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Faculty Senate Minutes
February 12, 2015
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom


Voting Members Not in Attendance: Debbie Allen, John Dyer, Tim Giles, Ellen Hamilton, Alina Iacob, June Joyner, Lindsay Larson, Susan Smith, Tiffanie Townsend, Lisa Yocco, Rebecca Ziegler

Administrators in Attendance: Brooks Keel, Jean Bartels, Martha Abell, Mohammad Davoud, Greg Evans, Barry Joyner, Tom Koballa, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker, Rob Whitaker

Visitors in Attendance: Paolo P. Gujilde, Marian Tabi, Robert Fernekes, Andrea Hagans, Michelle Cawthorn, Candace Griffith, Velma Burden, Cheryl Aasheim, Diana Cone, Malinda Moore, Morgan Cox, Robert Boyce,

1. Approval of the Agenda for the February 12, 2015 meeting.
Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator: Seeing none, all in favor, please say aye. All opposed? The agenda is approved. If you will notice something looks a little bit odd, we have to discuss this later on in my report.

2. Approval of the November 19, 2014 Minutes: Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator. The November 19th Minutes. I would like to move that those be accepted. Ginger’s and my struggles, taking care of those, notwithstanding, are there any corrections to those minutes?

Steven Elisha (CLASS): Misspelling of my last name.

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator: Duly noted. We will get that fixed, Steve. Any other corrections to the November meeting minutes? Seeing none, can we vote to approve them? All in favor, please say aye. All opposed? With that one correction of Steven Elisha’s name, the November minutes are approved.

(Note: corrected in minutes)

3. Librarian’s Reports of February, 2015, Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator
Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator: The Librarian’s Report. Again, I’d like to move that we accept the Librarian’s Report, which primarily is recording the minutes of the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees with a couple of other committees thrown in. Any questions about the Librarian’s Report.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Pat, will there be a separate report of the Undergraduate Committee? Okay, because I did find some typos in it.

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator: We have the general report as a whole and then we have the other three committees separately.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Okay, great, thanks.

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator: No questions about the general Librarian’s Report? All in favor of accepting this, merely recognizing that we’re accepting that the committees are reporting their actions accurately, including the FAR who just came in the room, please say aye. All opposed? The Librarian’s Report is accepted. Now it’s time for the Undergraduate Committee Report. Cheryl Aasheim is Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee this semester, and I’d like her to move that and give us some highlights if she has a few.

**Undergraduate Committee Report (Cheryl Aasheim, CEIT):** I’d like to move that the minutes be approved, and you said you’d like some highlights?

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator: Do you have any?

Cheryl Aasheim, (CEIT) Chair, Undergraduate Committee: I do. The November minutes are very long. The agenda is very long, because it is two meetings prior to the catalog changes being required, so in the interest of being brief, there was over a 1000 pages of agenda, 40 pages of minutes. I’m going to not summarize everything. I’m going to hit the highlights. There were numerous titles, catalog descriptions and prerequisite course changes, revisions made to update the catalog. I didn’t count those; there’s too many. In addition, there were 18 new courses added. I can break that down by college, if you need it. There were 29 courses deleted. There were 16 programs and 16 minors or concentrations that were altered based on those revisions, and additions and deletions. There was an announcement of one special topics course and there was one, this is kind of the biggest thing, there was one new program approved in that November meeting which led to an additional 26 courses separated those out because that was a new program.

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator: Okay. Being a committee recommendation, thanks for the highlights Cheryl, that does not require a second. Is there any questions or comments about the Undergraduate Committee minutes?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): This is really minor and I’ve already passed these on to Ashley, but in the Psychology courses, there were multiple different courses all reported as PSYC 1101 and I would like, as I said, I’ve already given the corrections to Ashley.

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator: Any other comments or questions about the Undergraduate Committee minutes. Seeing none, I’ll remind everybody that if we vote to approve these, the Undergraduate Committee minutes, we’re recommending to the Provost and
President that they approve all of these curriculum changes. All in favor of approving the Undergraduate Committee minutes from their November 2014 meeting, please say aye. All opposed? The minutes are approved. Bob Fernekes, the Graduate Committee Report.

Graduate Committee Report (Bob Fernekes, LIB): I move to approve the Graduate Committee minutes from the November meeting, and the minutes stand as submitted.

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator. Is there anything you want to say about them Bob? Nope. Are there any questions or comments about the November Graduate Committee meeting minutes. Seeing none, I’ll once again recommend or remind everyone that in approving these we are recommending the President and Provost make these curriculum changes. All in favor, please say aye. All opposed? The Graduate Committee meeting minutes are approved for November 2014.

General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report (Michelle Cawthorn, COSM): These are the January minutes that I request be approved. The Board of Regents is requiring that all core courses go through an assessment process similar to program review. The Gen Ed and Core Curriculum Committee has come up with forms that we will distribute, we’ve already shown them to the Deans, but distribute it to the Deans and the Chairs of departments involved with the core. We have examples of how to fill out the forms, we have directions for how to fill out the forms, and we’ve also drafted a policy for reviewing existing core courses and approving any new core courses that should be put forward.

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator: I have a point of order in terms of things, just information, I spoke with Delena Gatch earlier today and in terms of actually getting this approved as a policy because it has to do with curriculum, it should come to the Senate as a motion, say in the March meeting. Has she spoken with you today? Okay, were you going to share anything about the actual form or format or policy in terms of giving us some information that we have to go on, or should we await that as forthcoming?

Michelle Cawthorn (COSM) Chair, General Education and Core Curriculum Committee: I’ve got copies.

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator: Okay.

Michelle Cawthorn (COSM) Chair, General Education and Core Curriculum Committee: But I don’t have enough. The form that we are asking people to fill out is very similar to the Program Review Assessment Form, and so this asks for course information, and just briefly the title, the prefix of the course, the course number. Then it asks for you to identify which core learning outcome your course reflects, and these are core outcomes that were drafted by the Core Committee in 2010-2011. Then it asks for you, whoever is doing the form to describe how you are measuring the outcome, what kind of targets you are setting and what you expect your students to meet, how you are analyzing your data, what kind of results you got, and what the plan is for the future to address your results.

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator: Okay, thank you. Are there any questions for Michelle or questions about the Gen Ed Council’s meeting minutes from January?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I’m just wondering if it would be possible to maybe get that sent to us as an attachment, so we can look at it?
Pat Humphrey (COSM), Senate Moderator: Michelle is shaking her head, yes. Yeah, I’d like to have that with a motion for the March meeting, if we could. Any other questions or comments for the Gen Ed Council/Committee and Michelle? Seeing none, we should vote on approving their minutes. All in favor, please say aye. All opposed? Their meeting minutes are approved. Next is Dr. Keel’s report.

4. **President’s Report (Brooks Keel):** Thank you very much and good afternoon. It’s a beautiful windy day in Statesboro, and you have to know the reason why I’m glad that I’m not in Boston right now. So I mean we can all be thankful for that.

**Legislative Session**

This time of year, of course, is the legislative session. The session started about the second week in January and it’s predicted to go through April 2nd, by law it has to go 40 days. But they have tremendous control over how long they stretch that 40 days out into. A critical component of the legislative session this year and what I think is some very good news to Georgia Southern is that the Governor’s budget recommendation which comes out the first of January. It goes to the House of Representatives, in which they add to and delete from; then it goes to the Senate, in which they add to and delete from; and then it goes to a consensus committee, in which they hash it out and come up with a budget which we hopefully know what it’s going to look like in April 2nd. The good news is when the Governor puts things into his budget recommendation it’s very unusual and very rare, although possible, that those items are removed or significantly altered. For Georgia Southern, there are two significant pieces that the Governor did put in his budget recommendation: One is $33.6 million for a multipurpose academic classroom building. This is, as it is designed right now, 105,000 gross square foot building, that will do a number of things for Georgia Southern. It will essentially replace four temporary buildings the largest of which is the Forest Drive building. For those of you who are in Forest Drive, I know you’ve been waiting a very long time to have the temporary building become just that, temporary, not permanent. This building will serve to replace Forest Drive building; it will also serve to replace three other temporary buildings, including the Interior Design building, Fashion Merchandising building, and the Family and Consumer Science building. All told, those four temporary buildings are roughly 76,000 gross square feet, allowing an additional 29,000 gross square feet of additional growth for general purpose classroom, office space, etc. And it will be just that and in addition to replacing the uses of those four buildings that I just mentioned, it will also allow Georgia Southern to put on campus some classroom space that we desperately need. The Provost can certainly address this better than I can, but I know that there is some definite need for 75 to 100 student class size classrooms as well as other types of classroom space and that is what this building is intended to do. Now, we are early in the process, so please don’t start packing up your boxes getting ready to move if you happen to be in one of those four buildings. But the fact that the Governor did put it into his budget, is very very very good news. We will know by the end of this session whether that dollar amount has been maintained. That, we hope, as I say, will be around the first week of April and if that is the case the Board of Regents will then determine how the budget is allocated at their April or May Board meeting, and certainly by May we will know for sure. Once that starts you are now looking at probably about a year process before we actually break ground. I’ll look at Rob and he is shaking his head that’s about right. So we are a-year-and-a-half away or at least 18 to 24 months away before a new building is going to be constructed which we can move in. But the good news is the most important step the money has been identified and we are well on our way. The building is master planned to sit between the
existing Carroll building and the CEIT building. It actually will sit on the spot that the current temporary building Military Science is located. As you know, we received $9.5 million a year ago for Military Science. We hope that that planning process is and we know it is well underway. We hope to break ground on that in the next 6 to 9 months or so. Military Science will be raised. It will be relocated to a new spot to make way for the new Academic Classroom building, so the dominoes are lined up very nicely for that. So keep your fingers crossed, and we’ll certainly keep you up-to-date on the developments with that. Russell Keen, our Vice President for Government Relations and Community Engagement, is in Atlanta all during the session. He is working the House of Representatives as well as the Senate to make sure that this line item in the budget is not messed with for lack of a better term. In addition to that, the Governor also put $1 million in the budget, recurring, for Advanced Manufacturing at Georgia Southern. This will be a game changer for our Engineering program in terms of allowing us to ramp up the Manufacturing Engineering degree, which you know we just received permission about 5 or 6 months ago from the Board of Regents, it will jump start that whole program in a major way. The Governor has been very very generous and very supportive of Georgia Southern for a number of reasons: the Advanced Manufacturing and the Manufacturing Engineering degree he sees as a real opportunity for economic development in the state, especially with some of the, what we hope to see, the major companies moving to the state that will need the use of a well-educated and skilled workforce in Manufacturing Engineering, so we are very very excited about what that will do as well. Again, that’s the Governor’s recommendation. We hope that it will be carried forward in the House and the Senate and we have every expectation that it will. But it will follow the same path as I described for you for the Academic classroom building. So hopefully by the middle or end of April we will know about that one as well.

Pay Increase

Now the topic I’m sure is on everyone’s mind and certainly is on our mind is the opportunity for a pay increase. The Governor has allocated money in the budget for a pay increase. And that’s about as specific as I can get right now. I will tell you what we think will happen and I hope you won’t hold me to it because I lot will happen certainly between now and May. We feel that the System office will allocate about 1% to the campuses and give the individual campuses an opportunity to match that. That’s essentially what happened last year, if you recall. The System office put about .75 to 1% into the budget, we matched it with 1 to 1.25 to give a total merit based pool of 2%. It will be a completely merit based pool. And then the individual units will have an opportunity to award merit based on anywhere from roughly 0 to 4%, using that 2% pool. Now that’s where we are right now. The Chancellor has been very adamant about the need for pay increases. He has testified before the House and the Senate Budget offices and they know very well that we are losing very good faculty and staff because we as a whole system are just not competitive from a pay scale point of view. He is doing everything he can to make sure that we continue to see pay increases and we will do that same here at Georgia Southern. So that’s where we are with regards to the budget. A lot of activity yet remains.

Academic Classroom Building

As we get closer to knowing that the Academic Classroom building is going to be a reality, the Provost will then start working with the Vice President for Finance and Administration [correction: Business and Finance] to more programmatically plan the building and she’ll be working with the respective deans and chairs of the units that are going to be impacted in a positive way by that building to get more in-tune the design. So if you have not had an opportunity to provide input into this, don’t worry you will. We are just not quite far enough down the road on this particular building to be able to be able to seek specific input on that.
So that’s where we are. It’s all good news. Keep your fingers crossed and we hope to have better news as we go through the session. Any questions or comments for me? All right. Thank you very much.

5. Provost’s Report: (Jean Bartels): For anyone that doesn’t know Jean Bartels Provost and I’m happy to share a couple of things with you as well. This is kind of the ongoing report of the SACSCOC reaffirmation self-study QEP and the site visit and kind of gives you an update on where we are since the last time we spoke. I believe last time we spoke we had not yet received our off site review comments from the off-site review team regarding our reaffirmation self-study, so let me start there. The good news was that it was an extremely good review by our off campus site team. In fact, we had a phone call shortly after the team submitted its remarks and comments to us from the Vice President at SACSCOC who is our liaison to the SACSCOC. And the first words out of this person’s mouth were, “oh, you guys did a fabulous job,” but we said we had like ten areas to address. Well the others that got reviewed about the same time had upwards of 50 or more. So I guess indeed we did have a pretty good first-read response. Some of the items in those ten that we have to respond to in the focus report were ones we anticipated.

We chose not to submit evaluations of staff, administrators as they were because we’d have to redact so much information we said that those would be available on campus when the site team came to visit. Our annual review of our budget was not, that review doesn’t get done in time for it to have made the report so it’s things like that. The one area that still is raised as not a negative, it’s raised very positively in terms of process, and that’s our assessment work. And as you know you’ve all been involved, very intensely engaged in that and I do thank everybody that’s taken that up and is starting to actually not only see the value but to do actually very good work around assessment. The issue for the team was that and we think we probably solved some of this by another round of information to them, but for them it’s a question of maturity of your process. Our process they loved, they think we are doing a fabulous job; they liked absolutely everything we put forward. It’s whether we have done this long enough to see that all programs are actually doing the full cycle of using information from an analysis of a year’s data to come back and make changes appropriate to areas that were found to be maybe areas for improvement. So I think, in our focus report we resubmitted another whole year’s round of analysis, we think that may do it, but if we get any comment, it’s not because the work we are doing isn’t right or correct or good or even liked, it’s really a question of maturity of those assessment processes which, as you know, we had to do a lot of work to get up to speed. So that’s where we are with the focus report. The focus report is going to be submitted probably this week or next week at the latest. And we are looking real good, I think, with that. The other thing that we will be submitting by the end of the month of February is the Quality Enhancement Plan which is also due, that length of time, before our site visit. And we’ve been spending an awful lot of time with the development team which represents all the colleges; they all have representatives on the development team actually working to flesh out the Quality Enhancement Plan. To refresh your memory, I think you don’t need that, but just in case, the focus is on effective writing, particularly as one expects students to write within their discipline or their major. The students, you know, were very engaged in the whole process of not only helping to choose that focus, but also in working on developing a slogan for it and they are heavily involved in what will be the next effort, which is actually marketing that slogan. The slogan that the students chose for those of you that missed that was if you think about some of our cheer-chants its “Georgia Southern Eagles Write, Write, Write.” So we are in the process of turning that into bling that we can put out around campus and distribute so that everybody when asked what the QEP is will be able to very quickly say that cheer or at least tell people that it’s about writing. So the marketing campaign is beginning again, students heavily involved in helping us with that process. The
development team is starting to work with programs and departments who have already agreed to be on the beginning front of implementation of the QEP.

Our goal, ultimately, is to have 60% of all of our programs doing some focused activities, focused courses, not unique separate courses on writing, but writing intensive courses in their major. And we are going to do, we already have a cadre of programs that have self-identified that are either already doing a fair amount of writing in their programs or are interested in continuing to develop that. That’ll be out first kind of wave and then eventually we will roll that out until hopefully we will get up to 60% of our programs deciding that they want to participate in offering writing intensive courses in their programs. Much of the work that we do with that will be very discipline-specific with the appreciation that writing for every discipline or program or major can look very different from another because of the nature of the work of that discipline, so I think it will be a nice opportunity to really have faculty and students alike explore what writing should be like and what is like in the disciplines. We’ve gotten a fair amount of feedback from employers as well who have talked about the impact that writing has not only on the hiring process, but absolutely in the promotion and achievement process for their people that they do hire. So we are incorporating a lot of that work as well. This spring there is going to be a number of workshops and activities for faculty development that will go on with programs that are ready to begin with the QEP and this summer we’ll have a more intensive workshop as well with a national expert in writing in the disciplines who will be on campus to do some faculty development. CT2 is also actively engaged in doing faculty development activities to help, again, with helping faculty to think about writing, how it looks in their disciplines, how they might teach it, and what kind of effective strategies they might use to be able to incorporate this concept into their programs. The other thing that is happening is that we are in the process of getting ready for campus interviews for a QEP Director. This individual who will help us to oversee that the QEP is implemented, will help us with interim reports and will help us assure that we’re meeting goals and expectations that we’ve set for the QEP. We have two candidates that are coming to campus at the end of March, last week in March. I’m sorry the last week in February, first week in March, so hopefully we’ll a successful candidate after that.

And then last just to update you on the site visit. I keep reminding people about this every time I’m at the podium, but the campus site visit will occur from March 31-April 2. The campus, onsite team will actually arrive on the 30th, they will do their exit report on April 2nd, probably in the morning. They will be wandering about campus. We are going to house them over in the CEIT building because its central and because it’s a really gorgeous conference room over there. And it also quickly accesses into the Professional Development Center which is a place where the site team could actually have groups come to visit as they want to talk with them. So we think that will be working as well. The site team’s visit when they are here is primarily two things that they are really charged, well really three things that they are really charged with. The first is that they have a requirement that no matter what happened on your off-site visit, the onsite team does need to look at the federal requirements, so they will be going back in and looking at our responses to the federal requirements which are one of the three kinds of standards that we have to meet in the self-study. Their primary responsibility is to really look at the QEP to determine whether it is feasible, whether it is developed well, whether there is ample resources to support it, and whether they think that it is a manageable project to accomplish for the institution over the next 5 years. The other thing that we will do is if there are still items from the focus report that they want to reaffirm for themselves they could potentially ask for that. In this instance they will probably will want to look at evaluations and some of those things that we chose to not share with them ahead of time, but to keep them on campus. So March 31st until April 2nd they will be here and then we’re really anticipating that there should be some very
large party after that -- at least I’m having one, So with that I’ll close my remarks and I’ll be happy to take any questions that you might have. All right. We’ll be looking for you with the QEP.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: (Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair.): All right. Everybody is real talkative today. Okay. The Executive Committee report. Actually, I have a fair number of things to report. First of all, we had two motions submitted. One by the Academic Standards Committee in term of changes to Academic Renewal and Academic Standing policies. My understanding is this is prompted by BOR Policy changes so that we have to change our policies to match there’s. Another one by Mark Hanna from COBA relating to the questions about graduation rates. A couple of things I want to say that I did find out and report to people.

First of all, there was a question raised that has not reached an RFI or a motion standpoint yet, but it was discussed with both the Provost and the President earlier last week. That’s paragraph 210 in the Faculty Handbook, which has to do with appeals and tenure and promotion decisions. It got changed for 2013-2014 kind of under the radar, Speaking with Candace Griffith it had, it was felt somewhere along the line that because the decision only takes place at President Keel’s level, anything before that being merely a recommendation, you can’t appeal a recommendation, but somewhere along the line the language about going through the processes of your own college’s appeals and tenure and promotions got deleted and I can’t fault the SEC from prior years for having missed it because the change logs for the Faculty Handbook indicated no change in that paragraph for each of the last four years. So that said, I did discuss this with Dr. Keel at our meeting last week, and he was in favor of faculty having some sort of rebuttal ask for a recommendation to be reconsidered, I’d like to submit additional data, some sort of a process through a college actual formal process before things come to him. So probably we should be thinking about having a motion submitted by somebody to revisit or revise this paragraph for like March or April. On a related note, Dr. Keel also said that he was somewhat concerned in this years and possibly/probably other years tenure and promotion process things is that some colleges, like my own, have a requirement for tenure and promotion to have a set of outside referees, if you will, to recommend or support or whatever a person’s tenure or promotion decision, and he indicated that he found those outside letters to be extremely helpful especially in cases where there were divisions of opinion, and he also suggested that we think about in Faculty Senate making that a more uniform process across the whole campus because he did think those letters were very valuable to him. So we might to think about that as well. So that’s that.

As far as graduation rates and people who are walking not really graduating one thing I have discovered which hopefully will help rectify some of this situation, is that new procedures in terms of clearing for graduation are being carried out throughout the University. Most all colleges except for CHHS all advising is now going to be done through their professional advising centers. The professional advisors, among other things, have powers that we as faculty members don’t. They can update a graduation semester with something as changed, rather than us filling out a form and it going off to never never land like everybody knows that it has in the past. In addition, COSM and CLASS are taking over clearing for graduation for their own majors. For COSM and CLASS majors that will no longer be done by the Registrar’s office. The only time the Registrar’s office will actually clear one of our majors is after the fact when they have graduated and they are going to do basically a check as I understand it from our associate dean and from our advisor lead, and all they want to see on those DegreeWorks pages, is a lot of green, if it’s all green check you graduated. So that, hopefully will help change things because as
these advisors can update things as things happen, a student drops a course, a student fails a course, a student gets a “D” in a course that they need a “C” in, they can update things right there and then where we as individual faculty members cannot do that. There’s always going to be some, don’t get me wrong, something happens at the last minute, but hopefully we won’t see anything like excessive 30%.

The other thing that happened, as I was doing the Librarian’s Report, as I was transcribing and checking and editing the minutes, you might notice that we no longer really have a Librarian or a Secretary for Faculty Senate. Devon Jensen, people may have well aware, was recently appointed Interim Associate Dean for the Graduate School. Mark Welford is on Ed leave. He thought he’d be able to continue being Faculty Senate Secretary this semester, and it was sort of discussed with his department chair that that’s probably not a good idea, and copasetic with what he’s supposed to be doing on his Ed leave, so he has resigned from Senate as well.

