

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

2013

Faculty Senate Minutes-2013

Georgia Southern University

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



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

Recommended Citation

"Faculty Senate Minutes-2013" (2013). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 25.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/25>

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

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
February 20, 2013
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Deborah Allen, Tony Barilla, (Margaret LaMontagne for Yasar Bodur), Mikelle Calhoun, Jonathan Copeland, Robert Costomiris, Marc Cyr, Janice Dilworth (Steven Elisha for Olivia Edenfield), Chris Geyerman, (Jason LaFrance for Lucy Green), Mark Hanna, Chad Harmon, Greg Harwood, Mary Hazeldine, Helena Hernandez, June Joyner, Goran Lesaja, Jim LoBue, Jill Lockwood, Hsiu-Lien Lu, Ron MacKinnon, Brenda Marina, Ed Mondor, Linda Mullen, Kent Murray, Fred Mynard (Chair), Sze-man Ngai, (Valentin Soloiu for John O'Malley), Candy Schille, Debra Skinner, John Steinberg, Janice Steirn, James Stephens, Tim Teeter, Kathy Thornton, Robert Vogel, Patrick Wheaton, Tim Whelan, Robert Yarbrough, Lisa Yocco, Rebecca Ziegler

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Helen Bland, Greg Brock, John Howard Brown, Hemchand Gossai, Todd Hall, Anridhua Mitra, Robert Pirro, Mosefur Rahman, Sabrina Ross, James Woods

Non-Voting Members (Administrators): Brooks Keel, Jean Bartels, Martha Abell, Mohammad Davoud, Greg Evans, Barry Joyner, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker, Bill Wells

Senate Parliamentarian: Bob Cook

Visitors: Diana Cone, Maura Copeland, Kacey Danner, John Diebolt, Candace Griffith, Jayne Perkins Brown, Christine Ludowise, America Minc, Paul Reaves, Kristen Roberts, Fred Smith, Ariel Vipond, Mark Welford

(Secretary's Note: The recording of this meeting has gaps [such as the first ten minutes or so; the recording does not start until partway into President Keel's report], and – no jokes intended – is alternately murky and unintelligible.)

1. Approval of the Agenda for the February 20, 2013 meeting.

Approved.

2. Approval of the [November 27, 2012, Minutes](#): Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

With minor corrections noted in the posted version, Approved.

3. Librarian's Reports of [February 2013](#): Tony Barilla (COBA), Senate Librarian.

Jill Lockwood (COBA) wished to highlight an element of the Graduate Committee report: She noted that some Graduate program people in the system are puzzled about the BOR system for

approving graduate programs and are gathering to figure it out. We are not among those gathering, and she believed we should be involved.

With these comments noted, the Librarian's Report was Approved.

- a. General Education and Core Committee
- b. Undergraduate and Graduate Committee reports
- c. Report on the Fall USG Faculty Council meeting

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

Budget

The state is in a hole in the \$300 to \$350 million range. There are budget reductions statewide, and the University System of Georgia, and by extension, Georgia Southern will be looking at approximately a 5% cut this fiscal year, with probably a further 3% cut next year. GSU is going to be able to absorb these cuts because of the current funding formula, which at this point in time is based on enrollment headcount, and he hoped that our revenues will still allow us to address our shortage in staff and faculty for next year, including 33 faculty positions which have already been funded and which we are currently in the process of filling. Some USG campuses will have to implement furloughs to meet their budget cuts, but we will not be in that position. The Chancellor has been vocal about the drastic need for pay increases, and President Keel is hopeful that we will see pay increases, though not until the fiscal year after this.

Governor Deal has included in his budget a \$10 million request for a new Student Health Center at Georgia Southern.

Enrollment

Spring enrollment is down 236, for a revenue loss of about \$708,000. Our summer enrollment is down 803 compared to this time last year. That projects into a loss of revenue of approximately \$2.5 million. Part of this decline is due to the unavailability of Pell grants during summer. This is affecting all the USG, not just Georgia Southern. He encouraged everyone at GSU to make available summer employment opportunities for students in any way possible.

MOOCs ("Massive Open Online Courses")

MOOCs are a national phenomenon. There are a number of issues around MOOCs, many to do with transferring credit: whether a university will accept such credit, how to determine if the student has mastered the material, even how to determine if students have actually taken those MOOCs, test security, whether SACS will allow us to receive or transfer such credits, etc. The American Council of Education has already approved six MOOCs for credit, and Georgia State is already moving toward accepting MOOC credit in their university.

The BOR is already starting to talk about the opportunities of MOOCs, and they are being talked about very positively: MOOCs might be a way to reduce the cost of higher education by allowing students to take MOOCs and transfer them as credit to our universities. For example, they are discussing allowing students to take their entire first two years via MOOCs, transfer that to us or any system institution, and fulfill in-residence requirements only their second two years for a four year degree. President Keel thinks we need to discuss this situation and “get out ahead of this tsunami or we’re going to be swallowed up by it.”

Commented [GM1]: The word "be" out before "swallowed" was left out.

Complete College Georgia (CCG)

President Keel noted that CCG opens a “Lot of exciting opportunities.” Our system goal is 250,000 more graduates by 2020, and to reduce the costs for each graduate. CCG “is a done deal.” It is not open for discussion: “. . . we can no longer claim that students are the only ones responsible for their own success. We are responsible for their success. The Board of Regents has made it plain that we are. The Governor has made it plain that we are. And, in fact, our budgets as early as FY ‘15 are formula funded . . . dependent entirely on the completion of goals that we set for our own Complete College Georgia. We are supposed to be the experts in education, and I will certainly think that collectively we have got to find some ways to help our students become more successful.” President Keel asked faculty to find ways in which we can do this, and the administration is looking at ways to ease the advising burden on faculty so that faculty can “really focus on what [we] do best which is teaching and providing . . . lifelong career mentoring advice.”

CCG will also require closer cooperation between us and the Technical College System of Georgia. This is already being discussed, and the Lieutenant Governor has proposed a bill to rename the Technical College System schools as community colleges. President Keel said that Complete College Georgia is the right thing to do.

E2L

Commented [GM2]: "E2L" should be "D2L," which stands for "Desire to Learn."

E2L is an “analytics” system that the BOR is very excited about. If we have never heard of “analytics” we need to get up to speed on it. It’s all about dashboarding, and E2L will dashboard the entire University System of Georgia: “They will really be able to drill down and use analytical measures to the individual faculty member on every campus and his/her courses. So it is something that we need to be attuned to . . .”

Space Utilization

USG is working to determine the space utilization of every single building on every single campus. In the future, any proposal for new building, especially classroom space, will require detailed justification of the existing space utilization. This includes utilization outside 9:00 a.m. through 5:00 p.m. M-F, and weekends. Even faculty offices could be used for different purposes at different times.

Regarding Last Fall's RFI on Class Sizes

President Keel had provided a thick binder's worth of data and a graphical summary of some of that data. He noted that there are thousands of ways that one can evaluate this data. He thought it was going to be interesting to see what can be gleaned from the information.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) noted that we are still accepting students with lower than a 2.0 GPA, that they have a hard time digging out of that hole and being "successful," and suggested we not do that given the terms of CCG.

President Keel said that GPA is not the criteria we use for acceptance; we use SAT scores because GPAs are very high school specific. He noted that low GPA students accepted for various reasons are small in number (about 350 students a year out of the total student population of 20,000) and those students have a 90% success rate. We do have transfer students, but again the numbers are small. From East Georgia, for example, we take about 300 of their 2,500 students; he noted, though, that they don't do very well, and we're studying that and have put procedures in place to try to address that issue. He further noted that affiliation agreements that we have could make this transfer question an even bigger issue.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked President Keel how he knew that we have already met expectations the Board of Regents has for us that would prevent us suffering future budget cuts.

President Keel said he was talking about being able to offset this year's budget cuts; the changes to the funding formula probably won't take place until FY 15, and we don't yet know what GSU's goals will be for that year. But at some point we will have to make cuts in operating expense. We've had cuts of about \$99 million; in 2009 we went down to a budget of about 70, now it's back up to about 79 because increased enrollment has meant we have been able to meet those cuts. That's why we're so concerned about enrollment, retention, and graduation rates.

Costomiris said this spoke to Steirn's comments that our ability to meet these benchmarks depends on whom we admit, and if we admit students who are marginally capable, even with our abilities as educators it is difficult to succeed when people come with deficiencies. And if he understood the figures, we have a significant number, about 8% of students, in that category.

President Keel reiterated that we use SAT scores for admission and determining if a person needs to go in EIP. He further noted that there are a lot of arguments pro and con both GPA and SAT as a metric for these purposes.

Provost Jean Bartels said data showed the number of such students is too small to be of significant concern.

Costomiris then asked the President whether, in his discussions with the Regents, Governor, and other "big guys up there," they ever talk about increasing taxes to ease budget pressures.

President Keel said that conversation happens all the time. But in Georgia as in many other places, "taxes at this point in time are as taboo as they've ever been in history," and increasing

any tax on anything “is just absolutely not going to be an option.” He added that “it doesn’t make any sense; it’s not for making sense.”

5. **Senate Executive Committee Report: Fred Mynard (COSM), Chair.**

Mynard noted that the dataset recently supplied by President Keel in response to last fall’s RFI about class sizes is huge and will require time to digest, so there would be no extensive discussion at this time. He did, however, go through some charts supplied in PowerPoint by the President. *(Secretary’s Note: This detailed verbal description of visual charts coincides with a particularly difficult-to-hear stretch in the recording. See the data and charts linked here.)*

- [Class Size 2001-2012](#)
- [Class Enrollment Size Fall 01-12 va](#)
- [Average Class Size by Depart and Level \(F01-F12\)](#)
- [cirfac fall 12 teaching loads](#)
- [cirfac fall 11 teaching loads](#)
- [cirfac fall 10 teaching loads](#)
- [cirfac fall 09 teaching loads](#)
- [Fall 12 Teaching Loads](#)
- [Fall 11 Teaching Loads](#)
- [Fall 10 Teaching Loads](#)
- [Fall 09 Teaching Loads](#)

President Keel reiterated that there are many ways to evaluate, display, and graph the data; that people may choose other variables than he did; and that the charts represent a summary, not the actual data. One interesting “snapshot” is for fall 2012, showing those departments that have class sizes well above average. For him, this represents a strategic target: Those departments have a need for more faculty so this load can be distributed. This does not mean that those departments that fall below that average amount do not need more faculty, but this is one way to use “this monster of a document.” He asked that we take his example with a grain of salt.

Provost Bartels noted some (not all) of the data that can be gleaned for 2009-2012: averages for how many adjuncts, temporary, and full-time regular faculty we have; and averages for those across colleges, departments, and exact courses. This data allows us “to slice down into a lot of layers to be able to look at where the issues are”; as well as class size, we can get a sense of what we are doing with hiring of adjuncts, temporary faculty, and regular faculty, and what the course loads look like for each of those groups.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked President Keel if, with this new data in hand, he would still say that the average class size at Georgia Southern is 22 students per faculty member.

President Keel said there is a nationally prescribed way to calculate data that produced that 22/1 number, but there are lots of other ways to calculate the data too.

In other business, Moderator Mynard (COSM) noted that a motion re: tobacco was withdrawn by the SGA so they could work out some issues with the Staff Council. He then said that Provost

Bartels is putting together committees for the next SACS review, and Senators are needed on a number of these teams; he called for volunteers, but noted such volunteers would likely want some information on what would be expected of them.

Provost Bartels wanted to walk Senators quickly through our approach to our upcoming SACS reaffirmation ten-year visit: All of the documents/materials should be accessible on our website for review for every single standard by SACS (likely October 2014). In the spring of 2015, a different group of SACS people will actually be on campus to review those materials and the reports that the first review team submits; the physical visit is to see what's happening.

We've created a multi-level set of teams to collect data and write the documents for particular areas. The Leadership Team, which SACS requires, will include the President, Provost, Vice President for Business and Finance, our Institutional Effectiveness representative, and Student Affairs. Members of a Steering Committee made up of people representing every aspect of our institution are going to head up individual action teams. Those teams will address specific areas, many of which centrally concern faculty. She believed Faculty Senators are the people that ought to be on those particular teams, such as development of curriculum, assessment, and quality enhancement. She guessed that the teams would meet once a month. They would be asked to do the first cut of the draft response to that team's particular standard. The Academic Affairs office will do the final editing and have an external person also review for editing, probably also someone who is not from our institution to look at the materials and who has SACS background information and experience. So the actual work of an action team member will be to join a group of people who have common access to information or common knowledge of the standards and give his or her input to those. She did not think it would be cumbersome.

The standards addressed will be from SACS, from the federal government, and "[??]" standards that pertain to different areas." Separate from those standards is the Quality Enhancement Plan. Our last was Student Engagement; that is in place and continuing. But SACS requires something new specifically related to student learning. SACS has upped plan requirements, so we need to be much more specific about the plan this time around, and it has to be very much assessed and documented. The QEP group has already met, but we are going to try to add people because we haven't had volunteers up to this point. Faculty are critical to this.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked whether Senators were necessary because they have term limits and might not be Senators through to completion of the project.

The Provost figured such people might opt to stay on teams as non-Senatorial faculty, but she could come back to the Senate for replacements.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM) asked who's on the steering committee and the action teams.

Provost Bartels said the Steering Committee has been staffed by almost 20 people, and she couldn't name them all, but it is a combination of people who represent everyone in the divisions of the institution: Business and Finance, Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, Human Resources, faculty, Institutional Effectiveness, Physical Plant, etc. We need people with area expertise for some of the specific standards. The committee roster will soon be up on our SACS site.

- d. RFI: [Course Waitlist Utilization](#): This was referred to the Registrar.
- e. RFI: [Why are Service Dogs in Training Allowed on Campus?](#): This was posted and answered, the short form being that our practice conforms with state law. If a problem arises, such as verifying the credentials of a trainer, people should contact the office of Legal Affairs or Mike Chambers in the Student Disability Resource Center.

Ed Mondor (COSM) asked if there had been any incident where somebody was not in the service dog program. Moderator Mynard was not aware of any.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) said that the dogs make a positive contribution to the classroom.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) wondered if we could have something on the dog that identifies it as being in an approved program so that when people see the dogs on campus they don't have to wonder.

Maggie LaMontagne (COE) noted that service dogs in training are required to wear a vest that identifies their agency and identifies them as a service dog in training. And they can't go out the door without that vest on. There followed some concerns about counterfeit vests and the desirability of backup credentials to be carried by dogs and trainers.

6. **Senate Moderator Election:**

Moderator Mynard (COSM) noted we have been trying unsuccessfully since November to elect an SEC Chair/Moderator for next year, and asked again for self-nominations. There were none.

7. Motion Request (SEC): [proposed changes to Article IV of the Faculty Handbook](#)

Goran Lesaja (COSM) read the motion (*see link above*) and moved its approval. Its central import is to have members of all Senate standing committees elect their chairs. The rationales are to have better shared governance via chairs the committee members consider best for the job rather than someone appointed whose credentials might be little more than being a Senator.

Maggie LaMontagne (COE) asked whether elected chairs who are not Senators will be required to come to Senate meetings in order to report. Lesaja said, "Exactly."

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that a number of years ago, the SEC realized that there was a loophole in the election rules for some of the committees: The framers of the Senate bylaws had wanted the chairs of large committees to be members appointed by the SEC, but the rule was worded so that any Senator, whether in a Faculty seat or a Senate seat, could be elected. The SEC left the loophole there because it opened up the pool of people eligible. He supported this motion because it too opens up that pool.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) also supported the motion largely for that reason. She had been appointed chair of a committee about whose work she knew nothing, while others on the committee were both better qualified and more willing to serve in that position.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM) asked if this would allow the election of a non-voting member to chair.

(Secretary's Note: The tape is mostly inaudible at this point, but my notes indicate that non-voting members are ineligible. Moderator Mynard asked Parliamentarian Bob Cook for comments.) Cook noted further needed changes to allow non-Senatorial faculty committee members to be elected chair. He said these changes could be made at the next Senate meeting if the motion now on the floor were approved.

The motion was Approved.

8. Motion Request (FWC): [Periodic Review of Department Chairs](#)

Moderator Mynard (COSM) noted that this motion was the result of a similar motion approved last year not being approved by President Keel. Since then it had been revised via consultation between the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Council of Deans.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) read the motion (*the link is above*), noting an amendment to its wording to reflect changes in the numbering of *Faculty Handbook* sections.

The motion was Approved. Provost Bartels praised the productive collaboration of the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Deans.

Parliamentarian Cook raised the issue of a start date for this policy.

Costomiris said that hadn't been discussed because they weren't sure whether an approved policy becomes effective immediately the President approves it, or it has to be "codified" in published sources like the *Handbook* in order for it to be put into effect.

Cook thought it would be prudent and fair for Deans to advise the chairs on when this would come into play so the chairs have lead time for any preparation they might need to do, just as chairs advise faculty of when they will be reviewed.

Costomiris agreed, and Cook further suggested that the Provost, Deans, and chairs develop an implementation plan.

9. Unfinished Business.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) returned to the earlier discussion of MOOCs and asked President Keel how he planned to move forward on this issue.

President Keel said he didn't really have an answer to that. He hoped faculty would help craft a response, maybe via a Senate task force (though he was reluctant to burden faculty with yet another task force), though it really needs to come up out of departments and programs because they are responsible for the curriculum. He does not want unilaterally to craft and impose a U-wide policy. He asked some questions: "[H]ow are we going to verify mastery of the material? What sort of criteria do you think is important with regards to accepting credit . . .? . . . which departments [will] choose to really get out in front of this and implement this . . .?" Georgia State got out in front of this by having faculty come together to address the issue, and he thought ". . . it would be to our advantage to address this in some fashion now before it gets addressed for us."

What really got his attention on this issue was the recent Board of Regents meeting: The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs made a presentation to the Regents about MOOCs, and the Regents have actually come up with a System-wide policy as to how we go about doing this. They have "positive excitement" about MOOCs as a potential way to reduce the cost of higher education, though such courses are recognized as not appropriate for all programs.

Tim Whelan (CLASS) said it was his understanding that MOOCs are free.

President Keel said yes, MOOCs are free, but what is not necessarily free is how you take a MOOC and turn it into a university credit. You wouldn't want to charge \$154 a credit hour for accepting a MOOC for credit, but there might be some reduced charge.

Whelan had a hard time understanding the difference between a MOOC and the online courses we already have if students will take a free course, but then be charged by us to get credit for it.

President Keel said he wasn't proposing we charge such a fee, though other universities are looking at doing so. But there are costs associated with being able to prove that individual has in fact taken the course, and has mastered the material in the course, maybe some sort of quantitative testing to verify these things, and that's not a trivial matter.

Whelan still couldn't grasp why we want MOOCs when we have our online classes.

President Keel gave the example of a Math program's requirement for an introduction to statistics, and the class could typically have 40 students. The Math department might say "Stanford has a MOOC in Introduction to Statistics that's a fairly easy course to do that way. We are going to allow our students at Georgia Southern to take that MOOC and get credit for it." And now they have reduced the teaching load for the Department. This could be done for lots of generic courses. It would significantly reduce the cost that a student has to pay: take a course for free, pay some sort of nominal charge that it takes to verify the mastery of the course, and so instead of paying \$160 a credit hour, the student gets that credit for a nominal fee.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said, “One way of looking at this is that the system will get money to give them credit for it. They won’t have to pay a faculty member to teach a class.”

