their own set of bylaws which would, in fact, be put in place by the very faculty that make up those colleges. It seems to me that we’re rehashing things that have just been evaluated and I think evaluated in an exceptionally fine form. This is a college decision to make. And as long as a particular college doesn’t come up with some bizarre circumstance in which case the Provost or I would not allow that to go forward, it should be left up to the college, the colleges. It’s in the best position to determine what’s more appropriate for their respective departments and the department’s in the best position to know within the discipline what methods should be used to reach a particular bar.”

7. **Election of the Senate Secretary (2011-2012):** Marc Cyr (CLASS) nominated

Moderator Krug (CLASS) noted that Olivia Edenfield (CLASS) had to withdraw her nomination for Senate Secretary. Marc Cyr kindly stepped in and said that he would accept the nomination. Moderator Krug asked for additional nominations from the floor.
There being none, the Faculty Senate voted for Marc Cyr to become the next Senate Secretary.

8. Election of the Senate Librarian (2011-2012): Norman Schmidt (COST) nominated

Moderator Krug (CLASS) announced that Norman Schmidt (COST) has accepted the nomination to be Senate Librarian. There being no additional nominations from the floor, Norman Schmidt was elected to be the next Senate Librarian.

9. Report from the Senate Elections Committee: Pat Humphrey (COST):

Pat Humphrey (COST) provided an update on Senate Elections, noting that there had been some problems.

- The COBA and the Library have completed their elections.
- The CHHS had one person, Dan Czech, elected to eight committees, an impossible burden. So, Dan Czech will serve on the Faculty Research and Graduate Committee and CHHS will hold another election for the remaining positions. Professor Humphrey (COST) asked CHHS faculty to please consider getting involved.
- Elections in the COST were supposed to close last Friday at 3pm. Results are still forthcoming.
- Elections in the CLASS are completed, except for one grievance alternate that didn’t get filled.
- Elections in the CIT are underway.
- The COE is having a run-off which ends this Friday.
- There is no report on elections from the College of Public Health.

10. Report from the SGA Liaison: Bruce McLean (COST):

Bruce McLean (COST) reported that “The last meeting of SGA was last Wednesday, and their closing banquet will be this Wednesday. They sponsored a town hall meeting with John Riggs, Councilman from the District, on April 12, 2011, and will host a city council meeting in the PAC tomorrow night at 6:30 p.m.”

11. Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: James Stephens (JPHCOPH) for Chris Geyerman (CLASS):

James Stephens (JPHCOPH) began by congratulating the Georgia Southern student-athletes that were named to the 2010-11 Southern Conferenced Winter Academic All-Conference Team. Those student-athletes include:

- Samantha Williams, Junior: Women's Basketball GPA 3.96 in Accounting
• Ronnesha Smith, Junior: Women's Basketball GPA 3.76 in Modern Languages
• Meredyth Frye, Sophomore: Women's Basketball GPA 3.61 Graphic Design
• Logan Youngblood, Senior: Women's Basketball GPA 3.60 Exercise Science
• Krista Tate, Senior: Women's Basketball GPA 3.56 Writing and Linguistics
• Sara Curry: Sophomore: Women's Indoor Track & Field GPA 3.48 Multimedia Communication

Professor Stephens (JPHCOPH) noted that five out of the six were on the Women’s Basketball team. He also reported that “Our swimmers are not eligible to be recognized (and many would qualify for recognition) because the Southern Conference does not sponsor swimming as a championship sport.”

The second item in Professor Geyerman’s report was an announcement that Georgia Southern is hosting the Southern Conference Softball Championship Tournament from May 11-14, 2011. “This tournament was awarded to GSU and scheduled prior to the most recent changes to the academic calendar and, as a result, will be played out during the Wednesday-Saturday of finals week. In the event colleagues voice concern, please relay that information to them.”

The third item in Professor Geyerman’s report was an announcement that “the NCAA will be releasing the APR (academic progress rate) report between now and our next meeting and he will share those data with us at our next meeting, and summarize any self-reported violations at the next Senate meeting.”

12. Unfinished Business

Moderator Clara Krug (CLASS) noted that there was an issue related to the inclusion of the previously-adopted resolutions from the Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Governance in the Faculty Handbook. “At the last Senate meeting, we realized that in order to have this included in the Handbook, the organization [would need to change, resulting in the] elimination of the words ‘recommend,’ ‘resolve,’ and ‘resolution.’” The new wording will appear in the new “Section 110.02 – College Bylaws” of the Faculty Handbook. There was a motion from the floor which was promptly seconded. Before moving to a vote, Moderator Krug noted that this motion only indicated acceptance of the new wording as reflected below. This was not a vote on the content of the resolutions, as that had already taken place at meetings in February and March. She noted that she had worked with the SEC, Senate Parliamentarian Bob Cook and Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee Richard Flynn to translate the resolutions into language that would better fit the Faculty Handbook. The new section would read as follows (in red).

Section 110.02

College Bylaws
In the spirit of shared governance, the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Provost shall set up a mechanism to provide oversight in order to ensure that Shared Governance policies are followed consistently at departmental, college, and university levels.

In order to ensure consistency in governance throughout the University, each college shall have a set of bylaws available to all faculty members. Each college will elect two members from each department, or if a college does not have departments, faculty will elect representation to an executive/governance committee, and the dean of each of these colleges will charge this committee with writing the bylaws which would then be approved by the dean, Provost, and President. These bylaws must then be ratified by the faculty of the college in accordance with the existing procedures for implementing new bylaws or bylaws changes.

These bylaws shall include the establishment of a faculty-elected executive/governance committee within each college that will work in a spirit of consultation and cooperation with the dean. At a minimum, college executive/governance committees shall be elected by the faculty and chaired by a faculty member and shall conduct their meetings according to Robert's Rules of Order. Each committee shall serve as a liaison with the dean, administer along with the dean bylaws changes, and facilitate along with the dean the operation of standing committees of the college.

All colleges of the University must have a set of bylaws posted for all faculty and staff on the college website. At a minimum these bylaws shall include:

1. Organization of the College
2. The Unit within the University
3. Committees
4. Tenure and Promotion
5. Student Organizations
6. Ratification Process and Dates

Bylaws shall be in full force when approved by a two-thirds majority of faculty members present at a general faculty meeting

7. Amendments

Proposals to amend the bylaws shall be submitted to the college faculty not later than 10 days prior to any regularly scheduled faculty meeting or any special meeting called for the purpose of amending. Proposed amendments must be adopted by a two-thirds majority of faculty members present, provided the required quorum is present at the time of voting. Bylaws changes will be made in concert with the dean and with two-thirds of eligible faculty approval.
8. Definitions and Classifications
9. Policy and Procedures Changes

Faculty in each department (or, in the case of a college without departments, elected faculty) shall create the criteria for tenure and promotion which must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the unit. These criteria shall then be approved by the department chair, the dean, the Provost, and the President. Once the criteria have been approved, they will be submitted to the faculty executive/governance committee of each college for inclusion in the bylaws of the college.

Adopted by the Faculty Senate, February 17 and March 22, 2011

John O’Malley (CIT) asked about the use of the word “faculty,” given the persistent lack of clarity as to the precise meaning of the word. He noted that there are parts that refer to “faculty” and others that refer to “tenured and tenure-track faculty.” Moderator Krug (CLASS) stated that this is “what the Senate approved. We can’t change the wording of the motion that we approved.” She also noted that language in the Faculty Handbook could be changed at a later meeting if faculty were so inclined.

Pat Humphrey (COST) noted that she had a problem with the language that called for colleges to create bylaws. Since the colleges will do that in short order, “that paragraph will become dated very quickly.” Moderator Krug responded that the Faculty Senate voted on that resolution and approved it.

The question was called and the motion passed with two dissenting votes.

13. New Business

Ming Fang He (COE) asked if it would be possible to have a report from the Georgia Southern Affirmative Action Officer to illustrate how affirmative action policies have been observed in faculty and administrative searches over the past three years? Moderator Krug suggested that Professor He submit a Request for Information.

14. Announcements: Vice Presidents

None.

15. Announcements from the Floor

None.

16. Adjournment

Non-voting: Bob Cook, Senate Parliamentarian

Voting members absent: Marie Botkin, Amy Boyett, Tom Buckley, Christine Belge/Alton Standifer, Marc Cyr, Olivia Edenfield, Amy Hackney, Dena Hale, Todd Hall, Ming Fang He, Sonya Huber, Bob Jackson, Ron MacKinnon, Mary Marwitz, Sze-Man Ngai, Laura Valeri

Administrators: Brooks Keel, Ted Moore, Marilyn Bruce, Billy Griffis, Ron Core,

Visitors: Kathy Albertson, Candace Griffith, Bret Danilowicz, Dick Diebolt, Mike Smith, Stephen Zerwas

1. Approval of the June 8, 2011, Meeting: Clara Krug (CLASS) Senate Moderator: Clara Krug (CLASS) recognized Ginger Malphrus for her hard work on behalf of the Faculty Senate. The Senate Executive Committee is especially appreciative of Ginger’s support over this last year.

A motion to approve the June 8, 2011 meeting agenda was passed.

2. Approval of the April 18, 2011, Minutes: Michelle Haberland (CLASS), Senate Secretary: Michelle Haberland (CLASS) moved that the minutes from the April 18, 2011 meeting of the Faculty Senate be approved, noting that Professor Robert Jackson was incorrectly listed as not attending.

3. Librarian’s Report of June 8, 2011: Pat Humphrey (COST), Senate Librarian: Pat Humphrey (COST) introduced the Librarian’s Report.

   a. Report from the Undergraduate Committee: Bruce McLean (COST): At the April 12, 2011 meeting of the Undergraduate Committee meeting, members approved:
• 13 new courses;
• 20 course revisions;
• 25 new or revised programs;
• four course deletions, and
• Course revisions for FYE 1410 and 1410 Honors-Global Citizens.

The Undergraduate Committee report was approved.

b. Report from the Graduate Committee: Bob Fernekes (Library): The Librarian Report includes the approved Graduate Committee minutes from the April 14th meeting. The meeting began with the Dean’s update at 8:00 a.m. Under new business, the committee approved the following changes.

COST
• Biology course deletion;
• three new mechanical and electrical engineering courses;
• and changes in the Master of Science in Applied Engineering degree for COST;

CHHS
• a new Nursing capstone and selected topics courses;
• a new Nurse educator certificate, and
• updates to MSN and DNP information for the College of Health and Human Sciences;

CLASS
• a Music selected topics course update;
• three new Psychology courses;
• four new Writing and Linguistics courses;
• graduate certificate in Teaching English to speakers of other languages, and
• a new Women’s and Gender Study course for CLASS

COPH
• two new courses;
• ten revised courses, and
• five revised programs for the College of Public Health

COE
• two new courses;
• six course deletions;
• three revised courses;
• five revised programs, and
• the online Teaching and Learning endorsement for the College of Education.
In addition, Dr. Zerwas discussed the role of WEAVEonline as the institutional application to document institutional effectiveness and academic outcomes. Handouts are included in the minutes. There was no old business and the meeting adjourned at 9:05 a.m.

The Graduate Committee Minutes were approved.

4. President’s Report: Brooks Keel: President Keel provided an update on several topics.

Biological Sciences Building
President Keel announced the groundbreaking for the new Biological Sciences Building at 8:30 a.m. the following day across the street from the Nursing and Education Buildings. He noted that he was especially happy to participate in the groundbreaking, given these difficult economic times. Governor Deal and First Lady Deal, and State Senator Jack Hill will be in attendance, as will Representatives Butch Parrish and Jan Tankersley. Representative Burns, unfortunately, will not be able to be there due to a prior commitment. The new facility will cost approximately $35 million and have about 155,000 gross square feet of space.

Vice President for University Advancement Position
President Keel expressed appreciation for Billy Griffis and wished him well in his retirement. The Parker Search Firm has been hired to assist in the search to find the most outstanding candidates possible. “Airport interviews will be conducted over the next week or so to narrow the field of …six or seven finalists to a group of individuals who will be coming to campus....” President Keel hopes that the search will be concluded around September.

New Chancellor
President Keel announced that Hank Huckaby will be the new Chancellor at the University System of Georgia. Chancellor Huckaby has experience working in the Governor’s Office of Budget and Planning and was a Vice President for Finance at the University of Georgia. President Keel said, Chancellor Huckaby “knows exactly where Georgia Southern is and what we do and how important we are, so I think he’ll be a tremendous addition to the University System of Georgia. ....He has tremendous reputation under the ‘Gold Dome.’”

Chairperson of the Board of Regents
Ben Tarbutton is the newly-elected chair of the Board of Regents. Regent Tarbutton is from Sandersville and is the Regent for this district. President Keel expressed optimism about the upcoming year given Regent Tarbutton’s close ties to Georgia Southern University.

Athletics
President Keel noted that this was a particularly good year for Athletics. “Three of our teams have won Southern Conference Championships. The women’s volleyball team won a Southern Conference Championship. Our golf team won the Championship, and baseball, won a Conference Championship and did very well in the Baseball Regionals. Our cheerleaders came away with a National Championship in Cheering.” President Keel wished everyone a good summer.

5. **Provost’s Report: Ted Moore:**

**Strategic Goals**

Provost Moore explained that while he was a candidate for the position of Provost, he was impressed by the boldness of Georgia Southern’s goal to be recognized as one of the best comprehensive universities in the country. This is, in part, what attracted him to the position saying, “It’s ambitious, of course, but it’s appropriate.” The goal should be broken down “along the lines of our three-fold mission: we teach, we discover and create, and we serve.”

Provost Moore asked faculty to close their eyes and imagine that a time ten years from now. “Georgia Southern’s research effort has landed it in Carnegie’s high activity grouping” based on measurable accomplishments including external grand funding and doctoral student production.

Provost Moore encouraged faculty to think big, to imagine that Georgia Southern was awarded the Carnegie designation for outstanding service and research. Provost Moore stated that we were more competitive on this point than folks might realize, given Georgia Southern’s “Wildlife Education Center, Botanical Gardens, our museum, the planetarium, our Performing Arts Centre.” Faculty do an impressive amount of service and outreach as well, at the “local and regional and national and even international level.”

Provost Moore asked faculty to imagine that they had accomplished all of this “while maintaining the very strong teaching ethos that we’ve worked so hard to forge over many years, and we are then as we have been, a truly student-centered university.” He continued, “Ladies and Gentlemen, teaching, discovery and service, that’s what comprehensive universities do and I would argue that if we are recognized as outstanding on all three legs of the mission then haven’t we met our strategic goal of being among the best comprehensives in the country? I think we have. Now a harder question is can we do it? Don’t answer that yet. I know that answer’s on the tip of your tongue, but don’t answer it just yet. Let’s answer it together in a few minutes, okay. For the research dimension, Dr. Patterson, our Vice President for Research, who cannot be here today and sends his regrets, is developing a profile of institutions that are in Carnegie’s high activity designation. We’ll work backwards and see what we must do each year for the next decade to enter that group. With respect to the service dimension, ...our staff is now working on an application to the Carnegie Foundation for their outstanding service and outreach designation.
“We’re engaging friends from outside Georgia Southern University who’ve been successful in gaining this designation at other institutions. And there’s another, President Keel recently brought our attention to another highly visible designation from another President – the President of the United States. The White House maintains an honor roll of higher education institutions who are outstanding in service and outreach. We’re going for that, too. Now, as we work through the strategic decisions that must be made and there are countless of them, in order to achieve this strategic goal, this cocky, very, very ambitious goal, we’ll also bolster our commitment to excellence in teaching and mentoring. And a lot will be said about that in the months ahead. So, again, can we do it?”

Provost Moore continued with an allusion to Shakespeare, noting that Georgia Southern is a bit of an “underdog” in these areas. “You know that we have facts and figures that show that we are substantially underfunded. No matter how you slice it, no matter how you compare it, and that’s grown over the last couple of years. The student population has increased and budgets have been constrained. We are stressed as an institution. I am just being honest. I’m not telling you anything you don’t know already and haven’t heard many times, and experienced first-hand. We are doing more with less and that is not sustainable. And frankly, we are also a bit sloppy administratively. I look in the Faculty Handbook, for example, and I compare the prescriptive guidelines in that book with what we actually do. And there are many cases where there’s a big gap between what we do or say we should do and what we are actually doing. So either the book has to change or we have to change what we do or both. That’s just an example. There are other numerous cases that I’m seeing where we need to tighten up. Our financial planning necessarily has a one-year horizon. We are in a one-year budget cycle. Okay. That will not guide us to that place among the best comprehensives in the country in ten years or even twenty years.”