Looking through things there’s a couple of things that have come up in terms of the Senate Bylaws that we need to think about. One is, there’s nothing in the Bylaws about what to do about a resignation of a Senate officer in the middle of the year. Oops. How do we replace these? The other topic that came up is the question of who can serve on Faculty Senate. When I was moderator, before in 2005-2007, the question came up about could administrators serve? At that point, the sentiment was if their college wants to elect them-fine. However, in 2012, a motion got passed by the Senate that says “People appointed to either permanent or interim 12-month administrative jobs are highly recommended not to serve.” What does that mean? Can they serve or not? It was only passed as a motion; it was not passed as an amendment to the Bylaws in terms of who is eligible to be a Senator, so there’s another thing to look at in terms of the Bylaws. One question that I’d like to open things up for and we can, is that the SEC discussed, is should we be looking at changes like this to the Bylaws piecemeal, one item at a time, or should we have some sort of a committee to take a look at the Bylaws as a whole and say what’s good, what’s bad, and what needs updating. Sort of like we did with the Statutes, except I don’t think its as complex as approving new Statutes. Any comments on that?

Jim LoBue (COSM): (The comment was not recorded on the tape)

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Chair: I suppose the logical standing committee would probably be the SEC. There is no other kind of like a rules committee or anything like that. No.

John Brown (COBA): To get this process rolling, would you entertain a motion to form an ad hoc committee to consider revisions of the Bylaws?

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Chair: Are you making such a motion?

John Brown (COBA): I’m making such a motion, yes.

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Chair: Okay. Jim LoBue has seconded. Any discussion? How many people should serve on such a committee?
Li Li (CHHS): I would suggest, based on the choices you gave us, would suggest we do fix one item at a time whenever it is questioned, where there is a problem fix it. If we don’t have to revise the entire document, I don’t feel like we have to go through the whole thing if nothing is wrong with it.

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Chair: Different opinion. Any other comments?

James Woods (CLASS): *(Couldn’t hear on the tape, apparently he didn’t use the microphone or it wasn’t working)*

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Chair: Good point. I guess I could ask if we appointed such an ad hoc committee, if we were going to appoint such an ad hoc committee, who would be willing to serve on it? Okay.

Brooks Keel (President): There is, I am looking at the Bylaws now and there is a section 31 that’s says how you go about creating an ad hoc committee, and basically a Senate member requests in writing to the Senate Executive Committee stating specifically that the problem is, etc., about whether a committee should be formed, what it should do and that sort of thing and then the Senate Executive Committee makes determination if the ad hoc committee should be formed or not and reports back to the this group, so I’m sure you could make a friendly recommendation to the Senate Executive Committee to take this under consideration and then it seemed to me that would fall into the Bylaws quite well. And then Senate Executive Committee could determine if it is, you know, three members or four members and appoint folks, etc., from that point. Just my suggestion.

John Brown (COBA): In light of Dr. Keel’s comment, I’ll withdraw my motion.

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Chair: All right. The motion has been withdrawn. That concludes my part of the report. Anybody with any questions?

**Elections of Faculty Senate Librarian and Secretary for remainder of AY 2014 – 2015**

Okay. We do have a couple of semi-willing volunteers. The SEC did determine that rather than just appointing somebody to try to fill out the unexpired terms that we would ask for volunteers for an election for the Librarian and Secretary positions. I sent two different emails to the group and got how many volunteers? Zero. Li Li from CHHS from the SEC said he would be willing to be the Secretary for the remainder of this term. Are there any objections, or shall we just say thank you very much for agreeing, Li? Similarly, Jessica Minihan from the SEC also agreed to serve as Librarian for the rest of this term. Shall we thank Jessica? All right. John Brown, a motion from the Academic Standards Committee.

**7. Motion: Recommended Changes to Academic Renewal and Academic Standing Policies, Academic Standards Committee (John Brown, COBA for the committee)**
John Brown (COBA): As Pat, I think, noted, we have a policy called Academic Renewal, that’s mandated by the BOR. For those of you who are unfamiliar with it, someone who has been excluded and comes back can ask to basically have their slate wiped clean. They were a poorly performing student, so poorly performing that in fact, they were excluded. They are now back, hopefully, with more maturity and I don’t know what other word to use. More maturity I guess will serve. And they want a clean slate. And the BOR has recently changed their policy. They gave individual units of the USG discretion about how long someone had to sit out before they could apply for, could re-enroll and apply for academic renewal. There was a range of three to five years and that of course invites a race to the bottom. So the Academic Standards Committee recommends the adoption of the three-year minimum, hang on just a second, while I, if you have not read the document, it’s very brief, again, there are five points. First of all:

1) that Academic Renewal shall be granted after a 3-year period of absence (again the current policy is 5-years)
2) that students may request Academic Renewal within one year of re-enrollment (again that’s a little more generous than what we have currently)
3) that Academic Renewal granted at any USG institution will be honored by GSU (currently you can only get the renewal by being enrolled at Georgia Southern). Now you could come from Kennesaw or Georgia College.
4) that “overall GPA (all GSU and transfer) will be used to determine if students are eligible for honors at graduation” (which if I’m remembering in my poor old brain is basically only grades after your clean slate are counted toward honors)

And, of course,
5) the Exclusion 2 period which is currently 5-years will be reduced to 3 years.

Again that’s in line with System minimums which we assume everyone’s going to adopt. So again coming from a standing committee it;s our motion, or a standing committee it’s our motion doesn’t need a second. So

Pat Humphrey (COSM), Chair: Correct. As John just said this is a committee recommendation, a committee motion so it does not require a second. So that said, is there any discussion on this?

Jim LoBue (COSM): Could I ask when you say the slate is wiped clean, that means you said grades, but credit hours as well? The number of drops that a student is allowed for us those are kind of ongoing.

John Brown (COBA): I actually don’t recall a discussion about the drops in an academic career even coming up in our discussions in the committee. We’ve got grades, and your credit hours would not be counted towards graduation.

Jean Bartels (Provost): I can clarify a little bit of that. The only thing that’s wiped clean is a “D” or an “F”. And if a “D” or an “F” is wiped clean it must be a repeated course, if it is part of the major. So you don’t just automatically get some other grade, you have to actually repeat the course. But its only for “Ds” and “Fs”. Not for “C” or above and any other things like that, if you’ve, once you’ve used it up, you’ve used it up. It doesn’t pretty much matter which way you lost it. If you earned a grade or are repeating, so it would impact your credit hours from that
perspective in that you wouldn’t get additional ones. They would show up. Also what will appear on the transcript is what’s been renewed. So that documents still holds those even though they are not counted in part of the cumulative grade point average. Again, if someone gets a “D” or an “F” and they ask for academic renewal and it is a request they have to make, if they ask for it, only the “Ds” and “Fs” go away. And those courses would need to be repeated. Again, it wouldn’t fall to a different phenomenon.

Lucy Green (COE): Does this apply both undergraduate and graduate? It’s for both.

John Brown (COBA): I don’t know. Our discussion was strictly about the undergraduate rather than the graduate level education.

Lucy Green (COE): I just wonder if it applies to graduate, how that would affect programs and GOMEL, especially when you are talking about students being forgiven at other institutions, and being able to bring that clean slate to Georgia Southern.

Jean Bartels (Provost): The Academic Renewal the way that the Board of Regents put forward this new policy only pertains to undergraduate.

Lucy Green (COE): Okay.

James Woods (CLASS): Point of clarification. How many times are we allowed to be renewed?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: Once.

James Woods (CLASS): Once, okay, thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: Any other questions or comments?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I was just wondering if anybody had done any research to determine whether students are more successful at the five-year end than the three-year end. Like how the choice was made other than well, most people would rather do it after three than five. Would you get more students back? But I was wondering in terms of the students, and their success following renewal, whether anybody had looked at how long they stayed out and whether that was related to chance of success.

John Brown (COBA): It wasn’t a part of our discussion in Academic Standards. I see Provost Bartels’ indicating an interest.

Jean Bartels (Provost): What I can tell you is this: our records, we’ve gone back quite a ways to look at these indicate that if you are out five years you do not come back at all. There’s none.
Janice Steirn (CLASS): But were the records, I understand that part -- five years they drift off and do something else. What about, like when does academic success, I guess I’m wondering if it, you know, a year a student matures especially if they are told well, if you are not in school get a job, you know, they may mature real fast. But, yes, I was just wondering if anybody had just done the correlation between how long they were actually out and I don’t know, GPA when they came back. Would that be possible to do?

Jean Bartels (Provost): I think that would be a fabulous research project.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: for point of information from my four-years on the Academic Standards committee, I could tell you that back in the day when it was one semester on exclusion 1 and a year on Exclusion 2, a whole lot of people came back after both of them including a whole lot of students who didn’t realize that they had been excluded for say summer semester, and then oops now we’re facing Exclusion 2 because they goofed up again, so that one semester was not enough, especially when it happened over a summer. The one versus three, I don’t know because we haven’t had a three-year exclusion, so we couldn’t really say that its going to be better or worse.

Jim LoBue (COSM): Another point of clarification. On a student’s transcript in renewal is there any record that the person had, was renewal or that

Jean Bartels (Provost): It will be recorded that they requested renewal, so that will show up on the transcript, the final transcript.

Sally Brown (COE) It’s my understanding that on the transcript there will be a # sign and this will go across all universities in Georgia and any course that has a # sign next to it is one that was counted in that academic renewal, so that will be clear on there.

Jim LoBue (COSM): I’m not sure I understand what you mean by clear. Those are the classes, the # sign is where you will take any numbers away that are used in calculating GPA and that sort of thing and credit hours is that what you mean by clear?

Sally Brown (COE): Yes, it will be an indicator but I mean clear in terms of if we get a student from Kennesaw when they come and on their transcript if you pull it up you’ll clearly be able to see which courses counted in the academic renewal, and so all the registrar’s offices will be doing it in a uniform manner across the System.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: Any other comments, questions, discussion? Seeing none, the motion before us is to change the period for academic standing renewal from five years to three years to change the Exclusion 2 period from five years to three years. Excuse me, I forgot the other points. John you want to rehash?

John Brown (COBA): students may request Academic Renewal within one year of re-enrollment; that Academic Renewal granted at any USG institution be honored by Georgia
Southern; and “overall GPA (all GSU and transfer) will be used to determine if students are eligible for honors at graduation.” So someone who had totally screwed up their first time around, but got their act together could conceivably get honors if they succeed and finally graduate.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: Thank you, John. That’s the motion before the floor/ All in favor please say aye, All opposed? The motion is carried. Motion from Mark Hanna on improving commencement ceremony participants screening process.

8. Motion: “Improving the Commencement Ceremony Participant Screening Process,”
Mark Hanna, COBA: Sorry to be the squeaky wheel on this thing, but it’s kind of what I feel like. Last fall, when the RFI on graduation participants and their status with regard to their degree program came out I received numerous emails from faculty across campus suggesting that this was important to them and Senate should latch onto this and do something about it, so that’s why I’m still the squeaky wheel, I guess. The perspective generally is that when more than one quarter of the participants in graduation have not completed and will not complete their degree program at the time of the graduation when that’s the case it significantly dilutes the meaning and relevance of the ceremony itself. And may in fact go to, well, the effectiveness of our processes in my view to the, it relates even to the integrity of our processes and from a faculty perspective that seems to be the concern. So not wanting to dictate exactly how the problem is solved generally I subscribe to the notion that the people who are responsible for the process should be the ones who have the opportunity to make the appropriate amendments to the process. And I also subscribe to the notion that what gets measured gets done. And so those are the underlying elements of the logic and what’s behind the motion that you have seen and I’ll read it to you now. Very simply, “The Faculty Senate moves to request that the Provost charge the Registrar to:

1. To take steps to improve the proportion of participants in graduation ceremonies who have actually completed their degree requirements at the time of the ceremony to the point that virtually all of the participants will "have completed the requirements for the degree to which they are entitled" (as is asserted by various college Deans in the ceremonies).

2. That annually, by the first day of September, the Registrar would report to Faculty Senate the number of participants in the each of the prior two graduation ceremonies, and for each ceremony, the proportion of these participants that had not yet completed the requirements of the degree at the time of the ceremony, and finally for each ceremony the proportion that have not completed their degree requirements at the time of the report, lastly, the Registrar would report to the Senate any substantive changes that have been made to commencement procedures to decrease the likelihood of premature participation in a graduation exercise.”

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: There’s the rationale and the motion. Do we have a second? Janice Steirn has made a second. Is there any discussion on this motion?

Jean Bartels (Provost): I need to point out that the Provost does not charge the Registrar. The Registrar does not report to the Provost, so that would be a difficult piece to achieve. And I would also just like to be on record to say this. There are a number of reasons why students may not graduate or achieve all of their requirements at the day of the march; it’s a symbolic opportunity, and in many cases students are completing an internship, they are doing a summer course to finish up, whatever, there’s number of situations which are quite innocent which result
in the student graduating, but I would like to request, respectfully, that you don’t become mean spirited with a motion like this. To eliminate students who are by all means going to be graduating they will not receive a diploma until that moment is done, but to restrict them from a ceremonial opportunity, I think could look extremely mean spirited when indeed some of the reasons you got numbers like you did are very legitimately explained. They may not have, we graduate students in ceremony the same week they finish their exams. They are not approved through the graduation process until after that point just by virtue of timing. That’s one instance. Again, we’ve got several instances where students are doing something that would prohibit them from coming back to a graduation ceremony that you would then be disallowing them from being a part of that ceremony. So I’m just asking for, on behalf of students, for some sensitivity to what a process in ceremony is knowing that the actual awarding of a degree does not occur until the student has accomplished all requirements.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I totally understand what you’re saying and I don’t think it’s the spirit of the motion to do that. I think when we received the data that showed some of the students that had not completed requirements, never completed the requirements. That’s really is concerning. That seems to reach into, to really touch the integrity. Because it is a celebration, and if students have to finish three hours or if they’ve got a summer internship and they can’t come back there are always going to be some legitimate reasons, but I think that we should take as many steps as we can to make sure they are legitimate. I would love to know and I know that data were sent to us and I didn’t bring it with me and I don’t know if these data were in there, but the percentage of people who graduate without completion of requirements, what percentage of those are finishing just a three hour course? Or, you know, have to finish something during summer? What proportion thought they were graduating but failed a required course in their last term because due to the insane timing we can’t get papers graded in time, and what percentage actually fell through the cracks in clearing? And it sounds like some steps have been taken to hopefully improve the clearing procedure, but if a student knows ahead of time the only way they can graduate is take 19 hours that last term and they have a 2.01 average GPA, it’s a pretty good bet that student should be advised that they are not going to be able to finish.

Becky Kennerly (CLASS alternate): But I’ve been advising for such a long time and most of the students that go through our program are the very same case that Provost Bartels is talking about, and all of the different increments and issues that you are raising that you want more information about, I think that before any kind of motion ever gets made and accepted, you need to have that kind of information and decide who’s going to find that out before we’re charging people to try and take some kind of action that could be so negative on so many students. So there’s lots of information that you’re asking for we don’t have.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Actually, we did have a lot of data. I just didn’t bring it with me because I didn’t know I would be doing this. But we were sent a spreadsheet that told us a lot of the numbers, and the thing that really I have to say get to me was that there was a fair, first of all, how large the proportion was. You know, 25 to 30% of the students going through the ceremony hadn’t finished yet. And then there was, I don’t remember the proportion, but a fairly significant number of students who never completed their degrees. And I don’t feel like I’m being mean to those students; I want them to complete their degrees. You know, when a student says oh, I went through graduation at Georgia Southern, I want it to mean oh, I graduated from Georgia Southern. And I want graduation to mean something to those students who have completed their degrees.
Lowell Mooney (COBA): Jean, you seemed to imply that this would prohibit those students from going through graduation ceremony. I don’t think that’s what the intent is. The message may be to the student, well you can’t go through this ceremony, you have to wait until the next one until you are closer. Now, perhaps we do need exceptions for those that are within three hours or they are on internships, you know, the reasonable ones that we are hearing, but some of these students are gone for years and they still haven’t graduated, so I think it would give some extra incentive for these kids to get it done. If you want to go through the ceremony, then get it done and I think to imply that we are taking away their opportunity to walk, I don’t think so. We are delaying it until they get closer to accomplishing.

Jean Bartels (Provost): I guess I would like to see the data looked at again because I firmly believe that the data that was received did not capture actually what was going on. I think the data looked very skewed, in my opinion, was very skewed probably because of a lack of Registrar clearance just because of timing, so I think far worse that what the actual data is so to the least I would like to have an opportunity to look at the data again.

???. I think this is a fairly contentious issue, and I don’t know if we are ready to make a decision on this. And I would like to table the motion, not end it, but I would like to table the motion to next meeting and bring it up in a fuller context. I think that the points that have been brought up by my colleagues here and by Jean Bartels has been very good. I mean, I think we need to have a fuller discussion of that and there might be people who aren’t here, because I think this is an important issue and I think that we have to address this sort of making our graduation more meaningless by allowing people to graduate who never graduate. So I think this is an issue that needs to be addressed, but I think I would like to ask if anybody would be interested in tabling this until the next meeting and bringing up this issue.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: Excuse me, we have a motion to table this motion, which needs to be voted on first.

James Stephens (JPHCOPH): I want to make a comment first. I think we need to review the exceptions first before we go further with a motion on this topic. I know in our college particularly in our master of health care administration we require internship at the end of the two-years, and so we would be very concerned what the criteria would be on this. And that’s for every student that goes through that program. Now, we could maybe ask them to do the internship after the first year, but we don’t think they are ready. And most of them go into hospitals and securing internships at hospitals are not easy, and so we want to keep those relationships going. With the timing that the students come in there at the right time. And so if you need a motion to table or a second to table I’ll give make the second.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: All right. The motion has been made and seconded to table the motion. That needs an immediate vote.

???. Table it to the next meeting, I don’t want it tabled
Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: Yeah, table it to the next meeting. All those in favor of tabling this motion until we can get more information and bring it back up again at the next meeting please say aye. All opposed? Well the motion to table has been carried so we’ll try and get more data and bring this up again next time.

Point of order. Is a motion to table not a subject to discussion? All right. Thank you.

Jim Harris (CEIT) Can we get the numbers for this, Pat? Because I would like to see them again.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: Velma Burden is I see in the back there. Is it possible for us to get any kind of breakdown on these numbers by students who are within three hours of graduating or students who didn’t graduate because they are going to some kind of an internship or some kind of breakdown in terms of reasons why they have not actually completed their degree when they march?

Velma Burden (Registrar): I think it is certainly possible to look at the data to see what’s out there as far as if they are within three hours or six hours. As far as internship, I think we can only look at those that are registered for internship course that haven’t completed, so we could possibly do something like that.

Jean Bartels (Provost): I’m also wondering if this body would or someone in this body would be interested in identifying those situations which would be permissible for a student to be able to walk without, in other words, what are your criteria for allowing somebody to walk if their degree was incomplete at the moment of graduation.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I would be willing to help with that. I wouldn’t be willing to do it on my own. But I would be willing to help with that because I think we need input from a variety of people from the colleges because I don’t know what goes on in all of the other colleges, and when the timing of internships or anything like that may be, and then we could work with Velma maybe on asking for which kind of data, you know, that we would like. But I’m not going to volunteering unless there’s a bunch of us.

Mark Hanna (COBA): Sorry, I’d just say that I’m fairly invested in this I’d be happy to help with that as well.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: Okay, so far we have Janice and Mark willing to work.

James Stephens (JPHCOPH): I’ll be happy to be involved.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: That’s three people. Is three people enough willing to work on this? Janice Steirn, James Stephens, and Mark Hanna in terms of what might be legitimate reasons.
Janice Steirn (CLASS): I’m sorry. I don’t know what colleges the three of us would represent?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: James Stephens is College of Public Health, Mark Hanna is COBA.

???: I have a point of information I’d like to address it to either Dr. Keel or Dr. Barteks. My understanding is that the metric that Georgia Southern is being measured by these days is how many students we’ve shoved through the peg or shoved through the python. We don’t get credit for students who walk who don’t complete graduation right?

Jean Bartels (Provost): That’s correct. The only students that we can call graduated are those that have achieved all of the requirements, so when we look at graduation rates its only those students who have actually completed all requirements.

???: Well, this leaves me a little, I mean, I don’t see it as mean spirited if we tell people who come in May and want to graduate and we say no, you still have degree requirements, but you can march in December. I mean, we have two commencements a year. I’m not clear why its mean spirited to tell them they can’t march when they haven’t finished their degree.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: Well, the problem, what the Faculty Senate voted on back in 1999 was that people who anticipate graduating over the summer semester could march in the May graduation because at that time the summer graduation ceremony was being done away with. And the thought was if you’re graduating August, you’ll be gone somewhere and have a job and you won’t come back in December. That one is fine as far as I’m concerned personally. It’s some of these other ones who they didn’t finish in May, they didn’t finish in August, and heaven in the December ones who didn’t graduate in December.

Linda Mullen (COBA): Why don’t you bring back summer then? I assume it’s going to be an expense, but I graduated in the summer because I had credits and I had to take summer school. I do have students and I have cases and I think this is what we’re speaking to where students went through the ceremony for their parents, their grandparents and 80 million other people knowing they were never going to complete their degree, but it looked like it.

Errol Spence (SGA): I just want to speak from a personal case and on behalf of students. Many students, even in my case, fully plan on graduating in May, not in May, in July, after completing my degree requirements in July, but I would love to graduate in May because God willing I get a good job and if its far away, and it might be highly inconvenient for me to come back to school in December just to go through the formal ceremony of graduation and it would be probably convenient for my family members as well. So I would definitely look favorably upon considering a summer commencement, but if not I think it would highly inconvenient students to have to come back in December for the ceremony.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: That’s not really the question. The question is people who marched in May, who should graduate in May, or in the summer, but don’t really graduate in either one of them at that point.
Errol Spence (SGA): What I’m saying is it’s going to end up hindering those students who plan to fully complete their requirements in July and would like to march in May.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: Well.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS): I agree with our Student Rep here. There are so many reasons and graduating with family, graduating with friends, also I looked up from the Senate meeting that met in September 15, the numbers that we’re talking about state that spring, summer graduation in 2011, which is the last numbers we had, 240 students who took part in graduation exercises did not finish their degree. Now I don’t know how many we go through in the spring graduation, but the other one was fall of 2009 and 100 didn’t finish their degree. So not to be terribly picky but its not huge number and it is a ritual ceremony they haven’t graduated until they get their diploma. And I do think we have to be able to offer them that, I mean, its the celebration of an accomplishment and a number of our students are going to do their internship that summer or going even into fall and often those internships if they are the right kind of internship, turn into a job which means they don’t come back. And I don’t want them to come back if they got a job. Actually, I just don’t want them to come back, I want them to graduate. Right? I think we are being too picky right now. Also as a point of order, unless I just broke it, too, didn’t we table this?

???. I agree with ???.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: Yes. I think we need to move on and bring this back up again in March.

Li Li (CHHS): Point of clarification. I’m not sure what the rule says, based on the motion what Dr. Bartels was saying the motion probably needs to be amended because the Provost cannot have the Registrar’s office do anything, so are we tabling it, is that table actually opportunity for the motion to be amended?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: Yes, that would give it opportunity for the motion to be amended.