President Keel agreed that “That’s one way of looking at it.”

Cyr suggested that though there’s excitement at the system office because of this prospective saving via not paying faculty, he wasn’t sure how much excitement there might be in this room.

President Keel thought that was a very, very good point that got at the real sensitivity at the system level to the cost of higher education and how we can address that.

Jill Lockwood (COBA) said she would hate to see somebody get a degree from Georgia Southern taking all MOOCs and never entering a class here. We have rules that say so many hours have to be in-residence, and she asked if a MOOC would count as an in-residence class or as a transfer class.

President Keel said that was one of many questions that we have to address. His first response would be that a MOOC is like any other transfer credit, so a student couldn’t take 120 credit hours at another university and transfer to Georgia Southern and be given a GSU degree.

(*An unidentifiable speaker*) referred to President Keel’s hypothetical Math class example and said he/she could see doing that if a school did not have the capacity to do otherwise, but that is not the case for GSU. He/she wondered if MOOCs might lead to some departments being pretty much eliminated.

President Keel said that for any courses that we need as a part of our curriculum, we would want to have that expertise on campus. But that would not keep students out of MOOCs in the future, and we need “to address . . . it ourselves [as] opposed to having rules and regulations handed down to us.”

Moderator Mynard thought MOOCs were “new business” and suggested that having them as a discussion item at the next meeting would be appropriate.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM) asked Provost Bartels for an update on what the requirement is for summer student ratings of instruction: They are in the *Faculty Handbook* now, but he wondered if they would be required this summer, and whether there was forthcoming policy on including those or not including those in annual reviews, pre-tenure, tenure, and post-tenure dossiers.

Provost Bartels said the policy in the *Handbook* was put in place by Provost Moore, but that “We have said that it was up to the individual college or department to decide if they wanted to do a review of summer courses, so that’s no longer a requirement for all courses.” One might want to include them in one’s dossier, but “it’s not required. . . . It’s up to the faculty member.”

Yarbrough asked whether Provost Bartels could foresee a situation where a faculty member or individual departments could choose whether or not to include those in a tenure, pre-tenure, and post-tenure dossiers.

Provost Bartels could go either way, but thought departments should discuss the question and decide whether they want that standardized or not.

10. New Business: NONE.
11. Announcements: Vice Presidents: NONE.
12. Announcements from the Floor: NONE
13. Adjournment.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
March 14, 2013
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Tony Barilla, Heidi Bland, Yasar Bodur, Mikelle Calhoun, Robert Costomiris, Marc Cyr, (Jason LaFrance for Lucy Green), (Horst Kurz for Olivia Edenfield), Todd Hall, Mark Hanna, Chad Harmon, Greg Harwood, Helena Hernandez, June Joyner, Gora Lesaja, Jim LoBue, Jill Lockwood, Hsiu-Lien Lu, Ron MacKinnon, (Breyan Haizlip for Brenda Marina), Ed Mondor, Linda Mullen, Kent Murray, Fred Mynard, (John Hawkins for Sze-man Ngai), John O'Malley, Robert Pirro, (Linda Soares for Michelle Reidel), Sabrina Ross, Debra Skinner, John Steinberg, Tim Teeter, Kathy Thornton, (John Luque for Bob Vogel), Patrick Wheaton, Tim Whelan, James Woods, Rob Yarbrough, Lisa Yocco, Rebecca Ziegler

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Deborah Allen, Greg Brock, John Howard Brown, Jonathan Copeland, Jennie Dilworth, Chris Geyerman, Hemchand Gossai, Mary Hazeldine, Anriddhua Mitra, Mosefur Rahman, Candy Schille, Janice Steirn, James Stephens,

Administrators: Brooks Keel, Jean Bartels (*Secretary's note: I failed to pick up this one of the three sign in sheets right after the meeting and we have not been able to locate it.*)

Visitors: Amy Smith, Vince Miller, Michelle Martin, Steve Vives, Diana Cone, Bill Wells, Christine Ludowise, Mohammad Davoud, Curtis Ricker, Bede Mitchell, Greg Evans, Patricia Beblowski

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the March 14, 2013 meeting: Fred Mynard (COSM), Senate Moderator**

Mynard called for a minute of silence in memory of our colleague and Chair of the Music Department, Richard Mercier, who died on Friday, March 4th. The agenda was then Approved.

2. **Approval of the [February 20, 2013 minutes](#): Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary:**

With corrections previously noted to the Senate listserve, the minutes were Approved.

3. **Librarian's Reports of March 2013: Tony Barilla (COBA), Senate Librarian:**

Barilla noted that the Senate Librarian's Report was posted March 8 and then was amended on March 11 to include a report from the Undergraduate Committee. He noted also that all the reports that are submitted by committees are put into the Librarian's Report, and if you want a

specific report read, all you need to do is make a request for it. This procedure was put in place last year in order to better utilize meeting times. The report was moved and Approved.

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

Pay Increase

Pay increases are not only on the minds of faculty members, but his mind, all system presidents' minds, and the Chancellor's mind, who brought up the issue at the last Presidents' Meeting. The Presidents unilaterally cannot give across the board pay increases; if we have heard that some universities are doing that, they're not. They're addressing compression issues. Neither can the Chancellor make decisions about pay increases without permission from the Governor. And the Governor is not in a position to do that at this time because there are not the resources. For example, to give just a 1% pay increase across the state to all government employees would require roughly \$130 million in recurring, new money every year. For GSU, that 1% increase would be in the range of \$1 million new, recurring money because it would have to go in the permanent part of the budget.

Compression Issues

We are going to take a look at salary "Compression," situations in which professors who have been here for a long time find their salaries to be close to that of recent hires, rather than higher as one might expect, especially when the long-termer has higher rank. Such compression affects staff as well. Last year we addressed the very lowest paid of our staff to bring everyone here to at least poverty level; that caused a compression issue at that level. To address just the faculty compression issues would be approximately \$2.3 million of new recurring money. That estimate was based on data at least a year old, though, so he was going to ask Provost to reevaluate that study to put us in a position where we can begin to start thinking about addressing the problem; he was going to ask Ron Core, the VP for Business and Finance, to do the same for staff. Our Chief Diversity Officer does a study at least every other year in terms of diversity and equity imbalances with regard to salary and that information is available. The last time that he looked at this data, we were in pretty good shape in regard to equity and racial diversity differences in salary, though that doesn't mean it doesn't exist. But it's not at the magnitude of professorial compression. So we'll redo the studies, but we do not have money to solve the problem now.

One additional thing that he wants to look at is the amount of money that we get for professorial promotions. He is going to ask the Provost to begin to take a look at the typical amount we give and see how it compares with our peers in the state and across this country. There may be some opportunity to increase the amount that we're currently giving. Only about 10% of our faculty would benefit from that, but it's something.

He and the Provost have also talked about post-tenure review: We have a stick if you're not doing your job and post-tenure review lets you go back and get some additional help in terms of improving yourself, but there's no carrot for doing a good job in post-tenure review. We ought to be able to find a way to give salary increases to individuals who have a successful post-tenure

review. Again, that's a small number of faculty compared to the entire professoriate. But it is at least an attempt to try to reward our longstanding faculty members who are still doing an outstanding job.

We won't know what our resources are going to be for this next fiscal year until probably the April BOR meeting at the earliest. We expect that the process by which the BOR allocates funds to each institution will be the same as it has been in the past, that is, based off headcount enrollment as opposed to productivity – that latter formula will not occur until at least FY 2015. He hoped that towards the beginning of the summer we will know what our allocations are going to be, if we are going to get any new money and, if so, how much. The decision then will be whether we try to address compression issues or put the money into new faculty and/or staff lines. He said the decision is what faculty want to address, because we can't do both.

Last fiscal year we approved 35 new faculty lines. Those have been funded and those searches are underway. We also approved 8 or 10 additional staff. It will take an additional @ 65 faculty to get our student/faculty ratio below or at 22:1, so the numbers of new faculty that we need to try to address the increased class-sizes and workload that all faculty are facing is not trivial. He said we are fighting every chance we can to try to improve the salaries for both our faculty and our staff. He just wanted faculty to understand both the magnitude of the situation and the constraints on us. As the economy begins to turn around and as we get into an election cycle, he is optimistic that we will be in a position to offer across the board salary increases to address the entire faculty and staff, and at least chip away at compression issues.

Elizabeth Cook and Four GSU Band Members

President Keel noted that that night (March 14) four of our Georgia Southern band members would be performing on stage live with country-western singer Elizabeth Cook, one of our alumni, on the David Letterman show. This would be great exposure for us on national TV.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM) asked if the President had a dollar number in mind for dealing with the worst of the compression cases, or in some instances even pay inversion (*Secretary's Note: "Inversion" = longstanding faculty paid less than new hires*). He also suggested that we were not in an either/or situation – relieve salary compression/inversion, or hire new faculty – and wondered if we could deal with some of the worst salary cases and still hire new faculty to help.

President Keel said if we were to tackle compression, whether we decided to hire new faculty or not, we would attack the worst cases first and try to work our way up; obviously inversion is the worst-case scenario and we can identify those cases more easily. Unless the money we receive is pitifully low, we will try to determine the most critical faculty needs: What are some of the strategic faculty hires we want to make, and then what are the most egregious inversion and compression issues that we have, and then begin to balance those out.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked if the money for these 35 new faculty lines and 8 or 10 staff lines was money that we didn't expect to get.

President Keel said you never really expect to get any money. We never really know how much “new” money we are going to get until April/May and then we allocate it at that point.

Costomiris asked if the money for new faculty/staff lines is linked to Complete College Georgia?

President Keel said not at this time. The money we get from the state is called “formula funding” and right now is based on enrollment. We increased enrollment, so that allowed us to bring in new money and that’s the money that we used for the faculty hires. That same formula process will take place this year, and next year. But in 2015 funding will be based on Complete College Georgia criteria and on meeting those goals. And that is a very complicated formula that is still being worked out; it’s going to be several years before we can implement it fully. Next year will be relatively cut and dry, but the years following will be more complicated; any new money that we get will be linked virtually 100% to performance in Complete College Georgia metrics.

Jim LoBue (COSM) asked if the President had any sense of how many years the new formula will be based on – just the previous year, or more than one year?

The President said that’s still being worked out, but his understanding is that FY 14 will be the base, so we’re concerned about our enrollment between now and then because that base is built off of enrollment.

Robert Costomoris (CLASS) asked if the President had made a decision about the hiring of the new Vice President for Finance and Business.

President Keel said yes, but there were several notifications we had to go through to make sure that the other candidates were notified, and, since all three of these candidates were within the System, there is a requirement to notify the president of that campus before we make an offer. So he couldn’t tell the Senate yet.

5. Senate Executive Committee Report: Fred Mynard (COSM), Chair.

The RFI on course waitlist utilization was answered by the Registrar and posted with a link to the policy regarding the use of the waitlist, and a spreadsheet showing the number of courses that use such a waitlist in each college. He showed a graph noting the number of sections using a waitlist and the number of sections taught by each college. He noted that the answer to the RFI addressed more specific concerns about how the waitlist is used.

All motions that were approved by the Faculty Senate at the February 20, 2013, meeting were approved by the President.

He noted that at the last senate meeting, some visuals regarding teaching loads and class size and so on were presented. The Provost’s Office had provided extensive data on class size, and since we had a short turn around between that meeting and this one we did not have that data as a

discussion item at this time. We will at the next senate meeting and he invited all to look into this voluminous data before that April discussion.

He asked if there were nominees for the position of Moderator for next year (*Secretary's Note: The position was supposed to have been filled last November*). No one came forward.

He noted that we had two motions on the agenda regarding changing current campus tobacco policies and suggested a joint discussion. He noted that the Senate could not endorse both, and that neither need be endorsed.

6. **Motion Request (M. Reidel): University Staff Council: Resolution to Establish a Tobacco-Free Campus**

Lina Soares (COE) moved the motion for Michelle Reidel, representing the Staff Council. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The motion was Defeated.

7. **Motion Request (SGA): Faculty Senate adoption and support of the SGA "Resolution for recommendation to establish Tobacco Zones on Campus"**

Chad Harmon (SGA) moved the motion and it was seconded.

President Keel pointed out that this particular motion could be problematic from the standpoint of creating zones that are going to have to have some sort of cover. It would not be a trivial task to determine how many zones would be needed on this 670 acre campus, and it would have to be based on where people are working.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB) noted that some people had pointed out in the discussion of this online that the problems might be solved by enforcing existing policy. She noted that she had seen two existing policies, GSU's and the Board of Regents', and they are not exactly the same, but the gist of them is that smoking needs to take place in such a way that smoke can't be where people have to go through it in order to enter or exit buildings, or where it can get into buildings from outside. She thought it was important that we work out some kind of enforcement that will make this possible because there are some people for whom it really is a health concern to have to breathe other people's smoke coming in from outside or passing through it outside. She thought we needed to be sure of existing policy and determine needed steps to enforce existing policy.

Chad Harmon (SGA) had followed the online discussion and noted that smoking policy is consistently one of the biggest concerns the SGA hears about from students, though the concerns were not just re: health. Whether or not the SGA proposal moved forward, we needed discussion about our current policy and to make sure that we were at least enforcing the Board of Regents' Policy here at Georgia Southern.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that the BOR Policy – and this isn't reflected in Georgia Southern's own policy – has provisions about not being around any access into the buildings, and he

believed that trumps our policy, and it would be good to have that provision in our own policy. He noted it is already in place at Newton, and said it could be brought into play in other locations, though providing shelters might be an issue.

Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs) noted that the policy that we have here isn't inconsistent with the Board of Regents Policy, so they actually both are in place. Our policy just clarifies that you can't have it in the vehicles here on campus. The policy at the Board of Regents is meant to be our policy in conjunction with the Georgia Smoke Free Air Act. That Act makes it a criminal penalty for violating the policy. So there is a punishment for it. A person who is smoking tobacco in violation of that act is guilty of a misdemeanor and the fine is not less than a \$100 and not more than \$500. So it's a law enforcement issue.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked SGA representative Harmon what he meant when he said student concerns were not just about health. What were the others?

Harmon said some students complained because they had health issues, "but it's just a general complaint from students whether it be because of the medical issue or just . . . the simple reason . . . that that act was created, the Smoke Free Air Act, it's for whatever reason, it's not just for medical issues . . . but it's consistently something [SGA] are hearing from students."

Schille asked for clarification of what the other reasons might be.

Harmon did not know; the complaints were not specific.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that Ms. Copeland had said that our policy regarding smoking in vehicles was a clarification of BOR policy, but that vehicles aren't mentioned in the BOR policy. He didn't understand how our mentioning of vehicles or smokeless tobacco can be a clarification of something that is not mentioned by the BOR.

Jill Lockwood (COBA) thought that the issue is not that our policy contradicts the BOR Policy, but that ours adds something that perhaps the BOR policy does not address: We don't want somebody to go into a University vehicle that reeks of smoke because that could be very obnoxious. But we don't have a policy that contradicts the BOR policy.

Cyr asked if it was an allowable extension, then, rather than a clarification. Lockwood said yes.

Cyr then asked when the GSU provisions re: vehicles and smokeless tobacco were added, and by whom. He noted our revised policy was put on the books in April 2012 but did not remember any discussion of that revision by anybody. He further noted that he and Senator Jamie Woods (CLASS) had been talking about this before the meeting; they had been on the committee that wrote the GSU policy that then somehow got revised, and that committee specifically did not include chewing tobacco because they couldn't see how that presented a secondhand threat.

Moderator Mynard asked if there was anybody in the room with input on how this policy revision was made.

Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs) said that policies are proposed before President's Cabinet and President's Cabinet then votes on the revisions. She could not recall if that's what happened here, but that's what the process general is. She did recall, however, that one concern was "the grossness from chewing tobacco in the vehicles that are owned by the University."

Cyr said he had no problem with restriction against smokeless tobacco, although it didn't make any sense to him, or against the in-vehicles prohibition, but was just wondering where those revisions came from, and now he gathered it was the President's Council [*Cabinet*].

John Luque (JPHCOPH) asked SGA Representative Harmon, if this motion didn't pass, what would prevent establishing which buildings are problem areas and making some type of smoking areas that wouldn't be right by the doorways.

Harmon said there's nothing SGA could do, but that's something they could look at.

Candy Schille (CLASS) noted most buildings that she goes to have the ashtrays right by the doors. She suggested moving the ashtrays away from the doors.

Moderator Mynard thought that sounded like a good suggestion, but Teresa Thompson (VPSA & EM) noted that five or six years ago we did that and what happened was that Physical Plant then found that there were a lot of cigarette butts around the doorways.

Robert Costomoris (CLASS) asked if there was any money from the SGA that could be put towards building "smoking huts."

Teresa Thompson (VPSA & EM): "No."

Tony Barilla (COBA) asked, "So if someone gets busted for smoking a cigarette and gets fined we can't use that money to build a smoking hut . . .? isn't that common sense? That's how a lot of city governments survive [via] speeding fines and other things."

Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs) said we wouldn't get that money because it would be "a criminal fine."

Barilla asked if that was "a different pot of money."

Costomiris (CLASS) said one issue about enforcing this matter is that there are no police foot patrols. Most of the police are in their automobiles most of the time so they don't walk by the places where people are smoking. He wondered if police could ride bikes, walk across campus, or do things like that, and suggested that might help.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM) asked for clarification about who is responsible for enforcing this policy in the first place, since one of the big issues is that the current policy is simply not being enforced. He noted that many folks on the Senate Listserv concluded that problems would not be remedied by a new policy if whatever our policies are, they are not being enforced.

President Keel said that if it is a criminal offense, it's our Public Safety Officers who are responsible for enforcement because they are the only ones that can issue fines or tickets or do arrests. But we have a limited police force who are doing other things, so he figured it was up to all of us to make smokers who might be violating policy aware of that policy, and ask them to comply. He thought eventually this would be effective. But it all comes down to enforcement, and "every single one of us are going to have to be willing to take responsibility in a very nice way: 'I'd be most grateful if you'd move your smoking away from the building.'"

Yarbrough thought that was a great idea, and asked if we might not have some kind of "information campaign." Via the online discussion of this issue he had been "disheartened" to find that no one actually knew what the existing policy was. If faculty don't know, we can't expect students to know. He also said that if we put ashtrays by the buildings, that's a sign that it's okay to smoke there even if there is a sign that says no smoking within 25 feet, and so smokers are confused.

President Keel recommended that we put together a very small committee of representatives from Student Government, Staff Council, and Senate, to meet with him and try to come up with some get-the-word-out programs that aren't going to cost a lot of money, and develop signage, if we need to, that is non-intrusive and blends with our beautiful campus. That is, create "a proactive positive education program" to help smokers understand that we respect their rights, but that others don't want that smoke in their faces.

The motion was Defeated.

Robert Pirro (CLASS) wanted it to be on the record that the earlier Staff Council motion vote had been erroneously noted as "unanimous" by Moderator Mynard, but that some people had not voted at all, so the first motion wasn't rejected unanimously.

8. Unfinished Business.

None.

9. New Business.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) noted that some educational leave notices were being sent out. Evidently some people had heard, some had not: Was this an indication that some had been rejected, or was it just that not all notices had yet been sent out?

Provost Bartels said all notices had been sent out. There were three rejections, all at the college level. Unless they were rejected at the college level, they were all approved.