In Shakespeare’s Henry the Fifth, one of the loveliest and most often quoted lines comes from some underdogs in that play. Provost Moore recalled the Great Band of Brothers Speech that takes place among some soldiers before the battle of their lives. “They are outnumbered and they know it. Yet they are talking tough. They are both saying about how they’ll show off their scars years later after a celebrative victory. A victory in a battle that hasn’t even occurred yet. ...They are outnumbered and so on, but there’s one respect in which they’re not the underdogs and that’s the telling one.

King Henry says, “But we in it shall be remembered-We few, we happy few, we band of brothers.” Provost Moore pointed out that while King Henry’s soldiers were outnumbered, they were still a team. “They have each other’s backs when it counts. ...So in many respects they are underdogs, but you know its unwise to get in front of an army like this.”

Returning to the strategic vision, the goal to be one of the best comprehensive universities in the country, Provost Moore encouraged faculty to be “Bold, brash, cocky.”
Provost Moore asked faculty to consider “a less well known line in Henry the Fifth that comes after the famous St. Crispin’s Day speech, but it is still before the battle. It’s late in the evening and the lieutenants are gathered and they’re beginning to express some concern and Henry reassures them. He says ‘all things are ready if the mind be so.’ In other words, we will not make our goal; we will not win this battle without very careful thinking, planning, and execution. ...We have to use everything that we have better than ever. This means looking outside the usual parameters for solutions and answers.” A good example of this kind of thinking has already taken place in the search for a Dean of our College of Information Technology. It is “an underfunded unit, with no dedicated resources presently for associate deans and other positions in the College. We’ve relied on the heroics of Dean Ron Shiffler to serve as Dean as an additional duty for over three years. ...Now we also have an approved engineering program. .... But you see, that’s another unit that does not have an infrastructure: no dean, no associate dean, etc. It’s going to need an organization too. And of course all this is very expensive. So, suppose we create one college, rather than two. And suppose we all it something like the College of Engineering and Information Technology. And suppose we look around the country and see there are models for that in other institutions, too, and very successful models. A few weeks ago it was argued that the faculty will never go for it. Well, suppose we ask them anyway. And we invite them to plan the unit from the ground up. Take that ultimate opportunity to design a college — to address faculty governance, resource allocation, curriculum, organization, space planning. Well, President Keel and I did ask them last week — all the faculty, we’ve spoken with the Deans and the Department Chairs. We asked them to consider this as a proposal, not a fait accompli, that’s important.

“Shortly after we had that meeting, two Deans approached us with another proposed change in organization. We’re working on this now, with full faculty involvement and indeed the affected faculty seek the change.” Provost Moore noted that the ability to look at things from a University-wide perspective aided this kind of creative problem solving. He noted that this could be just the beginning of important changes, mentioning the need to extent the horizon for financial planning. He noted that “our resource challenges extend well beyond operating funds. We have to use space and facilities more efficiently than ever. We’ll have a Biology building by 2013, that’s wonderful, but that may be the last building that we build for many years. That’s realistic.” So, there is a new space planning process that was described in the last meeting of the Faculty Senate to address these concerns. “That process will be strategic, and in addition we are planning now for better information management so that we can take really better use of the academic space that we do have — that’s classrooms and laboratories. Returning to the issue of “administrative sloppiness,” Provost Moore announced that coming this fall “we’ll convene all of the deans, department chairs, and others and undertake a comprehensive review of all policies and procedures, all policies and procedures, that includes human resources, facilities, budget preparation” and other concerns.
He predicted that this will “underscore the need for more discipline and consistent approach in adhering to written policy and [the need] to revise and update policies.” The Faculty Handbook is only one example.

Provost Moore asked those who “still doubt we can do it, just look at how far this wonderful institution has already come in the past ten to twenty years.” He pointed out that it was faculty hat helped to make these changes a reality. “I’m sure we can make this happen, so thank you very much. We’ve gone well past the rhetoric stage and we’re now talking about the action steps that we need to take to get to that point where we are one of the best comprehensives in the country. We can do it.” Provost Moore then asked for questions from the floor.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked Provost Moore to elaborate on the financial side of the strategic plan. Provost Moore replied that he and the deans were engaged in a process of looking a number of alternative resources including better research funding. “If you look at those institutions that are in that high activity grouping you see that they are like in the $50-60 million a year range on external funding. We are around $7 [million], so we have a way to go. But we can do it.” Provost Moore also noted the role of philanthropy, pointing to the beginning “a major capital campaign like we’ve never seen before. It’s been tied to the strategic vision of the University, and that’s important because everything we do from this instance on should be dedicated towards satisfying that strategic vision.” Provost Moore also noted that state support was not as reliable as it had been in previous years. “In addition, tuition is not a lever that we can continue pulling as much as we have [in the past].

Michelle Haberland (CLASS): Yes.

Provost Moore was asked for clarification on the colleges that might face consolidation this process. He responded that it was too soon to say that there would be more, “But I can tell you that we’ve got to think along those lines over the next several months, with the help of the entire faculty.

Thomas Klein (CLASS) asked Provost Moore if there were any changes to the aspirational institutions used in the past. Provost Moore responded that “the Board of Regents has a list of aspirational institutions that they came up with and I would think that they did that in concert with the Universities, I would hope. And it turns out that they lumped together the regionals as well as the so-called state universities. And so Valdosta State is considered in a sense the same class that we are in, but also they take into account the other colleges such as, the other four-year institutions, and they come up with a single composite list.” Provost Moore felt that we will “have to do a much more targeted job to identify what those aspirational institutions are, and, frankly, it will depend on which dimension of our mission we’re speaking of.” He suggested that given our goal, it would be useful to look at the 107 universities in the Carnegie “high research activity.”
Searches

Provost Moore provided updates on a few searches. First, “the search for Dean of the College of Public Health is in a critical stage at this point determining the timing and so on of airport interviews and we’ll give you a full report on that as soon as we get past that immediate decision.” Provost Moore noted that there is an ongoing search for the Director of the Center for International Studies to replace Nancy Shumaker after her retirement.

Pat Walker (CLASS) asked Provost Moore if there were any plans to limit enrollment, given the budget picture and the strategic plan. She wondered if we will continue to grow at the rate we have been growing. Provost Moore replied that this was “a good strategic question.” There are “very careful discussions going on with the VP for Student Affairs and enrollment Management. ….We are close to capacity.” President Keel added that “The Board of Regents also has a lot of control over that, and they basically have the philosophy at this point in time that … no university should cap enrollment. And that the University System of Georgia should provide an education for every qualified student that wants an education regardless. Now, one could argue that that’s a realistic position to be in or not, whether you are confined by fiscal issues or not, and I don’t agree or disagree with that statement. I do know that the number of high school seniors that are graduating in the state of Georgia is continuing to increase at roughly 20 to 30,000 a year for the whole USG. We had about 311,000 students now across the entire state.” President Keel noted that one way to control growth was to “continually increase standards, which we are in the process of doing. As you know, our minimum SAT is now 1010. A year ago, it was 1000. Our goal is to increase that 10 points over a period of time until we can get up to about 1050.” He also noted that there is a “downside to enrollment growth” when it comes to capacity issues, including larger classrooms. Describing the situation as a “Catch-22,” President Keel noted that “For every student … over a six-year period of time, it’s roughly the equivalent of about $38,000 of revenue for the University – every single student. So if we were to cut enrollment or to limit enrollment you’re basically affecting your budget in many ways to about that degree as well. So it is a very difficult thing to balance in terms of your physical and personnel capacity to manage the students coming in that are generating the revenue to support the entire operation.”

Mark Welford (COST) asked Provost Moore “What kind of support will you be giving the faculty to achieve more research, more service and improve our teaching?” Provost Moore responded, “We know that in order to produce research funding, ...we have to make investments. We have to make careful choices as to where we are putting our capital over the next several years.”
Provost Moore also stated that recruitment was another area that will help, as faculty come in with actual grant funding or the potential to do so.

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

   a. **Approval of Actions Taken at the April 18, 2011, Meeting.** President Keel approved the actions contained in the March 10, 2011, Graduate Committee Minutes and in the March 18, 2011, Undergraduate Committee minutes.

   b. **A Request for a Motion: Richard Flynn**
   The Senate Executive Committee, Item B, approved Richard Flynn’s Request for a Motion to include in the College Bylaws language specifying program directors’ qualifications at both the undergraduate and graduate levels as well as a description of program directors’ duties. That motion appears at item seven on today’s agenda. It constitutes an addition to recommendation #three of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance adopted earlier this year.

   c. **A Request for a Motion: Richard Flynn**
   The Senate Executive Committee approved Richard Flynn's request for a motion to revise recommendation #4 of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance. That motion appears as item #8 on today’s agenda.

   d. **A Request for a Resolution: Senate Executive Committee**
   The SEC decided to propose item d, a resolution that would include a Graduate Student as a member of the Faculty Senate while a committee on revisions of the Statutes considers recommending this amendment to the Statutes. This resolution appears as item #9 on today’s agenda and it is printed out there rather than as an item that you had to download from your computer.

   The SEC discussed committee appointments and elections. Provost Moore has appointed Clayton Heller from COST and Lucy Green from Education to serve on the Technology Fee Committee. The SEC had already received nominations for election to serve as Senator on the Athletics Committee and as SGA Liaison. Elections will be held during today’s meeting. We received no nominations for a faculty member to serve a one-year term on the Parking and Transportation Committee. Moderator Krug asked volunteers to contact her, noting that it was a one-year appointment. The SEC decided to request that President Keel allow the SEC to appoint a faculty member in addition to the Senate Moderator to serve on the Space Planning Committee. He agreed. That will now give us two faculty members – the Senate Moderator and Reed Smith of Communication Arts who has agreed to serve in that capacity. The SEC discussed briefly the program review procedures suggested by Bob Fernekes chair of the Graduate Committee and Ron MacKinnon chair of the Undergraduate Committee, and developed by them, and Candace Griffith of the Provost’s office and Judith Longfield of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship. The SEC also discussed diversity in hiring. There will be a presentation about this issue by the Director of
Diversity, Gary Gawel, who also serves as Affirmative Action Director and Institutional Compliance Officer. Moderator Krug also noted that Provost Moore supported the efforts of the Graduate and Undergraduate Committees, to be charged with program review responsibilities.

7. **Request for a Motion: Program Directors’ Language to Be Included in the College Bylaws (Addition to Recommendation #3 of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance.)**

Moderator Krug introduced a Request for a Motion that the program directors’ language to be included in the college bylaws. This is in addition to recommendation #3 of these bylaws and the handout reflects the wording as it appears in the Faculty Handbook. Moderator Krug noted that “We adopted that language at the last Faculty Senate meeting.” The motion was read into the record: “College bylaws shall include language specifying program directors’ qualifications at both the undergraduate and graduate level as well as a description of program directors’ duties.”

Pat Humphrey (COST) wondered “how burdensome this might be for faculty governance committees, or other committees within colleges every time a qualification might change because of SACS requirement or some accreditation by a body of requirement, you’d then have to amend the Bylaws?”

Provost Moore responded that “a description of a program directors duties would be somewhat like the tenure and promotion criteria say in a department and if those criteria are changed they live inside the Bylaws, but that part can be changed without changing the entire set of Bylaws.”

Parliamentarian Bob Cook offered some clarification. “The question is whether Bylaws would dictate positions in a college, the qualifications in a college, and the duties of an individual in a college as opposed to committees which bylaws by and large currently identify the committees and the charge to those committees. And even include the qualifications for the chair of a committee. But this would, I think, be an a different category when you are talking an individual position, and I don’t know whether there are other Bylaws of any of the colleges that actually list individual positions and have that kind of detail.”

Pat Humphrey (COST) noted that “the COST Bylaws do not include that.” They simply stated “that program directors need to meet specific qualifications and will have duties assigned by and in coordination with their chair and the dean.”

Moderator Krug noted that this request came from the Provost’s office and asked Kathy Alberston (Provost’s Office) to comment. Alberston (Provost’s Office) responded that the concern arose with respect to a discussion about a program director in the College of Graduate Studies. The concern was over language, just
to be sure that workload issues were discussed. Pat Humphrey (COST) stated that for COST, it was her understanding that “the workload, the duties, the remuneration would be agreed upon between the chair, the dean, and the individual and that they did have to meet qualifications as necessary because of accreditation issues.” Dean Bret Danilowicz (COST) explained that “By putting it in the bylaws, the specific responsibilities of a graduate program chair that might work if all departments and colleges were structured the same, but about half of our departments have assistant chairs, half don’t. [So], we have programs then that have different duties depending on the functioning needed within that department so I think specifying it down to that level within any specific college will make it too restrictive. As Pat pointed out, then each time you revise a specific duty, there’s a huge amendment process which takes about a year in our college and you know if we are trying to be nimble moving ahead over the next ten years, I think the more that we can retain the flexibility while making sure that the workload responsibilities are there, but that workload responsibility comes down to the faculty governance committee within the college. That would be my perspective.”

Dean mike Smith (CLASS) pointed out that “CLASS is in the process of creating Bylaws. So, we don’t have them yet. We do have a policy, however, that addresses this issue of graduate directors and what the compensation essentially is for a graduate director. I see that as useful information to have in a policy, which is more easily changed and amended than a bylaw, which as Dean Danilowicz just pointed out, there’s a cumbersome process that’s in place to amend bylaws.”

Moderator Krug (CLASS) asked Dean Smith (CLASS) to confirm that “these policies do not appear in the bylaws” of CLASS. He agreed and stated that they would appear in the ‘College Policies and Procedures’ that are on the website.”

Dick Diebolt (COGS) noted that given Dr. Patterson’s absence, “we wanted to make these remarks. In the College of Graduate Studies we have over a period of time had significant and robust discussion in our Graduate Program Director’s meeting as well as in the Graduate Committee, regarding roles and responsibilities and also compensation for program directors and coordinators. And that’s been an ongoing process. We do have listed in our Graduate Program Directors Manual, a listing of the roles and responsibilities of Graduate Program Directors trying to define what they broad breadth of those responsibilities can be in the various programs. But one of the key things, of course, that has always been missing is the compensation or remuneration or support, monetary support for these individuals to carry out their responsibilities. So that is always an ongoing issue with respect to what has just been mentioned, with respect to how does one change these if those responsibilities or roles change.”

Provost Moore noted the support for the idea that “basically, it’s a good business practice to have these things codified, but obviously do not want to create
additional onerous burden of having to go through the formal ratification process of bylaws every time there is a change.” He suggested that the motion be withdrawn on behalf of the Provost’s Office and that the motion be brought to the floor again after some revisions. Moderator Krug agreed.

Parliamentarian Bob Cook (CIT) noted that “it seems that there might be a gap in that there is no policy on policy manuals. It probably is appropriate to have some guidelines, possibly in the Faculty Handbook or from the Provost’s Office on areas that need policy but would not be part of a bylaw.” He then suggested that the motion be tabled in the form of a resolution and that the Senate would ask the provost’s Office to recommend policy statements. Provost Moore expressed support for “a set of University policies that live outside of the Faculty Handbook.”

Pat Humphrey (COST) moved to table the motion and send it back to the Provost’s office. The motion to table was seconded and approved.

8. Request for a Motion: Revision to Recommendation #4 of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance: Clara Krug (CLASS) Senate Moderator: read the request for a motion to revise Recommendation #4 of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance.

Current Wording as Approved previously:
“We move that faculty in each department (or, in the case of a college without departments, elected faculty) create the criteria for tenure and promotion which must be approved by a two thirds vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the unit. These criteria shall then be approved by the Department Chair, the Dean, the Provost, and the President. Once the criteria have been approved they will be submitted to the faculty executive/governance committee for each college for inclusion in the bylaws of the college.”

Suggested Change:
Delete the final sentence “once the criteria have been approved they will be submitted to the faculty executive/governance committee for each college for inclusion in the bylaws of the college.” It would simply read:

“We move that faculty in each department (or, in the case of a college without departments, elected faculty) create the criteria for tenure and promotion which must be approved by a two thirds vote of the tenured and tenure-track faculty of the unit. These criteria shall then be approved by the Department Chair, the Dean, the Provost, and the President.”