Mark Hanna (COBA): Thank you for that and that amendment can certainly be made. I’d just like clarity with regard to the numbers that came out in the RFI, for example, in the fall of 2013, the number of participants in graduation, this is fall, not summer, we’re not talking about the students who might graduate in summer participating in May. So the December graduation had 1,736 participants of which 571 did not graduate. Perhaps some, were working on internships, but not likely 33% of the participants. So I don’t think we need to get into symantics about magnitude about whether the magnitude is significant or important or something of that nature. It passes the smell test in my view. I would just note one more thing that the motion was not crafted to specify a specific target for what proportion are participating that have not completed their requirements, so whoever has the opportunity to address the processes for determining who participates can use reason to drive down the number of individuals who perhaps are participating without completing the requirements with no intention of completing requirements or no likelihood of completing requirements and in the scenario Dr. Mullen described by
participating creating a social barrier to completing the requirements and that they would now have to tell their loved ones that they were actually not graduates even though they said they were. So the motion is not to prescribe the process and a lot of this issue about data will be very important to process revision. The motion is to get freedom for the administration to address the issue. Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: All right. That said I think we will table for good this tabled motion. Is there any new business? Seeing none. Are there announcements from vice presidents? I only see one. Thanks, Rob. Any announcements from the floor?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I’ll go ahead and tell you that I’m not entirely sure that this is a Senate announcement. But at 9:40 this morning, one of our faculty members Karen Naufel from Psychology gave birth to a beautiful little girl, 5 lbs. 8 ozs. and I just think that’s good news.

9. New Business

None.

10. Announcements: Vice Presidents

None.

11. Announcements from the Floor

None.


Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair: Any other announcements? Do I have a motion to adjourn? Do I have a second? All in favor?
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1. Approval of the Agenda for the March 9, 2015 meeting.

The agenda was approved unanimously.

2. Approval of the February 12, 2015 Minutes:

The February 12 minutes was approved unanimously with suggestion to make it brief for the future.

Librarian's Reports of March 2015,

The senate Librarian’s report, include the Undergraduate and Graduate Minutes, does not include the Faculty Research Committee report, was approved unanimously.

General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report

General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report was approved unanimously.

3. President's Report (Brooks Keel):

Governor's Budget

The House of Representatives have passed their budget out of committee on to the Senate and both the $33.6 million for the academic classroom building and the $1 million for Advanced Manufacturing survived the House budget. The Senate should take care of their business in the next couple of weeks. It is expected that the legislative session will be completed by the first week in April, and I think we are still on schedule to have that happen. If that does happen, then that budget will go to the Board of Regents who will determine the actual allocation. We are cautiously optimistic.

Faculty and Staff Pay Increase

We are expecting 2% pay increase for all faculty and staff payroll, we will know for sure in couple of months. It will be a merit pay exactly like we did last year.

Service to the University

I want you to please know that both the Provost and I value service to this institution equally as important as teaching and scholarship.

4. Provost's Report: (Jean Bartels):

SACSCOC

SACSCOC site visiting team will be here on March 31st departing on April 2nd.
QEP
We sent in our QEP document; we have started today and will continue tomorrow with the first set of training. There will be another session later this spring and then a nice summer workshop. We're going to make the entire QEP report a public document for you all very soon.

Catalog
The Registrar’s office in putting together a new software package that will be our catalog, CourseLeaf, that will be probably available somewhere around late spring, early summer, we should have that completed.

5. Senate Executive Committee Report: (Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair.)
Be remind that the April meeting is election meeting for the Secretary and Librarian for next year’s Faculty Senate; that each college should be having elections here either going on or coming up very soon.

The University System Faculty Council, which is the meeting of all the Faculty Senate Moderators, Presidents, Chairs, what they’re called at various campuses, will be held in Augusta on March 21st, if there’s any concerns that people here think should be brought up to the University System Faculty Council?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): CVS/Caremark are trying to pass the information along, but the overrides are not being written. So it’s a big problem.

The USG will open retiree exchange starting January 2016, where you’ll be given some dollar amount and you can go out on this exchange and basically get what you want. If what you want is not suitable with their dollar amount, you are going to have to make up the difference and there are a whole lot of other details that yet have to come out, but that's the way things are headed.

6. MOTION: GECC Recommended changes to Core Course approval, review, and assessment (Michelle Cawthorn, COSM):
Michelle Cawthorn (COSM): The Gen Ed and Core Curriculum Committee moves to approve the Core Review and Assessment template and rubric.

The motion passes 26 to 11 after a lengthy discussion, mainly from Richard Flynn regarding the difficulty of execution of this document.
7. **New Business**

   Jim Harris (CEIT): I would like to make a motion to move the table item of the Graduation Discussion to the next meeting.

   The motion from Mark Hanna will remain on the table until we actually get other data from the Registrar’s office in terms of graduation rates and reasons for why people did not graduate as much as we could ascertain.

8. **Announcements: Vice Presidents**

   none

9. **Announcements from the Floor**

   none

10. **Adjournment.**
1. Approval of the Agenda for the March 9, 2015 meeting. Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: 
Good afternoon. I’d like to call this meeting of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate to order. 
Just a couple of reminders. I just made another pass through around the table this time and I found one 
microphone locked on. I found two last time. Check and make sure that your microphones look dark at 
the center and that they are not locked on. There’s a little button on the side that allows that to happen. 
Because that has been, we think, been causing a problem with Ginger and I not being able to understand 
the recording because we were getting all kinds of static and feedback, but however, when you do want 
to speak, push your finger on that button in the middle and make sure it does light up and be sure to 
identify yourself and your college. All right. With that I’d like to move for approval of this rather short 
agenda for today’s meeting. Is there a second? Is there any discussion?

Jim Harris (CEIT): I think Mark Hanna wanted to discuss the issue regarding graduation, which was 
supposed to be tabled until this meeting. I didn’t see it put back on the agenda.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: That will come in my moderator’s report. We are not ready to 
bring it off the table yet. Any other discussion? Seeing none, all in favor of approval of today’s agenda, 
please say aye. All opposed? The agenda is approved.

One thing, first of all, a bit of miscommunication getting new people in the offices, I would first of all like to 
apologize for not getting the minutes and librarian’s report out early like they are supposed to be. If you 
recall, we had some new substitute librarian and senate secretary due to resignations so we are trying to 
get things organized here. But first of all, Li Li, the Senate Secretary, minutes from last time.

2. Approval of the February 12, 2015 Minutes: Li Li (CHHS), Senate Secretary. What do you want 
me to do?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I want you to move that we accept the minutes.

Li Li (CHHS): Oh,

Richard Flynn (CLASS) Point of order; the minutes only contain the Undergraduate and Graduate 
Reports.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: This is the Senate meeting minutes.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Oh, I’m sorry

Li Li (CHHS): I move to approve the last minutes.
Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there a second? Any discussion of the February Faculty Senate minutes?

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Yes, I do have discussion about the minutes. Since when did the Senate minutes become a complete transcript of everything that’s been said on the floor? Because when I was Senate Secretary we really boiled it down so we didn’t get like every word that was uttered here. I think that’s part of the job of the Senate Secretary to do that. It makes it very difficult to read the minutes when they come to us this way and it’s hard to locate, what business actually transpired when its mired in all that discussion, so if I could sort of request that some editing be done on the minutes in the future. I would really appreciate it.

Li Li (CHHS): I agree, since I am the new, if you’d like to coach, I would like to be coached. Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: It was a case, Richard, it was a case of timing. We got things ironed out. We had to get things done in a hurry, but, yes, I agree things certainly should be totally edited out and just keep things in that are germane to the topic. Is there any other discussion of the February minutes? Seeing none all in favor of approving the minutes, please say aye. All opposed? The minutes are approved. The Librarian’s Report, which, yes, does contain only the Undergraduate and Graduate Committee minutes.

a. Librarian’s Reports of March 2015, Jessica Minihan (LIB), Senate Librarian: The report that I am respectfully submitting, does only include the Undergraduate and Graduate Minutes. I did receive the Faculty Research Committee, and that will be in the next report. So thank you. and I’d like to that that be accepted.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: All in favor of accepting the Librarian’s Report, recognizing that at this point we’re really not doing anything because if you only have Undergraduate and Graduate Committees those are actually done separately, please say aye. All opposed? Thank you very much. Cheryl Aasheim, Undergraduate Committee Report. Do you want to hit any highlights for us please?

b. Undergraduate Committee Report (Cheryl Aasheim, CEIT):

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Okay. I’m sure you guys appreciate if after November and January. Are there any questions on the Undergraduate Committee minutes from January and February? Seeing none and recognizing this is a committee decision, or a committee recommendation that doesn’t need a second, all in favor of accepting these recommendations and forwarding them to the Provost and President as approved by the Faculty Senate curriculum changes, please say aye. All opposed? Thank you. Bob Fernekes, and the Graduate Committee reports for January and February, as well.

c. Graduate Committee Report (Bob Fernekes, LIB): The Librarian’s report includes the approved committee minutes from the January 22 and February 12 meetings. The January meeting is affectionately known as the catalog meeting, and I’m sure most of you are familiar with that. Quick synopsis of new business. There were curriculum items from all colleges; 21 departments, and the Institute for Public and Nonprofit Studies. The committee approved 140 course changes, which included new courses, schedule type changes, as well as course deletions. There were 44 program changes. The February meeting’s curriculum items consisted of only two new courses and one
course revision, and four minor program changes. That concludes my report. I move to approve the Graduate Committee minutes.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Again, this is a committee report and recommendations so it doesn’t need a second. Is there any discussion of items in the Graduate Committee minutes and recommendations? Seeing none, all in favor of adopting these changes and forwarding them to the Provost and President as approved curriculum changes, please say aye. All opposed? The Graduate Committee Report is accepted and approved. Michelle Cawthorn. Anything generally from the Gen Ed Council ahead of your motion?

d. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report (Michelle Cawthorn, COSM):
We have met twice, but I did not get the minutes submitted in time. We talked about the action; we talked about the issues. That’s it.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: We’ll talk about that later. She said they had two meetings, but they didn’t have any published minutes yet, so other than their motion request they don’t have anything to discuss,

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Where do we find the minutes of this committee?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: They get published in the Librarian’s Report.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Okay.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: All right. It’s time for Dr. Keel’s President’s Report.

3. President’s Report (Brooks Keel):

Governor’s Budget

All right, thank you very much. I’ll keep this as brief. I mentioned at the last Faculty Senate meeting, that we are in the middle of the legislative session. I think you all know, and that the Governor’s budget had placed $33.6 million for a new academic classroom building that will replace four temporary buildings we have on campus now including the Forest Drive Building, and he also placed $1 million recurring money in the budget for Advanced Manufacturing; and it is earmarked for Georgia Southern. That process has gone to the House, the House of Representatives have passed their budget out of committee on to the Senate and both the $33.6 million for the academic classroom building and the $1 million for Advanced Manufacturing survived the House budget. That’s a pretty significant statement, because typically there’s some horse trading that goes on between the House and the Senate. Both the House and the Senate does typically have on the order of about $50 million that they can fund some of their own projects and sometimes the House will take money away from the Governor’s budget to fund some of their things and expect the Senate to fill the holes and sometimes the Senate will do likewise with the House and it’s a very complicated process, but the fact that the House passed the budget out of committee with both items in tact is highly significant and highly significant in a very positive way.
I was in Atlanta last week, and spoke with the President Pro-Tem and the Majority Leader in the Senate, both are very much aware of the two budget request items that are in the budget now that reflect on Georgia Southern. Both also realize our very own Senator Jack Hill is Chair of the Appropriations Committee has a tremendous amount of respect in the Senate, both the individuals had indicated that they are very comfortable with the way the budget is right now with regards to our two budget items. If I am being a little cagey, I hope you will understand why, we can never want to count our proverbial chickens until they virtually hatch, but right now the chickens are just about at the end of their gestation and we expect hatching any day now. And look forward to a very, two very healthy chicks that are hatched one very large one at 33.6 million pounds and the other one million pounds.

We do have tremendous representation in both the House and Senate as well as incredible support out of the Governor’s office, and regardless of your political persuasion they are very supportive of Georgia Southern and I am excited about that and we are optimistic, but as I just said, we never want to get too far ahead of ourselves, but things are looking very good for both of those budget items.

The Senate should take care of their business in the next couple of weeks. It is expected that the legislative session will be completed by the first week in April, and I think we are still on schedule to have that happen. If that does happen, then that budget will go to the Board of Regents who will determine the actual allocation. So stay tuned again. I hope that next month I’ll be able to come back and tell you we’re still optimistic about things and hopefully at that time we’ll even know if the budget has indeed been passed. So things are looking very good with that.

**Faculty and Staff Pay Increase**

Let me also give you some updates on the possibility of a faculty and staff pay increase. Again, I don’t want to get too far ahead of ourselves, and what I’m about to tell you is tentative, again, based on two things: the budget being completely passed intact out of the Senate and the House, we’re optimistic that the Governor’s original allocation of, I believe, it’s $11 million, Rob, does that sound about right? to the University System of Georgia for pay increases will stay intact, we are very optimistic about that. We’re also optimistic that once it gets passed and gets to the University System that the System office will allocate that money to the campuses proportionately and then allow us to offer pay increases on campus. Again, we won’t know for sure until the Board of Regents meets. We hope we will know in April, so stay tuned for that. The Board of Regents’ meeting is the second or third week in April and hopefully by that time we should know all of that. Now, having said that, we are already getting some positive vibes if you will from the System office to the point that they have already provided Rob Whitaker’s staff and it will be divided to the University over the next what several weeks or so, Rob, I guess, instructions on how to prepare to give a pay, a merit pay increase to the campus. If you remember how we did this last year, what we are anticipating is the exact same thing will happen this year, by that I mean, the System office will award the campus a certain amount of money approaching 1%, we will be expected to add another 1% to that to give us a total merit pool of 2%.
That’s 2% for all faculty and staff payroll that we have here. We are already making preparations in identifying the resources and we believe we’ll be able to do that through new money to match what the System office will give us so we will have a 2% merit pool. The instructions from last year to refresh your memory is that the respective unit heads, by whatever that means, be it department chair, be it vice president, be it director, whoever is the unit head will be given a 2% pool of his/her employees: faculty or staff to be used for a merit pay increase. That individual would be tasked with the responsibility of determining each individual’s pay increase which will be somewhere between zero and 4%. Again, this is based entirely on merit. Last year, and the instructions are similar this year, we are explicitly forbidden to give an across the board pay increases. We have to be based off of merit, so there will be some people who will get upwards of 4% and some people who will get downwards of zero percent. That’s the way merit pools work. We will also have some very specific limitations on going above 4%. It’s very unusual that you would see that. It would require special permission from me for, especially for administrators or individuals on the high end of the payroll. We also allowed providing retention of salary increases, especially for our very important faculty, or staff, that we are in real danger of losing and so there is some flexibility in that, but essentially, it’s a merit pool increase of 2 to 4% it will be done exactly like we did last year. Again, I’m a little cagey. I don’t want, please don’t go out and spend your whopping pay increase, at least not at this time, but we are very optimistic that we will be in a position to offer pay increases and as you well know, I mean, and as you well know much better than I do, last year was the first pay increase you have received I think in some six years. But the fact we are getting any pay increase next year is a good thing. And you have, believe me, you have the support of the chancellor and the Governor who recognizes that we are losing valuable faculty and valuable staff to other entities or to other states because they are able to pay more, so we are optimistic about that so please stay tuned. Again, hopefully, around about the end of April we should have more definitive information for you.

Service to the University

Last thing I want to touch on just one topic and that has to do with service to the University and how it is valued, and I’m just going to talk off the cuff a bit, mostly to let you know that although we sometimes tend to focus more teaching and on scholarship, and less on service, and I’m talking about all aspects whether its post-tenure review, whether its promotion, whether its tenure, whether its promotion and tenure, I want you to please know that both the Provost and I value service to this institution equally as important as teaching and scholarship, and I’m sure the Provost may comment on that as well. The work that you do on the Faculty Senate is hugely important to this University. All you have to do is thumb through that Librarian’s Report, it makes my head hurt to look at amount of activity, the amount of work that you all have to do on those committees, All of this stuff, committees that we have on the Faculty Senate are hugely important to this University, to the academy, and to our ability to offer the best education for our students as possible. I know that. I respect that. I honor that. And I know the Provost does as well. We value the service that you give to this University, whether its Faculty Senate or whether its your professional service -- that all counts equally among the disciplines and we do value that very heavily and very consciously when it comes to our evaluation for promotion and tenure. We can never say thank you enough, and we can never say how much we value what you do enough and we can never let you know that we know how much you work because we are not there 24 hours a day that you do give to this University. So please just let
me say thank you for that and if nothing else just know that we do take it very seriously. We greatly appreciate the work that you do. So thank you very much and if you have any questions, I’ll be happy to try to answer, yes.

Linda Mullen (COBA): Are they going to address compression ever, our salaries and things like that.

Brooks Keel (President): That has not come up. We have attempted to address compression in the past, to be honest, we’ve not even begun to have that conversation at the level of the President’s Cabinet yet to see if we can even do this or not. And I’m not prepared to really answer that other than to say, again, although we’ll be given some amount of that 2% merit, we are going to have to come up with a balance. Last year, and Rob will correct me, I think we were getting .75% and we had to come up with 1.25% out of our own money, so the amount of resources I can tell you that we are going to have to address compression as well as the merit pool, so it will be very low. I’m just trying to, be honest with you. It is a real concern, believe me, I know. Yes?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): You had mentioned, I think you called it retention money for very valuable faculty to keep them here. What I’m wondering is if somebody who has done a great deal of service, but not much research, would be considered a very valuable faculty member that would be kept here with retention funds?

Brooks Keel (President): Absolutely. And I would say same thing with someone who’s done an outstanding job of teaching and maybe very little scholarship and very little service. I mean, I think for that three-legged stool is just that, it is a three-legged stool and each of those legs should be of the same length, and we know very well depending on the discipline, depending on the situation, depending on the position the person is in one leg might be longer than the other. But they are still a three-legged stool. We rely heavily on the unit heads to determine when a retention type of situation exists and to provide the justification for us to approve those, and for me personally service would absolutely count for that retention piece and Madam Provost, I think you would also agree with me. Yes?

Jean Bartels (Provost): I was to address this later in my report, but I’ll do it now because it probably makes a little more sense. One of the conversations that I have started to engage the Faculty Welfare Committee with is to look as we are looking at teaching and how we evaluate teaching and how that becomes part of our promotion and tenure and annual review efforts that we do the same thing with service and try to find some ways that particularly service is recognized overtly through ceremony, if you will, and very public recognition, but also in any review processes that are happening so we’re just starting that conversation.

Brooks Keel (President): Other questions? Thank you very much.

4. Provost’s Report: (Jean Bartels):
SACSCOC
My report also is very short. I almost said I didn’t have much to say, but then I thought well, its a chance for saying one more time before it happens that we are having this thing called the SACSCOC site visit coming up. And to remind you of the dates the visiting team will be here on March 31st departing on April 2nd, with their report that morning. We are all prepared with our documents in and we’re just beginning to make arrangements for the kinds of materials we need to have on site for them in their visiting suite. We will be housing the visiting team, when they’re here, in the CEIT building in the Dean’s office so that they have access as well to the Professional Development Center, so if you’re negotiating that area at any particular point in time you might find those individuals primarily in that spot. So that’s happening.

QEP
We also sent in our QEP document, and we started today and will continue tomorrow with the first set of training for the first wave, if you will, of faculty programs that are beginning to look at putting more intensive writing experiences in their programs and courses, so those individuals have been training up. They will have another session later this spring and then a nice summer workshop which we hope lots of people come to actually with an international, or a national I should say expert in writing in the curriculum, will be coming to do some work for faculty development as well. You should be seeing more physical display of the QEP materials and documents. We’re going to make the entire QEP report a public document for you all very soon. I think the Deans will get it very quickly and we are going to put it up in public arenas so you’ll be able to read that whole document to see what is happening with that. So be watching for all of that. I know that the Deans were all speaking with their program chairs and with the faculty in venues that that had to distribute some of the materials that are already out in Executive Summary form, if you will about the QEP.

Catalog
The only other thing I wanted to report is and it had to do with what when we were talking about the Graduate Committee report and the January committee getting ready for the catalog meeting. We are hoping that that’s going to start changing in the future. We are in the process right now with the Registrar’s office in putting together a new software package that will be our catalog, which will be bringing it up to this century and making it much more effective and efficient for us to be adding things into the course catalog. It is called CourseLeaf, but many of us across that particular catalog material right now which means taking everything out of our old catalog, getting into the new catalog and making any revisions we need to make or corrections we need to make in terms of what’s there. So be looking for that. I anticipate that that will be probably available somewhere around summer, by fall, I think, is that right? Jayne, back there, somewhere around late spring, early summer, we should have that completed. I think you will be very pleased to see it. It will be a nice presentation, again making the work of change to our curricula and change to the catalog a little more efficient, so with that, I’ll take any questions. None.
5. **Senate Executive Committee Report: (Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair.)** It was actually somewhat of a quiet month. There was only one request for a motion to the agenda from the Gen Ed Curriculum committee which is on today’s agenda. Dr. Bartels, Dr. Keel mentioned the idea of service and both of them have spoken with me privately about how much they do value service. With that in mind, I will remind everyone that the April meeting is where we normally elect the Secretary and Librarian for next year’s Faculty Senate and I’ll also remind everybody that each college should be having elections here either going on or coming up very soon. Please talk to your colleagues and get them involved in Senate and University committees and so on. Some committees, I'll grant you take a lot of work: Undergraduate Committee, Graduate Committee, lots of work. On the other hand, there are some committees depending on your mood. Academic Standards does most of their work at the beginning before each semester begins. If you like to have something to do during your time off, there is a good option. The University Calendar Committee -- I know from experience, takes about a total of one hour a year. So there are lots of ways to give service to the University depending on what your time budget is, but I will remind everybody that, yes, next month it is time to elect a Librarian and a Secretary for next year. And please consider those positions. Okay, other things to talk about. Mark Hanna’s motion from last month -- it was tabled to try to get new information and new data. Unfortunately, we don’t have any new data. Velma Burden, the Registrar, has been out for most of the last month, if not the whole month. Her husband was recently placed in a high priority heart transplant list. So there has not been any chance to get new data to further educate our discussion on the graduation rate. I didn’t see a point in bringing back that. Hopefully, there will be some data possibly for next.