On another topic: Jill Lockwood (COBA) noted that she chairs the Graduate Curriculum Committee. It was her understanding that one of our goals is to increase graduate enrollment by 25%. Since we're not going to get people who have degrees and are working to quit their jobs and move to Statesboro, she thought a lot of that increased enrollment is going to come from online classes and those will probably be new. She was concerned with the Board of Regents new policy on new course approval. She had had a very good meeting with Provost Bartels, who had "described the new policies as 'back to the future.'"

Provost Bartels: "On steroids."

Lockwood called this "going backwards and maybe putting on the brakes rather than going forwards and trying to simplify it." She understood budget constraints resulting in "a rather harsh set of rules to make sure that you get the biggest bang for your buck." At one point, we had a rule that when a new program was proposed, the issue could not be discussed with faculty unless the Provost's Office gave initial approval. She had waited three semesters for such an approval, and still didn't get it. She went to Dean Patterson, who went directly to the Provost, and Provost Bartels said that that is not part of the new policy, that she thinks that we should have early and aggressive discussion among the faculty before we put a package together. Lockwood's second problem was that after programs get to the Board of Regents, even after a very rigorous examination by the Provost's Office they sometimes come back with questions that we didn't answer. She thought we needed the curriculum committees to anticipate and answer such questions, perhaps via going to the Provost for information, before proposals go to the BOR, if we hope to improve the chances of approval.

Provost Bartels said that we now are under multifaceted integrated reviews by the Board of Regents whenever we try to propose a new program or substantial program change. The difficulty with this is that the BOR is taking a look at each proposal and deciding whether there is duplication, whether it is fiscally sustainable, whether there's been adequate exploration of need, and particularly need resulting in a positive economic impact because of job needs or new career path needs. Our proposals need to speak to those things, especially to be able to say, "This is a priority for us at the institution so we're going to really be pushing this forward with great vigor." The BOR reviews that she has witnessed are now extremely intense and comprehensive; they will send a prospectus back before they even allow us to write a full proposal. The Board of Regents is beginning a new dashboard to look at productivity of programs in general. They are starting a review of all programs in the system to look at them in terms of their productivity over a number of years: numbers of students enrolled, number graduated, that sort of thing. It's clear that they are going to add that to their list of what they look at when they decide on which programs to approve. They are discovering in the pilot cases they've done with this review that they are seeing programs dropped at different schools books because they weren't where they needed to be, and then those schools using those resources to come back with programs that had better viability. This is scrutiny that we never had before. Proposals that just think a program will do well are "not finding good water when they arrive at the Board of Regents." It would benefit

us to plan with very specific purpose and with information that we have the resources to make the program successful. We will thereby avoid a great deal of work that ends in a negative result.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked if Provost Bartels was speaking only of graduate programs.

Provost Bartels said no, it's all levels: associate, undergraduate and graduate.

10. Announcements: Vice Presidents.

None.

11. Announcements from the Floor.

None

12. Adjournment.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 18, 2013
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Deborah Allen, Tony Barilla, Helen Bland, Yasar Bodur, Mikelle Calhoun, Jonathan Copeland, Robert Costomiris, Marc Cyr, Jennie Dilworth, Olivia Edenfield, Chris Geyerman, Mark Hanna, Chad Harmon, Greg Harwood, Mary Hazeldine, Helena Hernandez, June Joyner, Goran Lesaja, Jim LoBue, Jill Lockwood, Hsiu-Lien Lu, Ron MacKinnon, Ed Mondor, Linda Mullen, Kent Murray, Fred Mynard, Sze-man Ngai, John O'Malley, Robert Pirro, Michelle Reidel, Sabrina Ross, John Steinberg, Janice Steirn, James Stephens, Tim Teeter, Robert Vogel, Patrick Wheaton, Tim Whelan, Rob Yarbrough, Rebecca Ziegler,

Voting Members Absent: Greg Brock, John Howard Brown, Hemchand Gossai, Lucy Green, Todd Hall, Brenda Marina, Anridhua Mitra, Mosefur Rahman, Candy Schille, Debra Skinner, Kathy Thornton, James Woods, Lisa Yocco,

Administrators: Brooks Keel, Martha Abell, Salinda Arthur, Jean Bartels, Mohammad Davoud, Russell Keen, Charles Patterson, Curtis Ricker, Teresa Thompson

Visitors: Lauren Bell, Maura Copeland, Bob Fernekes, Candace Griffith, Clara Krug, Cydney Long, Christine Ludowise, Vince Miller, Eddie Mills, Michael Moore, and Wendell Tompkins, Mark Welford

[Secretary's Note: There were early problems with the microphones being used by Moderator Mynard, President Keel, and Provost Bartels; these microphones had to be replaced partway through the meeting. So some remarks were not recorded, and I have relied on my notes.]

1 Approval of the Agenda for the April 18, 2013 meeting.

Moved and Approved.

2 Approval of the [March 14, 2013 minutes](#): Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

Moved and Approved.

3 Approval of the [Librarian's Reports of April 2013](#): Tony Barilla (COBA), Senate Librarian.

Moved and Approved.

4 President's Report: Brooks Keel:

Fees

The Board of Regents approved tuition increases throughout the system. The research institutions will increase tuition by from 3 1/2 - 7%, while all others, including Georgia Southern, will rise 2 1/2% for undergraduates, and 3% for graduate students. Fees were also approved at this meeting, including our student-voted \$10 sustainability fee.

Health Center

The legislature approved \$10 million for a new GSU Student Health Center. It now only awaits the Governor's signature, and since he supported this from the start, President Keel is confident we will soon get the green light to start that project.

Formula Funds

The BOR also began allocating formula funds. Those funds are still being allocated based off our student headcount and strategic proposals we made to the BOR. Our proposals focused on new faculty and new staff to help us with Complete College Georgia. He hoped that by the Senate's June meeting, he'd know more exactly what the situation will be regarding new faculty because we need to bring down our student/faculty ratio.

Kent Murray (CLASS) asked if President Keel had a projected location for the new Student Health Center.

President Keel understood from the master plan that it would be across the street from the PAC, where the old facilities shops were. Those facilities shops are moving to across from the recreation fields.

5 Report on the Capital Campaign: Salinda Arthur (Vice-President for University Advancement):

Our target to begin the "quiet phase" for this Capital Campaign is July 1 of this year. We are creating a major gift operation, which is essential to the success of a campaign. Prior to her arrival here about 1 1/2 years ago, the Foundation was structured primarily as an asset management foundation. Now it also includes developing a major gift operation, and putting a foundation board in place that will support and show leadership in both of these areas.

What has been done?

Among other things, they have:

- added new members to the Board
- identified more prospective Board members for future consideration

- received unrestricted Foundation commitments from all new Board members
- given Board members a choice of what committee they would like to be on, taking into consideration their restraints, their preferences, and what each could bring to the table. Most work will take place in these committees.
- instituted term limits: Each trustee will have a limit of ten years to serve
- restructured the advancement office to reflect increased responsibilities for department heads; reassigned some current staff; and added additional staff to handle a potential nine figure campaign goal
- trained existing officers, deans, and others in the art and science of major gift work
- provided officers with a central library of advancement resources and with “road warrior” tools
- created performance benchmarks for Fiscal Year '13 for all major gift officers
- established the first policies and procedures manual for the advancement division.
- established two new giving societies in addition to the existing [1906 Society](#). The [Marvin S. Pittman Society](#) and the [Legacy Society](#)
- created a new position to specifically address proposals, funding agreements and donor and recipient advancement stories
- created the first GSU [Foundation Annual Report](#)

Also, due to retirement and resignations, there are some positions currently open: Executive Director of Corporate Foundation Relations; and two positions open for COBA. They are also seeking an officer who will spend half-time working for the Executive Director of Corporate Foundation Relations and half-time working for the College of Public Health.

Last year, A Day for Southern set a new record: \$15,000 more than the year before.

They hired Associate Vice President of Major Gifts Campaign, Melissa Wohlstein.

Future plans include:

- including Athletics in the Capital Campaign
- placing an alumni officer in Atlanta for alumni programs.

The campaign is targeted to last seven years. During the quiet phase, a period of 3 to 3 1/2 years, 40 to 50 percent of the goal is to be achieved. The Foundation will focus on

major and leadership gifts. Major gifts are now \$25,000. She will be asking Foundation Board members for their campaigns to include reminders to remember Georgia Southern University in estate plans.

VP Arthur then introduced Wendell Tompkins (Senior Director of Alumni Relations and Annual Giving). He said the Alumni Association's mission states that it serves the University by establishing lifelong relationships with alumni and friends, which results in the alumni participating in and contributing to the University. This is where the major gift part of our Capital Campaign starts. They keep the connection going throughout the entire life and career of each alumnus. They figure out what interests an alumnus to keep that connection going.

They are in the process of establishing an alumni network in the major cities of Georgia. We started in the state of Georgia's major cities – Atlanta, Augusta, Savannah, Macon – and we are also starting to reach out to Jacksonville. Most activities are social in nature. Another initiative is Southern Women to provide a forum for women of Georgia Southern to connect with one another for personal and professional growth with the objective of encouraging interest and participation by all alumni in the University's programs. A third new initiative is Eagle Outreach, which plays upon outstanding community service work that our students are doing.

They recently started an alumni online community so alumni can find out about all the programming and events we have. It also has a complete alumni directory so that alumni can find each other. But one of the strongest connections alumni have is with the faculty. They hope we will help keep alumni connected back to the university.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked VP Arthur for an idea of how large our endowment is currently. She said it was approximately \$40 million. He asked what the annual interest income of that money is. Jodi Collins (Director of Accounting) did not know the exact amount, but that the most recent year earned 12.8 percent.

Costomiris followed up by asking if Foundation employees are University employees, or if they work for the Foundation.

VP Arthur said we have people who are partially paid by the Foundation, and the University. Both.

Costomiris noted that many more people had come to work in the Foundation office in the last 12 months, and asked if this would relieve the responsibility of Deans and other academic officials from fundraising.

VP Arthur said no, that in fact the Foundation hoped they would become more involved in it. Across the nation, she said, presidents are expected to spend up to 50 percent of their time on fundraising, and that is extended down to the deans as well, if not at quite that high a commitment of time.

President Keel (President) said that most people want to give to an area that's directly related to the one in which they got their degrees. And that typically means they want to have a relationship with someone in that particular college and that best person is the dean. The deans are going to play a critical role in helping us to raise endowed professorships and scholarships, sell building naming opportunities, and other things that will be college-specific. In turn, the deans in many cases are going to be asking the department chairs and the faculty to help them in those efforts because they know more about their areas and departments and students than anybody else and so can help a particular donor know where their money's going to go and how it is going to be supported.

Jill Lockwood (COBA) said she was concerned about events especially designed for women. When she graduated from college in 1969, although she was in a business area she couldn't join Rotary or Kiwanis because they were men only. So she did not like any type of organization or event that is restricted to one gender, especially given that nowadays she did not know why a woman would have concerns and a professional life that would be that much different than a man's.

Wendell Tompkins said that often the alumni program is lumped with athletics. When Southern Women held an event in Augusta it found 10 brand new alumnae that had never come to anything before because they weren't interested in the format of that event. The Foundation simply wants to connect to people in the way they want to be connected to.

Lockwood said she did not object to getting people together, only to excluding people on the basis of gender.

Tompkins said there were no official rules for who can attend such events. They are just trying different things to see if people will be interested.

Robert Pirro (CLASS) noted we will be doing two or three dean searches, and asked if these prospective deans would be given benchmark amounts of money to raise. President Keel said they would.

Pirro then asked who would fulfill the deans' traditional tasks when they were having to devote more time to fundraising. President Keel noted that colleges now have "zone officers" in place to do much of the time-consuming work, and financial resources for such things as travel associated with fundraising.

Pirro then asked if similar requirements are foreseen for department chairs.

President Keel said that would be up to individual deans, but he did not think it likely chairs would be too involved.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) said that faculty were already being asked to be more engaged in research while keeping our teaching excellence high, that faculty are exhausted, and

asking them to become involved in fundraising is too much, as is asking them every year to contribute to the University, despite the fact that their salaries keep going down.

VP Arthur did not think faculty would be asked to engage in fundraising on a regular basis, but perhaps only in a special circumstance where there was a particular project or particular donor prospect that enthused the faculty member.

6 **Report on Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP): Christine Ludowise and Mark Welford:**

Mark Welford (COSM) encouraged faculty to come to the Williams Center for one of two town hall-style meetings on April 22 and April 30 to discuss potential QEP ideas and also to go to QEP@georgiasouthern.edu, to give ideas. The QEP is one of the most important parts of the SACS Re-Accreditation. Our first QEP, the First-Year Experience, has been very successful. Development of the new QEP must be inclusive across disciplines, and involve faculty, students, and staff.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked how the final decision would be made about the path of the QEP.

Christine Ludowise said once suggestions have been given, they will research the top three or four, trying to figure out if we have what we need to support them as the QEP. Those we can support will be put out there for any feedback from the faculty, staff, and students; have a vote; and then the committee will present that to the President's Cabinet and the SACS Leadership Team.

Costomiris reiterated his question about who would make the ultimate decision.

Ludowise said the ultimate decision-maker will be the campus community.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) wondered, if the suggestion of the university were rejected either at the level of the President or SACS, whether we would just go back to the drawing board.

Ludowise didn't think such a rejection would occur because the committee's report and recommendations will have been thoroughly researched, supported, and discussed prior to submission.

Ludowise again noted the times of town hall meetings, and further noted that if faculty could not make one of those, there will also be similar staff and student meetings they can attend.

Provost Jean Bartels added that the one qualification that there is for QEP is that the plan has to address learning outcomes that are consistent with the mission of the institution and which data supports as an area for development.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM) asked if Welford and Ludowise could give some insight as to where we and/or our students need help; their initial directions seemed very broad, and he wondered if the committee already had something in mind re: student learning outcomes.

Ludowise said they had looked at other institutions' QEP's for "high impact practices." They had some broad areas to consider: effective communication and writing within the disciplines, undergraduate research, capstone projects, internships, experiential learning, diversity and global learning. These could be found at the committee's web site: <http://bit.ly/QEPforGSU> where there's a document that you can actually vote on. But mostly the committee has been concerned with getting as much input as possible into the QEP without preconceived notions as to what it would be, without stacking the deck, or trying to push anybody in a particular direction.

7 **Senate Executive Committee Report: Fred Mynard (COSM), Chair:**

Mynard noted three RFIs filed and answered for this meeting, two discussion items, and one follow-up RFI filed after the RFIs were answered; the follow-up may or may not be on the agenda for the next meeting. He further noted that a motion filed jointly by the SEC and the President would be considered under New Business because it came up after the deadline to submit items.

8 **Senate Moderator election**

No candidates came forward; the office of Moderator for 2013-2014 remains unfilled.

9. **Senate Librarian election**

No candidates came forward; the office of Librarian for 2013-2014 remains unfilled.

10 **Senate Secretary election**

No candidates came forward; the office of Secretary for 2013-2014 remains unfilled.

11 **RFI: [Clarification on web page control and template delays and design:](#)**

Moderator Mynard noted that the lengthy administrative reply had been posted.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) noted that the lengthy reply was poorly formatted and opined that might have something to do with our web design. He then asked what timeline we had by which everything will be in order on our websites. His department [Literature and Philosophy] had been in limbo on redesigning their website for a long time, and answers to questions never resolve in getting the website to integrate into the system that is being devised here.

Mynard thought there was some element of response to that question in the lengthy answer, but he was having trouble finding it.

Provost Bartels said the plan is to move the web page onto the new product by divisions. Academic Affairs and all its units expect to be live online by July 1st.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked if the list of units and rollout dates in the response to the RFI was exhaustive because she could not find CLASS, though she might have missed it in all that text. Her concern was “that the way things tend to work, I am worried that by the time we get almost to the bottom of the list, they’ll decide to change it to something else. You know. Because computers change.”

Helena Hernandez (CLASS) noted that each college has somebody representing them on a council [Web Advisory Council or WAC] for websites. For CLASS, that is Andrea Bennett in the Dean’s office, whom faculty can contact. Also, each department has somebody working on their websites and faculty should be able to check with their department chairs. Websites should be ready by July 1st; if they are not, they’ll be blank.

Steirn asked if everyone had to use a really specific template, and if so, whether that was available to everybody.

Hernandez said the specific template is WordPress and it is available to the people that are taking care of the websites.

Provost Bartels added that WordPress will allow much quicker, more efficient updating of materials that are on the websites, so that while we’ll use a similar template so we have similar looks, we’ll have a lot more opportunity at the local level in colleges and departments to actually make sure that the information that is there is accurate, and we can update and add to it much more promptly. This will let us demonstrate our resources to others that are out there.

¹² **[RFI: Faculty and Staff Members Eating at Lakeside Cafe and Landrum Cafeteria](#)**

Moderator Mynard noted that an answer was posted by Eddie Mills. He recognized the submitter of the RFI, Clara Krug, from the gallery.

Krug (CLASS) said she found a lack of response to her RFI:

She had asked, “Why may faculty and staff members not continue to buy food and beverages at these facilities, meaning Lakeside and Landrum, as in the past?” The response referenced only Landrum, not mentioning Lakeside. It says that people will be able to purchase meals as in the past, but no one in the past was required to purchase a meal at Lakeside to get a cup of coffee or similar single item.

She had asked, “If there is a reduced-price meal plan for them, meaning faculty members and staff, what will it cost?” A *George-Anne* article on April 16 specifies meal

plan rates for students, but not for faculty. [*Secretary's Note: The web site says faculty/staff rates are still being determined.*]

She noted that no one had officially informed faculty and staff members of this change, and wondered when that would occur. She noted that some of her departmental colleagues had already been required to pay for a full "all you can eat" meal in order to get the small meal they wanted.

She asked, "When will faculty and staff members receive written notification of the other facilities where they must purchase food and beverages?" The response noted that faculty can purchase food at 13 other locations, but she couldn't find them on the [dining services](#) website, or any information about their hours of operation, which is important because faculty members have little flex time between classes in order to get their meals.

She asked, "Who devised this new policy?" She noted Dining Services constantly changes offerings to better meet the needs of students, that 3,000 students had been surveyed on this issue, but that faculty and staff had not been surveyed and so she could not see how Dining Services had decided that few faculty and staff use dining plans.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB) said there's no place where faculty from a number of different departments can just gather to socialize and have discussions and so forth. In the past, this was done at Lakeside. At many universities, the faculty club serves that function, but University Club as it's being revived is not a place, but a series of events. We need a place where faculty from different disciplines can gather informally.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) gathered the big issue here is the inability to get just a cup of coffee or a sandwich *a la carte*. Basically it was going to be like cable television: You have to buy 8,000 channels, including the shopping channels. He opined that that might streamline accounting and bring in more revenue, but he thought it was absurd that he would not be able to walk to Lakeside, literally a few feet from his office, and get just a cup of coffee.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) hadn't realized what the prices would be until Krug mentioned them: "But, and my memory could we way off on this, but it sounds like some of those prices are more than the per diem that faculty are allowed when we travel and eat at a hotel, you know." This observation elicited applause.

Eddie Mills (Associate VP of Auxiliary Services) said the December 2010 student survey received 3,000 responses, and "anytime you can get 3,000 students to respond to anything, you realize that it's important." Students were interested in an all access plan to the dining halls. We have almost 5,000 students that live on campus and so we're providing this as an all-encompassing, all-access, in-and-out-as-many-times-as-you-want-to meal plan. If faculty and staff want to go in to Landrum or Lakeside, the price will be \$8.50 to purchase a meal in those places. We have six other places on campus for to-go, *a la carte* options. We can't possibly allow to-go option right now in the way that it is designed at Landrum and Lakeside because students will have the ability to take

advantage of that, take food out of there and feed their friends. In future, a to-go option might be possible.