The motion was seconded. There was no discussion and the motion was approved unanimously.
Resolution: Graduate Student Representation on the Faculty Senate.
Clara Krug (CLASS) Senate Moderator introduced a resolution about Graduate Student Representation on the Faculty Senate. She explained that Provost Moore and Vice President Charles Patterson had asked about the efforts of the College of to create a Graduate Student Organization. “They thought it would be beneficial to include a graduate student from that organization as a member of the Faculty Senate. Currently, the Statutes provide for a student representative and that student has been in an undergraduate could be a graduate student because some graduate students serve on the Student Government Association, but the thought would be that there would be an additional student. So, there’d be two students who would have voting privileges.”

The motion reads: “That one representative of the Graduate Student Organization serve on the Faculty Senate from August 1, 2011, until July 31, 2012, while a Presidential Committee on Revisions of the Statutes considers recommending this amendment to the Statutes.”

Moderator Krug noted that it is “required that there be a Presidential Committee if there is going to be an amendment to the Statutes. The Senate Executive Committee members at our meeting on Friday indicated that there is other wording that you will probably be changed in the Statutes. There have been developments over time and we have not reviewed the Statutes. So it might be that there would be additional changes, but at the minimum that committee would consider recommending this amendment to the Statutes as it regards Graduate Student” representation and membership.

Dick Diebolt (COGS) expressed the support of the College of Graduate Studies. “When we look at the SGA website right now, we find that there are five graduate students who are listed on that website. We [also] find that one student has graduated, three are proposed to graduate this summer, and one student is remaining,” leaving the graduate students with too little representation.

Caren Town (CLASS) asked for confirmation that the SGA representative that attends the meetings of the Faculty Senate is typically the President. Moderator Krug confirmed that the statues only state that it must be a “student representative,” but that it was almost always the President of Vice President.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

10. Election of a Senator to the Athletics Committee (2011-2012): Barry Balleck (CLASS) nominated. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. Moderator Krug offered her congratulations to Professor Balleck.
11. **Election of a Senator to Serve as Liaison to the SGA (2011-2012): Mark Welford (COST) nominated.** The motion was seconded and passed unanimously. Moderator Krug offered her congratulations to Professor Welford.

12. **Election of a Faculty Member to the Parking and Transportation Committee (2011-2012).** Michelle Reidel (COE) offered to serve, “only if there was a promise that there will be funny Parking stories.” Chris Geyerman (CLASS) assured Professor Reidel that there would be some “very interesting” reading” that would include “animated trees and so forth.” Michelle Reidel (COE) agreed to “take one for the team.”

Moderator Krug called for additional nominations. There being none, nominations were closed, the motion was seconded and Michelle Reidel was unanimously approved to serve as the faculty representative on the Parking and Transportation Committee, 2011-12.

13. **Report from the Senate Elections Committee: Pat Humphrey (COST):**
The Senate Elections Committee began the election process in the first week of February. The process was completed by the first week in May, save the university CLEC election. Pat Humphrey (COST) noted that the “biggest problem has been ...getting people willing to serve. Nominations [often] go out [multiple] times, looking for volunteers and nobody steps forward.” She noted that sometimes a helpful message to the faculty from their respective deans helps. She expressed concerns that “quite frankly a lot of people don’t see this kind of service as being worthy of something when we’re, you know, moving to a high intensity research and [our other goals]. We have to do something so that people do see it as worthwhile.” Moderator Krug noted that support from Dean Mike Smith (CLASS) resulted in competitive elections in her college, for the first time in a while.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) also suggested that as the bylaws and departmental policies are drafted and revised that committees consider putting some emphasis on university service of this kind. Norman Schmidt (COST) suggested that such service be rewarded at the department level. Moderator Krug agreed that reward ought to be part of the equation.

14. **Report from the SGA Liaison: Bruce McLean (COST):** SGA has not met since our the last meeting of the Faculty Senate, but President Standifer was re-elected. Bruce McLean (COST) expressed appreciation and support for Mr. Standifer.

Moderator Krug (CLASS) thanked Bruce McLean (COST) for his service to the Faculty Senate and for serving as SGA liaison.

15. **Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS):**
First, the **NCAA 2009-2010 Academic Progress Rate** was released on May 23, 2011. That report indicates that all Georgia Southern teams with the exception of men’s basketball, with a multiyear APR of 905, and football, with a multiyear APR 921, performed above the 925 cutoff point at which penalties may be incurred. According to the penalty summary of the report, the contemporaneous penalty for our football team is as follows: Limited to awarding aid to 27 initial counters (from the standard 30), limited to awarding aid to 78 overall counters (from the standard FCS of 85), and limited to awarding the equivalency value of 58.53 financial aid awards (from the FCS standard of 63).

Second, the 2010-2011 student-athlete GPA’s are as follows: the women student-athletes: 3.12; for the men student athletes: 2.69, for all student-athletes: 2.88. A comparison with the overall student body was not included in the report.

Third, Georgia Southern self-reported 2 secondary rules violations to the NCAA during the past academic year. Both secondary violations involved then prospective student-athletes. In both cases the institution took appropriate self-imposed action (accepted by the NCAA) and all student-athletes have been reinstated.

Fourth, the Southern Conference Spring Meeting was held May 31-June 2, 2011 in Charleston, SC. Pertinent highlights from that meeting include:

- Discussion of the NCAA Division I Board of Directors announcement in April 2011 of a moratorium, effective immediately, on the athletics certification program. This means that Georgia Southern will not begin its self-study this fall as scheduled. (That’s a good thing.) Over the course of the next 2 years, the NCAA will develop a program to replace the athletics certification program with a program that is, among other things, more focused on the student-athlete experience, technologically driven, and cost effective (the NCAA estimates the average cost of the certification process to be $300,000 per institution).

- At the Southern Conference Awards Dinner:
  - Georgia Southern men’s golfer and baseball player Jake Ware was recognized in absentia as the winner of a $2,000 graduate scholarship. Jake could not attend because he is currently completing an internship at the US Embassy in the Dominican Republic and will begin graduate study in the Bush School of Government and Public Service this fall.
  - The Georgia Southern Volleyball Team, Men’s Golf Team and Baseball Team were recognized as conference champions.

Clara Krug (CLASS) Senate Moderator thanked “President Keel and Provost Moore for welcoming me to their offices for discussions, very open discussions. We don’t always agree, but lots of times we do.” She particularly expressed
appreciation to Provost Moore for meeting with the Senate Executive Committee, noting that “Our meetings are so full of information that Provost Moore doesn’t have time to eat his breakfast.” She also extended her appreciation to the Senators and Alternates for their service this year. She then recognized the members of the Senate Executive Committee, noting that Ron Mackinnon was unable to attend and be recognized. She then wished everyone a good summer.

16. Unfinished Business

17. New Business

18. Announcements: Vice Presidents

19. Announcements from the Floor

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) announced that the Book and Cranny, our local independent bookstore is going out of business. She encouraged folks to partake in the half-price sale. This will help Book and Cranny end this chapter in the a positive way.

20. Adjournment

The next Senate meeting is September 19, 2011, in the Nessmith-Lane Ballroom #1603 from 4-6 p.m. Please note change in location.
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1. Approval of the Agenda for the September 19, 2011, Meeting

Clara Krug (CLASS), Senate Moderator, noted the Senate would be informed of administrative responses to actions taken at the June 8, 2011, meeting in item 6a. The Agenda was approved after Senators introduced themselves.

2. Approval of the June 8, 2011, Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary: The minutes were approved.

3. Librarian’s Report of September 19, 2011: No committees had reported, so Tony Barilla (COBA), Senate Librarian, had no report.


   b. Report from the Graduate Committee: Bob Fernekes (LIB): No report.

4. President’s Report: Brooks Keel (President):

   We have hired a new Vice President for Advancement, Salinda Arthur, from Virginia Tech. She will be starting the middle of October. She comes with a tremendous amount of experience, having just completed a $1 billion capital campaign and will help us kick off our major capital campaign; we will have a campus wide reception for her when she gets on board.

   New Ways of Assessing Faculty Productivity: Texas is talking about new ways of assessing faculty productivity and it “scares the bejeebers” out of President Keel. Although it does emphasize teaching, the productivity measures are “very very scary.” The state of Florida is also looking at this. This all has to do with accountability, and we need to be on the front edge of these discussions “or else someone outside of [the] confines of this campus is going to be telling us how to run our business, and it’s very, very scary.”

   Retention, Progression, and Graduation (RPG): Coming out from Washington via Complete College America [Secretary’s Note: Georgia has signed on to this program] is the issue of RPG. We have been having a long conversation here on that very topic. The White House is “basically holding the governor’s feet to the fire to in turn hold their respective campuses’ feet to the fire in terms of productivity.” This is now being translated into dollars; rather than the number of students determining formula funding, it will likely be based on graduation rates: “The more students you graduate, the more money you get.”
President Keel ceded further discussion of these and other issues to Provost Moore, who had prepared a long report.

5. Provost’s Report: Ted Moore

GSU’s guiding structures are the four strategic themes articulated by President Keel: (1) advance academic excellence; (2) enhance student success; (3) expand research, scholarship, and creative achievement; and (4) do so while maintaining fiscal sustainability.

Our University’s path to being recognized as one of the best public comprehensives in the country is through our threefold mission of teaching, research, and service:

- **Teaching and Learning**: maintain and improve as a pathway to being one of the best comprehensives in the country;
- **Research and Scholarship**: Advance strategically to a level of activity that leads us to a Carnegie designation as a high activity research institution;
- **Service and Outreach**: build on the excellence we already have and push along the path to being one of the nation’s best comprehensives.

The leadership of the institution, including department chairs and program directors, deans, vice presidents, Senate leadership, and the President, undertook preliminary planning of key actions during two full-day strategic workshops (July 15 and September 9).

1. **General Education** is undergoing complete review by a faculty team led by Dr. Jake Simons and supported by Academic Affairs. What must a well-educated citizen know? This is an outcomes based approach, and assessment of success in achieving these outcomes has been engineered in at the beginning. Faculty will be fully engaged in shaping the desired outcomes, and designing the curricular as well as extracurricular experiences needed to achieve the outcomes. **NOTE**: The team insisted that the administration follow through, and not commence the initiative and then allow it to drop once reaccreditation or some other milestone has been secured. In addition, the team asked that general education redesign be in the hands of faculty, and consequently President Keel and Provost Moore are committed to respecting faculty leadership. Toward that end, it is hoped that the General Education Committee will become a standing committee of the Senate.

2. **Maintain and support our strong teaching ethos**: A team has been dedicated to promoting teaching excellence that will review and make recommendations for the organization, staffing, and mission of our three centers that now support teaching – the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship; the Center for Online Learning; and CATS [Secretary’s Note: ?], and advise the Provost and others in how best to promote and maintain
excellence in teaching. This group will serve as part of a new permanent team.

3. **Organize for Excellence:** Already, the Hotel and Restaurant Management program has moved to COBA from CHHS, and the Department of Information Systems also will move to COBA from CIT, as well as Construction Management to COBA from COST. CIT will now consist of Computer Science and Information Technology, and our three Engineering departments will be Electrical, Civil, and Mechanical. These changes are to be effective the end of the academic year.

Further, a faculty-led review team with staff and student representation will take up design of a possible new college that will incorporate Engineering, Information Technology, and Computer Science, and also under consideration is the need for and feasibility of an Honors College, perhaps with the goal of degree completion in three years.

Also, Continuing Education has seen four outreach centers – Museum, Performing Arts Center (PAC), Botanical Garden, and Wildlife – moved to the Provost as part of a new strategic plan for Continuing Education. This allows better focus for Continuing Education and elevates the visibility of the outreach centers. These four and other units such as the planetarium, Center for Art and Theater, and the Carter Recital Hall signify what we’re about when it comes to community engagement. Because one of our goals is to achieve recognition for our service and outreach efforts, President Keel will soon seat a presidential-level team to review and oversee a coordinated service and outreach effort. In line with this, the Campus Life Enrichment Committee has also been moved from the PAC Director to the Provost, and its role is undergoing significant change.

4. **Graduate Education:** This is quickly growing in importance, as it must in order to allow us to expand our research presence. We have made available as much support as possible for the College of Graduate Studies and must plan carefully because pressure is on from the System office to limit new programs.

5. **Program Assessment:** What is a program intended to accomplish? How well is it achieving that aim? The Undergraduate and Graduate Committees of the Senate are overseeing the review process campus-wide. Data needed will be supplied from central sources, more precise guidelines have been developed, and following a pilot this summer with two programs, we are rolling out the new process this fall with about thirty-five programs slated for review.

We are truly a student-centered university. Georgia Southern says that and means that. One of our biggest challenges is RPG. Retention of freshmen is a little over 80%. A major puzzle is our six-year graduation rate, which is below 50%. Students
leaving before finishing their degrees is a complex phenomenon with no easy explanation, let alone a simple solution, but we are applying the most sophisticated analytical methods we have available to help guide us to understanding and improvement.

Military students – active, reserve, and veteran, and their families – require some special accommodation as they work to achieve college degrees. We are working to elevate our level of “military friendliness” and hope to be designated a Soldiers2Scholars institution soon. President Keel has just seated a special task force to review policy and consider additional ways that we can accommodate these important students.

Expanding research, scholarship, and creative achievements is key because we want to climb to “RU/H,” high-activity research university, in the Carnegie designations. In 2004 the institutions that were classified RU/H had a minimum of 20 doctoral programs, and first professional degrees do not count. A critical planning initiative – Pathways to Success [discussed later; see below] – is intended to organize the role the faculty will play in advancing research, maintaining teaching excellence, and supporting excellent service and outreach.

How do we go about delivering an education of academic distinction, enhancing student success, and expanding our research profile, and still maintain our financial integrity? What are some risks that we face, and how do we manage those over the next several years? Philanthropy must play an increasing role. We are developing a long-range financial planning model to aid us in making the difficult decisions that will achieve our vision. Those efforts include a major capital campaign. President Keel has also seated the Institutional Effectiveness Steering Committee, whose task is to insure effectiveness and efficiency university-wide regarding all resources – money, people, space, and information. This high-level team will be responsible to the President for steering Georgia Southern through our upcoming SACS reaccreditation process, but just as important, will be responsible for making sure we maintain the level of effectiveness that merits SACS accreditation even after the event is over.

With regard to space planning and allocation, we have seated a permanent committee to review and evaluate those issues and advise the President on all strategic space and facilities decisions. In addition, it is time to update the University’s Campus Master Plan.

Compensation: We have not had merit or COLA raises in four years, and while annual inflation has not been high, it adds up after four years. We have serious cases of salary compression, and in addition health benefits cost more, so that take-home pay has been diminished. “The President has determined that it is time to move beyond lamenting what we don’t have, and focus instead on what we can do with what we do have.” We will soon identify a study team with faculty and staff charged with recommending things we can do with the resources we have within
our reach. This group will also review dollar compensation and propose remedies that are economically feasible and politically permissible.

With respect to workload, the Provost withheld comment until the later discussion of the Pathways to Success Study Group (see below) and ended his report.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked if this reorganization of colleges would end up “changing the balance of the University” by enlarging COBA.

Provost Moore noted that the departments are moving intact to “a more natural home” that the involved faculty uniformly wanted. President Keel added that there are not “any grandiose plans of creating a mega college,” and that the number of departments need not be balanced among colleges in order to make things work, that what makes more sense is to have departments fit their degree programs more appropriately with their colleges, especially re: collaboration between departments.

Ming Fang He (COE) asked for more information about the compensation plan for faculty. She was particularly concerned re: junior faculty with families living near the relative-to-academia “poverty line”; we could lose such valuable people.

President Keel agreed that this is a big reason why the Provost wants to put together a committee to look at this. But we are not able to implement a raise even if we have the resources to do it because of Board of Regents policies. The financial situation that this state finds itself in is basically no different than so many other states nationwide. Salary inversion, compression, and those issues are a fact of life across the entire country. By most accounts we are at the bottom of the economic downturn, but it likely will be two or more years before the state entertains the possibility of pay increases across the board. It is hoped the Provost’s committee will have a plan already in place for when funds become available, a plan that will address both compensation and workload with regard to increased expectations for research and scholarship in the face of “a very large teaching load.”