Jim Harris (CEIT): I think Pat the rules are if there’s no motion to extend it then it’s dropped. So I would like to make a motion to extend the tabling to the next meeting.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) SEC Chair: Madam Parliamentarian? Okay. All right. I don't know if this is the proper time. I think we should probably do that after my report concludes. All right. A couple of other things to mention. If you have concerns you can talk about them now, or later, the University System Faculty Council which is the Convocation or meeting of all the Faculty Senate Moderators, Presidents, Chairs, what they're called at various campuses, will be held in Augusta on March 21st, the second Saturday of our Spring Break. I’m sure there will be lots to talk about possible raises, health costs, etc., etc. If there’s any concerns that people here think should be brought up to the University System Faculty Council. I’ll note that the Chancellor always attends as well as Houston Davis, who is the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Are you asking for concerns now?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) SEC Chair: Yes, if you have any you want me to bring up, sure.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Okay, I’m, until you said health concerns, I wasn’t sure if this was appropriate, but it’s come to my attention that CVS/Caremark is not doing a very good job. There are people who
have met their deductible and Blue Cross/Blue Shield knows that, but apparently CVS/Caremark
does not know it and they won’t provide overrides when Blue Cross/Blue Shield informs them of the
correct information, and so if that’s an appropriate concern to bring up.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) SEC Chair: That certainly is an appropriate concern, yes.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Yes. Because, I mean, what it means is people cannot

Pat Humphrey (COSM) SEC Chair: Between the two, right?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Right, and I’ve talked to both of them and the service rep for CVS/Caremark
even said we’re trying to pass the information along, but the overrides are not being written. So it’s a
big problem and I think it is not being resolved quickly.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) SEC Chair: I’ve heard concerns the other way where CVS is charging as
copay much less than the copay used to be in which case the faculty member says, oh, I guess I’m
okay. Anything else? Well, if people have anything that they’d like me to bring up, you can send me
an email. Give me a call, whatever.

One other thing that I think will probably be coming up soon, which I was just, well, I heard a rumor
about it last week, and then I got forwarded a letter from Jean-Paul Carton today for anybody who’s
going close to retirement, apparently retiree coverage is going to be changing here starting January
of 2016, next January. The USG is thinking about instituting an open retiree exchange, where you’ll
be given some dollar amount and you can go out on this exchange and basically get what you want. If
what you want is not suitable with their dollar amount, you are going to have to make up the
difference and there are a whole lot of other details that yet have to come out, but that’s the way
things are headed. I’m not sure I’m in favor of it, thinking about the fact that I’m not too far from
retiring myself. So people might be aware that that is coming down the pipe. Retiree health looks like
it’s changing. Looks like there’s going to be a full agenda next month, as I mentioned earlier, there’s
lots of things hanging fire, but they weren’t quite ready for this month. That’s my report. Any questions
or discussion? In that case, I’ll ask Michelle Cawthorn to present the motion from the Gen Ed
Curriculum Council on core course approval review and assessment.

6. **MOTION: GECC Recommended changes to Core Course approval, review, and assessment**

   (Michelle Cawthorn, COSM): The GECC moves that the Faculty Senate approve the Core Review
   form and rubric to go along with it. So I repeat?

   Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: Do you want to try it again, please?
Michelle Cawthorn (COSM): The Gen Ed and Core Curriculum Committee moves to approve the Core Review and Assessment template and rubric.

Original Motion: 1. The GECC moves that the Faculty Senate approve the CORE assessment form and Core Course Assessment Rubric for evaluation of CORE courses.

2. The GECC moves that the Faculty Senate approve the Core Course Approval, Review and Assessment Process.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: This is a committee recommendation from a standing committee so it does not require a second. Is there any discussion on these forms and the format of core course revision, assessment, etc.?

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Are we talking about all these documents or just one right now?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: As far as I understand it, all of them.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Okay, on the, sorry, procedure for reviewing existing courses, number three, it says if the course does not meet the Core Outcomes, the faculty have two options.

a. Option 1: Revise the course to align with the Core Outcomes. The modified course would be evaluated using the same process as described in number 2 above.

b. Option 2: Remove the course from the Core Curriculum through communication with the GECC; to seek approval from the USG General Education Council.

And this relates to the actual outcomes that were adopted, that came from the Board of Regents in 2010, is that correct? Okay. The Comprehensive Learning Outcomes, do those also come from the Board of Regents, or were those created here?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: I believe those are from the Board of Regents.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Okay. That’s not true?

Michelle Cawthorn (COSM): None of the outcomes are from the Board of Regents. All of the outcomes were approved by the Core Curriculum Committee and then sent or written by the Core Curriculum Committee and then sent to the Board of Regents and approved by the Education Council.
Richard Flynn (CLASS): I’m asking because there has been some concern in my department and indeed in my College about some of these sub-outcomes being tied to particular courses in our case World Literature. But where it says “Students will construct informed and ethical arguments about historical and contemporary fine arts or other cultural products from the standpoint of diverse cultures.” Now we were told sometime in February that that was a SLO, that we were supposed to apply to our course. It is mid-way through the semester and we have three department-wide SLO’s that appear on all our syllabi, this is not one of them. Furthermore, we have two courses, World Literature I, which goes from ancient through the renaissance and World Literature II, which goes from the enlightenment to the present, so I don’t know how our core courses can test this particular SLO which requires you to make arguments about both historical and contemporary, I suppose, literature falls under cultural products. And our assessment person has actually prepared a five-page document about this, and I was told by our Dean’s office that they heard about this in February. How are we supposed to assess courses by September with learning outcomes that don’t appear on our syllabi? And I really want to know why is this happening so late, if we’ve known about these since 2010?

Michelle Cawthorn (COSM): I don’t have the answer to that. I mean our committee was only tasked for this this year.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Well, I would argue against approving at least that portion of the document until such time as the outcomes are actually aligned with the courses that we teach, because we can at best developing if that outcome remains as it is. Because that’s, I mean, you know if you are going to align outcomes with actual courses, there’s a third option here that’s not mentioned besides revising the course to align with outcomes or removing the course from the core curriculum, the outcomes can be revised to more align global perspectives outcomes or the sub-outcomes can be revised to align with the courses. There’s nothing wrong with Area C, the large outcome, you know, some courses in Area C will analyze historical, some will analyze contemporary, some will do fine arts and then then other problem is this ethical business. We don’t teach ethics in literature, besides I suppose philosophers do, but how are, what does that mean?

Michaellle Cawthorn (COSM): Are you asking me?

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I don’t think these are ready for primetime; I really don’t.

Michelle Cawthorn (COSM): All these outcomes were approved in 2010. That’s all I can tell you. And every college had a representative on that committee.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Yes, but the move to align particular outcomes with particular courses, I don’t know when that was done, and I don’t know if we had anybody in that

Michelle Cawthorn (COSM): Comprehensive Program Review is due next March.
Richard Flynn (CLASS): Right, and we are now heading at being asked to assess courses by September, according to Learning Outcomes that appear nowhere on our syllabi. Are we supposed to revise our syllabi mid-way through the semester?

Michelle Cawthorn (COSM): We have training options coming up, so we have assigned all members of the committee as liaisons to various departments to help with this. We have individual training workshops planned in April to help people complete these. We realize that a lot of people are not going to meet exceeding at this point. This is a first step. We are just gathering data.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Well, it's not going to get any better as long as the outcome remains the same. Are we supposed to change the historical breadth of our courses or somehow bring in a philosopher to teach ethics in the course? I mean, I think that at least the revision, the part about the process for a course that does not meet the core outcomes, that portion of this document needs to be revisited, and I would argue that we should vote that down.

Jean Bartels (Provost): Could you tell me again which outcome you are referring to? I missed which one that you were having problems with.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Yes, Jean, it’s the “Students will construct informed and ethical arguments about historical and contemporary fine arts or other cultural products from the standpoint of diverse cultures.” There are awful a lot of things going on in that outcome, and we have two different courses that are in the core and one of them, as I said, goes from the ancients to the renaissance. In what sense are our students going to construct ethical arguments about contemporary cultural products in a course that focuses on historical only? I mean, or it might help in that but the other thing is if these are department-wide in SLO’s, 1) demonstrate familiarity with literary language periods and genres, 2) analyze literary texts in their context, 3) differentiate the features of literatures produced by various world cultures, and then this additional SLO, which must be addressed, which comes from the Core Curriculum Task Force in the fall of 2010, students will construct informed ethical arguments about historical and contemporary fine arts or other cultural products from the standpoint of diverse cultures, clarify the SLO, students will construct. I assume students will write informed arguments, informed either by the classes or research, ethical arguments, possible interpretations for that language or arguments about ethics, arguments using ethical models, arguments that don’t abuse their sources, arguments that aren’t biased or bigoted, historical and contemporary fine arts, possible interpretations, either historical or contemporary products of the art world, both historical and contemporary products of the art world, if the second one was chosen then English 2111 cannot be used for this assessment. Will students need to construct two arguments? One addressing a historical product and one addressing a contemporary product. Clarification is necessary here in order to develop a prompt and rubric for this SLO. Fine arts, the usual definition is a visual art considered to have been created primarily for esthetic purposes and judged for its beauty and meaningfulness, specifically paintings, sculpture, drawings, water color, graphics and architecture, this definition does not include literature or perhaps literature is included under other cultural products. From the standpoints of diverse cultures, students construct arguments using multiple points of view, which appear to be from a number of diverse cultures and thus must create multiple persona which appear to be from those cultures. I mean, in other words, I won’t continue with this. I got this from our main assessment person. This is not my analysis, who asked me to bring it up at the Senate today. But we can’t be testing things that we aren’t, we can’t be evaluating courses on the basis of things that we don’t do in the courses.
Jean Bartels (Provost): My recommendation is, first off, this process occurred with us needing to produce our outcomes for all these areas to the Board of Regents sub-committee and they actually did the approval. So these have been in approval mode for a long while. I’m going to contend that we’ve not had them incorporated well into the coursework up to this point, so this is an opportunity, from my perspective, to look back again now at where these outcomes placed and how are we are assessing them? I would also contend that the outcome is written broadly so that it can be interpreted in a variety of ways depending on what’s happening in the course. So before you get extraordinarily literal at this, I think there are many options with that allow for a variety of assessment processes to happen that coincide with the instruction that occurs in the course. So this is an opportunity for General Education to take another look at what’s in the courses and how these outcomes match up and if we have a discrepancy, the committee’s charge would be to look at if there’s a place that happens better where we can assess this, but it is a requirement that we assess it, so we’ll have to go back and revisit.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Is it possible to, I mean, to at least revise that outcome so it has or rather than and?

Jean Bartels (Provost): You can offer a revision. It will have to go back and be reapproved by the USG System.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: Any other discussion?

Rob ??? (cannot hear)

Jean Bartels (Provost): What I’m saying is that this is an option to take another look probably and analyze whether we’ve got a discrepancy and if the discrepancy is falling in the outcome or if its falling in what’s happening in courses? There’s another element thought that if these are the expectations that the faculty has for which should be occurring in the students core educational experience, then these kinds of outcomes should be happening someplace in the curriculum. So what I’m saying is that we need the assessment process to look at these outcomes as they’ve been approved and stands, we have to do that. But whether we have them placed correctly might be something we can revisit, and in the event that outcome perhaps is not giving us enough flexibility we might be able to go back and take a look at that outcome and seek re-approval of the outcome through the System.

Sally Brown (COE): I’m on the GECC committee with Michelle and there’s a document from Dr. Bartels dated December 28, 2010. That matches the outcomes to the particular courses that were approved at that date. So it’s something that didn’t just happen this semester, but that approval happened in 2010. The only thing that our committee is doing is collecting data about it now so it wasn’t that anybody just matched up these outcomes with your courses. That occurred back in 2010.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: As somebody who teaches, or regularly teaches a course that’s in the core and for some students it’s in Area D and for some students it’s in Area F. How would I find out which outcomes are matched to my course? Because I don’t know.
Michelle Cawthorn (COSM): They’re clearly stated in the form. So the Area D outcome is clearly stated and if your course, we are not concerned with Area F. And if your course matches one of the other outcomes it is listed.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I am not so concerned with a major outcome for Area C, as I am with the sub-outcome. And I don’t have, I actually went looking for the material on this today and I was unable to figure out where to find it, but now that I know that it is in the past Librarian’s Reports I will go look at it. What I’m concerned about is that we’re just now, I mean, I don’t, I mean, I brought this up at our college faculty governance committee and the Dean’s office said they just got this in February, sometime, these particular courses. And I don’t know how we’re supposed to, I mean, why weren’t we told you know in 2010 that you need to put these outcomes on your syllabi, and you need to start gathering data to measure these outcomes. Instead of saying, I found out about it in the middle of March, you’ve got to gather data that you haven’t, I mean, how are we supposed to, will we have one semester’s worth of data to gather for a five-year project? I mean, that doesn’t strike me as very sensible.

Jean Bartels (Provost): Actually, that Comprehensive Learning Outcomes that referred to critical thinking prospectus happened later than the SLO’s, the original ones, and there was a delay in that, and I will just say this, as we experienced with our entire assessment process, we have a gap in when things should have been done and when they are now being done. We are under, well, we are under, in my personal opinion, ethical obligation to be making sure that our students have the core expectations met for their general education, but we are also under mandate from the System that we have to report these now, so, yes, we’re behind where we should have been and this is consistent with other processes we are catching up with.

Sally Brown (COE): I’d also like to add on the form that Michelle has brought forward in terms of the motion of where you are going to complete it about the core assessments that go across the sections of the course, there is a section for an action plan, and I think some of the things that you are talking about, Richard, could be written into that action plan for the changes that need to be made in the future. So you would actually have a really good action plan for your courses.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Let me respond to that and say there’s no action plan in the world that’s going to measure those things in World Literature I because we’re not talking about contemporary text, constructing ethical arguments, and all those things. Those, you would have to completely change the course.

Sally Brown (COE): Okay, but I’m saying is that the action plan could say that outcome needs to be moved to a different course.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Moderator: Is there any other discussion on this motion? Personally, I think in my own case, my action plan for next year is start collecting data. We don’t have any. But okay. We have a motion on the floor for the Gen Ed Curriculum Committee to approve these forms and their use in terms of core course curriculum changes, new courses, and course assessment. All in favor please say aye. All opposed? I think we need a show of hands. All in favor please raise your right hand. The motion passes 26 to 11.
New Business? I think now is the time to make your motion.

7. New Business

Jim Harris (CEIT): I would like to make a motion to move the table item of the Graduation Discussion to the next meeting.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: Is there a second?


Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: Alright, is there any discussion on this motion to move our tabled item on graduation forward until next month?

Richard Flynn (CLASS): What happens if we don’t pass this motion? Will that motion die? Okay, well I would really very much like it to die, so I’m going to vote against this motion to extend, because I think it’s just kind of mean-spirited and unnecessary and from reading the minutes it seems like we don’t even really have control over what the Registrar’s does and so forth so I would urge people to vote this down, so we don’t have this on our plate any more.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I’d like to speak in support of the current motion, although it might be better worded to table it until the information is available because if the information is not available the next meeting then we will have to go through this again. I’d also like to say that the spirit of the motion was not to be mean-spirited, but simply to examine what is going on at our University to gather information to look at it, and to see, you know, how many of, or what proportion of the students were postponing finishing, are due to legitimate reasons. Because there are a lot of legitimate reasons.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Could somebody read us the original motion? Because I don’t, it was not my interpretation of what it said.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: The original motion, I don’t have it with me, it had to do with asking the Registrar’s office to present these graduation numbers in terms of number of graduates who actually graduated, the number who graduated later and so on, each year. After that I don’t have it with me.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): I have a question. Oh, can you hear me? Okay, I have a question. Does the Registrar’s even have a record of walked, so that they can compare the list of who walked and those who later graduate? Because as far as I know, there’s no paperwork involved in walking; it’s just, is there?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: Well, I know there’s the graduation clearance. Teresa Thompson, perhaps you could address that or Jayne Perkins Brown? Because I know they have to apply for graduation, and they’re eligible to walk according to what Velma Burden told me, if they have a
graduation application on file with the graduation semester that semester whether or not they are actually finished at that point or not.

Jayne Perkins Brown (Associate Vice President, Strategic Research and Analysis): The record is kept by those who actually request a cap and gown, and the name cards are prepared for those who intend, who offer that they intend to participate.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: So if you pay for a cap and gown…

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I found the motion on page 14 of the minutes. Would anybody else like to hear it or do you want me to read that for you? Because the motion asked the Faculty Senate to request that the Provost charge the Registrar to ask the Faculty Senate to request that the Provost charge the Registrar to take steps to improve the disproportion of participants in the graduation ceremonies who have actually completed their degree requirements at the time of the ceremony to the point that virtually all of the participants will have completed requirements for the degree to which they are entitled as is asserted by various college Deans in the ceremonies. And then the other part of 2, that annually by the first day of September, the Registrar would report to Faculty Senate the number of participants in each of the prior two graduations ceremonies and for each ceremony the proportion of these participants that had not yet completed the requirements for their degree at the time of the ceremony, and finally for each ceremony the proportion that have not completed their degree requirements at the time of the ceremony, lastly the Registrar would report to the Senate any substantive changes that have been made to the commencement procedures to decrease the likelihood of premature participation in a graduation exercise.

Senator Steirn, I think that it really does ask for an action to be taken on the part of the Registrar to insure that no one who has not met their requirements by the day of graduation, you know, I think they used to pull people out of line here back in the way olden days, but, you know, I mean, I see no reason for this. I mean, I see no reason for this other than, what does it hurt, if you get your diploma and the person next to you didn’t. I just don’t get it.

Original Motion: The Faculty Senate moves to request that the Provost charge the Registrar to:

1. To take steps to improve the proportion of participants in graduation ceremonies who have actually completed their degree requirements at the time of the ceremony to the point that virtually all of the participants will "have completed the requirements for the degree to which they are entitled" (as is asserted by various college Deans during the commencement ceremonies).
2. Annually, by the first day of September, report to Faculty Senate 1) the number of participants in each of the prior two graduation ceremonies, 2) for each ceremony, the proportion of these participants that had not yet completed the requirements for their degree at the time of participation, 3) for each ceremony the proportion that have not completed their degree requirements as of the date of the report, and 4) any substantive changes made to commencement procedures to decrease the likelihood of premature participation in a graduation exercise.
Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: First of all, Richard, they don’t actually get diplomas when they march.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I have a feeling when this comes back up we will need to make some friendly amendments because we found out at the last meeting that the Provost doesn’t charge the Registrar for one thing, so, you know, that will be I’m sure a friendly amendment. That that changes. Also, I don’t think we are so concerned, those of us who are in favor of this, and spoke last time, we’re not so concerned about the legitimate reason, you know, the internships, needing 5 hours to finish, whatever, but we are concerned with are students who go through the ceremony and there seems to be a large number of them who never ever finish their degree. What this means is we may as well invite all of our students to walk across the stage. Its a long ceremony that’s getting longer because our university is growing. And we don’t need to just have filler. People who have not finished and have no intention of finishing. If the students are going to finish, that’s wonderful. But and we’re not going to reduce it to virtually zero, but we would like to decrease it to those for whom the graduation ceremony is meaningful. And I believe that its a question of integrity of the university. I don’t want the university just letting everybody march because well, they’ve been here four years and that’s sort of their time.

Jean Bartels (Provost): Can I make one comment? This is not going to be about the comment, but I feel obliged to say it. The students graduate from this institution because they have the support that gets them there. Where they have the real significant reason why it doesn’t happen: illness, finances, increasingly that. I’m going to charge that all of us are responsible for making sure those individuals are ready and are able to graduate and have fulfilled the graduation requirements. And that’s where the responsibility lies.

Allen Mackelprang (COBA): I’d like to give a different perspective on this motion. At some point, we’ve been told that our funding rules will be changed and skewed more towards graduation rates. So keep in mind that identifying those students that are closest to graduation without graduating represents the lowest hanging fruit to improve our graduation rates. So this may be an opportunity to improve our data collection mechanism such that when our funding is really related to graduation rates we can make quick and easy improvements that will generate more income for us.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: I’d like to remind everyone that the motion on the floor is whether to extend the tabling of Mark Hanna’s motion to next month. The motion on the floor is not Mark Hanna’s original motion in terms of asking for the graduation rate data and so forth. There was a suggestion, and I don’t, I’ve lost track of things, there was a suggestion that just table this motion until we actually get the data that was thought we wanted last month. Does anyone want to make that amendment so that we don’t have to redo this next month?

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): I (cannot hear)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: Second from Janice Steirn
Janice Steirn (CLASS): I’m not sure if it’s a point of information or a point of order. But do we have to then check with the people who made and seconded the original motion to see if it’s a friendly amendment.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Moderator: Yes. Okay recognizing it as friendly, I believe we are now at leaving this motion on the table until we actually get more correct or up-to-date graduation data. Okay, so the motion currently is to leave this on the table until we get the correct data. Is there any discussion on that motion? Seeing none, all in favor please say aye. All opposed? I believe the ayes had it. So this motion from Mark Hanna will remain on the table until we actually get other data from the Registrar’s office in terms of graduation rates and reasons for why people did not graduate as much as we could ascertain. Is there any other new business?

8. Announcements: Vice Presidents
   Are there any announcements from the vice presidents?
   
   none

9. Announcements from the Floor
   Any announcements from the floor?
   
   none

10. Adjournment.
    Is there a motion to adjourn? Is there a second? All in favor? We’re adjourned.
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Page 2-3: brief outline of the minutes
Page 4-24: complete edited minutes
1. Approval of the Agenda for the April 21, 2015 meeting.
   Approved.

2. Approval of the March 9, 2015 Minutes: Li Li (CHHS), Senate Secretary.
   Approved with one amendment to the March 9, 2015 minutes.
   a. Librarian’s Reports of April, 2015
      Accepted.
   b. Graduate Committee Report (Bob Fernekes, LIB):
      Accepted
   c. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report (Michelle Cawthorn, COSM):
      No report.

3. President’s Report: Russell Keen (Vice President for External Relations):
   • We had a really good legislative session;
   • $33.6 million academic building that will replace the three temporary buildings on Forest Drive;
   • $1 million in our current budget for Manufacturing Engineering;
   • We’ve got a lot of friends in the Governor’s office and the House of Representatives;
   • Majority Leader will be resigning and Representative Burns has put his name in the hat for replacement (update: Representative Burns was elected as Majority Leader 5/11/2015);
   • Senator Jack Hill. He is a staunch supporter, advocate, and alum of Georgia Southern University;
   • (GSU faculty) are doing great works right here on campus and produce quality of students, that made a difference in my talking to legislators and appropriators;
   • The administration is extremely supportive of our efforts in the capitol
   • House Bill 152, A.K.A. Michael’s Law, passed the House and the Senate. Basically what that does is it puts certain requirements on local governments to report when violations occur on alcohol;
   • We are in the process of implementing the 2% merit increase.