Helena Hernandez (CLASS) suggested that surveying only students means Auxiliary Services sees only students as potential customers, but not faculty, and asked if faculty are not expected to eat at their facilities.

Mills said that was not accurate. They do see faculty as customers, but the large majority of what dining services is tasked with is to provide 21,000 students a place to eat all their meals at regular times, particularly students who live in our housing.

Tim Teeter (CLASS) was puzzled by the “stark choice” offered: Either all or nothing. Other universities have student meal plans where they pay as they need to for meals and yet still manage to provide *a la carte* service for other people as well.

Mills said they have sold these plans as all-access: Students can come and go as often as they want for \$1,650 for the semester. They can't allow *a la carte* meals at \$8.50. The cash price will be \$11, though there will be an EagleExpress package in which you put money on your ID card and it comes down to \$8.50 for the meal.

Teeter said there seemed to be a disconnect here. He understood the meal plan issue, but couldn't see why it could not co-exist with *a la carte* service.

Mills said once you have access to the facility, there is no pricing model for *a la carte*; you could pay \$3.00 for a piece of pizza and then just get food from a lot of other food offerings as well.

Tim Whelan (CLASS) said that if there're 2000 faculty and staff on campus, he didn't understand that marketing scheme.

Mills said there are other options for someone like Whelan.

Whelan said they'd just lost him as a customer, and maybe as many as 2,000 customers, so they'd lose that money, so he thought their plan was not logical. He has worked at colleges and universities all over the country and everywhere else he goes and not encountered something like this. He cited Emory as an example. He couldn't understand why there wouldn't be an *a la carte* section.

At Provost Bartels' request, Mills noted that on campus are eight other places for small-scale *a la carte* service: in the Nursing Building, Education Building, Library, Russell Union, Centennial Place, and the RAC.

Ed Mondor (COSM) wanted to hear what President Keel thought about that pricing structure.

President Keel said Mills had described the situation well: Two places on campus without *a la carte* service because their design will not allow it, but everywhere else with

it. To try to do *a la carte* in a dining hall with 1,600 seats would be impossible. The purpose of these two dining halls is to meet the needs of the students who are living on campus and need that sort of dining facility and have told us that's the sort of dining facility they want.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) pointed out that generally when you send a survey out, you usually get approximately one-third return. 3,000 out of 20,000 is not a third. But her real concern was what this would do to our students' health.

President Keel said that data shows that students actually eat less on this kind of meal plan, and they eat more healthily. He noted that commercial *a la carte* places try to sell you something to go with your cup of coffee. This is not the case with these meal plans. Students can have as little or as much of anything as they want. Data shows they eat healthier, and they eat less at a single seating.

Steirn asked if we would collect data to assess if that happens here. President Keel said he couldn't imagine why our students would be different than other students.

¹³ **RFI: [Georgia Southern University's Relationships with Pro-Gun Lobby Groups](#)**

Moderator Mynard noted that this RFI had also garnered a really lengthy answer, this one provided by VP for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Teresa Thompson.

Robert Pirro (CLASS) noted he had not been on Senate last year, and then asked some questions that Mynard noted had been discussed at that time. He asked Pirro to focus on the issues raised in this current RFI and the response to it.

Pirro asked if there has been discussion about possible negative effects that GSU's affiliation with gun proliferation groups will have on recruitment of high achieving students. For example, the Honors Program draws students from 50 states and from several foreign countries as well.

VP Thompson objected to the "characterization of pro-gun"; the Elite Shooting Sports Center is based upon hunting, fishing, all the things that go with elite shooting sports. She did not think there would be a negative connotation put upon it such as the characterization of pro-gun. She noted such facilities exist at Harvard, Yale, and Clemson. So she did not think that high ability students have been scared away.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) noted that in her response to the RFI she indicated that the Elite Sports Shooting Center is on the outskirts of the campus. He asked her to clarify whether it is on or not on campus.

VP Thompson reiterated that it is on "the outskirts of campus." It borders the Bypass; she said "that's outskirts as you can get to our campus."

Costomiris asked if it is campus.

VP Thompson said, “It’s on our campus; it’s the outskirts of campus. On our property. Bordering the Bypass.”

Costomiris asked if she was saying “guns are going to be on campus.”

VP Thompson objected that this question had been answered. Moderator Mynard agreed.

Costomiris then noted that her document states that the facility budget is \$7 million. He asked if that had always been the budget, or had it gone up.

VP Thompson said that budget was “based upon getting with contractors, Board of Regents, and all those things so that if we wanted to attract Olympic training for archery, there had to be . . . 16 lanes per side. In addition to that, if we offer a rifle team . . . for women . . . for NCAA competition, we would need the 16 lanes for each.” Therefore, the budget did increase.

President Keel noted there might also be opportunities down the road to have an outdoor 3D archery range. But that likely won’t be part of this project and that will take away a million dollars.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM) asked for an update on the progress of fundraising for this project’s budget.

VP Thompson said at that point we had a \$3.2 million grant, the city is adding \$500,000, and the University has put in \$1 million because of the women’s sports team that has to be a part of that. We have the money to complete the building with 16 lanes on each side. What we did not yet have is funding for final completion of the actual fields. We’re short about \$1 million and discussions are going on with different groups who may want to name the fields and those types of things.

Yarbrough asked if that \$1 million shortage would hinder building the facility.

VP Thompson said no; that money would be for the fields, not the original building.

President Keel said we won’t turn the fields into an outdoor 3D archery range if somebody doesn’t step forward and donate the money.

Yarbrough said he asked that question because in the RFI response VP Thompson mentions groups including the NRA and the NSSF. He opined that “the NRA itself and anyone that follows politics would kind of call the NRA a pro-gun group. . . .” VP Thompson agreed. Yarbrough asked if we anticipated going to the NRA or similar groups for the rest of the needed money.

VP Thompson said those groups have not indicated any interest in giving to us. Cabela’s and Mossy Oaks and others who sell archery equipment are more inclined to contribute.

They felt that gun groups don't feel like they have to invest in anything, and they also feel that they've already contributed via the grant because the grant came off of the sales of ammunition and guns.

Tim Teeter (CLASS) noted the response to the RFI says, in part, that this "will be a state-of-the-art venue providing educational and recreation opportunities with its archery and indoor shooting ranges. This project will create a safe, educational environment where people can learn about firearms from trained professionals." He thought he and others questioned whether or not a university is the proper venue for people to be learning about firearms. He did not think this was consistent with the "no guns on campus ethos that we are trying to promote here."

Robert Pirro (CLASS) asked President Keel whether, since during the most recent legislative session we narrowly avoided having a law imposed on us where students, faculty and staff could carry firearms in campus buildings and in classrooms, he had concerns our teaching about guns on campus could be used to say we don't mind guns on campus and in campus buildings.

President Keel said no such concerns have been expressed by the System office, the Chancellor, or anyone on the President's Cabinet here. There's been a very clear distinction between guns on campus and a sports shooting complex. He noted that he personally has "come out as staunchly opposed to having guns in the classroom. So has everyone, all the other 30 Presidents in this System as well as the Chancellor and the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents also unanimously approved this facility on this campus and are very, very excited about what it represents from the sports shooting side of things, so the Regents don't appear to have any issue with being able to distinguish between the two . . . and I don't believe that this community will either."

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked VP Thompson if, since the facility is now going to be larger than originally proposed, the projected operating budget has also grown.

VP Thompson said we could bring that back to look at. With an additional 8 archery lanes, there will be more air conditioning, and that type thing for a larger facility, but that's about it. The same holds on the shooting side; because the state-of-the-art had to be where you don't touch the lead, they already had an exhaust system, and so you're just adding. We had to buy the system initially for the 8, and so the 16 is just an addition.

Costomiris asked if it is not the case that for every certain number of lanes you need a supervising shooting person.

Moderator Mynard said this went beyond the scope of the current RFI and invited Costomiris to file an RFI specifically on the budget aspect.

Robert Pirro (CLASS) asked President Keel if there had been discussions about how to respond to an uptick in accidental discharges of firearms on campus, given the presence of firearms on campus at the shooting center.

President Keel did not respond because Moderator Mynard said this, too, went beyond the scope of the current RFI.

¹⁴ **Discussion:** [class sizes and teaching loads](#)

Moderator Mynard did not know if anybody had the time to really look at this amount of data. Since no discussion ensued, he moved to table the discussion until a later meeting. The motion was Approved.

¹⁵ **Discussion:** [Increase Reading and Writing Requirements](#)

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said that when Christine Ludowise and Mark Welford were talking earlier about the QEP, he thought that the QEP might be the most effective avenue by which this could be approached.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB), who submitted this discussion item, said she had proposed it as a QEP to the QEP committee, and welcomed this seconding it as a good QEP possibility.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) didn't know that the reading and writing requirements need to be increased. He was more concerned with getting students to do what he assigns them to start with. The good students are a joy, but others try to figure out if they even need to buy the textbook. So it's not a quantitative question, but a mindset question. He agreed with Cyr, but did not know how this applied in colleges other than CLASS. He noted that when he saw a list of the courses with the highest DWF rates, which definitely goes to retention as well, in CLASS they are the ones that are reading intensive, so he thought there might be a link with that as well.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) said reading and writing – mostly writing – were the first things that flashed through her head too during the earlier discussion of QEP. She noted she gets seniors in capstone courses who are terrified to write a paper. She thought this was partially mindset, and that repetition would help with that. They don't expect to write, and they don't expect to read very much, and the way to change that mindset is to make them do both a lot. The problem is how to require writing, let alone help with raising its quality, when class sizes are so large. If they are learning composition in Comp I and Comp II, clearly they are forgetting it the very next semester. She suggested "writing across the curriculum" so that they can't forget it the very next semester.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said he had taught composition. He had taught students in Comp I, had the same student in Comp II flunk a paper for some reason, and ask, "Why didn't anybody ever tell me that?" And he would answer, "Somebody did. I did. Two months ago." He thought there is a delete button that gets hit. The learning doesn't keep developing; instead everything is parceled out. When those students leave those composition classes, with a C or a B or an A, they're doing C, B, or A work. Two weeks later, it's a whole different story. You can't point at the composition people and say they're not doing their job.

Steirn said she wasn't trying to imply that they're not getting taught. She saw that same compartmentalization. Somewhere we have to be able to convince them that learning is not compartmentalized into little chunks that you can then hit a delete key on, but the learning is continuous. And reading and writing is key in every class.

Helen Bland (CHHS) wanted to have this discussion concurrently with the point re: class sizes and teaching loads because she thought we'd find that these two are inversely related.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB) wondered if this should become a QEP, which she understood came with some funding. If faculty have classes that are too big, perhaps some of that funding could be used to hire graduate assistants who are good writers themselves to grade extra writing.

16 **Unfinished Business.**

None.

17 **New Business.**

Ron MacKinnon (CEIT) noted that on April 6th, a Georgia Southern graduate was awarded the Entertainer of the Year Award by the Academy of Country Music. On behalf of the Senate Executive Committee and President Keel, he moved that **"The faculty and President of Georgia Southern University would like to congratulate Luke Bryan on being named the Academy of Country Music Entertainer of the Year. The Georgia Southern University community is proud of Luke Bryan, BBA, Management, 1999."** The motion was Approved.

18 **Announcements: Vice Presidents.**

None.

19 **Announcements from the Floor.**

None.

20 **Adjournment.**

Moved and Approved.

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

June 4th, 2013

4:00 to 6:00 P.M.

Nessmith-Lane Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Deborah Allen, Tony Barilla, Helen Bland, Yasar Bodur, Greg Brock, Robert Costomiris, Marc Cyr, Jennie Dilworth, Azell Francis (SGA), Chris Geyerman, Hemchand Gossai, Mark Hanna, Mary Hazeldine, Helena Hernandez, Devon Jensen, June Joyner, Goran Lesaja, Jim LoBue, Brenda Marina, Linda Mullen, Fred Mynard, Robert Pirro, Sabrina Ross, Debra Skinner, Janice Steirn, Patrick Wheaton, Rob Yarbrough, Rebecca Ziegler

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Mikelle Calhoun, Jonathan Copeland, Olivia Edenfield, Lucy Green, Todd Hall, Greg Harwood, Jill Lockwood, Hsiu-Lien Lu, Ron MacKinnon, Anriddhua Mitra, Ed Mondor, Kent Murray, Sze-man Ngai, John O'Malley, Mosefur Rahman, Michelle Reidel, Candy Schille, James Stephens, Tim Teeter, Kathy Thornton, Robert Vogel, Tm Whelan, James Woods, Lisa Yocco

Administrators in Attendance: Brooks Keel, Jean Bartels, Steve Burrell, Charles Patterson, Teresa Thompson, Rob Whitaker, Barry Joyner, Curtis Ricker, Bill Wells, Martha Abell, Bede Mitchell

Visitors: Diana Cone, Candace Griffith, Maura Copeland, Gene Sherry, Scott Beck, Santanu Majumdar, Vince Miller

1. Approval of the Agenda for the June 4, 2013 meeting.

Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the minutes of the April 18 meeting: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary:

Moved and Approved.

3. Librarian's report May 2013: Tony Barilla (COBA), Senate Librarian:

Moved and Approved.

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

USG Part of National Partnership to Explore MOOC-based Learning and Collaboration

The item sent to the Senate email listserv regarding the [University System of Georgia Partnership with the MOOC- based Learning and Collaboration Coursera](#) was an announcement that from the University System of Georgia: Along with several other systems and flagship universities across the country, USG signed an agreement with Coursera to use their platform to offer MOOCs to students at their respective universities. He cited some press release headlines: *“The non-exclusive partnership will enable the participants to explore how to develop and use MOOC technology and content to improve college completion rates, academic quality and access to higher education, both for students enrolled in colleges and universities comprising the systems as well as Coursera’s global classroom of learners”*; *“The new Coursera partnership will allow participating systems and institutions to share knowledge and resources to shape curriculum, adapt existing MOOC content, and experiment with ‘blended learning’ which combines online video lectures and content with active, in-person classroom engagement.* “

This May 30 press release was the first indication that President Keel had that the University System of Georgia was signing this agreement. He wanted us to know that he was not keeping anything from us. He was as surprised as we were, though at the last several meetings he had indicated that MOOCs had been a topic of conversation at the System-level and the Regents had been very interested in what MOOCs are all about.

He wanted to be very clear: If any of our faculty want to use MOOCs, or any of our students would like to use MOOCs in their progression, the system office now has a platform in place that can be utilized. He would certainly encourage any faculty member to pursue that to whatever degree is appropriate, but use of MOOCs will not be mandated by the Provost or him. He noted, however, that MOOCs are very much in the news. He cited the case that Georgia Tech just entered into a major deal with another group, he thought Udacity, to offer a Master’s degree in Computer Science completely through MOOCs at a very reduced price compared to what they have charged in the past. President Keel believed that students will be approaching us about the possibility of a MOOC that they have taken being granted Georgia Southern credit. We will need to have a conversation about that, to determine what is going to be the faculty’s position on how these courses should be handled.

Budget

Relatively speaking, Georgia Southern did very well this past legislative cycle. We were able to fund a number of initiatives. This coming fiscal year, our number one priority is new faculty positions, and our number two priority is new staff positions to support those faculty and the students at this University. That was our goal last fiscal year and again this fiscal year, and the Chancellor has been awarding formula funding to us based off those priorities. For fiscal year 13,

the fiscal year that we're currently in, we funded 40 new tenure-track faculty positions for \$3.9 million and 4 new advisors for roughly \$200,000. Those are new tenure-track positions, not just filling retirements and resignations. For fiscal year 14, which starts July 1st, we received enough money to fund an additional 26 new tenure-track faculty positions for \$2.4 million and 24 new advisors for \$1.04 million. In total in the last two fiscal years, fiscal 13 and 14, we have funded 66 new tenure-track positions for \$6.4 million and 28 new advisors for \$1.2 million. The Provost is now actively engaged with the Deans to mobilize these resources as best we can, for example, placing these advisors in the colleges where they are most needed. But 66 new faculty lines still doesn't get to where President Keel thinks we need to be. Two years ago we determined we needed an additional 130 faculty to get our faculty/student ratio down in the high teens. We are roughly halfway there and working to identify resources for more new faculty positions.

Salary Raises

Salary raises for all individuals, faculty and staff, is a number one priority with the Chancellor and the Governor. But for Governor Deal to give a one-percent salary increase to all state employees would be roughly \$130 million dollars, and there's just not that money in the budget to do that. So there will be no pay increases for fiscal year 14. President Keel was optimistic that this situation will loosen up in 2015.

There is also a huge salary compression issue across the board both for faculty and staff. We are trying to identify resources to begin to address that problem. Key words: "*begin to address.*" There's no way we can find the resources to address every case of compression, but we want to begin to address the most egregious. Professor Barilla has been looking at a model that will identify any gaps for every single faculty member, and who is most egregiously compressed. He has been working with the Provost to come up with a model to rank faculty from the most egregious to the least, so the administration can take the money that we have and begin to go down that line as far as possible. Paul Michaud in Human Resources is doing a similar study among the staff, working with Rob Whitaker, our new Vice President for Business and Finance.

President Keel urged faculty to not make a big deal about this so we can do this as an internal operation and not publicly broadcast that we are rich enough to address compression. He also wanted to be clear that there is no way we are going to be able to address every single person, and that means some will get uncompressed and some will not.

One caveat to this initiative is enrollment. It looks like we will have 450 to 500 fewer students this coming fall than we had this past fall. Dr. Thompson and Dr. Bartels as well as Rob Whitaker are looking at this data to determine why there is a potential reduction in enrollment. One reason is the new faculty-recommended policy that requires students to step out for a year when their GPA falls below 2.0 for a defined period of time. That lost us about 350 students. So fewer sophomores are going to show up in the junior class this year, and fewer will show up in the senior class next year unless we fill that hole in some way. We have been calling every single freshman student that is eligible for registration and asking them if they plan to register, and if not, why not? The reasons are all over the board, but the vast majority have to do with the economy. Students are stepping out for the foreseeable future with plans to come back when the

economy turns around, or they are staying home and going to their local, smaller universities for this period of time. We are looking at the possibility of increasing transfers. But we have to make sure the quality of our students is maintained. 400 students represent about \$2.4 million. Relief of salary compression is a recurring expense, not one-time money. We don't want to get ourselves too far out in compression relief if we are looking at the possibility of losing two to three million dollars because of a decrease in enrollment.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) thought it sounded like we had already agreed in some ways to accept the credits from MOOCs and asked, if professors elect to use a MOOC, are we accepting those for credit even though we can't verify the quality of the course?

President Keel said Georgia Southern has not said we will accept a MOOC for credit. He thought that, first, we needed to engage in a conversation to determine if we want to do that, and, if so, how. SACS allows us to accept credit for MOOCs but leaves it up to the faculty to determine what mechanism is used to verify that the person has taken the course and actually obtained the needed knowledge-base, what exams are acceptable, and so forth.

Provost Jean Bartels added that we might start to have students that come to us and ask for credit for a MOOC, and that will be another spur for our discussion. Right now, it's up to individual faculty to use their good judgment to decide how to use MOOCs and how to apply them toward credit in their classes. She thought most faculty who use MOOCs will use them only as an adjunct to something they're already doing.