Mark Welford (COST) suggested that if GSU would “reduce our teaching load and reduce our service load . . . we would be more amenable to do more work on research.” On another issue, he just got a grant that has been determined to be in the fundable category, but it is now contingent on funding of NOAA, and NOAA might be shut down. If we’re going towards more research but have legislators cutting funding, is it sustainable to push for more research and more grant money if the grant money is no longer there?

President Keel answered that applications for federal grants have always faced stiff competition and those opportunities may be dwindling, but there are many other opportunities for funding, such as industry and business grants and contracts, consulting, philanthropy, foundations, and so forth. We are going to be pursuing those aggressively, but there are no easy answers.

Approval of Actions Taken at the June 8, 2011 Meeting: President Keel approved the request of the Faculty Senate to revise recommendation #4 of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance. It now appears in the Faculty Handbook. He also approved the actions of the Graduate Committee on April 12th, and the Undergraduate Committee on April 14th.

b. A Request for Information: Greg Brock: The Senate Executive Committee approved this request and the Provost responded on 9-18-11:

1) Why is the DFW rate being used to evaluate courses and teaching?

There has been no mandate to “evaluate” courses or teaching based on DFW frequencies. DFW rates should be used as diagnostics just as we use the rest of the grade distribution. By virtue of exploring this question, though, “some departments have changed their delivery of a course’s content and improved student pass rates without lowering standards.”

2) Where is there a list of refereed research/evidence showing a link between DFW rates and teaching/learning by students?

We have used data from our First Year Experience program to help lower our course withdrawal rates from 10.5% in 2006 to 5% in 2010. There is also data to show an increase in GPA due to the limited withdrawal policy.

This link provides FYE information:
http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/fye/QEP.htm

The Quality Enhancement Plan submitted for the SACS 5th Year Report is also posted and can address the university’s interest in Student Success:
http://sacs.georgiasouthern.edu/.

Fact Book information can be found here:
http://services.georgiasouthern.edu/osra/fb/factbook2.htm

3) Where did the DFW rate =25% benchmark given to all chairs in my college [COBA] come from?

“We are not aware of a 25% mandated benchmark.”

4) Why is a “W” treated the same as a “DF”?
All three indicate that a student did not complete a course with average or better performance. We are interested in “W” because we care about college completion and progression.

A Request for Information from Marc Cyr (CLASS) regarding changes (if any) in numbers of students, faculty, staff, and administrators between 2007 and 2011, and pay for employee groups 2007-2011, has been approved for consideration in the October meeting. The RFI is posted on the Senate website.

**University-Wide Faculty Pathways to Success Study Group:** Moderator Krug met in August with Provost Moore, Associate Provost Kathy Albertson, and CLASS Dean Mike Smith on this matter. COE and CLASS have already done work on variable workloads. This is being called Pathways because it will include various options for people to earn tenure and promotion. Krug has received four nominations to serve on this Group from four different colleges since the Group was announced Thursday 9-15. The deadline for nominations is 5:00 p.m. on October 14. The Senate Executive Committee will choose two Senators. There will be one Dean, Mike Smith. There will be one department chair whom the SEC will select after nominations by deans, and there will be eight faculty members nominated by their peers in the various colleges and the Library. The Senate Executive Committee will select among them. The Chair of the Committee will be one of the faculty members; the dean and the department chair are not eligible for election to serve as chair. If someone nominates a Senator as his or her college’s representative, then there may be more than two Senators on that committee.

Ming Fang He (COE) asked if the SEC would choose representatives from intermediate career and senior faculty and the junior faculty.

Moderator Krug replied that it would depend on who’s nominated. There will be assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors. There will be people with strong interests in teaching, strong interest in research, and strong interests in peer appropriate service, so there’ll be a variety of people. We want to have as wide and diverse a representation as possible, though we’re not including faculty members with temporary contracts or lecturers, only tenured or tenure-track.

Cyr (CLASS) asked if this group would have as an option that we not have this program, or if this group is being established only to tweak a policy that has already been decided.

Moderator Krug confirmed that COE and CLASS are already exploring similar policies, though they are not yet in practice. She added that her understanding was that “an option is always yes, and an option is always no.”

Provost Moore said “differential workload” is imprecise wording. We all have a very heavy workload. But the composition of that work is variable; it varies over time in one’s career. It varies with respect to individual faculty interests and
abilities, etc. When institutions make a strong effort to advance in terms of scholarship and research, there is the fear that those who teach a lot but do not publish much become second class or third class citizens at the university.

Cyr reiterated his question: Was he correct that “we will have a policy like this at the University-level. I wasn’t asking about the college-levels, we will have a version of this, some form of this at the University-level and this group is being put together to determine, to make recommendations as to what form that will be. Am I correct on that? That we will have this at the University-level in some form?”

Provost Moore replied, “That characterizes it perfectly. It certainly does.”

Ming Fang He (COE) asked if there is a conflict between reaching for research intensive status and this Pathways to Success proposal, since it was her understanding that research intensive universities value only research.

Provost Moore did not believe there will be a conflict unless we allow there to be a conflict, if we allow ourselves to degenerate into a system where we have second-class citizens.

President Keel added that “we’re under no force or scrutiny to become anything other than what we choose to become.” He did not think we need to become a research one university; that has never been his goal. We are not going to create a future that does not honor all types of scholarship and creativity, and does not honor teaching at the same level. We will not have a university of the future that has a dual class or separate class citizenry in terms of teaching vs. research.

Tim Teeter (CLASS) asked for further confirmation of the answer to Cyr’s earlier question, that this “conversation” is about a decision that’s already been made, that “we can have conversations about implementing this policy, but we are not having any conversation about having a policy.”

President Keel said he was unclear on what Teeter was saying.

Teeter clarified further: “Well, that is to say that this notion of differential teaching loads and so on and so forth, that that’s a fait accompli at this point. That, you know, the committee that will be implementing this is implementing a basic strategic decision that has already been taken.”

President Keel stated that to ask our faculty to continue teaching at the higher level that they are teaching and also advance research and creativity, and not adjust that somehow, cannot work. He wondered if he was hearing that only a few of our faculty are overworked and the rest have plenty of time, so we don’t need to go down the Pathways road. That was not his assumption.

Teeter did not assume that was the case either. When he came to Georgia Southern, if the expectation at say UGA was 75% research and 25% teaching, and at West
Georgia it was 75% teaching and 25% research, at Georgia Southern it would be 50% teaching and 50% research, but he discovered it was 75% teaching and 75% research. Teeter did not dispute that we have a balance issue. But it seemed to him that this Group would be addressing a done deal, meeting only in order to implement a policy decision that had been made at another level.

Moderator Krug said a decision may have been made that there be some kind of a teaching load policy, but the policy has not been implemented. There are people that are volunteering to serve on the committee. Krug could not imagine our colleagues would volunteer to serve if they wanted to disband.

Jill Lockwood (COBA) did not have the perspective that somebody made the decision to have a differential policy and then decided to create a committee to discuss it. We have evolved greatly over the years, including adding doctoral programs, and teaching in a Ph.D. program is not the same thing as undergraduate or even masters programs, and how do we evaluate faculty teaching in various programs and be fair? Our current university policies do not allow us to make considerations for this variety. It is her interpretation that we want to enter into a conversation with the entire faculty on how best to accommodate this.

President Keel responded, “Well said.”

Moderator Krug thought that there is nothing to prevent the representative from each college and the library from having the conversation with the faculty in the individual unit for input. She thought that would be wonderful.

Bret Danilowicz, Dean of COST, joined Moderator Krug and President Keel in complimenting Lockwood. He further noted workload variation already exists from college to college and department to department, and that within departments different individuals have different workloads as well, but we don’t have any mechanisms to deal with this variation. The committee will discuss what makes sense to optimize the resources that we’ve got and the opportunities for faculty. It could be very similar to what we’re doing now, or it could be extremely different.

Moderator Krug asked if whatever is recommended will come back to the Faculty Senate.

Provost Moore said, “Yes.”

Costomiris (CLASS) remained puzzled. CLASS is working on a similar college level policy, and it was his understanding from Dean Smith that faculty had the options of endorsing or not endorsing such a policy, but he gathered now that that was not the case, that a college could not opt out of such a policy.

Provost Moore noted that we deal all the time with university-level policies that are not exactly the same as a college policy, but the college policy is consistent with the
university policy. Any policy that we have that is workable will certainly allow latitude within the colleges because there are different profiles.

Ron MacKinnon (CIT) said it sounded like we were having the committee discussion right now and suggested we move on because we were running out of time.

Moderator Krug, however, had already recognized Lowell Mooney (COBA), who responded to President Keel that we are overworked and don’t have a lot of free time, so he appreciates the administration thinking about this because “we all know where we’re going, and I don’t think we can get there with our current workload distributed as it is”; we need a new model.

Moderator Krug moved on to nominations for Service on a Committee to Write a Proposal for a Faculty Club with Designated Space at the Forest Heights Country Club. The Board of Directors of the club (now called the Faculty Club Team) and the club itself have been on hiatus since January 2009: There was no building available to house the club and its functions; there was no philosophical support from the upper level administration at that time; Board members were spending a great deal of time and effort planning and offering functions, but a significant number of faculty members did not want to pay to attend any event, so the Board didn’t know how to pay for events.

Provost Moore suggested a public/private partnership between Georgia Southern University and the Forest Heights Country Club and discussed it with Krug (President of the dormant club Board), who discussed it with the SEC, who nominated two Senators to serve on a feasibility committee: Greg Brock and Bruce McLean. Then the SEC nominated more people: Pattie Beblowski of ITS, Greg Chamblee of COE, Donna Hodnicki and Trent Maurer of CHHS, and Professor Emeritus David Stone. The goal is to work with the Forest Heights Country Club so that the faculty at Georgia Southern University will have a designated room for the faculty club. Club funds are about $141,000 and should generate about $6,000 in annual interest, enough for maybe 10 wine and cheese events over the year, and if people want to stay afterwards and have dinner at the Country Club, they could.

Provost Moore added that this is a symbiotic relationship; Forest Heights will benefit with our people being on premises.

Moderator Krug said such things as golf, tennis or swimming will not be free.

Mark Welford (COST) thought that meeting at the Country Club would be exclusionary. He said there is already a faculty social club that meets once a week, at different venues each week, thus “embracing the community and distributing our money around.” He asked if some of the funds could be set aside to encourage the social club to continue and expand. He said the Country Club proposal was “antithetical” to his views and he would not participate.
Moderator Krug said the $141,000 is dues from people paid over a long period of time, and the faculty club includes administrators and staff. She personally had no knowledge of the social club Welford referred to.

Ed Mondor (COST) agreed with Welford and suggested building a club at our newly-purchased Southern Links Golf Club location; it would be more welcoming than a relatively exclusive country club. President Keel thought that was something to consider for the future, but Forest Heights Country Club already has a staff and facilities, and current funding will cover costs.

Moderator Krug confirmed that past efforts at finding a Faculty Club building on GSU property had failed, as had attempts to get faculty to pay sufficient dues to fund a building.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) asked if any contract with Forest Heights would be short term in case another location or options open up.

Provost Moore said we’re not going to do something to commit the institution long term or do anything financially irresponsible.

Moderator Krug suggested that anyone willing to fund a Faculty Club building should contact the Provost. She then asked for questions on the response to Brock’s DFW RFI.

Robert Costomiriris (CLASS) asked where the 25% number comes from.

President Keel said he had no idea.

Costomiriris noted that everybody points the other way when asked this question.

President Keel said that he has never set any sort of benchmark percentage that he’s aware of.

Moderator Krug asked if it is possible for the Provost or the President to send to all faculty a message that there is no 25% benchmark on DFW rates. [Secretary’s Note: There was no reply to this question.]

Jill Lockwood (COBA) said that if we are using a policy to try to figure out why students are not progressing, whatever percentage we use ought to be uniform, otherwise we will get data coming in from everywhere that has no common denominator.

President Keel agreed. We are looking at those courses that have an inordinately high number of DFWs. But what percentage constitutes a large number of DFWs is something that departments and the chairs and the deans can help us determine, and it may very well be different for different courses. Such numbers “can be used
as a very poor indicator that for whatever reason, whether the faculty is not teaching appropriately or there’s a disproportionate number of unprepared students in the class, something’s not getting across.” The important thing is we’ve got to do a better job of identifying why these students are not being successful and where we can implement aggressive strategies to fix that.

Provost Moore added that all who teach look at their own grade distributions, as a form of quality control, whether one is talking too many A’s or too many F’s.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted he has heard the figure of 25% in CLASS from his Dean, and heard that it is used in COBA. He did not know if this was the source for that percentage, but had the University System of Georgia Team for Improving Retention, Graduation Rates Task Force report of May 2007, which had been chaired for the BOR by former GSU President Grube. On page 21, appendix C, it defines a high risk course as having 30% or more students get DFW.

President Keel responded, “Let the record reflect that Brooks Keel is now President of Georgia Southern University.”

Moderator Krug added, “So noted by the Senate Moderator.”

Greg Brock (COBA) noted that the response to his RFI states that W differs from D and F, but then lumps them all together for diagnostic purposes. He also suggested that if we have research status, “shouldn’t we be doing our diagnostics based on research that’s done in this area? Rather than simply a percentage off of our grade distribution?”

Provost Moore said this administration has not focused on DFW as a group; it’s the full grade distribution that matters. He said, “some of the folklore that we’re dealing with goes back to an earlier era.”

Caren Town (CLASS) said that a W is a very different situation than the D’s and F’s, that they should be uncoupled because there are all sorts of administrative reasons why and personal reasons why students drop, yet a faculty member winds up being accounted responsible for the Withdrawals.


8. Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS): The men’s student athletes for the academic year had a 2.69 as opposed to the male student body which was 2.60. The women’s student athletes for the AY had a 3.13 as opposed to the women for the overall student body, who had a 2.89. For the men the highest team GPA was tennis at 3.37, with golf at 2.99. For the women, everybody had a 3.0 or higher with the exception of women’s track, who had a 2.73. The highest was 3.37 by the volleyball team.

Generally speaking, here and nationwide student athletes do a little bit better than
the general student body. In addition, the Southern Conference Honor Roll listed 134 GSU student athletes.

He then went on to note that faculty often ask why athletics are always trying to raise money. The athletic department pays the University for the students’ tuition and fees; it comes out of their budget.

On another money issue: We are among the 125 institutions in the Football Championship subdivision. The school with the highest budget in 2009-2010 was Yale University, at $35,844,000. Number two was the University of Delaware at $31,836,000. Georgia Southern ranks 94th on that list, with a budget of $9,133,000. In terms of the Southern Conference, Georgia Southern ranks second from the bottom. In Geyerman’s opinion, we’re doing a good job with the budget we have. He noted that he was speaking in response to repeated complaints that GSU wins a lot of games and matches, but doesn’t get awards for overall performance; we do not because we do not have enough individual sports programs because we cannot afford them.


10. New Business: None.

11. Announcements: Vice Presidents: None.

12. Announcements from the Floor: None.

13. Adjournment: Moved fast and passed faster.

Submitted by Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary
Voting Members in Attendance: Barry Balleck; Yasar Bodur; Marie Botkin; Greg Brock, (Jocelyn Wang for Mikelle Calhoun); Jonathan Copeland; Robert Costomiris; Marc Cyr; Jennie Dilworth; Olivia Edenfield; Chris Geyerman; Michelle Haberland; Greg Harwood; Ming Fang He; Helena Hernandez; Clara Krug; Goran Lesaja; Jill Lockwood; Ron MacKinnon; (Lina Soares for Brenda Marina); (Reed Smith for Mary Martwitz); Bruce McLean, Edward Mondor, Lowell Mooney; Frederic Mynard; Michelle Reidel; (Greg Chamblee for Sabrina Ross); Joe Ruhland; Candy Schille; Debra Skinner; Alton Standifer; Stuart Tedders; Caren Town; Laura Valeri; Mark Welford; Patrick Wheaton; Robert Yarbrough

Voting Members Absent: Anthony Barilla; Christina Belge; Amy Boyett; Thomas Buckley; Les Furr; Todd Hall; Mary Hazeldine; Jim LoBue; Teri Ann Melton; Sze-man Ngai; John O’Malley; Dontarie Stallings; Timothy Teeter; Josh Vest; Theresa Welford; Chunshan Zhao

Administrators: Brooks Keel, President; Marilyn Bruce; Tony Bretti; Steve Burrell; Ron Core; Bede Mitchell; Charles Patterson; Michael Smith; Teresa Thompson

Visitors: Dick Diebolt, Maura Copeland; Georj Lewis; Diana Cone; Vince Miller; Jayne Perkins Brown; Gene Sherry; Keisha Hoerrner; Katherine Hilson; Deborah Allen; Jessica Minihan

Note: Technology took a short vacation and the recording missed the first twenty minutes of the meeting.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the October 24, 2011, Meeting: Approved.