4. Senate Executive Committee Report: (Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair.)
   • SACSCOC team did come, March 31-April 2. It was rather non-eventful;
   • USG Faculty Council meeting in Augusta on the 21st (see the report via separate email earlier);
   The search for QEP director was discussed.

5. Elections of Senate Secretary and Librarian for AY 2015-2016
   Marc Cyr is elected for senate secretary; Jessica Minihan is elected for senate Librarian for next year

6. MOTION: Senate By-Laws Amendment: Resignation of Senate Officers (SEC motion, James Woods (CLASS))
   Approved

7. MOTION: Senate By-Laws Amendment: Full-Time Administrators not Eligible (SEC motion, James Stephens (JPHCOPH)
8. **MOTION: Procedure for Appeals (Revision of Handbook Section 210) (SEC motion, Lowell Mooney, COBA):**
   Approved

9. **MOTION: Policy re: Granting Departmental Tenure or Tenure-Track Status to Non-Departmental Hires (Marshall Ransom, COSM, for Marc Cyr, CLASS):**
   Approved

10. **MOTION: Outside Letters for Special Faculty Evaluations (SEC motion, Lowell Mooney (COBA)):**
   It will be rewritten and redrafted.

11. **MOTION: Amend Faculty Handbook to better describe the evaluation of teaching (Faculty Welfare Committee, Fred Smith, LIB):**
   Approved

12. **Old Business: MOTION: Bringing off the table Motion on Improving the commencement ceremony participant screening process (Mark Hanna, COBA):**
   Motion withdrew

13. **New Business**
   None

14. **Announcements: Vice Presidents**
   - We had hosted Georgia Nurse Management Administration on campus;
   - Georgia Student Finance Commission will be meeting on campus;

15. **Announcements from the Floor**
   Service on senate committees should be appreciated;
   Please attend summer senate meeting;
   Next senate meeting is on Tuesday, June 2nd, at the Nessmith-Lane building

16. **Adjournment.**
1. Approval of the Agenda for the April 21, 2015 meeting.
2. Approval of the March 9, 2015 Minutes: Li Li (CHHS), Senate Secretary.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: (Corrections to the minutes) It probably should have been done two zero percent. Li, do you want to note that change that it was two zero percent? Is there any other discussion of the minutes? Seeing none, all in favor of approving the March 9th minutes, please say aye. All opposed? Minutes are approved.

d. Librarian’s Reports of April, 2015, Jessica Minihan (LIB), Senate Librarian: I respectfully submitted the Librarian’s Report for April and move they be accepted.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Is there a second? Do we have a second?
Janice Steirn (CLASS): Seconded.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Is there any discussion of the contents of the Librarian’s Report? Recognizing that the Graduate Committee and General Ed Committee will be discussed separately. All in favor of accepting the Librarian’s Report recognizing that all we are doing here is acknowledging the committees have reported their actions honestly and fairly, please say aye. All opposed? The Librarian’s Report is accepted.

e. Graduate Committee Report (Bob Fernekes, LIB): Thank you. The Librarian’s Report includes the approved Graduate Committee minutes from the March 12th meeting. The minutes are definitely an easy read. The meeting was atypical in that no course program changes, or new items were brought before the committee for approval. The Dean’s Update announced that the Research Symposium, which I’ll call your attention to, it’s this Friday, April 24th, for those of you who may have missed the other announcements. Under the Chair’s Update, the committee discussed the M. S. in Sport Management, the first of two programs undergoing review. Under new business Dr. Koballa introduced the topic, Prior Learning Assessment, and the Graduate Committee formed a subcommittee to investigate. That concludes my report. I move to approve the Graduate Committee minutes.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): That’s a committee recommendation, so it doesn’t require a second. Is there any discussion of anything in the Graduate Committee minutes? Seeing none, all in favor of approving them, please say aye. All opposed? The Graduate Committee report is accepted and approved. The Gen Ed and Core Curriculum. I don’t see anybody for Gen Ed and Core Curriculum.

Sally Brown (COE): I’m on the committee. We didn’t meet last month, so I don’t think there’s a report.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Okay. Thank you very much. The President’s Report. Instead of Brooks Keel, we’ll have Russell Keen tell us a little bit shortly about the legislative session and what’s going on at the BOR.

3. President’s Report: Russell Keen (Vice President for External Relations): Thank you. It’s a pleasure being here with you this afternoon. As was stated, Dr. Keel and Dr. Bartels and Vice Presidents Thompson and Burrell send their regrets for not being here, so I had the opportunity to share with you what the past three months of my life have been like in Atlanta under the Gold Dome.

Legislative Session
We had a really good legislative session. This is the 40-days, 180 nights it seems like, that the General Assembly is in session, and the one thing that they are required to do by the State Constitution is to pass a budget, and so that’s primarily what we look at, what we follow, but we also look at legislation, things of that nature.

Capital Projects
I am happy to report to you that initially Georgia Southern University in terms of capital projects, we’re not scheduled for this year to have a project. However, when the Governor released his budget recommendation at the onset of the session we were included in two places specifically. One is a $33.6 million academic building that will replace the three temporary buildings on Forest Drive, and the other is $1 million in our current budget for Manufacturing Engineering. The $33.6 million is huge because in total, at the end of the session, the total capital outlay in bonds is $334 million across all the University System. And $60 million of that went to major renovations and repairs across all the University System. So if you look at what Georgia Southern University, what the outcome was for us, with the 10%, of course. we had all the other institutions scratching their head as to how that happened.

How Did It Happen?
And so I’d like, at this time, just to tell you a little bit how it happened. First of all, we’ve got a lot of friends in the Governor’s office and the Governor himself is great friends of Georgia Southern University. He’s been here so many times I suspect that he’ll be here again real soon to sign the new legislation and budget items. But aside from the Governor, we also have great support in the House of Representatives. Speaker David Ralston is a good friend. We’ve had a great relationship with the Chairman of Appropriations. And our local delegation: Representative Jan Tankersley, Representative Jon Burns, Representative Butch Parrish, are great advocates for Georgia Southern.

Politics
Just to keep you updated on some local politics that are going on right now. It appears that the Majority Leader will be resigning and Representative Burns has put his name in the hat to become the next Majority Leader. The House Republican Caucus will meet in May and so we’re kind of keeping our fingers crossed there. We’ve got a lot of friends in the House and it helps out tremendously. Should he get it, it will be a great thing for Georgia Southern. In the Senate, many of you know Senator Jack Hill. He is a staunch supporter, advocate, and alum of Georgia Southern University. As Chairman of the
Appropriations, he sits on the conference committee for the budget. He was also able to hold our funds. It wasn’t an easy task, really, when you are looking at the limited amount of funds and Georgia Southern sort of skipped a year or two to get where we were. I think that has helped with things. One it speaks volumes of what you’re doing right here on campus and the quality of the students that we are putting out. I don’t say that as just a talking point. I say it because I know it. I’ve seen it; it’s made a difference in my talking to legislators and appropriators. They know the caliber of faculty we have; they know the caliber of the students we are putting out through our internship program and it helps us tremendously. I’d also like to say that the administration is extremely supportive of our efforts in the capitol, and Dr. Keel made several visits to all of the Vice Presidents in some form or fashion, helping out with our mission and our objectives over there. I’ve called on many of them from time to time for some very important requests that mean a great deal to legislators and us very much. So all in all we had a great session.

Legislation

Just, there are a couple of pieces of legislation that we are still looking at to move on when ready. Legislation that, we’re kind of waiting on some feedback from the Board of Regents and the Georgia Student Finance Commission, which I don’t have details of that. There was a bill that we followed very closely. House Bill 152, which is the, some people refer to it as Michael’s Law, and as ramifications resulted in after the unfortunate death of one of our students at a local establishment here. They were able to get that passed through the House and the Senate. Basically what that does is it puts certain requirements on local governments to report when violations occur on alcohol and things of that nature, but it also mandates that the age of the bouncer be 21. And so we felt that a great first step. That was collaboration with the mayor and the Department of Revenue and several people around the state are pleased to see that passed. So all in all we had a great session.

Board of Regents Meeting

We came back from the Board of Regents meeting held at Georgia Gwinnett last week and received our allocation. I think we did fairly well with that. So we’re right now as many of you have heard, and we’ve just discussed, are in the process of implementing the 2% merit increase. We are thankful to have that opportunity. But what I wanted to address to you as well, we recognize as a Cabinet, and it’s also recognized at the University System through the Chancellor, that 2% is not going to meet our needs. We know that. And we recognize that in the joint appropriations committee, the chancellor, his top priority was salaries and compression. And it started, he went so far to say in fiscal year 2000, we were ranked 5th on the Southern Regional Education Board states, and today, the most recent survey data, we rank 9th. This puts us behind our state neighbors including Alabama, Florida, South Carolina, North Carolina, Texas and Virginia. And an average full-professor salary, states have moved ahead of us including Mississippi, Louisiana, Kentucky, Arkansas, South Carolina, Tennessee, Florida, and Alabama. I tell you this, not to be a downer, but to illustrate that we recognize there’s an issue. And to the point that we also understand 2% isn’t going to fill in the gap. We are working diligently on that and send the message to our legislators and appropriators. With that, that sort of my External Affairs update. I’ll be happy to entertain any questions that I might be able to answer at this time.

James Woods (CLASS): Since I’m in one of the buildings slated to be replaced, do you have any idea about the timeline as to when that building, we will be getting a new academic building to replace the Forest Drive Building?
Russell Keen (Vice President for External Affairs): The short answer is, no, I don’t have an idea of when specifically that will take place, but, you know, last year we had the Military Science Building, the year before that the Health Center, and simply kind of looking at the progression of that, the design, the building and then all approved through the Board of Regents, and then once that process is done, the bonds have to sell, the architects and all have to be chosen, so I’d say it’s going to be a year or two.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): Russell, Dr. Keel told me it would be two to three years because among other things, yes, you are right, get the design, which is going take six to eight months. He has said that Dr. Bartels and faculty to be on that committee, to help design the building. But then we have to get places for you people to move while they start destroying the temporary building, so after the ROTC building is being built, should be done fairly quickly. So that takes care of them. The Fashion Design and the other buildings, people need a place to move. Their talking about using the old Health Center space and the new Health Center hopefully will be complete by the time the design for the new classroom building is done so that can move the Health Center and then use the current Health Center for swing space for the faculty who are displaced because their current building is being demolished.

Russell Keen (Vice President for External Affairs): Any other questions? Thank you.

4. Senate Executive Committee Report: (Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair.) The Provost is not here, obviously. For those of you who weren’t at the SEC breakfast, weren’t at the Spring Faculty Meeting yesterday, just a couple of highlights: SACSCOC team did come, March 31-April 2. It was rather non-eventful. They didn’t meet with the President’s Cabinet. They didn’t meet with the Deans. They didn’t meet with the SEC. They met with very few people and were actually on campus for a very short amount of time those three days. The big things that came out, we ended up with two recommendations. One had to do with roughly twenty programs on campus where the assessment wasn’t clear in terms of making changes to curriculum and programs. And the other one had to do with some shall we say lack of definite plans in terms of assessing the QEP, but that was it, so they were very very pleased with that. We got a bunch of accolades so all that was good. A lot of motions on today’s agenda. Seems to always happen at the end of the year, so it’s very crowded. I don’t have a lot to report other than I did go to the USG Faculty Council meeting in Augusta on the 21st, and I did send everybody my report and notes from that meeting. So if anybody has any questions, I’d be happy to entertain them.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): Going back to the Provost and the SACS visit, I’m not sure if you talked about this with the Provost, but what is the latest on this hiring of a QEP? I know that an offer was tendered, but does anybody know

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC: The only information that I got is that the search is still ongoing. So I don’t know if the offer was refused or what.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): Is there any concern in the Provost’s Office? This would be important for reaccreditation?
Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC: Not that I detected. Candace Griffith, Diana Cone, do you have any information on QEP?

Diana Cone (Provost’s Office): The offer was extended. That candidate did not accept the offer is the last I heard. And we are moving to look at other options to fill that position at this time. So I don’t think there’s any concern on the part of the Provost, because I think they have a plan for looking at trying to fill that position to get moving on the QEP by the fall.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): I just would follow that up in saying that, you know, my department did not fill searches. I’m just wondering whether people might be thinking perhaps see something that’s just not right? I would just suggest this might be opportunity to maybe think about whether something has changed? just throw that out there as a suggestion.

5. Elections of Senate Secretary and Librarian for AY 2015-2016

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC: I think, any other comments or questions? All right the next item on the agenda is the elections of the Senate Secretary and Librarian for the next academic year. Beating the bush again today, I guess it worked a little bit. Actually, Marc Cyr, who most of you probably know, has been re-elected to the Senate for next year, and he is the only one who expressed a clear willingness to be the Senate Secretary next year. Are there any other nominations from the floor? Seeing none, shall we elect Marc by acclamation? Two people today expressed interest to be Librarian for next year. Jessica Minihan and Ruth Baker. Are there any other nominations? Do I have a motion to close the nominations? Second? Just checking it’s actually been a while since we had an election. Jessica Minihan and Ruth, would you care to step outside? I guess Ruth is not here. All in favor of Jessica Minihan for Librarian for next year, please raise your hand. All in favor of Ruth Baker please raise your hand. For Jessica Minihan? All right. Now for the first of our motions. James Woods Amendment to the Bylaws Resignation of Senate Officers.

6. MOTION: Senate By-Laws Amendment: Resignation of Senate Officers (SEC motion, James Woods (CLASS)) This is a motion that came out of the Senate Executive Committee and it reads “Amend Section 10: Should any of the Senate officers resign during their terms, an election to fill the remainder of the term shall take place at the next regular Senate meeting. If the Senate Moderator resigns, the Senate Executive Committee shall meet immediately to elect a pro-tem moderator from among their members. Should the Librarian or Secretary resign, the Moderator shall fill that position until the election can be held.”

The rationale, “The By-laws currently do not state what should be done in the event of such a resignation. This motion codifies what was done AY 2014-15 upon the resignation of both the Librarian and Secretary and provides for the event of the resignation of the Moderator.”

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Okay, this is a Bylaws Amendment and as a Committee proposal does not require a second. It has been advertised in advance, which meets the requirements for amending the Bylaws. Is there any discussion on this amendment to the Bylaws?
James Woods (CLASS): I believe it is to fill them by appointment. Is that correct?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: No, will fill them period until the next Senate meeting. Like I did this year. My thinking was that the moderator gets a course release that other officers do not so that’s hopefully the right thing. Any other discussion? Seeing none, all in favor please say aye. All opposed? That motion is approved. Another motion to amend the Bylaws, James Stephens.

7. **MOTION: Senate By-Laws Amendment: Full-Time Administrators not Eligible (SEC motion, James Stephens (JPHCOPH))** The motion title is Full-Time Administrators not Eligible. “Amend Article II, Section 1 of the Faculty Senate By-Laws to add paragraph d as follows: “d. members of the faculty who are full-time administrators (distinguished by an administrative contract or no teaching duties) are not eligible to serve as senators or on senate committees. Should a senator (or committee member) accept a full-time twelve months administrative position, whether permanent or interim, that individual should resign from their senate seat and/or all committees on which they are serving.” The rationale “A motion to this “requesting” this was adopted by the Senate on November 27, 2012 and approved by the President. This has been the traditional practice for some time. However, that motion did not amend the by-laws; this motion makes that intent clearer.”

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Once again, this is an SEC Committee recommendation for a Bylaws amendment, so it does not require a second. Is there any discussion on this motion?

Rob Pirro (CLASS): So has it worked the last two years? Does anybody know of any negative consequences from this practice?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: I know of none. We did have some discussion on what we call an administrator, but I know of no negative consequences. Any other discussion? Seeing none, all in favor please say aye. All opposed? The motion carries. Another motion on appeals. Lowell Mooney, please.

8. **MOTION: Procedure for Appeals (Revision of Handbook Section 210) (SEC motion, Lowell Mooney, COBA):** Back in 2013, Section 210 of the Faculty Handbook on Appeals, Promotion and Tenure decisions was administratively changed to the current language. The SEC would like to remove that revised 210 to return the language and it would read as follows: “Appeals of post-tenure, tenure, and promotion review recommendations made by department or college committees or department/unit chairs must first be carried out according to college procedures, but may culminate in an appeal for reconsideration of the recommendation to the dean. Colleges should structure their timetables to allow for appeals to be acted upon in advance of the due date of the college recommendations to the Provost. Recommendations made by a dean may be appealed to the Provost within 14 calendar days of notification of the decision.” That’s the original paragraph then we wish to add a clarifying sentence that reads as follows: “Final decisions are made by the president. In accordance with BOR Policy Manual
Section 8.6, any appeal of the president’s decision must be made to the USG Board’s Office of Legal Affairs.”

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Once again, that’s a SEC Committee motion in response to some things that occurred when people realized that 210 had been changed back in December, so it doesn’t require a second. Is there any discussion?

Mark Hanna (COBA): Just a question of clarification. Does this suggest then that there’s already appeal of the department chair’s decision?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Excuse me. There what?

Mark Hanna (COBA): There’s an appeal to the Department Chair’s decision?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: The department chair’s decision being appealed to the dean as long as that’s in your college handbook.

Mark Hanna (COBA): I see. As I recall, our own college handbook the procedure for an appeal to the department chair for the department chair’s decision to the dean for the dean’s decision, and I’m wondering if this comports to that recollection.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: I’m not sure. I’m not familiar with the COBA policies, but normally an appeal of a decision or a recommendation, excuse me, is until you get to the president’s level, it’s all recommendations. An appeal of a recommendation at one level, level A, would then get appealed to the next level up, Level B. So if you to appeal the department chair’s decision, that appeal would go through the dean’s office. Appeal for the recommendation from the dean would be appealed to the provost and so on.

Mark Hanna (COBA): It seems the dean would get the department chair’s recommendation in any case.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: I’m not sure I follow you.

Mark Hanna (COBA): To appeal to the department chair’s decision, does not lead to reversal of a decision, if it would, the dean would not need considering the matter in any case.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: It could. What you’re doing to appeal the department chair’s recommendation it’s not a decision, is you’re asking them to reconsider it for whatever reason and a dean could very well say, oops I don’t agree with that recommendation and I’m going to change it. I do know personally a case that the provost had overturned recommendations made by deans.
Mark Hanna (COBA): that would happen in the normal course of the packet moving forward without regard to any appeal potentially. If the dean disagrees with the department chair’s decision, the appeal is superfluous.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Could well be, yes, in terms of that negative recommendation from the department chair to the dean, the dean certainly has the option for not agreeing with that recommendation.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I could be wrong about this, but my sense is that in appealing to the next higher level what it does is it gives the faculty member sort of like a rebuttal chance instead of the report going as it is, up to the next level, it’s sort of a chance to do a yes vote rebuttal.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: I think it is, but also could be a chance to gather new facts. Any further discussion or questions? All in favor of the motion to basically change back Section 210 of the Handbook to what it used to be please say aye. All opposed? That motion is approved. Motion about granting departmental tenure for non-department hires. ie. administrative hires.

9. **MOTION: Policy re: Granting Departmental Tenure or Tenure-Track Status to Non-Departmental Hires (Marshall Ransom, COSM, for Marc Cyr, CLASS):** This motion involves two changes to the Faculty Handbook. Amend Section 209 (Tenure Guidelines) Should I read all the language in this motion?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: I think you would just read the motion.

Marshall Ransom (COSM): Okay. “Section 209 (Tenure Guidelines) “In considering the tenure of an academic administrator (vice president, dean, department chair), the immediate supervisor must obtain the appropriate input from the tenured faculty in the academic department involved. Decisions regarding tenure of an academic administrator will be based upon the criteria outlined above and below and will be independent of administrative performance.”

“While such an individual holds the administrative position for which he or she was hired, his or her “faculty line” will in no way impact or circumvent the concerned department’s ability to seek new and/or fill other tenure-track or tenured lines as needed to staff the department’s programs.” and the language related to this type of decision, administrative decision. Amend Section 222 of the Faculty handbook currently titled “(Salary for a Fiscal Year Administrative Employee Returning to an Academic Appointment as a Faculty member). First, To (amend the title) “Administrative Employees Returning to an Academic Appointment as a Faculty member. “The Board of Regents Policy Manual (§8.3.12.1 [correction 8.13.12.2]) states “When a fiscal year administrative employee returns to an academic appointment as a faculty member, the salary shall be determined on the same basis as other faculty members with similar rank and experience within the department to which he/she returns or in other similar positions within the institution.”
“When such an individual leaves his/her administrative position and takes up a faculty line in the concerned department, that line will be supernumerary and will in no way impact or circumvent the department's ability to add new and/or fill other tenure track or tenured lines as needed to staff the department’s programs.”

The rationale “These changes put into writing the verbally stated intent of administration on the potential impact of an individual originally hired as an administrator who decides to step back into a faculty line. Such administrators typically require an “academic home” upon hire, but have never actually served as faculty in that department. Upon stepping down, their “faculty line” shall be in addition to any that exist in the department.”

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Once again, this is a motion from the SEC as a whole, so it does not need a second. Is there any discussion?

James Woods (CLASS): I’d like to, Marshall read that, he added a word in the first paragraph, the tenure of an academic department, it’s not the actual motion.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Excuse me, that was a change requested, I didn’t get it in the, that was a new addition that was requested by Dr. Keel when he reviewed the motion.

James Woods (CLASS): Okay. I’m sorry, I just noticed the difference.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: That was a note that has been added since it was published.

Li Li (CHHS): Sorry that I was not there when SEC discussed this. Does this mean there will be an additional faculty line?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: In essence, yes.

Li Li (CHHS): Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Put it this way. Motion has come through, I have not heard any quarrels from either Dr. Bartels or Dr. Keel about it. At this point, they both said “yes” when I showed them the motion that this was putting in writing. Any other discussion?

(Speaker did not identify themselves) sure, but the motion states that the Board of Regents Policy Manual states that and the Section is (§8.3.12.1). I think the section we are referring to is (§8.3.12.2), but then the quotes encompass the new material which is part of this motion which is not included in the Board of Regents Policy Manual. The Board of Regents Policy Manual stops before the sentence
which reads “When such an employee leaves his/her academic position,” and so it may be best to move the quotation marks to make that clearer.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: It seems to me that is the case. Any other discussion? Seeing none, all in favor please say aye. Opposed? The motions carry. All right. As I said earlier, the Parliamentarian said that to bring something off the table should be in old business and that motion has moved down. We have another motion from the SEC about requiring outside letters and James Harris is not here so Lowell Mooney will introduce that motion.