President Keel gave the example of a professor telling students that for homework they were to look at a MOOC lecture and then, when they came to class, instead of giving that lecture in their own way, having a class discussion, or breaking them up into groups. The faculty member is still determining if a student has mastered the skill to earn a grade. But giving credit to a student who walks in having done a MOOC is not something about which we have yet decided.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked where such credit-granting would begin, in core classes or major classes, and if Admissions was currently accepting students with MOOC credit.

President Keel said we haven't reached that point in our discussion.

Provost Bartels said if we get to that point, it will be a faculty decision, just like it is when we take any kind of transfer credit, and noted MOOCs are not dissimilar from CLEP exams. She anticipated any decisions coming via our Undergraduate or Graduate committees and through the Faculty Senate. She noted that ACE has already identified five MOOCs that they now say can be treated just like a CLEP exam, that are acceptable for transferring credit. Some institutions looked to ACE to identify those things that they would give credit for.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) suggested that the Senate Executive Committee ask the Academic Standards Committee to discuss the issue because it seems in their bailiwick. President Keel agreed, and thought it a good idea to start without any preconceived notions about what this is going to look like at the end, but we will at least be in a position to tell students who come to us asking for

credit for a MOOC yes, no, maybe, here's how, and so forth. He saw MOOCs as one of many tools that faculty have to educate students. And some faculty are not going to do this at all, some might fall in love with it, but that's a decision that faculty are going to have to make.

Devon Jensen (COE) noted that President Keel had said that "new faculty lines" did not include lines vacated by retirement or resignation, and commented that it is easy to lose such positions and have them subsumed into a new faculty line, but then that program, or that department is not any better off than they were, or a senior faculty member is replaced with somebody who is new and doesn't bring the same kind of experience to that particular program or department.

President Keel said that's the kind of job he expects the chairs and the deans to manage. He noted when a faculty position is given to a department no one should assume that that position is there forever. It might be that a position that was put in there 15 years ago is no longer needed in that department, that it could be better used in another department within that college, or perhaps it could be potentially better used in another college altogether. There are no "legacy appointments" for any position. We have to be smart and strategic about where we put resources, but that's a decision that would be made at the level of the Provost with her deans and chairs.

Provost Bartels agreed with what she called President Keel's "foundational statement." She believed that this particular year we would be filling all positions that were vacated, with those positions going back to where they were originally housed. Replacing a senior person with a new assistant professor, brand new out of college, is the kind of discussion she has with the deans because we can make a search that looks for more experienced persons if that's what the department or the college needs. They can also shift lines depending on what areas are expanding and which are not.

5. Senate Executive Committee Report: Fred Mynard (COSM), Chair.

We had two RFIs and one Discussion item approved; one Discussion item rejected; and one proposed Motion approved and two rejected. The rejected Discussion Item concerned student evaluation questionnaires, and the SEC decided to form an ad hoc committee that will be charged with reviewing the current practices for student evaluation, and discussion at the Senate may occur after this committee has a report. One of the rejected motions, Equitable Workload and Compensation for Faculty, was from the Faculty Welfare Committee to charge itself and the SEC will instead charge the FWC. Another rejected motion asked that we end a partnership with the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, but at the previous Senate meeting we were told that GSU is not a partner, so this was not appropriately worded.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked, if we are not affiliated, why the name of our institution is on the web site of that organization, and whether it shouldn't it be removed if we're not affiliated.

Teresa Thompson (VP Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) said Costomiris's characterization of the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation has been that it's pro-gun, but it's also pro-shooting sports. And they also do hunting policy, land management, conservation, all the things that go with it. The only affiliation GSU has is that we went to a particular meeting to

be introduced to the industry, which includes all types of industry, and that is why our name is associated with them. We've not given them any money, or that type of thing, but we are associated with the shooting sports industry. There is no doubt about that.

Moderator Mynard rephrased Costormiris's question because he thought this was the spirit of the question: "So is it appropriate to list the University as a sustaining partner and, if not, should it be removed?"

VP Thompson noted that the Georgia Department of Natural Resources, which is one of GSU's partners, is also listed, as is Toyota and Cabela's. There are numerous organizations that we will be involved with from shooting sports. So it would be appropriate for us to be associated with them in pushing those types of agendas, but as far as if we are asked to sign something to say that we don't support background checks, we've already had conversations with our own DNR that we will always push background checks and those types of things. She thought that where we are with the shooting sports group at this point it is appropriate. She thought that if the NRA were to ask us to become a partner, she probably would have a different response to that, but this particular group is not necessarily a group that is only known for pro-gun lobbying. It's known much more for conservation than it is for pro-gun lobbying.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that when the SEC decided to reject the motion it was because it wasn't worded correctly, and really the issue is whether GSU is happy with anybody – PETA, the American Communist Party, or anybody else – who says we are their sustaining partner on their website like that. He thought that we would object to that. This seemed to put GSU publicly in a very different position than simply attending a meeting now and then.

Moderator Mynard allowed visitor Scott Beck (COE) to join the conversation. Beck noted that, on their website, the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation describes being a sustaining partner as "*the single most powerful action you can take as an individual, company or organization to protect and advance sportsmen's interests in the political arena. At the CSF, we know how important it is to have an effective voice in the political arena looking out for your interests.*" He noted that that is what the CSF is telling us we are doing by being listed on their website, and it is not our option to interpret what that means. The CSF is already telling the public what it means that our name is on their website.

VP Thompson noted that Beck named it off as Sportsmen's Foundation, not Gun-Lobby, and what we're trying to do to promote shooting sports, whether it be archery or guns, is a sportsman recreational process.

Robert Pirro (CLASS) said we will be supporting sports shooting with an archery range and a shooting range and financing trips our shooting teams will take, and asked why we can't leave it at that rather than expose ourselves to possible blowback if something happens, such as this association becoming more NRA-like and so associated more with things that we don't want to be associated with.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked whether we were involved in the political arena on guns, or were planning an educational facility. She was uncomfortable with having our name put down as a sustaining partner when she wasn't sure we're doing what the CSF says we're doing.

Beck believed it was disingenuous to claim that the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation is not actively involved in pro-gun activities. They oppose micro-stamping of guns, they argue that assault weapon capacities should be left to the discretion of individual gun owners, and have opposed regulation of any semi-automatic firearms. These are not neutral positions, and not a whole lot different from what the NRA is doing. They are part and parcel of the gun lobby.

Cyr noted that Georgia Southern is extremely concerned about branding, about what has its name put upon it, whether it's an organization or a product. If this outfit is misrepresenting our relationship with them and doing it in a very public way, and we know that they are misrepresenting that relationship, he could not understand why we would not tell them to cease and desist. He thought that Georgia Southern's administration should pursue getting our relationship correctly represented.

Jim LoBue (COSM) wondered what advantage we have by having our name on their list.

President Keel said, "It seems to me that the best thing to do is for me just to ask if they would mind taking our name off the list. If it's causing that much heartburn, it's just not worth it. I'll be happy to do that. Let's move on."

This statement was received with applause from the Senators.

6. SEC Chair and Senate Moderator election

Moderator Mynard announced that Robert Costomiris had accepted the nomination and asked if there were any other candidates.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) nominated Deborah Allen (CHHS), who accepted the nomination.

Mynard asked the two candidates to step out of the room, and a secret ballot vote was conducted. Tony Barilla (COBA) and Mary Hazeldine (COBA) counted the ballots. Costomiris won election as Moderator for 2013-2014.

7. Senate Librarian election:

Mynard announced that Greg Harwood (CLASS) had accepted the nomination for Librarian. No other candidates came forward and Harwood was elected Librarian for 2013-2014.

8. Senate Secretary election

Mynard announced that Mark Welford (COSM) had accepted the nomination for Secretary. No other candidates came forward and Welford was elected Secretary for 2013-2014.

9. **RFI (Costomiris): [Details Regarding the Elite Sport Shooting Center](#)**

Moderator Mynard noted that this asked for the floor plan, an update on the operating budget, and who is in charge of the design, and all this information had been posted in response.

10. **RFI (Beck): [Follow-up to “Response to 4/1/2013 RFI ‘Georgia Southern University’s Relationships with Pro-Gun Lobby Groups’”](#)**

A response had not been posted yet, so there was nothing to discuss yet.

11. **Academic Standards Committee Discussion: [Plus/Minus Grading System at Georgia Southern](#)**

Robert Pirro (CLASS) wondered what started this discussion at the faculty level; had there been complaints by students?

Mynard said there was a discussion of this by the ASC and SEC because some faculty asked about a pilot program at the University of Georgia that was now fully implemented and whether this was something we should consider. The Senate Executive Committee asked the Academic Standards Committee to look at it.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked if there was any way to compare the grades a student would receive in one system versus another, and compare GPA's to see if there really is an impact.

Jim LoBue (COSM) called attention to a study that was done by Eastern Kentucky University in 2003. They implemented a plus/minus system for one year and then looked not only at what they did, but asked for input from other institutions that did it too. The GPA changed by one one-hundredth of a point, that is, just .01.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) could not fathom a system where what is called a “C” grade is below 2.0 and what is classed as a “B” grade is below 3.0. He said there are three elements in the mix: percentages, grade points, and letter grades. The real problem is a 4.0 grade scale because it doesn't work with percentages. He thought our current system was working well enough, and as Lobue had pointed out a change to plus/minus would have infinitesimal impact. He did not see much point in messing with what we have now unless we can get rid of the 4 point scale.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM and outgoing chair of the Academic Standards Committee) noted that according to most plus/minus systems, what Cyr said is exactly right: a C-minus would not be a “C” grade; a “C” grade would be at the 2.0 level. He understood Cyr's discomfort with the letter situation, but that's the point of a plus/minus system, that it would be a C-minus. How that would translate into a GPA would really depend on the exact numerical translation for each one of those

plus/minus grades and there are a few different systems for that. There would be many discussions that would have to occur about how to translate the grades to a GPA.

Mark Hanna (COBA) said an institution where he worked formerly had gone through a change like the one being considered, and there was really little change in terms of student outcomes, but there was a period of substantial upheaval. Many of our academic standards are built around these issues of a “C” or better in class for a prerequisite, for example, or 2.0. They had to change that and in the process professors had the choice of staying with the old flat letter grade or giving pluses/minuses. There were many attempts to game the system. He thought there was limited upside associated with such a change. He thought the primary interest of the student is best served by consistency over time.

Pirro asked Yarbrough for the top two or three reasons that the committee felt that we needed this change.

Yarbrough said the biggest issue was fairness: Is it fair to give a student a “B” for an 89.3, and another student gets a “B” with an 80.0? Dovetailing with this issue is the ability to more accurately reflect a student’s performance in a course.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) understood the accuracy issue, but said fairness is treating people the same way, and if all of the students know that between an 80 and an 89 is going to be called a “B,” and all students are treated the same, that is fair. She had bad experiences with plus/minus at another school because the system increased the amount of grade-begging by students.

Yasar Bodur (COE) said Steirn had defined “consistency,” not “fairness.” He thought two students getting B’s, one with 89.3 and the other 80.5, was unfair. He had been on the ASC sub-committee and favored plus/minus grading. He has worked under both systems, and plus/minus did not generate extra grade-begging in his experience. One problem he had with our current system is his end-of-term “moral dilemma” of giving the same grade to two students who are at the extremes of the grade scale. He wanted to be able to more accurately represent a student’s performance via the grade.

Costomiris said a student who gets a B with an 89 in one class might get a B for an 80 in another, so the fairness issue balances out in overall grade point average.

Bodur said he was working from the individual course level, where the different grading systems have an impact he sees all the time.

LoBue thought we should defer this discussion until we have completed our SACS evaluation because at this time such a change won’t “improve our standing” regarding RPG and would be “effort that is not well spent at this point.”

Sabrina Ross (COE) came from an institution with a plus/minus system and felt incredibly limited here by not having that, particularly in graduate school, with someone who makes a 90 versus someone who exceeds expectations and makes a 99%. She thought it to be a fairer system.

She cited an article about a high school where 34 of the students were valedictorians. You can't strive for excellence when you can't differentiate the excellence of the students in your class.

Pirro said one way he deals with the "moral dilemma" is to consider that there might be a deficiency in his assessment, so he tends to round up grades that are on the verge of the next letter grade level. He also noted that rewarding outstanding effort can be done via letters of recommendation and recommendations for department scholarships, both means more beneficial to the students' future careers than giving them an A+. And like Lobue, he didn't think we needed to be doing this at this time.

Azell Francis (SGA) said any system that is implemented should be to benefit the students. She noted that students take many core classes in which they may not necessarily be as strong or as adept as they are in their major classes, so a C- in a core class would put students at risk of not being able to progress towards graduation. She also seconded Pirro's point about other ways to reward outstanding performance.

Bodur thought Francis was deviating from the central focus. He thought Pirro's methods were good, but not all faculty use them. A plus/minus system would regularize and make consistent the ability to make finer distinctions. He also asked for clarification about why some people thought this was not the time to make a change.

Steirn said, regarding SACS, "you don't want to upset the apple cart when somebody is judging your apples." On the issue of consistency, as she understood it, using whole letters or plus/minus would be an individual faculty option, so there would be less consistency.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB) said one of the things that we have to do for SACS is to improve our assessment, and grading is a form of assessment, and so wondered why we couldn't work on those things together.

Goran Lesaja (COSM) suggested that we entertain a numerical system that would avoid any letter grades. This could avoid some of the concerns about a plus/minus system, and would be the most accurate. He thought the discussion should actually be expanded to include more options. He also wanted more student input.

Yarbrough noted that Academic Standards sent all their materials to the SGA, and there was an article in the *George-Anne*, and he arranged an interview with a *George-Anne* reporter in order to get out information. All of his feedback from SGA had been positive, and he had heard few negative reactions from students.

When Mynard asked if Yarbrough was satisfied with the Senate discussion, he said "very" and noted that the ASC members overwhelmingly supported a change to this system. He hoped the discussion would continue in the future.

12. Faculty Welfare Committee Motion: Periodic Review of College Deans:

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) read the motion into the record (*motion posted online*) and moved its approval.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) noted the first sentence called only for a review after five years and none thereafter, and suggested revising to “every fifth year.” He offered this as a friendly amendment, Costomiris accepted it, and there were no objections.

Robert Pirro (CLASS) asked the Provost’s opinion of the motion.

Provost Bartels was very much in support of a periodic review, noted we already do an annual review of the Deans that includes input from faculty and staff, but thought a designated number of years was appropriate to do a comprehensive review. She asked the committee to work with her to establish procedures to ensure the review is truly comprehensive.

Mark Hanna (COBA) asked if such a periodic review does not already take place.

Provost Bartels said the Handbook already says there is to be one, but she’s only one year into her job and while it is now part of the process, she couldn’t say what happened prior to her time.

Hanna then asked for the rationale behind designating thirty percent of the college’s voting membership as a threshold for requesting a review earlier than the five-year period.

Costomiris noted that it’s the same percentage we have in the review of department chairs and was a percentage that Stephanie Sipe recommended as a kind of minimum threshold based on some kind of loyalty thing which she knew much better than he did. He added that the motion “is not fleshed out,” that the specifics will developed in the coming year in concert with the Provost.

Devon Jensen (COE) said that waiting for a five year period might not give a well-liked dean information soon enough to prevent that dean from seeking another job elsewhere. .

Marc Cyr (CLASS) suggested the annual review by the Dean should cover that contingency. He added that one of the things he liked about this motion is that the faculty will be told what the results of this process are, which was not the case now.

The motion was Approved.

13. Unfinished Business.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked President Keel if the decision on whether or not to decompress salaries was dependent on seeing what the revenue stream is after fall enrollments are clear, and if there was a date by which that decision would be made.

President Keel answered “yes and no.” They need to make this decision fairly quickly because the beginning of the fiscal year is rapidly approaching, but they need to make sure that they have enough data to be able to identify all the individuals that are compressed, and put them in some

sort of rank order so that we can fairly and objectively address this. They will probably have that information before the actual final numbers on enrollment come in, but the income from enrollment is necessary to do anything.

Tony Barilla (COBA) said he had completed the salary study, and he just needed to go through it and give the Provost a briefing on how to interpret the data, which he will do this summer.

June Joyner (CLASS) asked if this study covered all faculty, or just tenure-track faculty.

Barilla said it covered only tenured or tenure-track.

Goran Lesaja (COSM) asked if there were any discussions going on at the Board of Regents level and Governor level regarding salaries and adjustments.

President Keel said there's been a tremendous amount of discussion going on, and the Chancellor has been very assertive and aggressive in making it known both to the Governor and to the legislature that going into five, six, or even more years without a pay increase is having a tremendous detrimental effect on the faculty in all of the 31 campuses in the University System of Georgia. However, the Governor had to fill up a \$300 million dollar hole with regard to Medicare, and that had to be done before any attempt could be made to provide any sort of additional money to the System, much less to the other state employees, to address salary raise issues. And this state has a balanced budget requirement, and so if the money's not there, it's just not there. The Chancellor had even talked to the Governor about the possibility of allowing the System to take the formula money distributed to the individual campuses and directing the Presidents to use some or all of that for pay increases. The Governor didn't allow that because USG employees are only one group of all state employees. He noted, though, that we are entering an election cycle, and while that's not going to change the facts if the money is not there, it does tend to make people think differently, and he was optimistic that next fiscal year we will be able to address pay increases.

14. New Business.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB) moved that "The Faculty and President of Georgia Southern University would like to congratulate Charles Minshew, a 2011 graduate of Georgia Southern University and former editor and chief of the *George-Anne*, for receiving a Pulitzer Prize as part of the *Denver Post*'s team that covered the shooting in an Aurora, Colorado Theater. Charles, your alma mater is proud of your accomplishment." The motion was Approved.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM) said he had found out that the "information sheets" for faculty who teach in the summertime would not be available until the last week of Term A. He asked the Provost why that was. He said his own experience was that these have been received later and later in recent years, and it puts faculty in a precarious position because they don't know what they'll receive in pay until, in this case, Term A is almost over.

Provost Bartels didn't understand the specifics, but it had to do with ADP, with "when we're able to input the information and when we are able to get it back out in the terms of a piece of paper for you to be looking at."

Yarbrough asked if something changed recently because we've been on this ADP system for a couple of years, and last year he signed his on March 22nd while this year we were told from the Provost's office we wouldn't receive them until June 16th or 17th at the earliest.

Provost Bartels did not know what the rationale for that was, but she would look into it to see if there was anything she could correct.

Yarbrough asked if she knew of any case where a faculty member would not be getting paid the standard 3% per student credit hour, with the exception of Study Abroad, which has a different system. Some faculty members might not even be aware they are not getting the full 3%, having not seen anything in writing about what they are going to receive in pay, and perhaps not having spoken directly with their department chair or their dean.

Provost Bartels said she expected any chair or dean who had to make a decision to offer or not offer a course based on a reduction would have that conversation, and if that did not happen she would like to know about it.

An unidentified Senator wished the Senate to express its appreciation to outgoing Senators, the administration and staff, and in particular Fred Mynard, then apologized because he realized he had just pre-empted President Keel's attempt to do the same thing.

President Keel praised Mynard's outstanding work as Moderator and presented him with a plaque in appreciation. (Applause.)

15. Announcements: Vice Presidents.

Provost Bartels (Provost) said that the day before, the Leadership Team of the SACS group from Georgia Southern was represented in Atlanta at the SACS Orientation meeting, at which time we discovered that our official written report of our self-study will be due on September 10, 2014, and we can anticipate our site visit to be March 31 to April 2, 2015.