2. Approval of the September 19, 2011, Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Secretary:

Cyr noted three corrections to his 9-19-11 minutes: On page 1, James Wood is not an alternate this year and so was not appropriately listed as a Voting Member; on page 2, because Academic Standards did report, there was a Librarian’s report although the Librarian didn’t know that, and it is now posted; on page 8, it should read “career-appropriate service,” not “peer-appropriate.” With these corrections, the 9-19-11 minutes were Approved.
3. **Librarian’s Report: Tony Barilla (COBA), Senate Librarian:**

Barilla was not yet present, so approval of his report was moved until later, pending his arrival from having his car serviced. Meanwhile, back at the Faculty Senate . . .

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

b. **Report from Graduate Committee: Jill Lockwood (COBA):** Approved.

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

President Keel ceded his time and all report issues to Provost Moore.

5. **Provost’s Report: Ted Moore:**

We have some updates on key searches.

- The search for Dean of the JPH College of Public Health is in its final
- The search for Director of the Center for International Studies is in the midst of the campus visit stage
- We’re also in the final stage of a search for Director of the School of Accountancy in COBA.

Next, he identified three prominent issues.

First, **Career progression** at Georgia Southern: With increased emphasis on research and scholarship, uncertainty is inevitable, but here are some bedrock principles:

A full-time teaching load is taken to mean the equivalent of four courses per semester. This is the practice nationally. Research and service commitments in the case of such a teaching load are minimal, but still expected. For a full teaching load, satisfactory research and scholarship would be that level of activity needed to maintain currency in our respective fields.

For teaching loads less than four-and-four, expectations for research and/or service are greater. (**Recording starts here.**) Reduced teaching loads should be matched with proportionately increased research and/or service contributions.

Changing criteria retroactively for untenured faculty is inappropriate. Failure to manage teaching loads properly in the face of expanded emphasis on research and scholarship
would result in shortchanging our students. Also, reduced teaching loads have a permanent financial impact on the institution.

Our aim is to provide a professional, supportive environment that allows us to achieve and contribute according to how best we can serve the institution’s mission. By succeeding in this, we’ll continue to appreciate why university teaching is among the very best, most rewarding, and most fulfilling professions.

We need time to develop strategies with due care, and faculty are asked to continue to participate in planning initiatives such as the Teaching Legacy Committee, the Pathways to Success Team, the soon-to-be launched Task Force on Service and Community Outreach, and others.

Second, we are seeing a movement now on a global scale that questions whether Universities are sufficiently effective and efficient, and that is being translated into legislative and executive edicts to improve certain outcome metrics such as retention and graduation rates, and even employment and placement rates.

Recent articles in highly visible publications represent what we are hearing:

- Nearly nine of out ten high school students say they want to go to college and earn a degree. Yet nearly half of college students drop out.
- Student loan debt now exceeds $730 billion dollars in the United States, up dramatically from just a few years ago.
- From 1990 to 2008, tuition and mandatory fees are reported to have increased 248% on average.

Many students take too much time to earn their degrees. Nationally about 61% of students take about eight years or longer to complete their four-year degrees. About half earn four-year degrees in six years. Also, there’s disparity in these numbers by race and sex, nationality, and socio-economic status. For instance, about 40% of African Americans complete four-year degrees in six years nationally. But we’re proud to acknowledge that Georgia Southern has a significantly better graduation rate for our African American student population. For students 25 and older, the so-called nontraditional student population, the graduation rate for a four-year degree in six years or less is only 27% nationally. Retention and graduation rates for women are notably higher than for men.

One can fairly question some of these numbers and their implications. For instance, 248% increase in tuition and fees is accurate, but the span 1990 through 2008 is a long time. The annual rate of increase averages 5.18%. This is greater than inflation measured by CPI, and that statistic has been quoted a lot. But it is perhaps not as dramatic as it sounds. The claim that nearly half of college students drop out is a direct
quote from a source that also complains that we do not track students well when they leave a particular college or university. In particular, students who “stop out,” that is leave college for a while and resume later, are very hard to track.

This small sampling of reported statistics may help us understand what’s behind the movement toward greater accountability. Add to that effectiveness and efficiency as well as transparency. And this movement has teeth as more states consider funding formulas that are tied to productivity, meaning graduation rates, retention rates, job placement, and so on.

This is a highly summarized version of 248-page report from a group called Complete College America, the source for an initiative from the Governor’s office called Complete College Georgia.

So something is coming at us, and we must be ready. The University of System of Georgia is preparing a system-wide plan to increase graduation and retention rates that likely will set higher goals for those rates. These kinds of requirements can be loaded with unintended consequences.

We will deal with this changing environment, however, and faculty will be engaged in making and executing the plans as we achieve the strategic vision of being recognized as one of the best comprehensive universities in the country.

And the third point to address: We are sloppy in some ways that we do business at Georgia Southern. Pardon my informal language-sloppy. Written policies are not always followed, and there are cases where what is written does not square with what is practiced, both re: personnel issues, and financial and accounting issues. Errors are often the result of inattention or not fully understanding rules and policies. GSU will institute new initiatives designed to make us all more familiar with procedures and policies.

Remember that institutions like ours are now in the sights of those who accuse higher education of lax accountability. We must be able to demonstrate that we are fully accountable and thereby affirm the public’s trust.

Candy Schille (CLASS) noted that accountability is fair, but when we talk about loads like two-two-two, and when we talk about graduation/retention we’re not talking about education and we’re not talking about class size, and those seem to be something that is not paid attention to at this university any more.

Provost Moore responded that USG is in conversation with all the University System Presidents, trying to understand these things better.
President Keel called Schille’s points excellent and said class size has to be taken into account with regard to teaching load as well. For example, if somebody is teaching a three-three and one of those classes is 150 then we ought to divide that 150 into two classes of 75 and make it a full four-four load. Another item coming down from the System office – these are not things that we are just dreaming up on our own – is a space accountability study that is going to be performed at the System level. We will have to demonstrate for every single bit of space we have, how many classes are taught in that space, what time of day those classes are taught, how many students are sitting in those seats, how many faculty are teaching, etc. This is an attempt to make sure that all USG schools are using space and times efficiently. So there is going to be a tremendous amount of increased scrutiny of everything we do from class size to how we are efficiently using our space to how our faculty are teaching to retention and graduation rates. The Complete College Georgia plan from the Governor’s office is saying by 2020 the state of Georgia will increase its completion rate, meaning a first-year certificate, two-year degree, or four-year degree from 34% which is where we are right now, to 60%. By January 2012 the University System of Georgia, by edict from the Governor, has to make plans as to how the University System will achieve that goal, and individual campuses will have to come up with their own plans by this coming July. So this is a tsunami that is coming at all universities across the country and we are certainly not immune to it. Look at Texas, Florida, and Missouri. The Governors are going to be directly linking funding to the campuses based off these metrics. We need to be on the front end of this tsunami as opposed to being completely washed out to sea by it.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) commented that the language of these things “coming at us” makes it seem like what we need to do is get ready, bend over, and hold our breath. What are the university presidents saying to the Governor and his people about what we realistically can accomplish?

President Keel noted that 35 presidents across the state are having the exact same conversation with their faculty that we’re having now. It is to try to help us put in place plans to address these issues. The Governor and legislature have control over our budget and this issue of accountability is not a new one. But more and more states, because of the budget crisis that we’ve just have been through and now are beginning to come out of, are coupling accountability with state funding that individual campuses get.

Costomiris (CLASS) noted that he is not against accountability, but against over-blown expectations that we can all of a sudden go 25% up in nine years without serious compromises to what it is we actually do here. Sometimes you need to say, “Nice idea, but we need about thirty more years for it to happen.”

Jill Lockwood (COBA) said we should take a look at those things which the institution can control, and if we can control it, then we should be held accountable for it. On the other hand, if there is something that is mandated, if there is something beyond our control, then it is basically unfair that we be burdened with that which we cannot
control, and what she meant was students who transfer into Georgia Southern that the state mandates that we must accept if they meet certain minimum standards, but who may not have a very high success rate. When we are collecting our data, it is important that we differentiate what our graduation rates are when we control the enrollment, versus when we are told that this is the minimum requirement and we must accept the student based simply on a timely application.

Provost Moore said the University System has just asked all the presidents to submit to them answers to fairly detailed questions about retention, progression, and graduation rates. Several of those questions get at what are the causes and where does the responsibility lie ultimately for remediating those causes. We can be sure that there will be a very strong statement to that effect that goes back from Georgia Southern, and the other 34 institutions as well. We’re hearing a movement and many of us say it’s simplistic. It’s based on factoids, incomplete understanding of the data. We will continue to argue, make the case. It is our job to point out what these unintended negative consequences of the current movement are to the decision makers, the legislators and the Governor, and let them see what the tradeoffs are.

Cyr (CLASS) noted that we are being held accountable for our students learning, not accountable for giving them the best opportunity to learn, and he did not think we can be held responsible for that, and added a codicil: Complete College America is funded partly by the Gates Foundation, who also funded initiatives in the Atlanta Public School System, and he hoped somebody would take a look at what their initiatives did in Atlanta. But if we’re going to have a number mandated to us—60% graduation, for example—then he would like a number mandated to him as a faculty member, a DFW quota, a curve, and he will pass the requisite number and then some, but it will be relative to the students in that class not to anything like a reasonable standard and that will make the state happy because he will meet their numbers, but what we won’t have is an educated population in Georgia.

President Keel absolutely agreed; that is what really concerns us the most. He added that we do not control the preparation of the students that we receive. And it’s not just the transfer students, but those who come straight out of high school. We are not in the business of remediation. The technical college system is taking that role on and there is going to be more and more of a push for the USG to accept courses from the technical college system in a seamless transition way, and there are a lot of quality issues associated with that. The report that we are going to make to the Regents will provide them with some ammunition to present a more reasonable plan to the Governor in terms of how we might try to get at the goal we are all interested in, which is to make a more educated Georgia, without dumbing down the process or the value of the degree.

Goran Lesaja (COST) picked up Cyr’s point re: the tremendous pressure the state is putting on increasing graduation rates leading to lowering standards. This is not going
to work unless we improve middle and high school education. And we will not achieve a 60% graduation rate.

Schille (CLASS) wanted to adjust Cyr’s idea that we’re being held accountable for students learning. We are actually being held accountable for students passing, which is a very different thing. She could not wish that the legislature would somehow see our way, that elementary schools and high schools would do a better job but we get sidetracked really easily, and she put in a word for more faculty, and more emphasis on education, and less on perhaps other things that universities do.

Provost Moore concurred completely and noted that Cyr had raised one of the most prominent unintended consequences that we all fear, that all of us as faculty have to combat, and that is allowing the academic integrity of our institution to diminish as we seek to satisfy certain goals which may or may not be particularly well thought out.

Laura Valeri (CLASS) asked if there is data about the retention rate historically: What was the retention rate twenty years ago?

Teresa Thompson (VP Student Affairs) said that in 2000 our retention rate was around 70%. We’re now over 82%. Our completion rate has gone from around 40% to around 48%. So we’ve done an incredible job at Georgia Southern and it’s not us specifically that they are after; we’re getting thrown in the mix. One thing that we can try to do is help decision-makers understand that there’s a difference between a technical college and a university. They can’t expect the same type of retention and graduation rates at the different institutions. Nevertheless, she is sure they are going to set retention and graduation goals, so we have to be aware of that, even though we are beyond the national average.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) I know we have a long meeting ahead of us, and I hate to sidetrack us with another issue, but could we get an update on SACS? I haven’t heard about SACS in quite some time.

Provost Moore: I’m sorry, I’m not understanding the question. What is your question about SACS?

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked for an update on SACS.

Provost Moore said we had a fifth year review, which is standard, and we had some shortcomings. We have a letter that’s due back to SACS in April, and we’re pursuing that now and we should be okay. We’re weak in the assessment standard at the 3.3.1, and we’re weak in another one called 2.8 which has to do with adequacy of faculty and counting faculty and so on. And some of those were data problems and they’re being cleared up now. But that said, we’ve got a long ways to go to get truly ready for SACS when they return five years later. That’ll be our tenth year; that will be our
reaccreditation. And when SACS comes they look back three years, so it’s not correct to say we have five years; it’s correct to say that we have two years to be ready. We’ve got our Institutional Effectiveness people, our people in Research and Statistical Analysis, and Student Affairs working on improving our data and so on. And we’ve got some work to do on Policies and Procedures.

***3 (redux). Librarian’s Report of October 24, 2011: Tony Barilla (COBA), Senate Librarian: Barilla having ambled in by now, the Librarian’s Report was Approved.

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

a. Response to Marc Cyr’s Request for Information

Krug read this statement: “The Senate Executive Committee thanks Provost Ted Moore for responding to the questions posed in Marc Cyr’s request for information. We recognize the problem with the definition of ‘administrator’ may have affected the accuracy of some responses. For example, the definition of administrators may have differed from the one provided by Paul Michaud and Karen Iler of Human Resources. To them, administrators include the following categories:

1. Vice President, Associate Vice President, Assistant Vice President
2. Directors
3. Deans, Associate Deans, Assistant Deans
4. Department Chairs

Inclusion of these categories may increase the number of administrators employed at Georgia Southern University in 2011. This is important because it is related to the intent of the request for information. The intent is to understand how the ratio of administrators to faculty members has changed rather than to understand how expenditures have changed.”

Cyr (CLASS) said that to save meeting time he would send some follow up questions for clarification directly to Provost Moore.

b. A Request for a Motion from the Graduate Committee was approved and placed on the agenda.

c. A Request for a Motion from the Undergraduate Committee was approved and placed on the agenda.

d. A Request for Discussion from Michelle Haberland was approved and placed on the agenda.
e. **University-Wide Faculty Pathways to Success Study Group:** The deadline for nominations was 5:00 p.m. on Friday, October 14th. We have twenty nominees for the eight slots. There is at least one nominee per each unit. We have six nominees for the one slot of a department chair in a college/or unit other than Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, and we also will select two senators. We will be working on that between now and our next Senate Executive Meeting.

f. **A Potential Request for a Motion Related to Percentages of D’s and F’s:** This is a follow up to our September meeting discussion of whether there is a percentage of D’s and F’s should be codified. The SEC is discussing making such a motion.

g. **A Potential Request for Discussion Related to Separating W’s from D’s and F’s:** This came about from Caren Town’s (CLASS) statement at the last meeting about various and sundry reasons for people withdrawing, whereas the D and F has to do with perhaps limited reasons in life. Again, the SEC is discussing making such a motion.

h. **Advance Notice: Election of Senate Moderator (2012-2013) at the November Meeting.** Nominations and self-nominations are now solicited.

Re: Chancellor Hank Huckaby’s visit of September 28, 2011: Provost Moore and President Keel requested that Krug assemble five faculty members to meet with the Chancellor from 9:30 to 10:00 on that date. She lobbied for eight, but lost. She chose the five re: diversity, gender, graduate faculty status, representation of various academic units, representation of various academic ranks, and various lengths of service to GSU: Ms. Betty Moore Nelson, an Instructor in the Department of Teaching and Learning who is on the Graduate Faculty; Dr. Tanesha Osborne, Lecturer in the Department of Chemistry, who is not on the Graduate Faculty; Dr. Ednilson Bernardes, Assistant Professor of Finance and Quantitative Analysis, Graduate Faculty; Jim Whitworth, Associate Professor, Information Systems, Graduate Faculty. The following is a summary of faculty questions and the Chancellor’s responses:

- Krug’s question: GSU has been designed a Doctoral Research University which requires that faculty members increase our level of research. How, if at all, do you anticipate that state funding can help GSU hire additional faculty members to allow us to reduce the number of classes that we teach, and dedicate that time to research?