10. **MOTION: Outside Letters for Special Faculty Evaluations (SEC motion, Lowell Mooney (COBA)):** Just the rationale here: Several colleges (CEIT, CLASS, COSM, JPHCOPH) currently require these outside recommendation letters for tenure and promotion decisions. The President and Provost expressed their support for such letters. I think the person who submitted this proposal would like to make it uniform across the campus with regard to these letters. I know COBA we are working on a policy ourselves for our college. So the SEC would like to amend Section 205.06 of the Faculty Handbook paragraph B (Faculty input and initiative) to add subparagraph 4 as follows: “Each faculty member undergoing either a promotion or tenure review shall submit to his/her chair or unit head the names and contact information of at least three qualified individuals not directly involved in the faculty member’s work (i.e., have not been involved as a mentor or close collaborator) who can objectively review the faculty member’s portfolio. The individuals should be experts in the faculty member’s field and hold an academic appointment at the rank of Associate Professor or above at an institution at least similar to Georgia Southern. The department chair shall solicit letters from two of the individuals that address the quality of work performed and readiness of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. The department chair in association with the Tenure and Promotion Committee chair may also solicit up to two additional letters.”

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Once again, it’s a committee motion, it doesn’t require a second. Is there any discussion?

(Speaker did not identify themselves) Could you read the rationale please?

Lowell Mooney (COBA): The rationale “At least four colleges (CEIT, CLASS, COSM, JPHCOPH) require outside recommendation letters for tenure and promotion, but procedures and the number of required letters vary. This motion seeks to make that more uniform across the entire campus. Further, President Keel has stated publicly that those outside letters help both him and the Provost in making their decisions, especially in cases where there was division of opinion at lower levels.”

(Speaker did not identify themselves) Just for the sake of the takeaway message, what is changed?

Rob Pirro (CLASS): So this is motion would ask for require at least four names be submitted two from the candidate and two from the department chair?
Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: No, it requires the candidate to submit at least three names from which the chair will pick two, and the chair could request at most two other letters.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): I understand that is the case, but say that two or three of these academic choose not to write a letter, what, is this motion going to require that there are four letters in that case, or just require that at least four people be solicited?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: It actually requires two people be solicited. The Department Chair may request two more letters.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): Once again, I’m sorry for the confusion that I have, but at the end of the day it’s just setting a requirement for solicitation for the number of letters in the file, I guess.

Lowell Mooney (COBA): I believe the intent is to have the letters, so if John refuses to write a letter, then the candidate may have to submit an additional name.

Nan LoBue (CLASS): I’m just wondering if this change would also apply to lecturers who are being promoted to senior lecturers?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: It should, yes.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I’m wondering if we could clarify the phrase “at an institution at least similar to Georgia Southern.” I, at least similar, in what? Number of students? Wonder if they call that “Carnegie” yeah, I mean, I guess I’m not sure about the phrase “at an institution at least.”

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: I think that, taken with a little bit of leniency, I mean, we wouldn’t want to talk to Ogeechee Tech or East Georgia, for example, they’re not similar to us. But I don’t think we’d want to be restrictive that it must be on our peer and aspirational list, for example.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): This is actually related to Nan LoBue’s question. So you said that it probably would also apply, I’m not exactly sure we hire instructors, where are they related? They are not hired to do research. Is there reputation as an incredible instructor supposed to spread throughout the country? We’re only going to get outside unrelated letters, so that’s, i mean, that’s going to be a problem for some of us hired under the old system where research wasn’t as important. We might have a shot at it, but I’m not so sure about instructors or lecturers.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Lecturers still have a requirement of being active in their profession and professional development, so they’d get letters related to that.
Lowell Mooney (COBA): The motion doesn’t apparently say faculty member’s research portfolio, it just says portfolio. So I would say that faculty members are charged with carrying out research then the portfolio would the same. What I might would like to remind the members just because the SEC put forth these motions, we put forth the motions that were submitted by the faculty members. We may have our own objections to the motions, I worry that if a faculty member solicits, or excuse me, submits two letters in support their application, the faculty member’s department chair doesn’t value letters those people write. Now we have two letter to support, two letters against, I am wondering how that would play out, so has that been considered? I’d like to address in this motion.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS): is the wording of the motion for tenure or promotion to the full professor?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: no, its just promotion or tenure.

Tim Whelan (CLASS): This is just clarification regarding (recording was not clear)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: It’s not new in COSM.

Tim Whelan (CLASS): (recording was not clear).

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Somebody, who, for example, can be a collaborator.

Tim Whelan (CLASS): (recording was not clear) co-authored a paper, conferences, (recording was not clear)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: I don’t know, I think you’ve got to submit the names of people you think can be objective, but I’m not going to submit John Doe, who I’ve never known before.

Tim Whelan (CLASS): (recording was not clear)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: (recording was not clear)

Janice Steirn (CLASS): In my experience, generally it’s somebody that is excluded, but actually it’s the kind of people that you’re mentioning might be sought after to show that you’re really active in the field that you do know a lot of people that go to conferences, your whatever conference, buddies with them, as long as you’re not actually doing the research with them. You don’t want to go out and, I mean, if you’re doing well in your field, you don’t want to avoid everybody that you are intellectually close to, you know, because if you do that, you’re then looking at people in the field that may not be as active. So my sense is as long as you haven’t actually worked together, you know, talking together and stuff is fine.
A couple of years ago there was a part of our faculty governance conversations and motions stated that any changes to tenure and promotion policies need to start at department level then they put this in the Faculty Handbook for department and the dean of the college. Now, the rationale coming from the Senate, or these colleges, decisions at the department level? That’s my first question. Then the second question if we pass this motion here do we still ask faculty in the departments if they approve this or not? In the spirit of this motion?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: the decision that was made a couple of years ago as the criteria of motion and tenure, but not necessarily the process. Somebody correct me if I’m wrong.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: (recording was not clear)

Li Li (CHHS): Sorry, but I wasn’t there for the SEC meeting that discussed this motion. I have a few questions. First question is why, what would non-tenure track promotion be included in the motion? I wouldn’t think that it made sense any type of motion included promotion of non-tenure track. That’s one, and two, who would make the judgement, in regarding if the external reviewers are colleagues or people intimately familiar with the one being reviewed? Who’s the one that actually makes the judgement. Look at here discussions seems like everybody is different when judging this, and we don’t have a clear definition what it is. Then somebody has to make the judgement. And then should we clearly state this in the motion, who’s the one actually making this judgement on the level of the college, on the level of the university, or on the level of the department. All these things need to be specified or specified who’s going to make the judgement. I would recommend the department level, make this judgement. Further, I would suggest that the department chair is the one responsible seeking those recommendation letters. I would suggest the chair of the promotion committee solicit for those letters. And then I think the other thing the rank of people who are making the recommendations should be considered too. If you are seeking for to be promoted to associate professor that would be fine, but if you are seeking for to be promoted to full professor and recommendation should come from a full professor rather than an associate professor.

James Woods (CLASS) I think this changes, I think your point is very good and I think that, I think this motion given the fact that I think a lot of this needs to be figured out, I think this motion needs to be defeated because it needs to be completely amended to represent the concerns of my colleague.

Lowell Mooney (COBA): I definitely see a disconnect because it says each faculty member undergoing either a promotion or tenure review, so that would certainly suggest that lecturers who would be promotion to senior lecturer would be subject to this, then the Associate Professor or above all go with that. So I think that is a legitimate issue. I don’t think the person who submitted this motion, I don’t think they were trying to micromanage this. I don’t think they were trying to dictate every procedure that will be included in this process. I think they were just looking for some overall uniformity between the colleges and they chose that number. The fact that there will be letters. Some colleges don’t currently have letters, can be a reasonable number, you know, obtained by the submitter, by the
applicant and then possibly by the department chair. So I don’t think we’re trying. that this person was trying to use their own authority of a college or a department to set their own tenure and promotion requirements. I think its a higher level than that. If the will of the, should we vote to simply defeat it or should we withdraw?

Rebecca Ziegler: I was going to ask if it is possible for me to make a motion that we withdraw this motion, that we amend it to more carefully defined consideration the issues that have been raised here and the amended motion be brought up at the Senate in the future. Is that permissible by parliamentary procedure?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) I don’t believe so, while this motion is currently on the floor. I think that we can do is vote on this motion and defeat it and then you can make another motion to request this one be redrafted.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I agree that i think the thing to do would be go ahead and vote on it and if we defeat it we can simply make a recommendation to go back to committee. I don’t know that we need a motion for that recommendation.

Lina Soares (COE): Is this not similar to the decision about graduationpractices the first time we made a motion to table it?

Pat Humphrey (COSM): Senate Moderator: Not only table in terms of waiting on new data. Since this one, since it seems the will of the Senate that this motion should be rewritten, that’s a different situation and I think in that case this one should be defeated with a recommendation that it be rewritten. Our parliamentarian says that is Okay, all in favor of the motion as it currently stands, please say aye. All opposed please say nay. Okay that motion is defeated. All right, does anyone want to make a motion or a recommendation about this motion? Or should the SEC just go back to it?

Rebecca Ziegler: I move that motion should be amended in line with the discussion and that be resubmitted

Jim LoBue (COSM): Second.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: There’s been a motion and a second by Jim LoBue. Any discussion of that motion?

Lowell Mooney (COBA): I think if we approve this, then someone doesn’t have to file another motion, request for a motion, so it would be more efficient if approve this. Just speaking in terms of supporting this, Rebecca’s motion.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: All in favor of sending this back for a restudy and a redraft, please say aye. All opposed? The ayes have it so it will be rewritten and redrafted considering some of
the discussion that was held here today. Motion on the evaluation of teaching, which comes out of the Faculty Welfare Committee.

11. **MOTION: Amend Faculty Handbook to better describe the evaluation of teaching (Faculty Welfare Committee, Fred Smith, LIB):** Forgive me for reading, but the last time I saw a transcript of what I sent off the cuff, I said never again. What I am going to say in the beginning here, concerns the rationale and probably a little history. Beginning this work was a recommendation coming from the Ad Hoc Committee on SRI’s at same time last year. That committee found evidence teaching evaluation relying solely on SRIs. In addition to one we recommend some review best practices of evaluation and teaching/ Later, the Faculty Welfare Committee. We discovered early on that there were two problems with that approach. One that to interpret best practices in evaluation and college teaching beyond the expected to do. The second was that ??? discussed it here and ???. it seemed to us that drafting something that ??? the faculty handbook be the better way to do. We spent our first few meetings, examining what is being done now in the colleges and departments around the university. I don’t ???. it seemed to me that many effective procedures are already in place, but there are many approaches out there and when we start talking about what we should say could be required, there wasn’t much ???. so what we have done we think improves what’s there now. Its not a game changer by any means. Two other points: in looking at the current wording in the Faculty Handbook on this topic, some committee members were quick to point out a concept of teaching and learning style ??? knowledgable about this said that current scholarship tells us ??? so we replaced that with the word “multimodal.” The other thing it does paragraph immediately following previous states that SRIs should not be used as a sole factor in evaluation of teaching. That concern ??? taking care of in the fall. The short title the motion to amend the Faculty Handbook to better describe the evaluation of teaching. The motion reads: “The Faculty Welfare Committee moves to amend the paragraph in the Faculty Handbook under Section 205.01 Teaching from: (current wording) “A demonstrated record of superior, effective teaching is the first and most important area of evaluation. Superior teaching is reflective, student-centered, respectful of the diversity of students, adapted to various learning styles, and focused on student learning outcomes. Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the classroom, laboratory, or studio, and direction of research, fulfillment of professional librarian responsibilities, mentoring, and the like. Teaching activities also include the development of new courses, programs, and other curricular materials, including the development of online courses. Judgements of the quality of teaching activities are based on measures such as examination of course syllabi and other course materials, peer evaluations when available, critical review and dissemination of teaching products, performance of students in subsequent venues, follow-up of graduates in graduate school or in their employment, and student ratings of instruction.” Still trying to get it up on the screen. An awful long thing to try to hear it and make sense of.

**** The actual file sent by Fred Smith, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, after senate meeting *****

The beginning point of this work was a recommendation coming from the ad hoc committee on SRIs at this time last year. That committee found evidence of teaching evaluations relying solely on SRIs, and in addition to wanting to put a stop to that, they recommended that someone review best practices on the evaluation of teaching. Later it was decided the Faculty Welfare Committee was a good fit for that assignment.

We discovered early on that there were two problems with that approach. One was that to do a thorough review of best practices in the evaluation of college teaching was beyond what a committee
such as ours could be expected to do. The second was that if we produced such a report, it would be read and discussed here and then likely forgotten. It seemed to us that drafting something which could be codified in the Handbook would be a better way to go.

We spent our first few meetings examining what is being done now in the colleges and departments around the University. I don’t know that anyone voiced this, but it seemed to me that there are many effective review procedures already in place. But there are many approaches out there, and when we started talking about what we would say should be required, there wasn’t much that we could all agree on. So what we ended up with we think improves what is there now, but it is not a game changer by any means.

Two other points: in looking at the current wording in the Faculty Handbook on this topic, some committee members were quick to point out that the concept of “teaching to learning styles” is out of date. People who are knowledgeable about this said that current scholarship tells us this is not valid. So we replaced that with multimodal.

The other thing to know is that the paragraph immediately following this clearly states that SRIs are not to be used as the sole factor in the evaluation of teaching. That concern of last year’s ad hoc committee was taken care of in the fall.

Short title:

Motion to amend the Faculty Handbook to better describe the evaluation of teaching

Motion:

The Faculty Welfare Committee moves to amend the paragraph in the Faculty Handbook under Section 205.01 Teaching from:

A demonstrated record of superior, effective teaching is the first and most important area of evaluation. Superior teaching is reflective, student-centered, respectful of the diversity of students, adapted to various learning styles, and focused on student learning outcomes. Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the classroom, laboratory, or studio, and direction of research, fulfillment of professional librarian responsibilities, mentoring, and the like. Teaching activities also include the development of new courses, programs, and other curricular materials, including the development of online courses. Judgments of the quality of teaching activities are based on measures such as examination of course syllabi and other course materials, peer evaluations when available, critical review and dissemination of teaching products, performance of students in subsequent venues, follow-up of graduates in graduate school or in their employment, and student ratings of instruction.

To:

A demonstrated record of superior, effective teaching is the first and most important area of evaluation. Superior teaching is reflective, student-centered, respectful of the diversity of students, multimodal, and focused on student learning outcomes. Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the classroom, laboratory, or studio, and direction of research, fulfillment of professional librarian responsibilities, mentoring, and the like.
Teaching evaluation procedures should include both formative and summative elements. All teaching evaluation procedures should include a narrative or self evaluation and student ratings of instruction. The narrative should include a description of teaching methods used to achieve or maintain excellence in teaching, description of new course development or course revisions, conferences attended on teaching and learning, college level teaching and learning projects, pedagogy scholarship, contributions toward special teaching initiatives, mentoring of student research and student writing, examples of course syllabi, and other class materials. Further evidence of excellence in teaching can be found in classroom evaluations by peers and/or the department chair, peer assessment, and examination of student work. A teaching evaluation might include any of these kinds of evaluations as well as other evaluation methods not listed here.

---------------------

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Trying to get it put up ???

Fred Smith (LIB): Actually, I’ll just continue to read, go ahead and read the recommended language, or you want me to wait and see if gets

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Yes, please, in case ???

Fred Smith (LIB): Okay, and I will add the first piece of ??? is actually like the current wording. The exception of this wording, multimodal taking the place of teaching and learning style. The new language: “A demonstrated record of superior, effective teaching is the first and most important area of evaluation. Superior teaching is reflective, student-centered, respectful of the diversity of students, multimodal, and focused on student learning outcomes. Teaching represents professional activity directed toward the dissemination of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. Such activity typically involves teaching in the classroom, laboratory, or studio, and direction of research, fulfillment of professional librarian responsibilities, mentoring, and the like.

Okay this is the new piece: “Teaching evaluation procedures should include both formative and summative elements. All teaching evaluation procedures should include a narrative or self evaluation and student ratings of instruction. The narrative should include a description of teaching methods used to achieve or maintain excellence in teaching, description of new course development or course revisions, conferences attended on teaching and learning, college level teaching and learning projects, pedagogy scholarship, contributions toward special teaching initiatives, mentoring of student research and student writing, examples of course syllabi, and other class materials. Further evidence of excellence in teaching can be found in classroom evaluations by peers and/or the department chair, peer assessment, and examination of student work. A teaching evaluation might include any of these kinds of evaluations as well as other evaluation methods not listed here.”

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Okay, we did finally get the wording up on the screen. All right once again this is a committee recommendation. This one comes out of Welfare, so it doesn’t need a second. Is there any discussion?
Marshall Ransom (COSM): I’m not aware of research that says that paying attention to learning styles is counterproductive.

Fred Smith (LIB): I certainly am not either, but there were some people on the committee that about that at the meeting. I don’t know if anybody else

(COE): Learning styles is a, that’s normally used education therefore, using such language

Janice Steirn (CLASS): In Psychology there’s some research that indicates that doing assessment doesn’t really matter because I think the word multimodal would, it’s more like an umbrella term and it will cover people with different learning approaches or whatever. I think it’s a more broad term and it would take care of questions of

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Any other discussion? Seeing none, all in favor please say aye. All opposed? Motion carries. That concludes the at this point we’ll return to old business and we need a motion to bring off the table Mark Hanna’s motion from February. (so moved) Is there a second? That was moved by Jim LoBue and seconded by Li Li. All right, so the motion about improving commencement ceremony participant screening process is back on the floor. We did get new some updated information from Jayne Perkins Brown. I’ll let Mark Hanna say what would like to say at this point.

12. Old Business: MOTION: Bringing off the table Motion on Improving the commencement ceremony participant screening process (Mark Hanna, COBA): Thank you. First I’d like to express appreciation to Dr. Jayne Perkins Brown, the Senior Associate Vice President and Director of Strategic Research and Analysis for providing this clearer picture of the proportion of commencement participants who have and who have not completed their programs of study over recent years. You all should have seen this data. It was distributed on the Senate Listserv. It indicates that the original numbers were given in response to my RFI last fall were in fact misleading. The current data suggests that the proportion of participants over the last five spring commencement ceremonies who had not completed their program of study before the end of summer averaged 2.3% so significantly less that what we thinking. It ranged from .5% to 4.2% depending on the ceremony. For the December ceremonies, the range was from 9.7% to 12.1% and averaged 9.7% so roughly 1 in 10 participants in December, the commencement ceremonies over the last five years would have not completed their program of study. And then the summer, or sorry, spring ceremony the proportion was more like 2.3%. As yet, we have not been able to obtain the additional information the Senate was looking for when this motion first came forward, which you all asked for had to do with the characteristics of the individuals who were participating or it wasn’t that they were participating without having yet finished their program of study. Dr. Perkins Brown suggested that considerable effort would be required to retrospectively determine the breakdown of what was lacking for each of these individuals, going through file by file, personally that this sort of information was not readily available through a database search. So it would be perhaps possible to get this data going forward as the Registrar’s office determines whether or not to award a
degree. Whether the individuals are considering participating or not to participate in the ceremony. However, the administration hasn’t yet determined that they’re willing to bear the cost of such an endeavor. So that’s kind of where we are datawise. One thing that the current data are sufficient to demonstrate is that we do have a substantial pool of students who are very close to graduation, sorry, very close to completing their program of study, that are no longer making progress toward graduation, for example, based on the most recent data that we have it’s clear that over 250 students who were expected to graduate during the 09-2010 academic year, had not graduated five years later at the beginning of this academic year. I believe we need to understand the characteristics of this pool of students that have applied for graduation, yet I would say using maybe borrowing a term from some of our math colleagues that are complete ??? so this group of students that complete ??? for extended periods of time indeed including many students who will never graduate is a pool of students that we need to understand better. I think that is especially true if in their future our funding will be tied to graduation rates in any meaningful way. So what’s the way forward? In COBA, we have a committee that deals with the student retention progression and graduation and it’s our intent in that committee to study this pool of graduates among COBA students. It may be possible or of interest to faculty in other colleges to see something similar, so, too, the advisory centers may have interest or may in fact be willing to support this type of effort. Perhaps by studying these nearly complete students we can find a way forward to reduce the size of the pool of students that are complete ??? . In any case, it seems that the current motion perhaps is outlived its usefulness within the distance between the motion and the availability and willingness to ??? on the part of the institution, so with that in mind, I would respectfully, for the time being, withdraw the motion. Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: All right. Our parliamentarian agrees with me that a person who made the motion, withdraws it. We no longer have a motion. We no longer have a motion. I think we did do some good work in terms of digging into some of the numbers and finding out what’s going on. Hopefully, we’ll possibly continue that. At this point, is there any other old business? Is there any new business? Are there any announcements from the vice presidents?

13. New Business

None

14. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Russell Keen (External Affairs): I wanted to mention to this body that we had the fortune of hosting Georgia Nurse Management Administration on campus when they did their strategic planning and we just special thanks to Suzanne Tatum in my office, but also Vice President Teresa Thompson, and Dr. Jayne Perkins Brown, Todd Deal, Amy Ballagh, Steve Hein, they put on a great couple of days for them and execute a path forward. This really powerful administrative agency in the state of Georgia and they go back to Atlanta talking about Georgia Southern. Personally, I think we’ll see more agencies and things of that nature will come to us for this type of leadership. Also, I wanted to mention to this body that April 29 and May 1, the Georgia Student Finance Commission will be meeting on campus. There’ll be some details from this the afternoon of the 29th, and then that next morning in the Nesssmith-Lane building and of course, we are very close to Georgia Student Finance Commission as they work to providing student aid to the students of Georgia, so I just want to say thank you.
15. Announcements from the Floor

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Are there any announcements from the floor?

Fred Smith (LIB): This not really an announcement, just a couple suggestions. Last year, the Faculty Welfare Committee had a project that we ended up calling a bunch of long-serving chairs, assessment chairs, trying to pick their brains about university service and one thing that several of them said something to the effect that I’m not willing to award with Professor Smith any credit for service because his name is not on the list of members of an award, so anyway one little thing that we could do to help ourselves in that regard, if you do not chair any sort of committee, a Senate committee, a Task Force or anything else like that around the university, at the of the year, take a few minutes and write a little formal letter to the person’s chair and just say what the committee accomplished, what kind of time commitment that it was, and anything special like good ideas that took your notes or whatever and if you want to say something about points of university service and that kind of thing. If the person is a no-show just skip that person. You know, or those people that never come to the meeting, just don’t do it for that person. Anyway just a thought. The other thing is that the summer meeting last year, we didn’t have a quorum and I don’t know who was there, but I think it was very short, we had to sit around for about 3 to 5 minutes hoping for a quorum and some motions that were prepared and all this stuff so as it occurred to everybody to get in touch with your alternates and lets try to avoid that.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Absolutely. Our next meeting is the June meeting which is the last one for this academic year. And please, people, come. I know that, just to add to something Fred Smith said I know that both Dr. Keel and Dr. Bartels are big on service, i.e., did you just have a name on the list of committees, or did you actually do something so Fred’s idea of a letter that says what somebody actually did would be good use.