16. Announcements from the Floor.

None.

17. Adjournment.

Moved and Approved.

Faculty Senate Minutes
September 16, 2013
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Debbie Allen, Olga Amarie, Tony Barilla, John Howard Brown, Sally Ann Brown, Jonathan Copeland, Robert Costomiris, John Dyer, Steven Elisha, Azell Francis, Hemchand Gossai, Frank Goforth, Lucilia Green, (Ron MacKinnon for Mark Hanna), Greg Harwood, Mary Hazeldine, Helena Hernandez, Pat Humphrey, Devon Jensen, June Joyner, Li Li, Hsiu-Lien Lu, Santanu Majumdar, Jessica Minihan, Edward Mondor, Kent Murray, Shahnam Navaee, Robert Pirro, Mosfequr Rahman, Marshall Ransom, Camille Rogers, Sabrina Ross, Susan Smith, Lina Soares, Janice Steirn, (Clara Krug for Tiffanie Townsend), Robert Vogel, Mark Welford, James Woods, Patrick Wheaton, Rebecca Ziegler

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Helen Bland, Breyan Haizlip, Jim Harris, Nan LoBue, Marc Mitchell, Anirudda Mitra, Linda Mullen, Sze-man Ngai, Joe Ruhland, Kathy Thornton, Timothy Whelan, Lisa Yocco,

Administrators: Brooks Keel, Jean Bartels, Jayne Perkins Brown, Steve Burrell, Mohammad Davoud, Greg Evans, Barry Joyner, Russell Keen, Vince Miller, Bede Mitchell, Charles Patterson, Curtis Ricker, Teresa Thompson, Juan Vargas, Rob Whitaker

Visitors: Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Maura Copeland, Bob Fernekes, Candace Griffith, Christine Ludowise, Suzanne Tatum, Laura Valeri

1. Approval of the Agenda for the September 16, 2013 meeting.

Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the [June 4, 2013](#) Senate Minutes: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Secretary

Moved and Approved.

3. Librarian's Reports of [September 2013](#): Greg Harwood (CLASS), Senate Librarian:

Moved and Approved.

4. President's Report: Brooks Keel:

Salary Compression and Salary Raises

President Keel made it clear he is trying to address the issue of salary compression on campus. He was able to apply \$1.2 million toward faculty and staff compression this year using a formula developed by Professor Barilla and the Provost's Faculty Salary Taskforce in consultation with College Deans. Because of budget limitations, only 58% of compression target was met. The total amount that was used to address faculty compression was \$801,969 and a total of 270 faculty were affected. This is a majority of faculty who were compressed and each award represents a permanent addition to faculty salary. Awards ranged from a low \$223 to a high of \$7647. Dr. Keel stressed it is his goal to keep chipping away at compression across campus. Some 386 members of the staff also received some form of salary compression relief. The process used was slightly different than what was proposed by the Provost's Faculty Salary Taskforce, although it was a similar objective approach. The total amount budgeted for that was approximately \$400,000. Dr. Keel again stressed that this does not solve compression and he has a long way to go to eliminate compression.

As it's an election year Dr. Keel thinks the Governor will do everything he possibly can to try to address faculty raises. Certainly the state revenues have increased from a low of \$15.3 million in FY 11 up to \$16.5 billion in FY 12, and \$17 million in FY 13. However, Dr. Keel noted we are still not at the level that we were in 2008

Dr. Keel also noted that for the first time since 2008, Georgia Southern was not asked to plan for a budget cut.

Enrollment

Dr. Keel noted enrollment is down across the System by approximately 3%, this translates to a \$20 million reduction in revenue. Eleven institutions saw an increase in enrollment and 20 institutions saw a decrease in enrollment. Here at Georgia Southern, our enrollment is stable. Our current enrollment report shows we are up 60 students compared to last year.

Post-Tenure Review

In addition to addressing compression, Provost Bartels and Dr. Keel implemented a post-tenure review award. This adds a permanent increase of \$1000 to each faculty who achieved at least a satisfactory review. Of the 35 faculty that went through this past cycle – 32 received a satisfactory review and were awarded a \$1,000. Dr. Keel also stated he would like to see a some way to differentiate between those faculty that have a satisfactory review, which is an

expectation of every faculty, versus those faculty that have exemplary review at this university.

Summer

Dr. Keel also noted the following: the opening of the new Dining Commons, which used to be Landrum with 1,100 seats; the opening of the Lakeside Dining Commons with 500 seats; and the opening of the new Biology [correct title: Biological Sciences Building] Building, all 158,000 gross square feet and \$41 million. Georgia Southern also broke ground on the Paulson Stadium expansion and Football Operations Center that will be completed by this time next year.

Health Center

Dr. Keel also noted the BOR approved the appointment of a construction manager on the \$10 million Health Center. The new Health Center will be directly across the street from the PAC, where the old Facilities was located.

Military Sciences Building

The Regents also approved \$550,000 in planning and design money for the Military Science Building.

Space Utilization

Dr. Keel also noted that during the recent BOR mandated space utilization study Georgia Southern came out in the top 25%.

SACS Accreditation Review

Dr. Keel also noted we are in the middle of preparing for a SACS accreditation review and that the site review will be here before you know it.

Chancellor's Visit

Dr. Keel announced that the Chancellor will visit the campus on September 25th. It's a half-day visit, a short visit. He will meet with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Student Government Association Executive Committee, and he will be given a quick campus tour to a couple of our buildings to emphasize to him that while we have some outstanding new buildings, we have some not so outstanding old buildings that we need to pay attention to.

Questions to Dr. Keel:

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Senate Moderator; Chair, Senate Executive Committee: Could you say where, how you were able to move up \$1.2 million to relieve compression where that money came from budgetarily?

Brooks Keel (President): It came from the money that we were able to receive at this last budget cycle – the allocation that we got from the Board of Regents.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Just a correction. You mentioned temporary structures, I said 30 years for Foreign Languages, it is 25 old.

Brooks Keel (President): I do recognize that there are Temporary buildings that appear to be permanent, and we are going to do everything we can about replacing them.

Brooks Keel (President): Dr. Keel noted the old Biology Building needs renovating.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Asked when people, who are receiving compression relief, could expect compression and had they already been notified?

Brooks Keel (President): Yes to both. The Provost clarified that the relief began in the August paycheck..

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Senate Moderator; Chair, Senate Executive Committee: President Keel, could I ask a question. How it is that Military Science has a kind of been frontloaded where the Humanities Building that has been talked about for twenty years has never quite reached the top of the list.

Brooks Keel (President): Mostly the sheer cost that is involved. The opportunity, the heightened awareness of the military in both the System office and the Governor's office and in the legislature and the condition of that building versus other buildings all those things both added up.

5. Provost's Report: Jean Bartels:

Enrollment

Last year our freshman retention rate was 77.2%. This year our freshmen student retention rate will be a little over 80%.

Board of Regents

Dr. Bartels noted that the Academic Committee of the Board of Regents has three ongoing recurrent key areas that they expect reports on every single meeting: what's happening with Complete College Georgia; what's happening with new programs they've approved and ongoing programs in terms of enrollment and productivity in terms of graduations, and what's happening with innovative educational approaches (e.g., MOOCs). Dr. Bartels noted that BOR is looking at new program (approved since 2008) enrollment. Our report was fine.

The BOR is also inventorying low-producing programs. The criteria they used to determine that a program is low-producing: Bachelor's Degrees with less than ten graduates; Masters Degrees with less than five graduates, Specialists in Education less than five graduates, doctoral programs with less than three graduates. Georgia Southern has 72 programs that fell into these categories. We had 15 ranked in the undergraduate level as being low-producing. We had one program of our 49 graduate programs. Dr. Bartels noted the BOR is fully aware that there are sometimes very good reasons for these numbers but the critical point is that we will undoubtedly have to defend those programs under-enrolled, and under-graduating and/or eliminate or suspend programs that cannot be defended or re-designed.

Budget

In the new budget we were able to continue funding for replacement of faculty and create 22 new full-time tenure track lines, so 99 searches will be going on. We also will hire 22 new faculty advisors including 7 interventionist advisors. We are funding additions to the graduate assistants stipends.

Complete College Georgia

Georgia Southern's thirty-four member team continues to meet to move forward CCG plans. Institution plans must go to the Governor by October 1st. The plans four goals are as follows:

- 1) Maintain progress in achieving our institution's First-Year Experience activities, to impact retention and progression.
- 2) Assess retention rates.
- 3) Shorten the time to degree by addressing things that are inhibiting students from either taking fuller loads and work on summer enrollments as a way to keep students engaged because we have literature that shows that students who do summer tend to graduate quicker.

- 4) Assess programming and support for students success in terms of building a culture where students are engaged on multiple levels.

SACS

Dr. Bartels noted our SACS Fifth-Year monitoring report was accepted in June without the need for additional reporting and that our 15 SACS Reaffirmation study teams are in place and preparing for September 2014 offsite review. Our onsite visit from SACS for Reaffirmation will be on March 31st to April 2nd of 2015.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plans

Dr. Bartels also reminded the Faculty Senate Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plans for 2012-2013 are due October 1st while 2013-2014 plans will be due June 14th of next year.

Dr. Bartels also reminded the Faculty Senate that the SACS Reaffirmation Self-Study demands a new QEP - a Quality Enhancement Plan. Our last QEP, focused on dealing with First-Year Experience this stays in motion. The new QEP steering committee is in the beginning stages of looking at what ideas that emerged from the recent QEP forum.

6. Vice President for Government Relations Report: Russell Keen:

Mr. Keen reported that Georgia Southern matched funding for a BB&T Eminent Chair in Banking. Mr. Keen then summarized the 2013 legislative session stating there were 695 House bills and over 1,000 House resolutions. There were 279 Senate bills and 731 Senate resolutions. Senate Bill 396 saw the Herty Foundation was transferred to Georgia Southern University. House Bill 45 - the Carry Forward legislation now allows universities in the System and technical colleges to carry over certain funds from year to year to make strategic decisions.

Mr. Keen also noted that House Bill 512 and Senate Bill 101 will be re-visited. Dr. Keel and he did travel to Rock Springs and Calhoun, Georgia, to visit with some of the folks who sponsored this legislation. We made our case clear that we are in favor of the current law as it stands today.

Mr. Keen also reported that the overall University System of Georgia budget increased from \$1.82 billion to \$1.883 billion representing a 2.9% increase. University System received \$63 million in new formula funds to support enrollment growth.

Mr. Keen also reported he facilitated some testimony in committees during the session to help foster relationships for instance President Keel, and at the time, Interim Dean of the College of Business Administration, Bill Wells, testified before the Banks and Banking Committee, updating them on how we were doing with the \$500,000 match of the imminent chair of Banking. Steve Hein, Director of the Center for Wildlife Education, testified before the Fish, Game, and Parks Committee on a Falconry Bill, House Bill 274. He arranged for the Ranger Challenge Team to be recognized on the floor of the House and the Senate – House Resolution 465 and Senate Resolution 417.

Mr. Keen also noted there will be a Georgia Southern Day at the capitol on February 6th.

Questions and Statements:

Charles Patterson (VP for Research): Noted we have a public relations firm in DC to open the doors to certain federal agencies.

7. Senate Executive Committee Report: Robert Costomiris (CLASS), Chair:

Dr. Costomiris summarized Senate Executive Committee activity and noted that the Faculty Welfare Committee has been charged to generate a periodic review of college deans.

Dr. Costomiris also noted that faculty were frustrated with IT issues and the SEC has invited Steve Burrell to a SEC meeting to discuss the state of technology across campus. The SEC is also planning to charge the Faculty Research Committee with identifying tool to evaluate the relative worth of grant applications versus print scholarship.

Dr. Costomiris stated the SEC will create an ad hoc committee to examine the current instrument of the user of student ratings of instruction.

Dr. Costomiris also commented on a motion brought to the SEC about parking that noted that Armstrong Atlantic does not charge faculty and staff for parking. Although not placed on the agenda today Dr. Costomiris noted this is worth discussing in the future.

8. **Election of Senate Parliamentarian:**

Bob Cook (CEIT) elected

9. **Election of Senate Representative to Student Government Association (SGA):**

Helena Hernandez elected representative to the SGA

10. **Election of Senate Representative to University Athletics Committee:**

Ed Mondor elected representative to the Athletics Committee.

11. **Election of Senate Representative to University to Parking and Transportation Committee:**

Janice Steirn elected representative to the Parking and Transportation Committee.

12. **[RFI \(Li Li\): Status of Strategic Planning at GSU](#)**

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Senate Moderator; Chair, Senate Executive Committee: the following RFI was submitted to the Senate Executive Committee about strategic planning at the University,

“I would like to request an oral presentation at the next faculty senate meeting for the current status of the university’s strategic planning. Strategic planning is an important process for any sizable organization. The University’s website has a page (<http://www.georgiasouthern.edu/strategic-planning/>) for Strategic Planning, along with the Strategic Vision, Themes, and Study Teams. It lacks of a mission statement, although the mission statement can be found somewhere else on the University’s website. More importantly there are no detailed objectives and benchmarks. Reading through the strategic planning pages, minutes from any study teams are dated from more than one year ago (<http://www.georgiasouthern.edu/strategic-planning/>). Given the importance of the strategic planning process, I would like to request an update from the administration on the current status of the University’s strategic planning.”

Response - Brooks Keel (President): Dr. Keel suggested we re-visit this issue after our SACS Reaccreditation visit, and then at that point go through a very comprehensive, very campus wide, very inclusive, full-blown strategic planning process to chart the course of this University for the next five years.

13. **Unfinished Business.**

None

14. New Business.

James Woods (CLASS): I would like to report that the SDRC appears to be unresponsive to several student requests for note-taking in classes.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Senate Moderator; Chair, Senate Executive Committee: Recommended an RFI on the subject.

15. Announcements: Vice Presidents.

Charles Patterson (VP Research and Economic Development): Last week, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, we put on the STEM fest here on campus and the efforts of our office of Career Services on Thursday and our faculty on Friday came together with industry, and their fellow faculty members at Georgia Southern. On Saturday, the i²Explore was very successful, and in cooperation our Institute for Interdisciplinary STEM Education or the i²STEM. We had about 1500 children and their parents on campus to experience STEM education at Georgia Southern so for all faculty, staff, and students that contributed to that, thank you very very much.

16. Announcements from the Floor.

Mark Welford (COSM): Faculty Senate Secretary. Dr. Welford reported he attended the USGFC (University System of Georgia Faculty Council), meeting in Bainbridge on Saturday. During the meeting Houston Davis, Executive Vice Chancellor for USG stated the following: Dr. Davis applauded individual university's efforts to address compression; Dr. Davis suggested that the USG would support colleges and universities obtaining programs or trying to change current designations, but noted that the USG would only support these changes if 1) academic support was available, 2) there was sufficient faculty expertise and infrastructure available, and 3) internal money to support new programs or designations.

Azell Francis (SGA): Azell Francis informed the Faculty Senate about the Wednesday State of the Union Address which is an opportunity for students to hear from the administration at Georgia Southern.

Tony Barilla (COBA): Dr. Barilla thanked Dr. Bartels for supporting the Provost's Faculty Salary Taskforce recommendations.

17. Adjournment.

Faculty Senate Minutes
October 15, 2013
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Deborah Allen, Olga Amarie, Tony Barilla, Helen Bland, Jonathan Copeland, Robert Costomiris, (Manouch Tabatabaei for John Dyer), Azell Francis, Hemchand Gossai, Lucy Green, Jim Harris, (John Hawkins for Lisa Yocco), Mary Hazeldine, Helena Hernandez, Pat Humphrey, Devon Jensen, June Joyner, Li Li, Marc Mitchell, Nan LoBue, Hsiu-Lien Lu, Jessica Minihan, Marc Mitchell, Marla Morris, Linda Mullen, Kent Murray, Shahnava Navaee, Robert Pirro, Mosfequr Rahman, Marshall Ransom, Camille Rogers, Sabrina Ross, Susan Smith, Lina Soares, Janice Steirn, Tiffanie Townsend, Robert Vogel, Mark Welford, Tim Whelan, James Woods, Rebecca Ziegler

Voting Members Not in Attendance: John Howard Brown, Sally Brown, Steven Elisha, Mark Hanna, Santanu Majumdar, Aniruddha Mitra, Edward Mondor, Sze-man Ngai, Joe Ruhland, Patrick Wheaton

Administrators in Attendance: Jean Bartels, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker, Teresa Thompson

Visitors: William Amponsah, Steve Rutner, Rob Yarbrough

Approved

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the October 15, 2013 meeting.**

Moved and Approved.

Approved

2. **Approval of the September 16, 2013 Senate Minutes: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Secretary:**

Moved and Approved.

(correction to minutes of 9/15/2013 from Clara Krug: In the section re: the Chancellor's visit (p. 3), Chancellor Huckaby will visit the Forest Drive Building, a 25 year old temporary building for For. Langs., History, and International Studies."

In "Unfinished Business" J. Woods and C. Krug were asked to submit an RFI about the SDRC about several issues surrounding note takers.

3. Librarian's Reports of October 2013: Greg Harwood (CLASS), Senate Librarian:

Moved and Approved.

3A. Report from the President: (in Dr. Keel's absence) Dr. Jean Bartels will report:

Dr. Bartels stated that the SACS committees are working feverishly to meet our first audit of the first draft. Dr. Bartels also stated because of our declining enrollment (along with 20 other institutions in the state) we have been told that we could not ask for any new money in the FY 15 budget. In addition we must plan for a 5% cut. Dr. Bartels noted that she had already asked the Deans to start to look strategically at what would a 5% reduction look like for them.

Questions to Dr. Bartels:

Helena Hernandez (CLASS): Asked how the budget reduction would affect our current faculty searches for this year?

Jean Bartels (Provost): We will have to look strategically at where these cuts will occur especially when we don't have any option to increase our finances.

Robert Pirro (CLASS): Would the current searches be affected and cut?

Jean Bartels (Provost): I won't even speculate on where the cut might come from.

Robert Pirro (CLASS): Didn't the President say that we had made up that deficit?

Jean Bartels (Provost): Dr. Bartels responded by stating that we under by 30 to 50 students, which translates to about 400 plus credit hours. She also reiterated that everybody across the system got the 5% cut.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): How does this relate to formula funding?

Jean Bartels (Provost): Dr. Bartels responded by stating that some system units lost up to 40% of their student population. Others like us lost under a percent. Starting in FY 16 40% of our formula funding will be tied to the students that we retain as they achieve 15 hours, 30 hours, 60 hours, 90 hours, etc. The remaining 60%, will probably related to graduation numbers.

Mark Welford (COSM): Does this lead to further a consolidations of universities?

Jean Bartels (Provost): No but the Chancellor said they are not off the table.

4. Senate Executive Committee Report: Robert Costomiris (CLASS), Chair:

Moved and Approved the minutes from the Undergraduate Committee and the Graduate Committee.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: The SEC met with the VP Steve Burrell on 10/8 to talk to him about the state of IT on campus. In January, Burrell reported that we are going to have a significantly improved capacity thru a variety of upgrades to the system hardware. Burrell also recommended streaming videos using Caltura and D2L.

The SEC met with Chancellor Huckaby. Huckaby was pretty unequivocal about not wanting to compromise quality in light of desire to RPG students. MOOCs came up and the Chancellor said that he did not think online education was a silver bullet. He also said that a new position would be created to oversee the MOOC issue.