  Chancellor Huckaby: This is not a great opportunity immediately. However, there will be areas of interest. What Georgia can do to help will depend on the federal budget. For example, if there are reductions to the Medicaid budget, the state will need to pick up that difference.
Dr. Bernardes: How receptive will the Board of Regents be to new Ph.D. programs?

Chancellor Huckaby: Decisions will be based on an integrated approach related to academic need, available facilities, and funding.

Betty Moore Nelson: With heavy teaching and supervisory responsibilities in the College of Education, additional research in the short term is not popular.

Chancellor Huckaby: There are twenty-two teacher education programs in the University System of Georgia. They need to make a case for improving the effectiveness of the teachers who graduate from their programs. GSU needs to answer the question, what should be given credit for?

Tanesha Osborne: In the future, when GSU hires faculty members, will some be designated as just for teaching and some just for research?

Chancellor Huckaby: He favors this and he thinks that it needs to come to GSU. He added that the concept of research varies with the college, not with the university or institution, but with the college within Georgia Southern.

Jim Whitworth: What information can you give us about furloughs and raises?

Chancellor Huckaby: Foresees no furloughs. There may be a possibility of raises in 2014.

7. A Request for a Motion from the Graduate Committee:

Lockwood (COBA) said the motion had two purposes: One is to increase the number of alternates from one alternate per unit to two alternates per unit because what they do is extremely time sensitive and if they do not have a quorum then they are stopped dead in their tracks. Also, the non-voting members would now include the Associate Dean for the College of Graduate Studies, and a representative from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The motion was Approved.

8. A Request for a Motion from the Undergraduate Committee:

MacKinnon (CIT) noted that the Undergraduate motion was similar to the Graduate motion, increasing from one alternate to two; and the alternate can replace the elected member of the committee or the appointed member of the committee. The motion was Approved.
9. **Discussion of Guns on Campus** (Michelle Haberland, CLASS): Krug noted that as submitted by Haberland, this had seven questions, to which the Senate Executive Committee added an eighth. What department/unit will bear responsibility for this range? Vice President Thompson answered questions one through seven, provided additional information about Campus Recreation and Intramurals Shooting Sports Education Center, and provided information about the National Shooting Sports Foundation’s offering colleges $300,000 in grants to shooting programs. Krug limited discussion to 20 minutes and would recognize Senators first, then participants from the Gallery.

Greg Brock (COBA) noted that VP Thompson’s reply said in part, “There is a strong need to provide firearm education and training. We fear what we do not know and we believe that there is an inherent responsibility to provide this education when the opportunity presents itself.” The American Academy of Pediatrics website says, “The absence of guns from children’s homes and communities is the most reliable and effective measure to prevent firearm related injuries in children in adolescence.” He asked if we shouldn’t be promoting the absence of guns as the Academy says because they seem to contradict some elements of VP Thompson’s reply.

Lockwood (COBA) agreed with the Academy of Pediatrics, but felt that was an ideal, that there are guns in the home, and she would like to see people who have been schooled on when and how to use a gun, how to store a gun, how to keep guns away from children, and more particularly when they are legally privileged to use that gun. And if this is what this particular facility does then she will support it.

Nevertheless, Brock (COBA) urged that we check this out with data.

Cyr (CLASS) noted that because of the potential for NCAA Shooting Sports, he was not in principle opposed to the gun range and archery range, but wished it were at the golf course so that it would be farther away from the main campus and he would be less likely to get hit by a stray. But if it is going to be in the elbow of 301 and the Bypass so that classes can more reasonably get to it, he had a number of suggestions for security that he had already given to Teresa Thompson. He felt that the way the proposal is set up would allow all and sundry very easily to be walking across campus with arms and with the Georgia Southern police unable to identify who is and who is not excepted to do that. He read into the record four suggestions (go to the link above). He was further concerned that as currently proposed the ranged could well serve as the wedge to open up the whole campus to gun carrying all the time, and felt we had to make absolutely sure that the guns aren’t anywhere but right there and secured.

VP Thompson noted that Cyr’s proposals were already in the process and by state law everything he proposed has to occur. Students, if they do bring guns, have to be checked there at the range and cannot carry guns across campus. We do not know now if a
person has a gun on campus unless we do a body check. We will make it very clear with all the rules that all state laws for guns on campus apply. One of the reasons that we strategically placed it on that elbow was so we could have greater control:

- it will be totally fenced in
- there also will be video
- people will have to do background checks, but
- students will not be allowed to have guns on campus. That is the only facility that they will be allowed. At any point if they are caught with guns, they will be expelled. We will make sure that that information is put out to everyone on campus and clearly understood. We have done a large amount of research. We’ve check with other institutions across the United States and there has been no reported incidence of increase in guns on campus with all of these shooting facilities.

Schille (CLASS) directed attention to VP Thompson’s reply, page 1 of 7, under question 1, paragraph 2: “Additional academic activities classes have been requested for many years by faculty and this additional space will allow GSU to offer archery classes.” Also on page 3 of 7, she pointed out the mission statement of Campus Recreation and Intramurals, and on page 4 of 7, at the top, an attempt to link Academic Success and apparently Recreation and Intramurals, which she called vague at best. She suggested that if faculty have been asking for space devoted to academics, they didn’t mean a shooting range or an archery range, and this doesn’t satisfy faculty desires nor does it satisfy the University primary mission which is to educate students.

VP Thompson noted the archery classes have been requested for many years from the Activities classes, and we did not have the room we’ve had to take the soccer fields away so that we could add the archery fields. We have had students approach us and they have created an archery club through Intramurals. Faculty are asking for additional activity classes. Activity classes take a lot of space and archery is a growing sport across Georgia and across the country. Whether they offer shooting classes would totally be up to the faculty, but current emphasis is on archery. We now have the opportunity without using any university dollars to be able to have a very elite shooting type of sport facility for archery, and also indoor shooting.

Krug (CLASS) asked if Thompson was referring to faculty members in the Department of Health and Kinesiology when she mentioned faculty members.

VP Thompson did not answer but added that we offer over 40 classes right now in the RAC and that is at capacity.
Haberland (CLASS) had concerns regarding the process. First was rumor over this summer, then an AAUP member happened to come across the *Augusta Chronicle*’s August 20 article which discussed that Georgia Southern was planning this gun range and that one week prior the Board of Regents had authorized the school to move forward with the project. And so she was concerned that this hadn’t been discussed and considered in a thoughtful way up until this October 24th Senate meeting, and that was a long time for no faculty input and no SGA input to have been solicited.

VP Thompson said we could not move forward unless we had Board of Regents approval because they are the only ones that can authorize us to have a designated area that would have some type of shooting facility. SGA were approached last year re: the lack of recreational facilities for the increased enrollment. We have not signed the grant, however, though we have had the proposal from DNR and they would love for us to sign the grant, but until we could do all of our due diligence then we were not going to do that, and part of that was having this discussion with the Faculty Senate.

Alton Standifer (SGA) confirmed having those conversations and added that one of the reasons that it was not announced previously was that they did not want to tell students that we had this opportunity to bring something and then it get to Board of Regents level and not be approved.

Ed Mondor (COST) noted that it said on page 3 of 7, “$325,000 from Recreation Reserves.” Were the students asked in a very systematic fashion, such as taking some sort of vote, if they are in favor of their money supporting a shooting range on campus?

Standifer (SGA) noted the SGA commonly preaches to the students that the monies from recreation activity reserves left over at the end of the year are then to be used for additional recreation, and the Recreation Activity Center is busting at the seams, so we needed additional spaces, and that’s where we were able to move forward with the multipurpose facilities that will be at the golf course, and this opportunity. Also, this will free up some of the fields that are currently being used for archery. Last spring the students had an archery event that had around 300 students there, so a decent number of students are interested.

Mondor (COST) thought there is a big difference between something like a soccer field or a climbing wall versus a shooting range where people are learning how to kill something more efficiently. He wondered whether students would support that or not, and would like to see something formal to see if students really would be in favor of supporting something like a shooting range.

Standifer (SGA) offered to forward to Krug the minutes from a previous SGA meeting where they had a vote of the student representatives on that issue.
Costomiris (CLASS) remained perplexed at how uninformed the faculty has been about this. We got it through the Augusta paper, nothing locally, nothing from the administration here, that this is coming, yet this is something that is going to impact all of us. He was adamantly opposed to having any weaponry on campus, especially firearms. He objected strongly to faculty being kept in the dark. He did not see any openness in this process until it’s so far along that possibly it can’t be stopped. And he would like to see it stopped.

Krug (CLASS) called for gallery input, but received none. A motion to extend discussion for five more minutes was Approved.

Cyr (CLASS) noted that he and other AAUP members had discussed the private funding of the range, that Easton has been involved in Olympic archery and sports archery for a long time, but the National Sports Shooting Foundation is the number one trade organization for gun manufacturers, and basically they oppose anything that might restrict anybody’s right to carry or use any kind of firearms anywhere. He would be very leary of NSSF being involved in this.

Bruce McLean (COST) wanted clarification on how the RAC has been maxed out.

Gene Sherry (Campus Recreation and Intramurals) responded that currently there are 64 academic activity classes per semester and they are allocated time between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Additional spaces that are available are outdoor fields, and they certainly are not in use 24/7 so it may be somewhat figurative to say maxed out, but our participation rates and the hourly usage of spaces within the RAC 8-5 are. We would begin to displace the general student recreation which the facility was designed for.

Haberland (CLASS) followed up on Cyr’s assessment of the NSSF by noting that the NSSF has recently taken the ATF, the federal law enforcement agency that oversees the sale of guns in our country, to court because the ATF is now requiring in certain parts of the country that when you sell multiple semi-automatic weapons there be a report associated with that. The NSSF says that is not a good idea. She then noted that the news report suggests that the range will be open to the public, and so we will be encouraging members of the public to bring their guns from home to our campus.

VP Thompson said the grant is a partnership with the Department of Natural Resources, which does gun education, and they were looking for a partner for South Georgia. Regardless of whether this is put on our campus at the wedge where we have control, the DNR will have one near our campus because they want the location of students because of the National Archery Program. Here we have an opportunity to partner with DNR and we have greater access and control over this than if they find a piece of property right next to us and build the project. They are looking for a place in South Georgia because there are so many hunters, and they want the partnership with a university.
Krug (CLASS) noted that the time extension for discussion had run out. Another motion to extend discussion was defeated, so Krug closed discussion. She noted this did not preclude further requests of motions or discussions at a later meeting.

10. **Report from the SGA Liaison: Mark Welford (COST):** Welford noted that he had been present at an SGA meeting when the gun range did come up, and it was a very confused discussion. They had not got very much information, but the general gist of it was that only one student that he heard was in favor of it, and a lot of students were quite worried and concerned about the overall situation. But he was not there for the vote that came the week afterwards.

Standifer (SGA) confirmed that there was a vote of 26-19 to support it, though that support is contingent on SGA receiving more information.

11. **Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS):** Nothing to report.

At this point, re: the gun range issue, several senators and gallery visitors remained fuzzy on the concept of “discussion is closed.” Krug clarified that it meant no more discussion during this meeting; that another Request for Discussion could be submitted for a future meeting; that a Request for a Motion could also be made were someone so inclined, and this would naturally include discussion; or a Request for Information could be made. After two transcript pages’ worth of clarification, she moved to . . .

12. **Unfinished Business:** None

13. **New Business:** None

Krug had two announcements. The first was all faculty should have received a vellum mailing, and she urged us to not throw it away. The second announcement was that the SharePoint program in use by the Senate seldom works, she would like to take an axe to it, and we may replace it by the good old “Submit something, Ginger sends it out” method. She will keep us posted.

14. **Announcements: Vice Presidents:**

Steve Burrell (Information Technology) noted that IT had successfully upgraded SharePoint to 2010. He had had seven distress calls that morning. We’ve had seven distress calls this morning.

15. **Announcements from the Floor:** None

16. **Adjournment:** Moved and Approved.
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Voting Members Absent: Marie Botkin, Amy Boyett, Thomas Buckley, Olivia Edenfield, Leslie Furr, Michelle Haberland, Mary Hazeldine, Goran Lesaja, Jim LoBue, Sze-Man Ngai, John O’Malley, Joe Ruhland, Don Stallings, Caren Town, , Theresa Welford, Chunshan Zhao

Administrators in Attendance: Brooks Keel, Salinda Arthur, Bede Mitchell, Ted Moore, Michael Smith, Tony Bretti

Visitors: Diana Cone, Stephen Rossi, Vince Miller, Ellen Hendrix, Chris Caplinger, Kathy Albertson, Candace Griffith, Michelle Cawthorn, Amy Ballagh

1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 16, 2011, Meeting.

With one change – Provost Moore would speak before President Keel – the agenda was Approved.

2. Approval of the October 24, 2011, Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

There were some additions to those attending: Senators Tony Barilla and Jim Lobue attended, and visitors included Michael Moore, Kathleen Comerford, Maria Adams, and Julia Griffin. The amended minutes were Approved.


The Librarian’s Report was originally dated and posted on November 2nd, but after that a correction came from the Undergraduate Committee. Barilla asked Ron MacKinnon (CIT) from the Undergraduate Committee to explain.
a. **Report from the Undergraduate Committee: Ron MacKinnon (CIT).**

The meeting of the Undergraduate Committee was October 11th. Most of the decisions were revisions. In the College of Education, there were three deletions; in the Department of Teaching and Learning, for Global Citizens and 1410 Honors, there were SACS-suggested changes in the descriptions of the courses. In the Honors section, there was a request from the Honors Program that the Undergraduate Committee authorize the University Honors Program to verify honors-level work in contracted classes and allow them to place the “H” on the course. **There were several changes in BA Chemistry degree**, a revision to the Bachelor of Science in Geology, a revision to the BS in Mathematics, and revisions to programs in the Department of Construction Management and Civil Engineering. From the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, revisions to the Comparative Literature Interdisciplinary Minor and the Department of Music-Seminar in Music Education. In other business, Dr. McLean asked if the SGA Representative was a voting member. According to the Operating Code for the Undergraduate Committee, the answer is No. The Undergraduate Committee Report was Approved.

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

Under new business the committee approved four course deletions, a course revision, and revised program information and endorsements from the College of Education; two course deletions, and a program revision from CLASS; and four Graduate Committee faculty volunteered to serve on the 2011-2012 COGS Scholarship Sub-Committee. In addition, information items were presented on the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (known as the ICPSR) and the Center for Research Libraries, which are both available through Galileo. Under Old Business, there was an announcement on program self-study information being made available on-line through the Institutional Effectiveness office. The Graduate Committee Report was Approved.

Belatedly, the Librarian’s Report as a whole was Approved.

**4. Provost’s Report: Ted Moore:**

**Complete College Georgia**

Complete College Georgia has been adopted by the University System of Georgia. The Governor has initiated this plan to increase the number of college-educated adults in our state. It is patterned on a national initiative called Complete College America. It calls for increased collaboration with the Technical College system, and requires that each unit in the USG system develop a campus "completion plan" by June 1, 2012. Faculty will be engaged in the planning effort as well as the execution phase.
Consolidation Principles

The Chancellor of USG has announced that careful study will be undertaken to identify possible opportunities to consolidate higher education institutions. The political and social ramifications are well recognized, and the System Office has produced a set of guiding principles that will serve to inform discussion of possible consolidation efforts. The GSU administration is not encouraging speculation. All affected parties will be engaged at the appropriate time.

College of Engineering and Information Technology

On November 4th, the President accepted a recommendation from a merger team representing faculty, staff, students, and alumni to form a new college by merging civil, mechanical, and electrical engineering and the computer science and the information technology department, both of which are now in the College of Information Technology. The same team proposed that the new college be known as CEIT, the College of Engineering and Information Technology; it will blend engineering science and modern information science. GSU is prepared to mount a global search for a founding dean and is in active discussions about interim leadership of this new unit. Provost Moore said that this was a faculty-led initiative in response to the suggestion by the President and Provost that such a configuration be examined.

Financial Accountability

The week before, Provost Moore sent all faculty a memorandum about audits and accountability. Findings from a half dozen financial audits of units within the Academic Affairs domain have been serious. These span more than one unit, involve faculty as well as staff, and are not confined to purchasing card mistakes and travel issues. Some of the audits have resulted in reprimands, restitution, or legal action. One of the audits is still underway.