Lowell Mooney (COBA): Can we get an update on how our capital campaign is going on while she was here?

Russell Keen (External Affairs): She had to leave early. My understanding is that they are working on the statements right now.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Any other announcements from the floor?

Rebecca Ziegler: Question: when is the next meeting?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Hang on. Tuesday, June 2nd.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): And just a reminder, especially for anybody new, we won’t be meeting here. We meet at the Nessmith-Lane, so especially for people in their first year. I know my first year I came over here. I
Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Any other announcements? Do I have a motion to adjourn? all in favor. We’ll see you Tuesday, June 2nd, 4:00 p.m. in the Nessmith-Lane Building.

Faculty Senate Minutes  
June 2, 2015  
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.  
Nessmith-Lane Assembly Hall

***************************************************************

• Brief summary, pp 1-3  
• Full Minutes, pp 4-23  

Note: There was not enough microphone for everyone at this location. The recording was not a complete record of the meeting. We have to work with what we had for this Minutes,

***************************************************************

Voting Members in Attendance: Lisa Abbott; Debbie Allen; Olga Amarie; Scott Beck for Yasar Bodur; Larisa Elisha; Steven Elisha; Frank Goforth; Ellen Hamilton; Mark Hanna; Jim Harris; Pat Humphrey; Emil Iacob for Alina Iacob; Scott Kersey; Enka Lakuriqi for Marshall Ransom; Shainaz Landge; Li Li; Jim LoBue; Nan LoBue; Lawrence Locker; Alan Mackelprang; Bryan Miller; Jessica Minihan; Aniruddha Mitra; Lowell Mooney; Clint Martin for Shahnam Navaee; Rob Pirro; Edward Rushton; Lina Soares; Janice Steirn; Meca Williams-Johnson; James Woods; Rebecca Ziegler

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Helen Bland; Sally Ann Brown; John Brown; John Dyer; Richard Flynn; Tim Giles; Lucy Green; June Joyner; Lindsay Larson; Karen McCurdy; Marla Morris; Linda Mullen; Mosfequr Rahman; Joseph Ruhland; Susan Smith; Erroll Spence; Jim Stephens; Kathy Thornton; Tim Whelan; Lisa Yocco; Jianqiang Zhao

Administrators in Attendance: Brooks Keel; Jean Bartels; Rob Whitaker; Mohammad Davoud; Greg Evans; Barry Joyner; Thomas Koballa;

Visitors: Evans Afriyie-Gyawu; Lydia Cross; Naronda Wright; Candace Griffith; Diana Cone; Trent Maurer; Cheryl Aasheim; Jayne Perkins-Brown, Chris Geyerman.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the June 2, 2015 meeting.

Approved without discussion.

2. Approval of the April 21, 2015 Minutes: Li Li (CHHS), Senate Secretary.

Approved without discussion.

3. Librarian’s Reports for June 2015 Jessica Minihan (LIB), Senate Librarian.

Accepted without discussion.
a. Undergraduate Committee Report, March and April 2015 (Cheryl Aasheim, CEIT):
Accepted without discussion.

b. Graduate Committee Report, April 2015 Minutes (Bob Fernekes, LIB): Rebecca Ziegler (LIB):
Accepted without discussion.

c. Faculty Athletic Representative Report (Chris Geyerman, CLASS)
d. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee – no report (no regular committee meetings in March or April)
Neither reports were presented nor discussed

4. President’s Report (Brooks Keel):

FY16 Budget
Recommendation of $33.6 million for a new academic classroom building
$1 million recurring budget for Advanced Manufacturing

Faculty Athletic Representative
Chris Geyerman will serve his third six term as Faculty Athletic Representative

SACSCOC
Jean Bartels (Provost):
We did receive the final SACSCOC initial report;
SACSCOC Board review will take place in September;
The decision being rendered on the report in December;
The two recommendations that we received: 1). related to our assessment plans and 2). had to do with one of the outcomes in the QEP plan. It was really a very clean report.

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

It’s been really quiet for the SEC.

There is a long-term (20-30 years) conceptual plan for the 208 acres that we now have across the bypass, the plan will continue to evolve.

7. **Motion on Outside Letters for Tenure and Promotion (Jim Harris, CEIT):**

Approved after lengthy discussion. – T / P portfolio should have outside letters for evaluation.

8. **Unfinished Business:** None
9. **New Business**

Senate meeting calendar was discussed with no change resulting from the discussion.

10. Announcements: Vice Presidents
11. Announcements from the Floor
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13. Approval of the Agenda for the June 2, 2015 meeting.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: recording starts here: (so moved) hear a second? (second) All in favor of approving the agenda please say aye? All opposed? The agenda is approved. Li Li, would you like to step forward and move for your April minutes? You’ll notice we have microphones at the front.

14. Approval of the April 21, 2015 Minutes: Li Li (CHHS), Senate Secretary. Okay, Madam Moderator, I will present to this body the last minutes and I submit them for approval.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Is there a second to that motion? (second) Is there any discussion of the April minutes? Seeing none all in favor of approving the minutes of the April 21st meeting, please say aye. All opposed? The minutes are approved. Jessica, Librarian’s Report.

15. Librarian’s Reports for June 2015 Jessica Minihan (LIB), Senate Librarian. I’d like to submit the June 2nd, Senate Librarian’s Report, and I would like to comment that there was some confusion about whether or not the Undergraduate Committee Report from September 2, 2014, had been approved and so I added it, but it turns out it had been approved so.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: There was confusion and it was approved at the November meeting. Ginger found the memo. Any discussion of the Librarian’s Report? All in favor of accepting the Librarian’s Report, recognizing that by accepting it we are just recognizing that the committee have reported truthfully in their own actions and we are not endorsing those unless they come in a separate motion, please say aye. All opposed? The ayes have it. Thank you, Jessica. Undergraduate Committee Report, Cheryl Aasheim. We have two sets of minutes, March and April.

e. Undergraduate Committee Report, March and April 2015 (Cheryl Aasheim, CEIT): The committee (inaudible) We met on March 10, 2015 and at a (inaudible) meeting we had 11 course revisions, two revised programs, and, in addition, we discussed
the process for doing program reviews. In the April 7, 2015, meeting we unanimously approved the program reviews, there were 15 reviews done campus-wide, and then in addition we approved 12 course revisions, five new courses, six deleted courses, four program revisions, one new program, that was the BS in IT (inaudible) Math Department, and then we had one revised program, one review program, that was a BBA in Regional Health, and one selected topic. I’d like to move that both sets of minutes be, make a motion.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: All right. That is a motion from the Undergraduate Committee so it doesn’t require a second. Is there discussion of these program course changes by the Undergraduate Committee? Seeing none all in favor of approving these changes and forwarding them to the Provost and President please say aye. All opposed? Thank you, Cheryl, your recommendations are approved by the Senate.

f. Graduate Committee Report, April 2015 Minutes (Bob Fernekes, LIB): Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): And I’m reporting on the Under, sorry on the Graduate Committee April 9, 2015. And the minutes are included in the Librarian’s Report. We heard, some highlights from the Dean’s update included comments on the SACSCOC onsite visit, and the Chairs update. The committee discussed and submitted the Graduate Committee reports for the Masters of Science and Sport Management and the Masters of Science in Mathematics program reviews. Under new business, the Graduate Committee approved curriculum items from the College of Engineering and Information Technology, the College of Science and Mathematics, and the College of Education. And I would just like to add that we had quite a lively discussion regarding some issues raised by the SACSCOC visit, and the program reviews and comments from that discussion are in italics in the minutes, and we moved to especially call these to the attention of the Provost’s Office and everyone else, so I move to approve the Graduate Committee Minutes.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Thank you. This, again, is a committee recommendation so it doesn’t need a second. Is there any discussion about what’s included in the Graduate Committee’s report and recommendations? Seeing none all in favor please say aye. All opposed? Thank you. Those are approved. I saw Chris Geyerman here earlier, then I saw him leave. There was a report from the FAR-Faculty Athletic Representative, and so I thought I’d just bring it up and point out mostly it was about GPAs for athletes. I was actually pretty darn pleased at some of the GPAs our athletes have had. The women’s volleyball team had a 3.62 collective GPA for spring semester, the men’s tennis a-3.58 and even basketball and football were up close to 3.0. So those are pretty darn good numbers for our student-athletes. There’s no report from the Gen Ed and Core Curriculum Committee because they had no regular meetings in March or April, mostly they had (inaudible) about course assessment, as I well know. So next on the agenda is the President’s Report.

g. Faculty Athletic Representative Report (Chris Geyerman, CLASS)
h. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee – no report (no regular committee meetings in March or April)

16. President’s Report (Brooks Keel): Good afternoon. My report will be fairly brief.
FY16 Budget

The main thing I wanted to, of course, you probably know that Governor Deal was on campus several weeks back and he signed into law the budget for FY16. Included in that budget was the recommendation of $33.6 million for a new academic classroom building. So that was the final step in the approval process, budgetary process for that project. It's just the beginning of all the approval processes we have to go through at the System office in terms of planning, design, construction management firms and architectural firms, etc, for that building. We will begin the planning process for that building, the Provost is already giving thought to what the best position to put us in in terms of that. She will be seeking input from the various entities that are going into that building to assist with making sure we design in the most efficacious and efficient way that we possibly can. To refresh your memory, we will be essentially replacing four temporary buildings, I believe, Rob, if that's not correct, including the Forest Drive building which is the biggest building on campus that we will replace. In addition to that there are several other temporary buildings on campus and (inaudible) the individuals who are in those buildings will be placed in (inaudible) classroom buildings, so the opportunity for a great deal of discussion about who goes in the building is going to be limited basically to who's going to be essentially replacing temporary classroom buildings, with Forest Drive being the major one. We are very excited about the opportunity to be able to construct this building obviously. Something that I know so many of you have known much better than I have because you have have been in that building for a long long time. You were promised it was temporary and no one told you temporary was going to turn into twenty years or more, so hopefully we won't have any more such buildings on campus in the future, but we are excited about that. I would suspect that from today, it will probably be about two years before actual move-in day and that's pretty good estimate. About a year, nine months to a year planning, design and then about 12 to 18 months construction. Its different that what you see (inaudible) Very excited about that and tremendous support from the legislature for that particular project. In addition to the Governor also signing into law including the $1 million recurring, that's not a $1 million at one time, that's every year a $1 million added to our budget for Advanced Manufacturing which will allow us to jumpstart our degree program in Manufacturing Engineering. We are also very very excited about. This fits in very well with the Governor’s plan for economic development especially in this part of the state and will allow us to put into place a degree program that the workforce needs for manufacturing in this part of the state in the future. Dr. Davoud is here, I believe we enroll, we start the first this coming fall, so if I’m not mistaken. If you look at The Chronicle of Higher Education look at the May 29th issue. In there is a full-page ad that we just submitted that sort of kicks off our Manufacturing Engineering program and lets the rest of the world know what we are doing. We’ll also be placing several smaller ads in other trade journals associated with manufacturing to the the world know what we’re doing and then Dr. Davoud (inaudible) of Engineering will begin the process to search for a new chair of that department and for faculty (inaudible) to get that up and going and again we are very excited about what that’s going to do for our old (inaudible) program and being able to meet the economic development of the state in the future. I think that’s (inaudible)

Faculty Athletic Representative

I do want to mention it is time for Faculty Senate to make a recommendation to the President regarding the Faculty Athletic Representative. As you all know currently that is Chris Geyerman. Several months back the Senate approved a motion that changed the structure of that position
so that a existing FAR could serve multiple consecutive terms. It used to be term limited where the person could serve a couple of terms and the he or she had to by definition step out. This does allow this person to continue. However, you still have the authority and the opportunity to recommend a different person if you so choose. We will be coming to you the first meeting in the Spring, Fall, sorry, first meeting in the Fall, thank you, first meeting in the Fall and ask you to make that recommendation and nomination to me. Dr. Geyerman has generously agreed to continue in his role. if that is who you’d like to see in that position, I encourage you to do so. He’s done a fantastic job as our University FAR and this does not make him lifetime FAR, but it does put him in this position for a period of time. You’ll have an opportunity in the future to replace him if you so desire. So that will soon be coming to you and it will be in the early Fall. Any questions on anything I’ve not covered or anything that’s on your mind?

?? How long has he been in that role and how long will the next term be?

Brooks Keel (President): Right. The question was how long has Chris Geyerman been in that role and how long will be be in the future, and the answer I don’t know the answer to that. That’s a very good question. Pat may know?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: The term is six years and he is currently serving the second term.

Brooks Keel (President): Now there is a stipulation, just so you know, that if you do decide to put a new person in to replace Chris, there is a nine-month or so interim transition period. It allows the new person to sort of shadow the existing person. Chris’ position actually doesn’t expire until 2016, if I’m not mistaken, but because of that requirement for a transition, you’ll need to make a recommendation to me now so that we can be sure that we can be sure that (inaudible) so desire.

?? Ask President Keel, (inaudible) department (inaudible) will we have an opportunity to look at how the design?

Brooks Keel (President): I’m going to refer that question, the question was whether or not the History Department and right, would have an opportunity to have an input (inaudible) I want to defer that to the Provost.

Jean Bartels (Provost): Actually, we’re just deciding on occupants for the new building. So it won’t necessarily be an automatic that your (inaudible) new buildings. It will probably be a CLASS though. Reconfiguration of where the programs are located. Whatever programs are identified to be in the new building will have faculty and dean representation in the whole planning process. So there’ll be an opportunity for input in terms of what kind of space you feel like you need and what you might want to do.

?? so the Forest Drive, (inaudible) Forest Drive (inaudible)
Brooks Keel (President): I think that’s a fair statement, yes. Anything else? Thank you very much.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: When I last spoke with Dr. Bartels about a week and a half ago, I went to a conference last week, she said she didn’t have a report at that time. Has anything changed?

**SACSCOC**

Jean Bartels (Provost): What I can report, just one thing that did occur this week, we did receive the final SACSCOC initial report. This is not, this is the report that our visiting onsite team submitted to the SACSCOC Board for another review. That review will take place in September. The decision being rendered on the report in December, actually in a meeting. I can tell you that the two recommendations that we received did continue into that report. The two recommendations, well, one recommendation was and we’ll be responding to both of these which I think probably will clear them off the table, but one recommendation was again related to our (inaudible) assessment plans. They identified, the team identified somewhere in the neighborhood of 20 programs they didn’t see evidence that the assessment data had been used to generate any change in the program. I didn’t see any (inaudible) that said it had to be 100%, but apparently they took that fairly thoroughly. We will have those results from them, and then we will be able to document all programs have been done that by this September through submission of our response to the document, so I anticipate that that probably will be modified and not be a tremendous problem for us. The other recommendation had to do with one of the outcomes in the QEP plan. They thought that it was a little hard to measure and we think they just didn’t read it very carefully in terms of what the assessment plan was for that. So we will provide more documentation about that as well. But that’s the only recommendations. It was really a very clean report. They had a lot of very positive things to say (inaudible) campus from people to resources to facilities, so the report actually was quite good, and we’ll take care of those other issues in it. We have the option to (inaudible) for September submissions, so (inaudible) that’s really the only thing that I have, unless you have questions.

17. Senate Executive Committee Report: (Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair.) It’s been really quiet for the SEC. It’s been so quiet the we didn’t even meet before this meeting. There were no requests for information. There were no agenda items submitted by anyone other than the SEC, except for Rob Whitaker who wanted to talk to us about what was going to be going on the other side of the Bypass in the long range future. There has been a lot of chatter from the USG Faculty Council. Some of you may or may not seen some articles in some of the newspapers around the state regarding Presidential Salaries, especially those who are the presidents of Georgia State and Georgia Tech and UGA. I’m not sure what’s going to happen there. We are talking about there. We were talking about that in a special meeting of the USGFC to try and say something to the Board who certainly seems to recognize some stellar university presidents. We would certainly like them to recognize some stellar faculty a little bit more than they have, but we will see about that. That’s really all I have to say unless anybody has any questions for me at this point. Well, I’ll turn it over to Rob Whitaker.
Land Acquisition Master Plan Report (Rob Whitaker, VP Business and Finance): Thank y’all very much for allowing me a chance to come and present to you and seek some input on what we’ve done internally in the Division of Facilities Services on a long-term conceptual plan for the 208 acres that we now have across the bypass. I do want to emphasize long-term, (inaudible) but 20 to 30 years. I don’t even think I’m going to be here that long, so it is very long term. It’s very conceptual. We’ve used the expertise of our University architect, our landscape architect, construction manager within the division to help us develop this plan. Its also very important to recognize that this plan will continue to evolve. It will evolve based on (inaudible). What I’m going to ask you to do is, all the faculty and staff, to do is just to submit information, edits, comments, thoughts, as it relates to what we show you today. So it will continue to evolve it, it will also evolve as we evolve as a university going forward based on our objectives in the future. Our plan is going to be that after this meeting in the next week, we’re going to send out a GSU News email to all faculty and staff. It’s going to have the link that’s up there at the top so you don’t have to worry about trying to write this down, and I’m not going to share it with you today. i just want to show you the page, but you’ll have that link. That link will allow you to go through all of the information and I’m going to kind of review with you all as well today and then at the bottom there’s a survey that’s really what we want folks to do is to hit that survey link to go over to a survey and provide some comments and feedback back to us so we can make sure that what we develop right now currently looks like what the majority of the population of the campus also thinks is a good idea for that 280 acres. Alright, let’s see, when you get the email, you click on the link, basically you are going to go to this web page. There’s some introductory information to kind of welcome you to the site. There’s going to be two graphics, You click on the main graphic and both sides will come up and I don’t know if y’all can see the left side as well, the left side is a 3-D map, can we turn the lights down? I can do that. Oh, you are going to get me in trouble like I’ve never had before. You can tell I’m not a professor. Now I can’t read anything I wrote. So you’re going to have two graphics up here. The left side of the graphic is going to be one a 3-D picture of the land. The right side, which is probably will help you understand what we want to develop as a plan as a color-graphic that kind of lays out the different buildings and it gives them a component for each building. There are two things that are important to understand as we develop the plan for this site. There are considerable amount of wetlands on this site. You'll notice there are green trees on the left side. I didn’t bring a pointer with me, but I see green trees on the left, component side, and there are also recognized by the, identified by green on this side as well. Obviously with wetlands it is a challenge to build in those areas, so we’ve been able to avoid those as much as possible in this plan. There’s also a Georgia Power powerline ease here because right through the middle of the property, and that’s easily on the right graphic kind of goes right through the middle, starts in the right hand corner and goes to your left. I can’t reach or show you, right over that parking lot.

Brooks Keel (President): Use your mouse pointer, Rob.

Rob Whitaker (VP Business and Finance): My mouse pointer? Oh, we are fancy now. It starts right there and goes across the property like that. And that’s why you see a lot of parking spaces underneath that because you can building parking underneath the power line. You can’t obviously build buildings under that power line. But that’s the starting point. We are able to start amassing spaces and buildings on this piece of property. I’ll kind of direct you to the right
hand side because it’s much easier for me to understand that. We basically placed some academic classrooms back in the buildings. They are all represented by the orange around the property. We have some research labs. They’re represented by all the pink on the property. We have some student housing that we’ve placed on the property represented by the yellow. We have support functions represented by brown. And then we have some speciality uses represented by this green. It will be very high level, very conceptual, amassing buildings and trying to keep some level of consistency and groupings of the space of the buildings. Again, as we mentioned, the key is the survey, so that we can gather as much input from faculty and staff on what we’ve developed as this long-range plan. This is the webpage that I just showed you. Here’s that survey. Once the email goes out, the link goes out, to follow the link to this page and then you hit that survey and this is what’s going to pop up. It’s going to be basically another page that will allow you to kind of provide some input. If you don’t tell me who you are and all that, the most important stuff up at the top, the key is that last box right there, that’s that wide open square where we are seeking comments from everybody on campus to try to help us understand what you all see, what you all might not have seen, so we can better guide this process into the future. And that is all I have. And I’ll take any questions from anybody in the group. I see a hand.

?? What kind of enrollment does this plan [(inaudible)]

Rob Whitaker (VP for Business and Finance): Enrollment did not factor into the way we’ve amassed this current plan.

Rob Pirro (CLASS)? (inaudible) First of all, (inaudible) population growth then we might be facing problems in getting our (inaudible) especially in (inaudible) I’m just wondering whether anybody is thinking about that as a (inaudible).

Rob Whitaker (VP Business and Finance): Correct, again, we didn’t take any direct enrollment related data, or any kind of projection of future enrollment to put together this plan. It was more looking at the site itself, thinking about some level of academic research, those important buildings that are necessary for those kind of buildings to come up with what we’ve got right now. And again, that’s why we consider it considerably long-term, conceptual plan.

Brooks Keel (President): One thing I would add to that is obviously enrollment is going to play a significant role in terms of what that part of campus will look like 30 years down the road. For example, housing. We have about 5,000 beds now for our current enrollment. That is adequate for what we need. If we were to get to be 25,000 in say the next 25 years or so, which might not be a question that clearly we would need to take another look at housing. And the housing might become a priority versus research, for example, than say what academic space as the enrollment, was to increase in 25 year time frame, it would be clear we would need more academic space, classroom space and that sort of thing, which would also factor in there as well. But again, as Rob has now emphasized quite a few times, this is very very conceptual and mostly really just aimed to helping us understand where the wetlands are, what we could possibly do, where we might want to think about putting in roads, utilities like sewer and power and that kind of stuff. What you don’t want to do is, say wow it would really be cool to say we
need an engineering research building, that is on the near horizon. That would really be cool to stick it right in the middle of that land and then 20 years from now you say man if we’d just thought about a little bit better we’d know we couldn’t run a utility straight into that thing. So that’s really at this point, it’s really what kind of what this is really aiming at. But at least it does give you a general idea that in 25 years, 30 years down the road, regardless of what happens we have great space that could accommodate virtually anything that we could see.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): My first question was are going to enrollment, but I do appreciate the need for a coordinated plan buildings some place where, what i’m worried about, I think is really related to our if you look all around Statesboro, there are planning the future by building and and i hate for us to see that happen to our campus. I mean that, works very well, like how far is our campus now?