The Chancellor also reiterated his desire not to see guns on campus.

5. Discussion Item: Summer Pay and Summer Contracts

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: The SEC would also like to initiate a discussion amongst faculty and administrators about when faculty receives contracts and how rates of summer remuneration are determined for summer teaching.

In 1997 faculty were paid 10% for each three credit hour course taught in the summer. In 2008, Provost Bleicken changed the language in the Faculty Handbook without faculty input to read that faculty may be paid at the rate of 3% per credit hour.

An RFI from Jennie Dilworth last year identified that some colleges indeed linked pay to the enrollment in courses and that certain colleges established thresholds classes must meet in order for a faculty member to receive 9%.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I think that faculty should have a choice of when a summer class is going to be cancelled and would faculty be willing to teach at sliding rate given class size.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): To what extent a chair has the discretion to cancel a summer class. Do we want a one-size-fits-all for the whole university? Do we want colleges to decide? Or do we want departments to have flexibility as well?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I think that thresholds for classes making should be different for freshmen and upperclassmen classes.

James Woods (CLASS): What about students who failed in the spring and they might want to take the course in the summer, but courses are cancelled.

Mark Welford (COSM): We do have to remember the state's not going to subsidize us throughout the summer. We have to make money to cover our costs.

Bob Cook (CEIT): First, on the 5% budget reduction, if we, for example, had offered more scholarships or work study or incentives for 50 people to come to the University, we potentially would have paid for the costs of a lot more by avoiding the 5% cut. So I think the same thing applies to summer school. If our money from the state is going to be determined by RPG and we have upper level classes with potentially low enrollment that are going to accelerate people graduating then that's a factor that should be considered independent of just drawing lines. What is the success of online summer classes?

Mark Welford (COSM): I've taught an online summer course for three years in a row and it always maxes out at a hundred students.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): I also teach an online course in the summer and it's not full at 100%, but it is full at roughly 35 and yes there are people begging, pleading to get in there.

June Joyner (CLASS): I wonder if the new advisors would help us better plan classes for summer because we sometimes offer too many and that's part of the problem.

Tony Barilla (COBA): If we look at this at college level, I understand that that if my introductory class fills up this allows some of my other colleagues who are teaching upper division classes to teach these even though they weren't full.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Whatever, the target that has to be reached. I think there should be separate target numbers for graduate and undergraduate classes.

Jean Bartels (Provost): One of the problems in summer is that some faculty who are higher paid 3% means more than does for someone who is paid less. In other words, using 3% per credit hour of your salary as the base has always struck me as being inequitable. Other models that are available include flat rates. It gives you an opportunity to be more equitable to faculty who are perhaps lesser salaried.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: What about a model that aggregates everything over the course of the summer.

Jean Bartels (Provost): One of the problems we have is that summer is actually divided so half of summer falls in FY 14 and half of it will fall in FY 15. That would also mean that you don't get paid until after summer is completely finished?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: Maybe we should look at the overall numbers in each department.

Debbie Allen (CHHS): I think faculty want to know what they are going to make before they agree to teach a summer session.

Li Li (CHHS): My understanding is first and foremost summer school is to provide students flexibility to take the classes over the summer. Yet faculty also need to supplement their income. But my sense is right now is that summer class are a revenue generating machine. But if we are to try to provide flexibility and at the same time compensate faculty income, we could split larger sessions into mini sessions, providing students with the flexibility.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM): For the last three years of faculty have been receiving summer contracts later and later in fact faculty didn't receive contracts at all this summer. So in future, we can anticipate not getting summer contracts?

Jean Bartels (Provost): There apparently was some miscommunication with Deans not understanding that they needed to download contracts off of ADP. Receiving summer contracts early means summer course cancellation deadlines have to be set much earlier. So if you want summer cancellation deadlines to coincide with drop/add deadlines contracts will be sent out after the courses begin.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM): So was the university allowing time for those classes to fill?

Jean Bartels (Provost): That was the case for this last year where we were desperately trying to increase the student enrollment in summer so we did push back the decisions on whether the classes were going to go or not.

Jean Bartels (Provost): Another issue that factors into summer contracts is that faculty teaching in particular areas are paid much more than others -- this affects the ability to pay all people who want to teach summer school. We could have even more courses if we had a flat rate structure.

Linda Mullen (COBA): Any discussion of summer contracts should also include a discussion of compensation for Study Abroad teaching.

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH): Any discussion of summer contracts should include discussion of drop/add and withdraw dates. Withdraw deadlines should be brought forward so contracts can be offered earlier in each summer session. Adjusting the 3% to 2% to 2/12% or whatever based on enrollment during the course is a slippery slope and might make faculty think twice about teaching summer school.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: How many people received a salary reduction teaching in the summer because courses did not make a minimum threshold? And how much did this cost the institution or save the institution in terms of an overall dollar amount?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I do think we need contracts since our services should be contracted for.

Kent Murray (CLASS): What's our next step? Where do we go? Create a committee or what's the next aspect of this?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: To sum up:

- Variability of class size and pay seems to be an issue
- Equitability seems to be an issue
- Availability of the classes in the summer in terms of how it affects RPG seems to be a big issue
- The use of the summer money in the GSU budget in general is a little bit unclear
- Date of contracts and certainty that faculty have about what they are being paid is still a big issue

Devon Jensen (COE): In the College of Education we have many sections that are completely filled by TAP students and so that has an impact on revenue that is generated by that particular program or the college in that they're not getting the revenue through tuition, they're getting in through enrollment, which is a much different revenue stream and so sometimes that can place a burden on particular

programs to run courses that are that are heavily loaded with tuition assistance program students.

Devon Jensen (COE): For example Instructional Technology, Educational Leadership, both of the P-12s, and the Higher Education stream.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: Move and Approved to end discussion.

6. Unfinished Business

7. New Business.

Lucy Green (COE): I just wondered if I could ask a quick question about Steve Burrell?

Lucy Green (COE): Steve Burrell. Could I ask a question? By any chance did he mention the Student Technology Fees and why they are not accepting applications for those at this time?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: We did not discuss that.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: I would like to recognize Curtis Ricker who has been appointed CLASS Dean.

8. Announcements: Vice Presidents.

9. Announcements from the Floor.

10. Adjournment.

Faculty Senate Minutes
November 20, 2013
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Deborah Allen, Olga Amarie, Annalee Ashley, Tony Barilla, Helen Bland, John Howard Brown, Sally Brown, Jonathan Copeland, Robert Costomiris, John Dyer, Steven Elisha, Hemchand Gossai, (Ron MacKinnon for Mark Hanna), Jim Harris, Greg Harwood, Mary Hazeldine, Helena Hernandez, Pat Humphrey, Devon Jensen, June Joyner, Li Li, Nan LoBue, Santanu Majumdar, Jessica Minihan, Marc Mitchell, Aniruddha Mitra, Ed Mondor, Marla Morris, Linda Mullen, Kent Murray, Shahnavee, Robert Pirro, Marshall Ransom, Joe Ruhland, Susan Smith, Janice Steirn, (Ellen Hamilton for Kathy Thornton), Robert Vogel, Mark Welford, Patrick Wheaton, Tim Whelan, James Woods, Lisa Yocco, Rebecca Ziegler

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Lucy Green, Hsiu-Lien Lu, Sze-man Ngai, Mosfequr Rahman, Camille Rogers, Sabrina Ross, Lina Soares, Tiffanie Townsend

Administrators: Brooks Keel, Steve Burrell, Russell Keen, Charles Patterson, Rob Whitaker, Martha Abell, Mohammad Davoud, Greg Evans, Barry Joyner, Tom Koballa, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker

Visitors: Christina Abreu, Ruth Baker, Barry Balleck, Diana Cone, Maura Copeland, Brett Curry, Marc Cyr, Dick Diebolt, Evan Dressler, Steve Engel, Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Cynthia Frost, Lori Gwinett, Katrina Jackson, Christine Ludowise, Michael Moore, Michael Nielsen, Jocelyn Poole, Jamie Scalera, Sonya Shepherd, Debra Skinner, Fred Smith, Lisa Smith, Diana Sturges, Steve Vives

- Approved **1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 20, 2013 meeting.**
- Approved **2. Approval of the [October 15, 2013](#) Minutes: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Secretary.**
- Approved **3. Approval of the Librarian's Reports of [November 2013](#) Greg Harwood (CLASS), Senate Librarian.**
- Approved **a. Approval of the Undergraduate Committee Report: Ellen Hamilton (Alternate for Dr. Kathy Thornton, CHHS)**
- Approved **b. Approval of the Graduate Committee Report: Bob Fernekes (LIB)**
- Approved **c. Approval of the General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report:**
- 4. Election of the Chair of the Senate Executive Committee who**

will serve as Senate Moderator for the term of 1 August 2014 to 31 July 2015:

Robert Costomiris, Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: There's one nominee - Devon Jensen from the College of Education. Are there any other nominees?

Marshall Ransom (COSM): I'd like to nominate Pat Humphrey.

Robert Costomiris, Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: Pat, do you accept the nomination?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Yes.

Robert Costomiris, Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: So the election results are Pat Humphrey will be the Senate Moderator for the coming year.

5. Senate Executive Committee Report: Robert Costomiris (CLASS), Chair: I'm onto #5, which is the Senate Executive Committee Report. One is that the SEC established an ad hoc committee and charged it to look at the student ratings of instruction. This committee is being chaired by Rebecca Ziegler, who's on the SEC, should report back to us by April 1st.

The other issue is the formulation and issuance of University policies. This overarching policy does not to address issues of faculty involvement in the creation of academic policy. Anyway, Dr. Keel and I discussed this matter. I brought him the same documents that I'm showing you here today with the relevant bits highlighted here, and I just would like to go through some of these just so you can see them for yourselves. "Faculty therefore have a role in developing policies including, at the appropriate levels, strategic planning; academic and curricular policies; committee establishment and appointments; selection and retention of academic unit leaders; review and revision of the shared governance process; and faculty personnel actions, including hiring and evaluation of faculty (annual evaluation, pre-tenure, tenure, post-tenure review, and promotion). As used here, "policy" is understood to include guiding and governing principles and any applicable procedures, instructions, or forms developed along with the principles." That is from the Faculty Governance section of the *Faculty Handbook*.

In the *Statutes of the University*, the faculty are charged with responsibility "for regulations affecting academic activities, general education policy, the welfare of the faculty, and other matters as may maintain, etc. ~~Faculty shall serve,~~ Faculty Senate shall serve as a representative and legislative agency of the faculty. As such, it shall serve as the official faculty advisory body to the President."

Jumping down to the bottom, "the academic affairs of the University which concern the

Faculty Senate and for which it shall be responsible in formulating policies and reviewing procedures include those enumerated powers of the faculty listed in Article IV.”

And then there’s a BOR policy. Anyway the point is ~~I felt that this~~, everyone seemed to feel that the document formulation and issuance of the policies didn’t really allow for these mechanisms to be functioning. Dr. Keel ~~has made~~, has written to me and said that he has been working on this with the Cabinet, and we will hear more about how that’s going from him, I assume, later. Yes?

Brooks Keel (President) Or I can do it now, if you wish. I can do it very very quickly while you are on this topic. Maura Copeland has revised this policy to reflect the unique status of the Faculty Senate and throughout the document has indicated before it had said vice president, it now says president or vice president to reflect that, so we will get that to you in the next several days so you can have a chance to see that.

Robert Costomiris, Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: Thank you, and we look forward to seeing the changes. So one last thing to say is that the SEC is still discussing summer teaching compensation. We’re hoping that we can make some kind of a recommendation early enough in the spring.

6. Requests for Information

6.1. [Graduation Rates for Student Athletes at Georgia Southern University \(Athletic Director\)](#): the following document was provided to us by Keith Roughton, Director of NCAA Compliance.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): The numbers were interesting. The gaps between our football student athletes and our University male non-athlete overall are about what I expected from the NCAA and the grade gap report 2%, 6% depending upon where you look. Some of the other numbers like a 4-year class average of 35%, but a one-year FGR of 71% for baseball is interesting, but probably can be accounted for by luck of the draw, just depending upon the cohort for that year. But what I was concerned about was that one of the questions was not answered. Q: What impact, if any, does Georgia Southern expect our move to FBS and the Sun Belt Conference to have on our football players’ FGR? And On what bases are these expectations grounded? That really did not receive a reply as to what impact is expected, and why we might expect that because we are moving into ~~an environment~~, a conference environment where the football gap is far larger than it is in the conference in which we are now probably, I’m just speculating because of increased competition, but if we are moving our students into that academic environment, I wonder if academics were considered at all in making the move to the Bowl Division. And if so what’s in store for helping our student-athletes who play football have a decent opportunity and not a lessened opportunity to graduate with a college degree.

Robert Costomiris, Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: Is Chris Geyerman here?

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) NCAA Faculty Athletic Rep: I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the academics of any student group, and athletes, in particular, since I work so closely in an oversight capacity with respect to their academics and overall well being. I don't know that its that the academics weren't considered in making the move, and I'll give kind of a, in fact, they were considered. I'll give you one factual example, and I'll rely on Provost Bartels and Vice President Whitaker to correct me, if I misspeak. One of the things that's happened in planning for this move because the expectation is that the athletic department will grow a little bit. Certainly the football team will. As in this summer, I chaired a committee and we hired a Director of Student Athlete Academic Services. Her name is Allison Ruff. Until Allison came on board, Student Athlete Academic Services were grouped in with Compliance, and Keith Roughton, did both of those jobs, and they are both full-time jobs. Since arriving, Allison has done a really nice job. She's come to the University Athletics Committee meetings. Dr. Mondor serves as the Senate Rep on those committees, so he can attest to what I'm saying and so can your elected colleagues from your respective colleges. And she's doing a really nice job in terms of planning and getting her structure in place, given the fact that we're going to be in the Sun Belt next year. I also want to point out that this office in consultation with Athletic Director Kleinlein, he and I had several lengthy discussions and came to the conclusion that its more of an academic affair than an athletic affair. That there was kind of an apparent, at least room for a perceived conflict of interest having student athlete academic affairs, in the Athletics Department, so that office now reports to the Provost and is housed in the Provost's office, and the budget line for that entire office was transferred from the Athletic Department into the Provost's Office, so it didn't eat up dollars that were already in the Provost's Office. So that's one thing that's happened, structurally. In addition, the University Athletics Committee, just at our meeting this morning, was talking about what's this going to mean for our student athletes and one of the things that we're going to do as we begin growing is send a member from the Student Athlete Academic Center on the road trips with the student athletes and conduct study hall while they're on the road, actually that would be the same as if they were here. Another thing that's happened in terms of discussion, nothing substantive has come of it yet, it will be on the agenda for the Faculty Athletic Representatives Association at the Sun Belt meeting this May is we're trying to work out a kind of tradeoff so that when a school say from Texas comes to Georgia to play Georgia Southern and Georgia State that we open up our Student Athlete Academic Success Center to them for a couple of hours and when we're on the road we'll do the same thing. That's going to be a logistical nightmare and it will be kind of fun to be involved in those discussions, so those are some things that have happened, and I totally agree with Marc that it wasn't that that aspect of the RFI definitely wasn't directly addressed, but those are some of the things that have happened. And I could share my opinion, but that's all it would be and the grounds on which I hold that opinion with respect to the changes that the move to the Sun Belt will make. And I don't think they're going to be significant, personally and I'll tell you why, is in my

experience you get a head coach that holds the kids accountable they're going to be accountable. You get a head coach that doesn't and they're not going to be accountable. If you think back to the cohort for the 38% federal graduation rate that the football team has in this year's report that's the 2006 cohort, right. If you go back a little bit and look at what was happening with the football team in 2005, we dismissed a coach that was a winning coach. He was winning on the field and nobody knew why that coach's contract wasn't renewed, and the then Athletic Director took a lot of heat for that. We then had a coach for one year and then we had a bunch of instability in the football program, so I feel pretty confident in predicting that next year's federal graduation rate when its released in the 2014 stats, might even be a little bit worse because we are right into the heart of the instability this thing going six or seven years back. And I don't think it will affect any of the other sports because they are not making a change in Division. All of our other sports except football are already in Division I, so the volleyball team, they're going to go to, you know, the same NCAA Tournament that Georgia and Georgetown and you know all of the other Division I schools go to. The only sport that it represents a change in Divisional affiliation for is football. And it will be interesting to see if we have a coach that emphasizes athletic, or academic, they're all going to emphasize athletics, then its a great thing, and the kids will do it. And if we get a coach like when we interviewed one coach, and the comment was, and I have to listen between the lines, I want to make sure all my kids stay eligible, and I thought oh my God, if that's the expectation that's exactly what we're going to get. And the eligibility expectation for the NCAA is 12 hours a semester. Well, that's been up increased, but the GPA is a 2.00, which is a little bit on the low side for my likings as a faculty member, so that's those are some things that have happened in the planning that have actually happened and my opinion for whatever that's worth.

6.2. Status of Current Searches (Provost Bartels)

Robert Costomiris, Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: The response was written by Provost Bartels, who submitted it to the Executive Committee. And she said that at the current time, searches are moving forward, but colleges have been asked to submit a plan for a strategic 5% reduction in order to meet this. It is possible that the plans submitted might include cancellation/elimination of one or more searches. Once all College's 5% reduction plans are submitted and approved, decisions regarding the continuation of affected faculty searches will be made. So any comments or questions on this RFI? Okay. Moving to the third one then.

6.3. Distribution of FY 2015 Budget Cuts (President Keel)

Robert Costomiris, Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: The third one came in about the distribution of FY 2015 budget cuts, and whether a question asking if Academic Affairs or other units, whether this was a shared, whether the 5% cut was being shared across the University units. Okay. And the answer was from President Keel. And again I'm not going to speak for him, but this may prompt questions if you have any, please perhaps hold them off until he speaks or after he speaks. You can see his response here and you can may have it with you today. Okay.

6.4. Research University Status (President Keel)

Robert Costomiris, Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: The fourth one 6.4 was the research university status. Whether the question, and the question was does the university still aspire to the status of a research university, given, again, given by the budget cuts that we've been asked to make and the President also responded to that on the 15th of November. And again you may read that for yourselves and ask your questions of Dr. Keel after he speaks or if you can hold them that long. Okay.

6.5. State Contribution to the GSU Budget (Robert Whitaker)

Robert Costomiris, Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee: And the fifth one was the state contribution to the GSU budget, which was passed off to Rob Whitaker, the Vice President for Business and Finance. He is here today. He is on the agenda to speak about budgetary matters in general and so he, and he has submitted a response to this in the form of a what do I want to call it?

7. GSU Budget Report: Rob Whitaker, VP for Business and Finance:

A couple of things that Robert asked me to do is 1) look at that budget data and kind of take you through that. The fact that we've been asked to prepare a 5% budget cut — that request came from the University System of Georgia as opposed to coming down through the Governor's office.

Well, starting off with the total budget of Georgia Southern University, this chart will basically show you that there is a total budget right now of \$342 million dollars at Georgia Southern. Board of Regents Policy and business procedures requires each institution to budget and expend funds in support of the operations specific to each fund. They are not interchangeable. When one fund is losing revenue or support we can't take away from one and move it to the other.

The five smallest funds, about 6.5% of the budget or \$21 million, that's unexpended plant capital type project indirect cost recovery money we get through our research grants, technology fees, departmental sales and services, and student activities. That's about 6.5% of the budget.