An audit of an individual or a unit may be requested based on suspicion of something inappropriate, or may be at the request of management, meaning a department chair, dean, provost, president, a division director. And it is standard practice to seek an audit in the case of a change in budget authority. For example, a change in dean, a change in department chair, and so on. This is a "best practice," and it is in everyone’s interest, the incumbent as well as the successor. It indicates nothing about suspected impropriety. In addition, though, unit audits also arise on a routine rotating basis.

There is an established protocol. First, audit findings are reported to the USG Audit Office. In cases where wrongdoing is suspected, the System General Counsel is consulted. The State Attorney General may then be consulted to determine next steps. The AG may advise an investigation by law enforcement, and depending on the outcome, the Attorney General or a District Attorney may decide to prosecute.

It is important to note that audit results go where the facts lead. The protocol is not to be influenced by Presidents, Provosts, Deans, or Department Chairs or anyone. The
Provost, President, and Deans do not decide whether to investigate or to prosecute. That goes through channels through the System and ultimately, if necessary, into the court system. This has to do with the integrity of the audit process. That demands an arm’s length arrangement with our auditors, and that arrangement is fully respected at Georgia Southern.

The audit staff here has a dual reporting line, as is the case with every institution in the System. The auditor reports to the President and the auditor also reports to the System Audit Office. Our audit office takes integrity seriously, but they do not overreact to findings. All of us make mistakes, but not with the intent of deceiving anyone or covering something. The current audit reports are not about human mistakes, but about things that are more serious than that.

What must we do, what can we do, to ensure to financial accountability?

1. The audit process will continue. We have a small audit staff, only three auditors for a budget of around $300 million a year in expenditures. The number of transactions that are involved in just administering that budget every day are enormous, so mistakes happen. Processes can be weak and so on. We asked that an audit be conducted of the College of Public Health. We’re bringing in a new Dean, Dr. Greg Evans, who will benefit from having an audit of the unit before he comes in, and Dr. Evans realizes that when he leaves that deanship there will be an audit at that time for his successor’s benefit. That’s not because of suspicion, but because it is good business practice.

2. We must all reacquaint ourselves with policies and procedures from time to time. We have a seven-part workshop series in place for all department chairs and associate deans this year. We will devote a portion of this series to financial accounting policies, the audit process, and good business practices. Our deans will receive additional exposure, as well. The office staff in Academic Affairs is asked to apply greater care and scrutiny of financial actions, and we’re doing some retraining there as well.

3. The VP for Business and Finance is completing a new policy that clarifies approval authority for all financial transactions at the institution. And other policies and procedures will be reviewed, as well.

4. For faculty and staff, the decision rule for conducting a transaction should be to do so only if we know it is right, not because we were unaware that it was wrong. Look for written policy. Auditors audit to written policy, not folklore. Second, apply the "newspaper test." As you submit a request for travel reimbursement, or some other type of financial transaction, ask how you would react if this were laid out in a newspaper story. The transaction involves public funds, and therefore it is public information, and there is much scrutiny now being devoted to accountability in universities in the United States.
5. The Provost then urged everyone to be sensitive to the difficult nature of bad audit findings. Developments that we have seen recently can be the subject of gossip and speculation. This serves no purpose. He said the administration does not dodge questions, does not hide things. When it is appropriate to speak they speak, but it is important to allow inquiries to be channeled properly. Our Marketing & Communications Office is fully informed routinely and equipped to address media inquiries. Provost Moore said the administration was not suggesting that we not talk to the press. We have freedom to do that. But our Marketing & Communications Department has been equipped with full context on any of the issues that people may be hearing about, and most of us individually do not have that full context. So if we receive a call from a reporter asking for comment on something we may have heard about, what we have heard may very well be correct, but we should think about how much else we may not have heard. When Provost Moore gets a call from a reporter, he calls Christian Flathman of the Marketing & Communications Office.

Provost Moore said a positive and constructive aspect of all this is that Georgia Southern is identifying its own problems. We are not reading about these in the Atlanta Journal Constitution. We are not being surprised. We find our own problems. We are devising remedies. We hold ourselves to the highest standards. Our recent audit experience demonstrates that we will accept nothing less.

6. President’s Report: Brooks Keel:

President Keel introduced the new Vice President for University Advancement, Salinda Arthur, who comes from Virginia Tech with a tremendous amount of experience. He then apologized for any problems his broken leg might cause to his usual conduct and deportment, but he should be completely healed in 3-6 months.

Next, he apologized to faculty for failing to keep them properly informed on matters that significantly affect the university. He called the Shooting Complex one example of that, although the administration brought this to the attention of the Senate when they felt the timing was right. Some projects take a great deal of time in order for them to develop to a point where the administration has answers to questions. He promised the administration would do better on this subject in future.

He next admitted he had failed to seek faculty advice and input on issues that impact faculty ability to perform their duties as teachers and scholars, and pledged to do his job better so that faculty can do theirs. He noted the reapportionment of Veazey Hall as a good example of this. We now have a Space Utilization Committee in place with appropriate representation that will be able to address these issues.

He next noted that Moderator Krug had brought to his attention faculty reaction to the recent decision to tax endowments and major gifts to the Foundation to allow GSU to support the staff of the Foundation. He said this is a practice that is very common, in fact almost universally accepted at most larger universities, and it is an indirect cost, or administrative overhead, that allows us to pay for the staff to support our efforts to try
to raise upwards of $100 million in the next capital campaign. Our consultants have told us we need at least 14 new staff members. We have to find ways to pay for those 14 new staff positions other than using E&G money. He was sure faculty would agree.

Does he need and should he welcome from faculty constructive criticism, advice, and input, both solicited and unsolicited, on matters of importance? Absolutely, and he will seek to better promote an open and transparent environment where such input and indeed criticism can flow freely. However, will he seek faculty advice and input on every significant matter or every decision? Absolutely not, and he would hope that faculty would not expect him to.

Like it or not the running of any university is not a completely democratically governed process, and the administration of the entire university cannot be done by committee. There are many forces both internal and external that influence the myriad decisions that he as President, the President’s Cabinet, the Deans, the Chairs, and the Directors make on a daily basis.

It is just not practical nor in many cases appropriate for the administration to seek input on every decision that must be made. And unfortunately there are decisions that must be carried out that do not allow for an open discussion of the reasons why such action occurred. He gave one crucial example:

Personnel decisions, whether positive or negative, often have to be made without the benefit of open discussion, and there are many reasons for this.

- We live in a litigious society. Litigation may result from a personnel decision and we must protect the university. Openly discussing these issues would put the university in an untenable legal position.

- As the Provost has pointed out, legal action, even criminal prosecution may result (i.e. a possible crime has been committed) and openly discussing these issues would hamper law enforcement investigations and prosecution.

- We always strive to protect the privacy and reputation of the individuals in question. Openly discussing personnel decisions precludes such privacy, and very often puts the individual that is in the center of all of this in an untenable position of having to have this played out in public instead of being held privately.

Does this mean that administration decisions are “none of your business”? Does this mean that faculty are not entitled to ask questions? Does this mean that the administration wishes to stifle faculty contact with the media or to voice opinions or concerns? Absolutely not. But there has to be appreciation for the position of the administration and trust that the administration is doing what is best. Also, there has to be a great deal of respect and trust by the administration for the faculty and staff, including these groups’ input, thoughts, concerns, etc., where appropriate in decisions that affect the university.
President Keel said we all have a responsibility first to the institution, and then to ourselves. He was not telling anyone what to do nor admonishing anyone for doing anything specific, but wanted everyone to consider several things: This is America, and freedom of speech is one of our most precious tenets. The same applies for the concept of academic freedom. But with this freedom comes great responsibility. No one will ever tell you that it is inappropriate to speak to the media, or to speak your mind. The Provost had already addressed this. However, we all need to consider the ramifications of what we say openly, ramifications to the University and to individuals. The administration has seen examples of comments made to the media that are potentially hurtful to the institution and to specific members of the faculty and staff, and in many cases he has seen no purpose behind this except to cause disruption, to further stimulate controversy merely for the sake of controversy itself, or for self-promotion. He has also seen instances where it appears that students have been brought into the discussion as a mechanism to further stimulate controversy. He found this troubling.

He called *The George-Anne* a fine venue for our students to report campus-specific and world-wide news, express views, and learn respectable journalism. We all have responsibility to insure that these student reporters have the facts, and if we are uncertain of the facts, the real facts and not just opinion, unless they just simply ask for our opinion, then “no comment” is the appropriate response, or a referral to Christian Flathman.

He went on that faculty have the right to request information from the administration, and the RFI process of the Faculty Senate is a very appropriate venue for this purpose. However, some of the RFIs take an inordinate amount of staff time to track down all the data required to adequately provide answers. This takes an already stretched-thin staff away from their routine duties and can cause a huge burden. He asked that faculty first try to find answers on their own and then ask themselves what the reason is for asking the questions in the first place.

President Keel said we have many challenges ahead of us, and named a few:

- increasing student:faculty ratios, and their potential damage to our student-centered relationship
- increasing class sizes
- decreasing, or at best, flat budgets
- no pay increases in 4-5 years, none on the close horizon
- changing the culture from “excellence in teaching” to excellence in teaching AND research”
- managing teaching loads responsibly
- financial accountability
- RPG

But he noted we also have an incredibly bright future ahead of us. He has been impressed with the incredibly civil nature in which the Faculty Senate, and all faculty, and the Administration have worked. He acknowledged and accepted responsibility for
a few slips in transparency and openness, and pledged to work even harder towards a productive, collaborative, and collegial relationship with the Senate, and with all faculty.

Frederic Mynard (COST) asked if President Keel had a specific example in mind of RFIs that may take an inordinate amount of staff time.

President Keel noted he had hoped that no one would ask for a specific example because it gives the impression that the administration is singling out an individual or a particular instance, which he did not want to do.

That said, an example did come to his mind of when just a simple asking of a question to someone else would have precluded the need for a formal RFI process: The administration had to spend a tremendous amount of time looking at the issue of how many administrators GSU had and currently has. He thought that was an incredibly valid question, and it came from an AJC article that asked a similar thing about other institutions, but it took a tremendous amount of time to collect and go through all that information. He asked that faculty not get him wrong, that he was not saying don’t ask questions and don’t submit RFIs, but that in some cases information could be attained without having to go through that formalized process. Once we get to a formalized process, it requires a formalized response. And that means going through a tremendous amount of information to get that data. Many of these things can be addressed more cordially without having to go through a formalized process.

Mynard (COST) noted that the particular RFI used as an example by President Keel had a follow-up report slated on the agenda for later in the meeting.

Moderator Krug added that this had not been staged.

Robert Costomoris (CLASS) was under the impression that the whole point of an RFI is to make information public instead of having it kept private, so while he understood it’s a hassle sometimes, RFIs are asked in the spirit of the subject being important and out of a desire that everybody receive the same information; private conversations between two individuals can lead to hearsay and its consequences, rather than the positive consequences of the administration providing an official and authoritative answer.

President Keel said that was a very good point.

Provost Moore agreed, but said individuals could find answers on their own and then share them. His example: If he wanted to know how many faculty we have, he should know, and he can count them and then tell, for example, the Faculty Senate.

President Keel also mentioned that much of the information is readily available, with just a little bit of digging. The annual reports provide a huge amount of information on enrollments, on GPAs, on statistics, on the ethnicity of our faculty, on part-time vs. full-time, distribution of our students. And in many cases, faculty may not even realize that we have that. If that’s the case, then it is incumbent upon the administration to help faculty better know where that information can be obtained. He does not know where to
find everything himself. He reiterated that this was not intended to be an admonishment.

Moving on for now, Costomiris (CLASS) asked the President and the Provost if they saw any connection between Complete College Georgia and Pathways to Success.

President Keel saw the two as completely independent of each other. One is based off the history and culture of the University in the past, and the other is based on how we move the university forward in the future. Teaching was the primary focus and mission of this university. We are changing to include excellence in research and scholarship as well. This cannot be done overnight. For one thing, we have promotion and tenure issues and do not want especially younger faculty caught up in changing requirements that they did not sign on for. We also do not want senior faculty, who came here for lots of different reasons and have excelled in their discipline in teaching, to feel left out, and the worst thing we could possibly do is to create a two-tier system where the teachers aren’t important and the researchers are, or in which being an important faculty member is tied to how many dollars that individual brings in.

He said that this committee will help us come to grips with how we change this culture. How do we create a situation where those faculty who want to be outstanding teachers can be valued at this University? How can they be sure that five/ten years down the road they will not be devalued because they don’t bring in the big bucks? He then noted that the faculty who really want an opportunity to do scholarship are what really drive him, faculty who think teaching is cool, but really want to do scholarship. How can they get the time to do scholarship and not be an incredible burden on the rest of the faculty who have to make up that teaching load? To President Keel, that aspect has absolutely nothing to do with Complete College Georgia. But clearly, everything we do as a faculty is intertwined and you can’t talk about RPG without talking about teaching load. So yes, Pathways to Success and Complete College Georgia are somewhat linked, but really are very different.

Provost Moore agreed and added that the Complete College Georgia document approved by the Board is quite general. We are going to determine our own specific goals and metrics, to the extent that we can do that with the approval of the System.

Laura Valeri (CLASS) thanked the Provost for his clear comments in reference to the audits, but had two questions, if that was okay.

The first was re: auditing from policy. Finding the right forms for the right kind of reimbursement is extremely complicated, and she wondered whether that might be part of the cause of some of the recent events and whether there was any thought being given to making the process more straightforward. Second, if it was okay, she asked if what the Provost called “serious audit findings” was related to the dollar amounts involved.

President Keel said the dollar amount has absolutely nothing to do with it whatsoever. If there is intention to defraud or commit theft by deception, the Attorney General in the
state of Georgia has absolutely no sense of humor. We’ve had issues over $1,800, we’ve had issues over $186, and they are both viewed with the same intensity and pursued with the same aggressiveness.

Provost Moore, on the issue of clarity of policies and procedures, said we need to find where the confusion lies, but the issues that have generated legal scrutiny are not filling out the wrong form, that sort of thing. It goes beyond that.

President Keel added that they don’t want to scare anybody into, for example, not traveling anymore. A lot of this is just common sense. For example, you can’t take vacation and expect the University to pay for it. If you want to take your spouse or your partner with you to a conference and take a side trip to have a little bit of a vacation and your spouse or partner stays with you in a hotel and eats—there’s nothing wrong with that. Just make sure that you delineate that the University is only paying for your part of it, and you are paying for your partner’s part of it, and give a little explanation.

Fred Mynard (COST) apologized for going back to the issues of the RFI on numbers of personnel in various categories, and the remarks on the Pathways committee. He further apologized in advance if what he was going to say sounded confrontational; this was not his intent. He saw the RFI and Pathways as linked. He understood it had caused a hassle to dig through the data, but this was precisely so that we as a body can have a conversation about what options are on the table if we want to develop research. For instance, if it appears that the resources directed towards administrative positions are significant, we can have a conversation on whether the resources should go towards administrative positions or faculty positions. Pathways is one thing, but the best way to develop research and everything else in this university is to create faculty positions. Therefore, though it might be a hassle, he thought this a very important RFI.

President Keel wished he had never brought the topic up. The administration wants to make sure that they provide all the information needed so that faculty can have confidence that we are utilizing resources to the fullest to accomplish our goals. The Provost and he have been very vocal about saying their number one objective is to increase the number of faculty. Accomplishing this will solve virtually all of the problems that we have, from increasing classroom sizes, to student:faculty ratios, to dispersing teaching loads, because we would have more folks to make that happen.

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

a. The President had approved the rewording of the descriptions of membership of the Graduate Committee and the Undergraduate Committee in the Faculty Senate Bylaws in the Faculty Handbook.

b. The following were approved for the agenda and were upcoming in this meeting: A Request for a Motion from the Academic Standards Committee, a Request for a Motion from the General Education Committee, a Request for Discussion from the Library Committee, a Request for Information from Sandra Peacock, a Request for a Motion
from Robert Costomiris, and, at the request of the SEC, a Follow-Up Report to a Request for Information from Marc Cyr.