The next largest fund is restricted/sponsored that's where we do our private funded research. Also our financial aid is processed through that fund. That's about 11% of our budget or \$39 million.

The next largest fund will be Auxiliary Services. It's about 25% of the total budget or \$87 million. That's where our Housing, Food Services, Transportation, and Athletics — a lot of different groups are in that that allow us to operate those auxiliary service

functions that are services to our students.

The final fund which is probably the most important fund is general operations. It makes up the largest percent, 57% of the budget and it's \$194 million. That's where we conduct our core mission of instruction. That's the day-to-day operations of the University. There are basically three fund sources for general operations. There's state appropriations, there's tuition and fees, and then there's some miscellaneous revenue, the biggest of those is the institutional fee that we charge students. Tuition made up 51% or \$98 million of our general operations budget. State appropriation made up 42% or \$81 million, and then the miscellaneous, other fees, was about \$14 million or 7% of the budget. That's basically the quick answer to the RFI for the current year that the funding is basically 51.42 or actually it will be 51.49 when I add the two together. The largest place we spend our money in our general operations budget is obvious to everybody, is instruction — \$94 million of our budget, 48% if you add to that the academic support function of \$22 million basically 60% of everything we bring in in general operations gets spent on instruction, and the support of instruction.

The next largest piece to the pie is institutional support — \$33 million, or 17% of the budget. And then we have Physical Plant where we make an investment there to maintain our buildings of \$26 million or 13%. Student Services — 7.6%, \$14 million; public service and state funding research, a small 2% or \$3.9 million of the budget.

John Brown (COBA): Could you tell me exactly what institutional support is? It's a term that doesn't convey a lot of meaning to me.

Rob Whitaker (VP, Business and Finance): That's all the services that support the institution — it will be Business and Finance, Accounting, it will be IT, its the marketing, operations behind the scenes, making the institution work.

John Brown (COBA): How is that different from academic support?

Rob Whitaker (VP, Business and Finance): Academic support is your Deans, Chairs, its more related to supporting the academic function, the instruction function.

Rob Whitaker (VP, Business and Finance): Funding for higher education in the state of Georgia has significantly changed in the last 20 years.

The funding formula, 20 years ago, was based on a premise of 75% - 25% percent, split — 75% to be funded by state appropriations/25% to be funded by tuition and fees. In 2014, like I mentioned just a while ago, 42% of the budget came from state appropriations and then 58/59% of that came from tuition and fees. If you go back 13 years, you'll see that the split was 69 state appropriation and the balance of that being

tuition and fees. In about 2011 we made the crossover from being funded majority state appropriation to now being funded majority tuition and fees.

If you look back over the year's you can see back in 1994, we had \$5400 worth of state funding per student. And if you look now in 2014, that's an estimate going in to the Fall Semester of \$6,082. So less that \$600 increase over the last 20 years and I think all of us in this room can agree that the cost of educating students has increased by much more than just 24% over the last 20 years. Enrollment drives the formula. If you look back, Georgia Southern has enjoyed a very good robust five-years of enrollment growth. We had some very good years starting in 2007 working our way up to 2013.

Obviously, now here in 2014, this Fall Semester, we're down about a hundred students, enrollment decline in this Fall Semester is what created the reason that we're being asked to do that 5% budget cut. This enrollment decline does two things: it reduces our tuition that we're going to have to offset any budget cuts, but at the same time, it drives that enrollment funding formula. I want to go back to this chart, if you think about the last five years, go back one year, the five years where we had enrollment growth. But at the same time we have had 32% budget cut to the University System of Georgia. I think only 2010 fiscal year did this institution pass along any budget cuts down to the department level. We've been able to maintain our funding through enrollment growth, through the increase in tuition revenue, and so that's why we've not experienced the cut that we're having to look at this year as we go into the next fiscal year.

You'll notice that the System is going to have to cut its funding by \$20 million because of enrollment related decline throughout the System. There is actually about \$40 million institutional decline and about \$20 million in growth. It netted out to \$20 million decline to the System, and so that's what the System office is having to manage and that's why the System office has asked us at Georgia Southern to prepare for a 5% budget cut. The same time they also told us we could not ask for any new money next year. We're excluded from even asking for new money, and they've told us that tuition increases, if at all, will be very very small, and, so again, we've got to look to grow our institution from the organic inward looking as opposed to what we might get from the Board of Regents or through the legislative process.

The current formula we use was created back in 1982. It is driven by credit hours. It has a couple of productivity factors.

There was actually a Higher Education Funding Commission that was set up. They've already made the recommendation that we will move forward to a performance-based funding model, the Tennessee model is what we're going to use for our framework. Its

obviously going to reward progression degrees, its going to have target populations that will be incentivized. It will also look at what the sector mission state priorities might be to kind of help derive how we get that end result in the formula. The Ground Rules for the new formula is its going to go into effect for Fiscal 2016. That next topic there that FY15 formula, whatever gets finalized in this legislative session for 2015 budget which starts July coming up is going to be the base for this new funding formula. We're not going to have any new money. We should not reduce the money. We don't expect the tuition policy will be put into the new funding formula.

We've been told that we can expect that a freshman coming in at Georgia Southern we'll get 50 cents on the dollar of that first 15 hours or basically tuition money only. They are not going to get any state funding until they progress to that 15 credit hours, 30, 60, 90, graduated out the door. How do we convince students that 15 hours is important, not 12, not 14, how do we get them to 15, and get them completed through 15. We want them to succeed in that 15 hours, so it is an important piece.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): One question. I don't know if this is more appropriate for you or Dr. Keel, but it came up at our department meeting earlier today. Given that we all still have the clause of bad furloughs in our contracts, has there been any talk about using furloughs to try to make this 5%?

Dr. Brooks Keel (President): I can address that. No, there've been no conversations about furloughs to address the budget cut.

Devon Jensen (COE): In your report, and something that has been troubling me a little bit, we have a 2.74% decline in the revenues at the college, or at the Georgia level, yet they are asking for a 5% reduction. That's a big difference. We know that institutions are already running right on the edge so why are they asking for a 3% reduction from institutions?

Rob Whitaker (VP, Business and Finance): I think the answer to that question is better answered by the Board of Regents is because they gave us the 5% but I think their thinking is that they had to insure enough monies from institutions to be able to manage a \$20 million decline in funding from the legislature.

Brooks Keel (President): Let me just add to that. That's essentially what we were handed down. You need to keep in mind that although the state of Georgia passes money to the University System of Georgia, with the intention of it going to the individual units, the Board of Regents and the University System of Georgia has complete authority to distribute that money in essentially any way they see fit. They are looking at roughly 20 institutions that saw a decrease in enrollment and roughly 11 institutions saw an increase in enrollment. And as I understand it, the budget instructions which were passed out to all 31 institutions, those universities that had an increase in enrollment were asked to indicate how they would spend any new money

that they might collect from the Regents; those that were flat or slightly decreased were asked to prepare for a 5%; those that institutions that had significantly, a greater decreases in enrollment were asked as to how they would actually come up with their own cuts and there were some institutions that had significant decreases in enrollments.

Tim Whelan (CLASS): One of the last slides, it said something about bonus and it was pass rates. Can you explain that? Are you talking about pass rates from a class?

Rob Whitaker (VP, Business and Finance): It was a framework item, and I think there were trying to think about how they may bring in pass rates on professional exams into the formula.

Brooks Keel (President): That's exactly correct, and just to, there are other unique things that may or may not apply to us. There is going to be something for special initiatives, I think, that Rob mentioned. There'll be something for adult learners, there'll be a bonus for pass rates, and now you are looking at law schools and vet schools and medical schools and those sorts of things that have professional, our nursing program, may or may not qualify for that.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): I have two questions. That 75/25 formula that's changed for all units across the University System, is that correct?

Rob Whitaker (VP, Business and Finance): The 75/15 formula was a mechanism to appropriate to the University System of Georgia, so in essence, yes, all institutions now are funded through that 75/25 formula that's no longer 75/25.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): But did the decrease in the contribution to various units within the University System is different, is that correct? So some might get 41%, some might get 50, or is there variation across the units of the

Rob Whitaker (VP, Business and Finance): I think it will vary a little bit, percent to here and there, but I don't think you'll find an institution that's still 75% funded by state appropriation and 25%. I think all institutions average-wise are in that same realm of 50/50 now.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): The last question I have, has the University System made an official statement as to why they've gone from 75/25 to 40/60?

Rob Whitaker (VP, Business and Finance): It's not the University System of Georgia, its our Governor, its our legislature, they have implemented budget cuts to a funding formula.

Brooks Keel (President): We are no different than virtually every state in the Union. With the possible exception of Texas and North Dakota who have seen increases

because of minerals and that sort of thing that they have. Virtually every state is in the exact same position that we are with the state contribution, the subsidy, if you will, that states provide for public education has been decreased almost the same as it has in Georgia.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS): As we move forward to the new formula who's going to be tracking that data of the recruitment, the retention, the promotion, and the graduation? Is that an internal collected data base or is it going to be collected at the University System level, and we have to justify one way or the other?

Rob Whitaker (VP, Business and Finance): Combination of all of the above, but yes we obviously are going to collect data at the institutional level.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Will any consequences of not meeting the progression goals be divided down to like college-levels, or will it be kept at the University-level?

Rob Whitaker (VP, Business and Finance): We've not had conversations about how we would implement that at the University-level.

Brooks Keel (President): The cuts most certainly will be passed down to the University, unless something drastically changes in the way the System operates, and I don't foresee that ever happening. That would be up to the individual university campus to decide how they would split those cuts around, but I can certainly assure you that we are going to be looking at every single college, we do that now, and every single Dean is looking at every single department, and I'll ask the Provost to comment as it clearly falls in her wheelhouse, but the are expectations are that the colleges will have goals to meet and if they don't meet those goals there will be budget ramifications associated with that.

Tony Barilla (COBA): I just had a really quick question. I didn't see your formula, I saw a list of your variables. I was actually waiting to see the formula so I could identify which was one a revenue side and the cost side, and so I would just like to ask a simple question, going in blind because, again, I haven't seen your formula, yet. If we're at such an enrollment situation where we are down 52 students from last year, or 60 students from last year, has anyone done a cost benefit analysis as to whether we should just simply give out a 100 new scholarships and attract 100 new students from other schools, and then therefore take that cost compared to the revenue cut that was coming and seeing if there's the benefit that occurs or not?

Brooks Keel (President): The use of state dollars for scholarships is a very difficult position to be in as you would imagine. It has to come from Foundation, private sources, and that sort of thing, and if what you're essentially talking about is buying students and we are obviously doing that all the time. You know, there are a lot of way we could increase our enrollment. One would be the easy way would reduce our minimum entrance requirements from 1010 down to say 950. So what that means is

that the students that we're going after have a higher SATs and right now as you know our average for this past Fall was 1112, and in order to do that, we have to offer scholarships to a lot of those high-end students and as the other universities are beginning to look at enrollment and every single one of them is, those that have the greater endowments, foundation endowments to offer scholarships those students are going there.

Ed Mondor (COSM): One question that I have is **will we be penalized if Georgia Southern students transfer?**

Brooks Keel (President): Wow, that's a great question.

Jean Bartels (Provost): What I can tell you is there has been conversation about what happens with students who transfer. Essentially that would be kind of a transfer situation. What happens with transient students and there's a sensitivity to understanding that we should not get penalized because a student has continued in the System. We're fortunate here because our database systems, our office of Strategic Research is able to trace where our students go, so we actually can tell you where our students are and document that they have not left; they are going to be graduating someplace else, so they made a transfer decision, but they are not lost to the System, or to a degree of any kind from any place. The System is starting to, has made many many conversations about that very fact that they are going to have to look at that and we can't be punished for somebody that makes a transfer.

Brooks Keel (President): If I could add just one thing along those lines, and Dr. Bartels indicated that the System is looking at how they calculate graduation rates to be fair to those sort of things. The federal definition of a six-year graduation rate is first-time entering freshmen, first-time full-time freshmen, that stay at your institution for six-years and ours is roughly right now 51%, and that has increased over the last several years, again much if not entirely to all your credit. But if you add those students that leave Georgia Southern and go to another University System of Georgia institution and graduate in our old engineering program, not the new engineering program, but the old engineering program is a great example of that, the GTREP program where kids would transfer to Georgia Tech, you can add 10 points to a six-year graduation rate. If you go nationally and we're just now beginning to get the national data in place so we can track a Georgia Southern student that transfers to California and graduates and how do we get credit for that, because that's a success. As you well know, the whole population of students is radically different now than when it was when the six-year graduation rate was first determined because of the number of times the student would transfer in and out of a university is phenomenal now than what it compared to be. And so all those issues are still being worked out. This formula has not been decided yet. They are working feverishly on it and we will certainly keep you up-to-date as we hear exactly how these issues are going to be dealt with.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I'm really wondering about what seems to be the apparent public disconnect between what we're getting from the Chancellor's office and what we're getting from the legislature. I'm quoting from Senator Jack Hill, the Chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee in his newsletter from last week where he outlines many of the same things that you just outlined for us in terms of the deficits that the state is facing and he goes through a long series of these things, but in the last two paragraphs of his document he says, "In this document we have outlined about \$173 million needed for the FY 14 amended budget. For FY 2015 general we have totalled approximately some \$527 million in entitlement and formula requirements and other obligations. The good news is that monthly revenue growth appears to support the amended needs and year-to-date revenue totals are in the 4-5% range which would support the above expenditures." So why are we getting this disconnect from the Chancellor's office and the state legislature? Who, by the way, several members of my department have had private conversations with Senator Hill and he says that this is something that is not being discussed by his colleagues in the legislature at this point.

Rob Whitaker (VP, Business and Finance): I don't know that there is a disconnect there as much as just a misunderstanding. When you think about what he says in the paragraph, he talks about there's money to fund entitlements, there's money to fund formulas. Well, our formula has some positive lines to it. But there's one negative line at the very top and so when he says we can fully fund the formula. Well, they're never going to say they can fully fund the formula. If they fund the net increase or decrease to the formula funding for higher education and they've done what they in theory are supposed to do and there's other formulas: K-12 is on a formula funded bases, and they'll get an increase of the revenue. The revenue is increasing so there's more money to fund all those things he lists, and they are going to do that. The System office is trying to manage and grapple with, if we don't get that \$20 million, and you have to really remember its a \$40 million cut to a \$20 million gain. How do we manage that within the University System of Georgia.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): Well, but as it says he addresses that \$21 million deficit in this document and then says at the end revenue should be or would be sufficient, doesn't say should he says would be sufficient to do this. And it just seems to me we have this public discussion going on from the Chancellor's office who is having the discussion with the USG institutions, but we're not seeing this discussion take place in the larger public. And I'm just wondering if there's any speculation as to why that is occurring.

Russell Keen (VP, Government Affairs and Community Engagement): Also read Senator Hill's newsletter that goes out and I think what he's talking about in terms of the discourse that's not being discussed is that as people are receiving these updates on

state revenue continuing to increase, but what they're not getting the updates on are the increased health care costs, Medicaid and those type things. As Vice President Whitaker alluded to earlier, if you look at the University System you've got a \$20 million enrollment deficit in addition to the \$20 million increase in health care. I think they are, you know, just to repeat what's already been said, they are trying to address those issues. I think as a state, they are looking at increased health care costs, Medicaid, there, you know, there is this perception that the revenues are going up 5%, 9% and all this is great news, but what we're not hearing are the increased expenses there so I don't think that, you know, if you take one segment out and say well, the increase in revenue could cover this specific portion, that may be true, but the big picture it presents a different story. So I don't know if that, just wanted to clarify some of that, and then just to go back a little bit to explain that the budget for the state of Georgia originates in the House. The Governor makes a recommendation. The budget originates in the House through all of the committees. The House passes a budget, it goes to the Senate. The Senate goes through a committee process. They have their version of the budget. Then there's a budget conference committee. Its represented by three conferees from the House and three conferees from the Senate. And the Governor's office is certainly at the table, and has some influence there, but ultimately they come up with a document that they pass out.

Mark Welford (COSM): I was curious, where is our Capital Campaign funding, could this have provided some monies to generate scholarships to meet enrollment shortfalls.

Brooks Keel (President): The Capital Campaign is getting geared up to launch the silent phase which will probably begin this summer. The Campaign is a \$100 million Campaign and we hope that in seven years after its completed, keeping in mind that the silent phase will not even start until this June or July. That we will start having some of those dollars that we desperately need to provide those scholarships. Its a constantly evolving situation for us and we're going to keep fighting for it.

- 8. President's Report: Brooks Keel:** Thank you very much, and I will try to keep my comments brief, so we can answer any specific questions that you may have and I think that most of what I will tell you many of the questions you have asked I anticipated and hopefully and have already been answered.

Chancellor

Let me give you just a few quick updates that are associated with this, and then I will talk specifically about the two RFIs and try to move from there. We've had several opportunities to interact with the Chancellor. We always do. Of course, the Chancellor was on campus ~~just as~~ several months ago. This past weekend, the Chancellor and his family were here. The Executive Vice Chancellor was also hear, Steve Wrigley, we gave him a campus tour and pointed out some of the structural issues that we have on campus and I think that was indeed a very very positive meeting. Let me first tell you

that I had as early as last week a meeting with the Chancellor and the Presidents and he remains optimistic that the possibility, if you can keep your mind on all those caveats from, remains optimistic about the possibility of a pay increase, its still very much alive, and he is fighting for that every chance he gets. I don't know how to convey that sincerity any more than I can, but he certainly recognizes that we have not had a pay increase in this System for some six years now. He also recognizes that the cost of health insurance has increased, so you've had a net decrease in pay. We certainly recognize that. The Chancellor recognizes that this issue is not good for any University, we are losing good faculty, we are losing good staff, we're not able to recruit the best faculty because who wants to come to a state that's not going to give pay increases. They recognize that. I think that the legislature recognizes that. The chair of the Appropriations Committee in both the House and the Senate are recognizing that a pay increase is something that needs to be considered greatly and I know it will be seriously considered in this next year. Primarily because we as a state have seen an increase in revenues over the last several years. Now, what percent that will be, I have no idea. If we get a pay increase at all. But I do think it is being discussed and talked about and I feel very optimistic that we will. We also need to keep in mind its an election year; its difficult for any Governor to get re-elected in a year in which the voters are not enthusiastic lets say and so I think that there are a lot of the stars that are aligning I think that we could certainly hope, and I'm more hopeful now than I have been since I've been here about the possibility of a pay increase. So please don't lose hope in that. Please know that we are all fighting as much as we possibly can to try to secure that. Having said that, the Chancellor also uses the words new normal. I know you're tired of hearing me say that, but the Chancellor continues to say that at virtually every place he goes. What he means by that is that the budget cuts that we are seeing now, we would not expect us to see a dramatic increase in the amount of money that we from the state in the foreseeable future, if ever. That's the definition of the new normal. What we have now, is what we're going to get. We have to be more creative and more organic in terms of how we identify resources to do strategic things for the University. And he also mentions, as you would expect, that enrollment is the key. The System is down in enrollment I believe for the third year now, I think, Rob is that correct? Do you recall? I believe it is the third year now by some 5,000 students. We are fortunate in that we have a very robust enrollment management program plan here and we can make projections on enrollment that are incredibly accurate. I have been talking about enrollment virtually every time that I have spoken before this Senate. The importance of enrollment, where we are

9. Unfinished Business.
10. New Business.
11. Announcements: Vice Presidents.
12. Announcements from the Floor.

13. Adjournment.