7. **A Motion from the Academic Standards Committee to Revise the Student Grade Appeal Procedure: Rob Yarbrough (COST).**

This came about because of a request from the Provost’s office regarding confusion about some of the language and especially the timeline. The current policy says the process must start at a certain term and the question was whether or not summer counted as a term. For example, a spring grade appeal was generally passed over until the fall before a student could begin a grade appeal. The proposed change would open up that window during which a student can begin the process while at the same time recognizing that many faculty may not be available during the summer, and so allow for that flexibility of a faculty member not being available during the summer to complete stage one of the process. The motion as read (the text having been posted earlier):

“The Academic Standards Committee moves that the Faculty Senate adopt the revised Student Grade Appeal (aka Petition to Review/Change a Grade) Policy below. This revised policy would replace the current language found in section 318 of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook and the ‘Petition to Review/Change a Grade’ entry in the General Academic Information section of the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog.”

The motion was Approved.

8. **A Motion from the General Education Committee to Include this Committee as a Standing Committee: Lowell Mooney (COBA).**

Historically, as we prepare for a SACS visit we revisit the core curriculum and Gen Ed requirements via an ad hoc committee. This motion seeks to have this be an ongoing process. Also, ad hoc committee recommendations for changes have had to come through the overworked Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. This General Education Committee could bring recommendations straight to the Senate. Mooney read the motion:

“Voting membership of the General Education Committee shall be composed of senators or senate alternates representing each college and the library, one per unit, appointed by the Senate Executive Committee and faculty members elected by and representing each college and the library, one per unit. Non-voting membership shall be composed of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs (or his/her delegate), who shall vote in the case of a tie among the voting members of the committee, the Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness (or his/her delegate), the Vice President for Student Affairs & Enrollment Management (or his/her delegate), and the SGA President or SGA Vice President of Academic Affairs. The chair shall be a senator elected by the voting members of the committee.”

The motion was Approved by the required two-thirds majority for a Bylaws change.
9. A Request for Discussion from the Library Committee: Greg Harwood (CLASS):

Pursuant to a senate motion in Fall 2008, the Library Committee supplied information to the Faculty Senate on the Library budget and how it relates to the student populations of our Library in relationship to other designated peer and aspirational institutions.

Moderator Krug noted that the full report was in the Librarian’s Report.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) was struck by the fact that Georgia Southern is beneath Valdosta State, which is a much smaller institution with a less robust research program than this institution. He found our numbers to be sad.

Bede Mitchell (Dean, University Library) said that while we are clearly not where we would like to be in relationship to these other libraries, it is important to know that when we first started reporting these data that figure was $224 per FTE student; it is now up to $278 per FTE student.

Costomiris (CLASS) asked when $224 was in place. Dean Mitchell noted that was 2008.

Mark Welford (COST) said that we keep getting asked to streamline the journals that we want and the amount of electronic access to journals, and yet if we’re going to pursue more research that is just the kind of thing that we need. While he saw that the numbers have increased, as a faculty member he has fewer resources available to conduct research, and that’s very distressing if we are to do more research and be more productive. It is the opposite of what we need.

Provost Moore agreed and said that one of our major missions will be to develop a long-term plan on how we actually go about implementing a move toward greater research presence. That is going to take investment from faculty, it’s going to take investment infrastructure, it will take investment in support materials and library periodicals, etc. So we have a lot of work to do before we can move toward our goal.

Harwood (CLASS) added that the Library Committee were impressed with the creative ways the Library has tried and get the biggest bang out of their little buck, such as trying to pay ahead for subscriptions before the prices go up. They have been very diligent about trying to maximize the resources that they have.

10 A Request for Information about Guns on Campus: Jennie Dilworth (CHHS):

Sandra Peacock submitted this RFI, a list of additional questions regarding the proposed shooting range on campus, to which VP for Student Affairs Teresa Thompson responded. The whole thing was four solid pages, so Dilworth begged off reading it because it had all been posted for some days.
Robert Costomiris (CLASS) noted that one of VP Thompson’s responses to the RFI stated, “A person utilizing their personal firearm at the facility will register the weapon, undergo a background check, attend an orientation session and be issued a pass to carry the registered weapon on the premises of the facility only.” He wondered how people could actually adhere to these mobility restrictions.

VP Thompson said the location of the facility offers that opportunity. It is directly off of the Bypass. They won’t have to come past that facility, but will be able to stop right there. We can have signage also at the entrance of campus, but it’s like any other process: You cannot have guns on campus. There will be no reason for anyone to come on the roads of campus. The facility will be right at 301 and the end of Register Road; the entrance will be right there as people turn into that part of the outskirts of campus.

Costomiris (CLASS) asked what people coming to use the range would have to do.

VP Thompson said there will be firearms that students can check out with the range master. If they bring their own guns, the only way they could have those guns is to not come on campus, go directly to that facility, check in the guns, they will be kept in a locker, and can only be checked in and out at that point.

Costomiris (CLASS) was still unclear on exactly where the facility would be.

VP Thompson said that from where the RAC facility is now, directly across the street, but facing 301, as you turn into the campus on Register Road.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) asked about modes of transportation. He understood that someone would have to drive directly to the facility and wouldn’t be able to drive around campus. He was not sure how you would logistically police people driving around campus with a gun in their car, but beside that point, asked if that meant that no one would be allowed to walk or take any other mode of transit besides driving a car directly to the facility. He suggested that someone with a personal firearm who decides to walk to the facility will be unlikely to walk some other route rather than across campus to get there. He thought this was not about people not believing that the plans will address security, but about whether many of these questions have actually been considered.

Moderator Krug (CLASS) asked if the question had not only to do with this particular facility, but with the entire campus. Yarbrough said that was so. Krug ruled we would not get into something that has to do with global life at GSU, but would fix on this one response to the request for information. Questions about something else, such as access to any road by anybody with a gun, were not sufficiently focused. The access question had been answered.

Ming Fang He (COE) asked what would happen if students or faculty members have a gun in their trunk while driving on campus.

VP Thompson noted that if you’re found to have a gun on campus, by current state law you will be prosecuted. For example: We had a routine traffic check this past year where
they stopped a student and saw a gun in the back seat. The police arrested the person. You cannot carry a gun on campus. The only way in this specific instance is right there at the edge of campus: You will turn off a public road and immediately into that facility.

Moderator Krug noted this question again was not specific to the range, and ruled that the question had already been answered.

Many hands were raised by Senators, allotted meeting time was running short, so Moderator Krug gave this topic only ten more minutes.

Barry Balleck (CLASS) wanted more clarification re: the range location.

VP Thompson described it as the corner of the 301 bypass and Register Road. We might petition to have a turn directly off the bypass, but as it stands to enter the facility you would be on Register Road for ten feet.

Balleck (CLASS) assumed there may be increased traffic in that area, and that is a horrible intersection, with literally dozens of accidents. He asked if we would petition the state for a stoplight.

VP Thompson said the University has petitioned several times for that, among our reasons being the death of one of our students, and the State Department of Transportation has not allowed it. Balleck wondered if the increased traffic/turning caused by the range might provide the needed impetus for that change, and Thompson said she hoped so.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) understood that one of the reasons for having the range is the potential to develop college shooting teams and wondered if we could mandate that team practices only be held when students would not be tempted to go to a practice and then run to class, such as that they would only be held at night.

VP Thompson did not know at this point of plans for such teams, but there could be that opportunity to make such recommendations. Again, she noted there will be very strict rules as to where guns can be, and typically a team situation like that would have the guns locked there on a regular basis; members wouldn’t carry them in and out.

Josh Vest (JPHCPH) said that the message that guns are illegal on campus, but then please come to our fantastic new facility, is very conflicting, and asks a lot of human behavior to be able to reconcile those two things on a regular basis. He asked about the membership fees: When will those who pay RAC membership fees be consulted on the proposed gun range, and can people opt out?

VP Thompson said we covered that at the last Faculty Senate meeting. The SGA voted, and the Advisory Group from the RAC have already started their own archery club. Archery was where this really got started; the gun part is being emphasized, but that is going to be a small part of the project. The administration asked the SGA to look at this, and they voted to approve it.
Tim Teeter (CLASS) read from the RFI and VP Thompson’s response: “**Question**: How will the operating expenses for the facility be covered? If the facility is supposed to be ‘self-supporting,’ please identify the ongoing revenue sources. What will happen if the facility does not generate enough income to cover operating expenses? **Answer**: The revenue will come from sales and service, as well as student recreation fees etc., etc.” He asked how something that is being paid for at least in part by student recreation fees is “not campus.” And will it be policed by campus police?

VP Thompson was not sure what he meant by “not campus.” Teeter noted we have a very specific campus, and asked if you cross the road to this new facility, have you left the GSU campus, even if it’s being paid for my GSU fees?

VP Thompson said the issue is outlined by the Attorney General’s office, giving special permission for that area only. Recreational fees can only be put towards recreational activities. In addition to that, we have a $3.2 million grant from the Department of Natural Resources to construct this facility, a $500,000 grant from the Easton Foundation, and an additional $250,000 from the Archery Trade Association. We also have lined up, if this goes forward, many donors that are willing to provide for this facility, most especially the Archery facility.

Teeter felt there was a language confusion problem here, because on the one hand, we are being told no guns on campus, then we’re being told no guns on campus except for this part. So when you walk onto that range from wherever you come, or you drive all the way around campus, you just stepped onto the campus of Georgia Southern University. Therefore, how can it be legal to carry a weapon there?

Maura Copeland (Legal Counsel to the University) said it’s not “not campus.” It is campus. A duly authorized official for campus can provide permission to be on site for a specific purpose with a specific weapon, and that is the exception we would be using. So it is “campus” and will be policed by campus police.

Mark Welford (COST) asked if there will be someone outside to insure that the individuals do drive in off the bypass. And if they don’t drive off the bypass but come down Old Register Road from the University, are they then going to be arrested?

VP Thompson said we will use the same security process we use now. We don’t check every car that comes through campus. Welford felt this meant there is no security.

Ming Fang He (COE) asked if there were measures to make sure that place is under control all the time. Moderator Krug ruled that question asked and answered.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) had two questions about the process. He said faculty learned about this in a very kind of back door manner. Krug ruled this asked and answered at October’s senate meeting. Costomiris said his remark had been a prelude to a question, not a question itself. He asked when the process with DNR actually began,
chronologically. Krug said that had already been answered by VP Thompson in writing. Costomiris noted that no dates were given.

VP Thompson believed DNR approached us in August of 2010, just in a passing conversation, and then there was research done off and on during that time to see if it was even feasible through the state government. How would we pay for it? And so, as Dr. Keel expressed, there were times that the administration had to find out information before they presented it formally, to see if the Board would even allow us to pursue it or the Attorney General would not allow it.

Moderator Krug called time and closed discussion of the shooting range.

10. A Motion to Schedule Three Fora Related to Guns on Campus: Robert Costomiris (CLASS):

The Motion: “I move that the university administration host three separate fora (one each for students, faculty, and staff) in order to inform the university community of the administration’s intention to build a Shooting Center on campus and provide the university community with the opportunity to learn more about the project and ask questions about it.” The motion was seconded.

President Keel was in favor of an information session, but did not understand the need to have three separate fora.

Moderator Krug (CLASS) asked Costomiris if he would entertain a friendly amendment to modify the number of fora and the restrictions on participants. He said “No.”

Jan Steirn (CLASS) agreed there should be more than one forum because we’re not all going to be available at the same time, but was not so sure of the need to split into only faculty, staff, or students.

Costomiris (CLASS) thought each of these communities may have different issues that they wish to have addressed that might be specific to those communities.

Tina Belge (Vice President for Academic Affairs for SGA) thought it might be beneficial for students to see the various sides that could be offered in one large forum. She thought it might create a more transparent relationship, especially with an issue this controversial, one that is going to affect all three parties. She suggested two fora, in order to accommodate MW and TTh schedules.

Mikelle Calhoun (COBA) agreed we should separate them by faculty, staff, and students, but suggested others be allowed to come and listen. She suspected if students come and faculty are there, faculty will take over, or the students will expect faculty to do so.

Lowell Mooney (COBA) noted that the students have already requested a forum.
VP Thompson said she had already spoken with the SGA President and the Chair of the Staff Council, both of whom would be happy with a single session, but said two would be fine in order to accommodate different schedules.

Costomiris (CLASS) stated that the students who had already accepted it form a very restricted group of students. Those he had spoken to did not accept it and are ten-to-one opposed to it. He thought there were a lot of students who would like to express their views instead of being restricted to the narrow body that had spoken on the matter.

President Keel thought Costomiris had just built a case for eliminating the Faculty Senate.

VP Thompson felt President Keel was exactly right.

Costomiris (CLASS) called this an issue that needs a lot of public exposure. He said that many faculty and students had only glimmers of a project that could change the face of this University.

VP Thompson said that, just as the Senate is a representative faculty body, the SGA is a representative student body, and should be given the same respect. Second, she has had both faculty and students tell her they support the range, the student newspaper has come out for it, the SGA supports it, and the students at the RAC. People are pushing both for and against.

Tina Belge (SGA) said this was something that had been talked about numerous times, and there was still a strong majority vote to support this on campus. She also noted the SGA had as much validity as any other such elected representative body.

Chris Geyeran (CLASS) sided with Tina Belge because we champion as an institution of higher education getting people in the same room with different points of view and there is inherent value in interacting with them, and that we can all learn from one another. While he agreed faculty, students, and staff may have different concerns, we all could benefit from knowing what those are.

Mikelle Calhoun (COBA) saw each dedicated forum less as excluding attendance, and more as a chance for each group to express group-specific concerns and questions.

Moderator Krug asked if someone wanted to call the question, and someone did. The call motion was approved. The Motion for forums, which Costomiris read again, was then Approved.

**12. Follow-Up to a Request for Information about the Increased Number of Administrators at GSU: Marc Cyr (CLASS):**

Since time was pressing, Moderator Krug asked Cyr to distribute the follow-up by email, but give a pithy summary sentence. Not wanting to waste anyone’s time, Cyr assented.
He noted this information had been found by SEC member Fred Mynard (COST) only late the afternoon before:

According to the *GSU Fact Book*, in the period 2007-2010, GSU added 111 people to the Executive/Admin/Managerial category and 12 to Faculty, so roughly 9 Executive/Admin/Managerial personnel added for every 1 faculty member, or a **133% increase in the number of Executive/Admin/Managerial personnel**, compared to a **1.7% increase in Faculty** over that four-year period.

13. **Election of the Senate Moderator for 2012-2013: Clara Krug.**

Fred Mynard (COST) was elected by acclamation.

14. **Report from the University System of Georgia Faculty Council: Fred Mynard.**

Again, time pressed, so Mynard agreed to distribute his report by email.

15. **Report from the SGA Liaison: Mark Welford (COST)** [Secretary’s Note: The recording was inaudible at this point and Welford was out of the country over the break, so this portion is his recall of events related 1-18-12.]:

Welford said the only business had been the SGA vote regarding the shooting range, but that he had understood that the passed motion was to hold an actual vote on recommendation (or not) later; there was another SGA meeting schedule for that evening, after the Faculty Senate meeting.

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

Southern Conference Graduate Scholarships: If faculty know student-athletes that are headed for graduate school next year and who make pretty good grades, please send them Geyerman’s way.

The Southern Conference Fall Meeting raised two things that impact academics. One of them was trying to not schedule competition during final exams, particularly in the spring. The problem is that when you look at all of the institutions in the Southern Conference, those exams span from April 25th to May 18th, so it’s very difficult to get those scheduled. It’s going to be addressed again in the spring.

The NCAA announced a new APR penalty structure. The new cutoff will be 930. Teams that don’t hit 930 are going to be, among other things, ineligible for post-season play. For example, were this now in place, the GSU squads that would be hit are football, which is at 921, though that’s on the way up, and men’s Basketball, which is 904.

He then offered an example of NCAA minutia: On the NCAA website is proposal 2011-78, awards, benefits, and expenses; category: housing and meals; subject: fruits, nuts,
and bagels; sub-subject-bagel spread; effective date August 1, 2012, sponsored by the Big East Conference; intent, to permit an institution to provide bagel spreads e.g. butter, peanut butter, jelly, cream cheese, with bagels it may provide to student-athletes at any time. Geyerman became aware that while institutions can provide student-athletes with bagels, it is a violation to provide them with cream cheese. He has not decided quite how to vote on that one yet.

17. Unfinished Business: None.

18. New Business: None.

19. Announcements: Vice Presidents: None.

20. Announcements from the Floor: None.