Rob Whitaker (VP Business and Finance): I think our campus right now is about the 4 times the size of that site.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Okay, so we’re enrollment, but we’re talking growth increases. Because we current growth, then, yes, we would be more room for faculty probably people. A lot of buildings are shared, don’t 25% increase in the need for all new buildings and stuff. I mean, I do know a lot of campuses around the country that have engineering and whatever, but, I mean, going to have 25% increase

Brooks Keel (President): You know, at this point, we are looking at the and the worse thing that I think we could do now is to not think that we are ever going to need this and 30 years from now a whole new group of people sitting in this room or a room like it saying I wish that we had thought about this 25 years ago. You know, just because we have the capability of building what you see here doesn’t mean that we will or that this would even look like that, but at least we have the opportunity to expand. We are basically landlocked toward the east and west. There are small parcels of land here, there and yonder around us that could be acquired, but nothing that will allow us to do major construction. We also of these some 600/800 acres that we currently have a lot of also. The good news is this campus will almost always be green. The bad news is that we’ve never be able to build out on this campus in terms of any new buildings, but as you know, we’re basically going to have to raise some buildings and destroy some buildings to even make room for the buildings that we currently have in the pipeline. So again, you know, don’t get too down in the with what this is, but this is at the stage for something that none of us really has the opportunity to see right now provides the flexibility of the University down the road.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): Well this touches on something that sure that there will be regular and frequent of the transportation needs, but this part of campus and that part of campus too far anyone to walk, 15 minutes between class here and
Brooks Keel (President): Absolutely.

?? One thing that President Keel brought up was the issue of being landlocked, we’re also aware that the three biggest institutions in the state are basically landlocked also, and so its very hard for Tech, UGA and State to think in terms of expanding dramatically. And so this is space that 20/30 years from now the Regents may look at and say, hey we need to have a new program, and we can’t fit at those campuses maybe Southern has the space for it.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Okay, that would (inaudible) Regents. I guess what i was really wondering if because we are (inaudible) we are still (inaudible) I am worried about spending money today on tomorrow's, maybes. Because we don’t seem to have enough money to (inaudible) and I appreciate the (inaudible) raise old buildings, but I (inaudible) fact that they probably shouldn’t have been raised in the first place, but you know I think, i guess (inaudible) I am worried about the financing this. We have this land, very cool, its sitting there, but if we start gosh planning 30 years in advance are we making, are we saving money on (inaudible) you know surveys, plans, laying it out,

Rob Whitaker (VP Business and Finance): That would be a good piece of what you actually see. All this is paid for by staff that are already on the payroll so we didn’t go out and hire an outside architect to do all this work. We did it within our own resources, and what we are really trying to do is just do as good a job as we can on space and land use planning for the future. We’ve laid out an idea. It may or may not happen depending on true evolution, how much enrollment we have over the next few years, and what the finances are for funding new buildings and new programs and all those things that we’re all talking about. We just don’t know. We don’t know what the future has, but if we did, money was never an object, then we would do just whatever we want, and we started to put buildings out on this piece of property based on what we know, here’s an idea that fits within the conditions in the soil, and what we think we might need as we look into the crystal ball, so that’s just, that’s how we’ve gone about it. I see a gentleman in the back that’s been waiting.

?? Thank you. I think it’s fantastic that the property is in our possession and the opportunities of the University that might (inaudible) so its those who make decisions to acquire should be commended. its in a location that is unique, that it’s across the bypass, but unique also of its very easily accessible for people who might travel?? the bypass so I like what you’re doing with the (inaudible) concept there and it seems to me just a thought that Hanner Fieldhouse was built when we had a much smaller student body and perhaps much less attendance at events, (inaudible) and wonder if there are thoughts about an arena or something of that sort (inaudible) itself would support something like that being (inaudible)

Rob Whitaker (VP Business and Finance): This green square right there that I’m putting the hand on. That is exactly what that item is. Its a special use building that is basically a large (inaudible) center that we centered and placed on that right at the corner of Lanier, bypass, very visible to people using that thoroughfare so that’s what that special use building is right there.
Ellen Hamilton (CHHS): (inaudible) I’m excited about this. (inaudible) business world and if you (inaudible) so my hope is that we (inaudible) and that Georgia Southern continues to grow (inaudible).

Brooks Keel (President): That’s exactly why we bought that 208 acres and exactly why we are going to this next step to make sure that we, regardless of what the needs this University may need down the road, we’ve got, at least we’ve got the land to put it on. Coming up with the resources to build it, now that’s another discussion, but right now we will accept it as it is. Thank you.

?? Well, I actually, sort of, my question. Could you give us just a little bit of history of this piece of land, where did it come from, how we got it, and what the reason we (inaudible). You know, (inaudible) history it’s really hard to conceptualize how’d we actually get here.

Rob Whitaker (VP Business and Finance): The land was actually purchased about a year before I came here as Vice President, and I think it was purchased really with the intent of having that space available to allow the University to grow and the only direction that land would allow to grow was just to the south end of the campus. It just a strategic purchase that was made by the University to allow us to have that, and now we are in the process of developing a whole land use of that location.

?? The (inaudible)

Rob Whitaker (VP Business and Finance): It think it was 12 and 13, there was a combination of, two purchases made. So

Brooks Keel (President): The land just gratuitously became available. It was on the market and was being looked at by other potential private investors to come into Statesboro to develop. We knew that and we’ve been approached by a private investor in the past to be a part of an adventure project that could eventually put on that privately done. The land was owned by a family in Statesboro, been here for many many years. The name you probably recognize if you heard. We approached the family when we knew that the other private that were looking to purchase this land to turn it into commercial, multi-storage and that sort of thing. And we began to negotiate with them. We were able to buy the land at the estimated value price of farmland before it got commercial, for a commercial, and made the purchase and secured it at that time. We knew at that time and this is 2011-2012 time frame that if we did not purchase that land, it was going to be sold to someone and then the opportunity for Georgia Southern to ever purchase that land in the future would either be tremendous price or completely preclude us to do anything with it because of what (inaudible).

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): Can and will the land be used for educational purposes meantime (inaudible) development starts or (inaudible) all sorts of possibilities for biological or ecological research in those wetlands, research on land use as the development process (inaudible)
Rob Whitaker (VP Business and Finance): Yes, we actually have done that. We spent some time developing, I don’t think it ever came to fruition with the museum, but I know right now we do have a test site, I don’t know where we’re at in the process with the FAA for a drone research that’s going on out there. So those things come up all the time and we have an opportunity to do that and we are using, we do use the back end of the property for our recycling (inaudible) so it is getting some use but as opportunities come, we are always willing to sit down and what is it and if it works, (inaudible) happen.

Brooks Keel (President): The only real limitation to that would be sort of research would require water, sewer, or power right now that’s something (inaudible) other than that it is Georgia Southern’s land and we would welcome any opportunity for the departments to use it as it is right now. We would please encourage to make sure we know what is going on out there but no, its Georgia Southern land and its available.

Rob Whitaker (VP Business and Finance): We are spending a lot of time learning about deer hunters, so that’s why we wanted to know you were out there so we could protect you.

?? I just wanted to ask is there any plans for the University to acquire (inaudible) convenience store (inaudible), I just read a couple of weeks ago (inaudible) sale. Is the University interested, I’m curious (inaudible) about (inaudible)

Rob Whitaker (VP for Business and Finance): I’ll give the same answer i gave the newspaper and I’ll see if my boss agrees with my answer. I think that’s a piece of property that would be a very strategic purchase for the University. Assuming the price is right and we can afford it. Sound like a good answer?

Brooks Keel (President): I think that’s a very good answer and I think the final thing he said really summarizes it very nicely if the price is right and if its available, and the other thing is as you probably know, there are establishments (inaudible) consider right now that some of long term leases and I wouldn’t want the University to purchase land that had a lease on it that would not fit with the mission of the University. That’s (inaudible) enough for you; no, no, it’s obviously, its a very strategic piece of land for us, but as you might imagine any time anybody understands that the University is even thinking about a piece of land that, as I mentioned there are several, there are a couple of acres here there and around the University that might be of use to us, but as soon as anybody thinks we are interested the price escalates tremendously. So we’ve got to be very strategic in how we approach, no, no sir, its a great question and one that we obviously are looking in to.

?? James, I think they already (inaudible) I think they’ve been sold.

??And I thought the whole parking lot (inaudible) has already sold and
Rob Whitaker (VP for Business and Finance): The parking lot has been sold and that’s (inaudible). I do know that Henry’s was on the market; I did not know it had actually gone through a sale. And then the balance of that land is the commercial/retail/establishment that’s owned by somebody who currently, I know it’s for sale, but we, that’s where it stands right now. Any other questions? Like I said, we appreciate the chance to present to you all first the email will go out next week. Again, we are going to just try to solicit as much information from all of our faculty and staff and then at some point in time we may get (inaudible) come back and give regular updates to this group. Appreciate it. Thank you. Do you want me to turn the lights back on?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Okay this is an amended motion from what was discussed back in April, and Jim Harris is going to present it.

19. Motion on Outside Letters for Tenure and Promotion (Jim Harris, CEIT): For those that are unable to understand more than 140 words, I’m going to give you the short version. I guess everybody knows, I guess this was discussed, I wasn’t at the last meeting, I had to go to class so I guess this was already discussed, so I’ll go ahead and read the amended motion. This was the last email that was sent. So the title is Outside Letters for Special Faculty Evaluations. It amends section 205.06 of the Faculty Handbook paragraph B (Faculty input and initiative) to add subparagraph 4 as follows: “Each tenured or tenure-track faculty member undergoing either a promotion or tenure review shall submit to his/her chair or unit head the names and contact information of at least three qualified individuals not directly involved in the faculty member’s work (i.e., have not been involved as a mentor or close collaborator) who can objectively review the faculty member’s portfolio. The individuals should be experts in the faculty member’s field and hold an academic appointment at an institution at least similar to Georgia Southern with rank at or above the rank to which the candidate is aspiring. The department chair or chair of the department’s Tenure and Promotion Committee shall solicit letters from two of the individuals that address the quality of work performed and readiness of the candidate for promotion and/or tenure. In addition to submitting names for individuals who may be contacted for external review, the faculty member may submit up to three names (and contact information) of individuals who may NOT be contacted by anyone involved in the tenure and/or promotion review. The department chair in association with the Tenure and Promotion Committee chair may also solicit up to two additional letters from any individual not on the forbidden list that he or she may think has background commensurate with carefully evaluating the candidate’s portfolio and contributions to the profession.” Do you want me to read the rationale? Here’s the rationale: “At least four colleges (CEIT, CLASS, COSM, JPHCOPH) require outside recommendation letters for tenure and promotion, but procedures and the number of required letters vary. This motion seeks to make that more uniform across the entire campus. Further, President Keel has stated publicly that those outside letters help both him and the Provost in making their decisions, especially in cases where there was division of opinion at lower levels. The proposal has been modified to specify only TT or tenured faculty (not lecturers) and (to eliminate possible vendettas/feuds), the candidate faculty member may specify individuals who may NOT be contacted.” I guess I’m making a motion for this to be considered by the Faculty Senate.
Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Is there a second? All right. The motion has been seconded. Discussion?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I’m questioning whether this is going to be appropriate for all (inaudible) in all colleges. I can easily think of examples where people’s research may actually be consumed by an individual’s (inaudible) part of it. (inaudible), may be more applicable in industry (inaudible) engineering, manufacturing, and all that. Yes, but it may be (inaudible) universities (inaudible) industry and also (inaudible) to know that this (inaudible) might not be appropriate for everybody. We’ve already been told, okay, (inaudible) we have been told that we are not to consider ourselves a research institution. We’ve also been told (inaudible) we’ve also been told our current (inaudible) now we’re forever and of course he’s gone, but you know (inaudible) that we are not a research institution and that there are a lot of people out there who still say Georgia what. you know, it never hurts. A lot of our people are here, i(inaudible) and (inaudible) and ask them to be able to go out and find other people who are really really in tune to their research and the influence there or impact their research and on their heels when they are (inaudible) first and researches/(inaudible) secondarily really seem to be putting those people in a huge disadvantage and goes against what I’ve heard (inaudible) equally valued. We’re never asked for outside letters (inaudible) or how awesome our service is and so I really don’t know that this something we should impose as requirement across the entire campus.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: If you’ll take a look, this just says evaluate your portfolio, it doesn’t say evaluate only your research. Teaching. service, being involved in your profession are certainly things that also can be evaluated by outside people.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS): I’m speaking on behalf of my colleagues. There are some real concerns within certain of our programs within the College of CHHS about the external review. I brought my notes with me so that i would not forget. There were certain units within CHHS that have decided that it was, it was not sufficient reviewers who are appropriate for those to have external review done and that was within CHHS as I  said and within COE. There are some questions that we’d like to still have answered, and those questions are:

- What if there are not sufficient people available to serve as reviewers?
- What if the reviewers says no?
- What if a reviewer does not complete the review by the deadline?
- What exactly are the reviewers to review? Scholarship only? If we could just answer that question.
- What if it’s just, and so the question then if it’s only scholarship, that’s only 30%, but you answered that question as (inaudible) complete portfolio.

In some particular areas there are reviewers out there who are not particularly familiar with the scholarship of some of our particular departments and we may not have enough external reviewers with similar programs. We looked, I will give you an example, specifically of our child and family development program, where there are only six others out there, other than Georgia Southern that are actually the same kind of department that don’t just consider Counseling,
Psychology, or Marriage and Family Therapy. So there are only six institutions for that particular program to choose from. And so if there are only six, two of those on their website don’t talk about the... (inaudible). And then the four other schools that are out there, there are only nine full-time professors total that would be able to be reviewers for that particular program. It creates quite a problem we believe and that as somebody has suggested it probably is not the best for every school to be looking at external review. We potentially could lead to a pandora’s box of grievances, being opened by faculty and also create issues for recruitment and retention.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): (inaudible) Add a provision that a particular department or program could petition to opt out of this requirement and they could make a case about why... (inaudible)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: The department or program wanted to opt out that’s pretty much I think the status quo as it is now. The idea here was to make things about this standard for the whole University.

?? Reviewers standard across the board?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: My understanding is and I’ve talked to a lot of people, i’ve talked to a lot in the last few weeks, outside reviewers are pretty much standard, pretty well everywhere.

?? What’s already required and as you said it’s... (inaudible) so its not just creating work for research. The benefit of this is standardizing the numbers. I understand the concerns that you are raising. I think that there is some validity to that. Although you can, It doesn’t specify that it has to be within a state program... (inaudible), so in Family and Child Development you can go to, can you not go to people who are doing research and scholarship in the same areas?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: I would certainly think so. I mean if there’s only 90 programs in the country, you’re going to have some awfully small conferences to go to. And not much in the way of publication reading.

?? I wanted to, I’m sorry, the only reason I appreciate about the is this standardizing of numbers because when I went up for tenure, I had to come up with five names and a junior faculty... (inaudible) with three names and... (inaudible) requirements with that three year difference have fluctuated so much so how are... (inaudible) helpful. I do think we always have to understand that there are going to be exceptions. (inaudible) allowing for, in case ofs, makes sense.

Mark Hanna (COBA): I have constituents... (inaudible) who are opposed to this and some who are in favor of it and... (inaudible) support of... (inaudible) mixed... (inaudible) among the faculty in our college regarding the value of the outside letters. My sense is that this particular proposal is too specific and/or inadequate which, for example, is something about how people will, well, for example, there’s a packet that is mentioned, but the packet is not... (inaudible) will send back.
There is a notion that it should, the process should be the same processes on our campus, but I’m not certain that’s necessarily best for the process to be the same for Marketing professor as and Art History professor. The word “solicit” the process is about procuring letters, soliciting letters. The, I mean, in other words, can you make a phone call and arrange agreement that a letter be provided or do you just request that a letter be provided? It’s all how many letters do you get. These are the kinds of questions that are raised by my colleague earlier. To me it seems that a more appropriate action presented would be to say the University in the interest of University each college should develop procedures in order to procure an adequate number of external letters to support P&T decisions that are being made. And the allow the colleges to develop those. I’m not sure that there’s a need, personally, I don’t understand why there is a need for the exact process or routine be the same across each college and each department.

?? We appreciate the fact of a standardization and I think that helps everybody along in the process. However, at the same time, I guess as my colleague behind me is speaking I’m thinking in that each department not writing the same type of writing. Each department has their own individual writing and I think we have some colleges that are find external, even though I think there are some programs that will be very difficult to find to evaluate and sometimes when a college someone else evaluate research. Well, they in the same kind of research, sometimes I think it is very difficult for them to understand the significance of the complexity of the research somebody else is doing if they are not field. And so I understand the need for standardization but, you know, a school is a school and a school is not a school.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): I find it very that people outside the University campus. my sense is that research I mean, it’s clear for example, does a pay raise that Georgia State and Georgia Tech taken out of the money that is to go to us year. So its clear we’re not so if you want us to more research conferences, get these people to recognize your work and it seems to me that we’re just adding more layers of work on ourselves and we’re not to take our as well. So I would say that in theory is a good idea to encourage more research for those that don’t have to opt out

Li Li: As I am listening to the discussion, seems like as this discussion just being voiced here, my impression is this room feels like this is something in addition to what we ought to do, and it’s putting, personal experience, I offered some reference to this work, I got to ask for tenure review at least about a dozen times a year. So I do this as a universities. So from my personal practice, this is actually a very common practice at other campuses. And that’s one. I’d like to point out from my view this is not something unique we try to do here. And two, when we put this together, both Pat and I and the other people from the SEC, at least we this to the Faculty Handbook at UGA, Georgia Tech and Georgia State. They all have, if you search Google, they all have such a document, you can find has their Faculty Senate, so at least as a practice, you know, it’s not a unique practice. That’s the second point. The third point and I’ll let you
offer I look at this from a protection of the faculty member’s perspective. Anybody from a department, we have all experienced this, I may not get along with my department chair, I may not get along with all my senior professors, and what I do is anybody who goes up for tenure or promotion, a broader to say in my scholarship is unique on campus, but I can find support from outside. Right, and we send back a detail in there to evaluate service, teaching, in addition to scholarship. It’s quite a common practice. I give you one example, last month I got a letter from Ithaca College, they actually have three sets of evaluators. One set only evaluates service, the other set only evaluates teaching. I think that it’s a little excessive, but that kind of practice is out there. So evaluate service and teaching, it’s out there and people are doing it. So its really not just unique to research itself, but all in all I think, I really think this kind of motion has a protection for the people who are promoted so you’re not being evaluated within each department teaching a unique course, we have a unique skillset, we’re doing unique research. There are people out there probably more to value of work in terms of compared to people next to my office, to so that’s just my two cents. Thank you.

?? While I agree there are a lot of colleges that are, there are also a lot of colleges that are not. And I think that as has been said over and over, one size does not fit all. And so it might be appropriate for you to have and i would hate for us to make a university-wide policy I think it would be more appropriate for each individual college to be able to make that decision.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): to support what you said and Li, also to something that Li said the schools you named where they had those policies, those are the ones that got the raises, they’re the research schools and we’re not. I you know what they are people that I because of their research and you don’t really care about and they’re not going to know necessarily involved in the service of what we do or in the oh, three whereas my student classes may have all six of the colleges here have research faculty that were hired to do research. Not all college have that because we’re not a research school. This, i mean, this is just something we’re going to have to accept. We have been told over when we need extra money and all those research institutes, but right now, most of us aren’t to be able to do research. Most of us don’t teach one course a semester or like some of our other schools and none of us get raises, so I don’t think we should model ourselves on the UGAs. They are not an aspiration for us.

Brooks Keel (President): Let me just, let me make a couple comments. We are getting too sidetracked on whether we want to be called a research university, not on someone else’s criteria. That is totally and completely irrelevant. I don’t care what department that you’re in or what college you’re in there is and has always been and will always be an expectation to do scholarship, and as we get scholarship is entire discipline dependent. And the discipline has to be one that makes the determination as college-defined. We are not going to say just because the System Office doesn’t call us a research institute, we don’t do scholarship here. I know that I have say that. You get too sidetracked whether or not we want to become a research university or not. That is irrelevant. Scholarship is always required to get
promotion and tenure, and it always will be. These letters are intended to help faculty, especially in those cases which there is huge disagreement within the department that in many cases, the Provost and I can’t tell if there is contentious and petty disagreements or that this real basis of the disagreement. In 99.9% of the times, these letters will help us determine that. And that is always in the benefit of the faculty. So this is not intended to produce extra work, its just intended to provide a basis so you can be evaluated fairly and objectively.

?? I think that the policy needs to be (inaudible) the practice has to be, I just (inaudible) phrase I don’t know that you can say one size fits all.

Brooks Keel (President): I don’t think we are saying that. What we are saying is that the department chair or the chair of your promotion and tenure, (inaudible) going to supervise the whole process and he/she will make determinations to see if who you are asking to provide these letters is appropriate or not. And also he/she will make sure that if there are individuals that you disagree with in the field, that’s inappropriate, that those people are going to be radioactive, so this is a (inaudible) process, it’s just that to try to get some clarity among all the colleges so one college is not expected to produce five letters and one is expected to produce one. I hope that you don’t really read too much into what this is intended to do.

?? (inaudible) concerns. It is very important that we understand the (inaudible) on this issue. What this motion does is not standardize at all the colleges (inaudible). What this motion does is forces the one size fits all policy onto all units, even over the objection of those units. If a unit, if the faculty in a unit who are experts in their field say, this is not an appropriate way to evaluate faculty in our discipline. This motion substitutes the judgement of the Faculty Senate for theirs. It takes from them their right to say, we know in our field how best to do this. We know why this won’t work in our discipline. if we are going to pass this motion, and you are saying that the Faculty Senate knows better how to evaluate faculty than the faculty in their own fields do. And I have a problem with that.

?? (inaudible) I would say for a number of my colleagues in the College of Education. We were very comfortable with moving the other (inaudible) of the decision regarding this out of the departments throughout the college.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): Would it solve any of the problems that people are raising (inaudible) if instead of discussing (inaudible) for letters at the other universities comparable to Georgia Southern. leave it open to (inaudible) people that

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Rebecca, it doesn't say comparable; it says at least similar. That means at our level, which would be our peer and aspirational, the DRU, or an R-I, above us.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): (inaudible) for some fields that might be more appropriate to get a letter from an external organization that has been the recipient of that person’s service, or as
someone pointed out, (inaudible) it might be more appropriate to get a letter from someone in
the business world instead from a faculty member at some other university.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): It sounds like (inaudible) do this very much as a one size fits all. Everybody
has got to use the same minimum level of (inaudible) or higher. Everybody's got to have the
same number, you know, what can we do the same for? That (inaudible) work. I (inaudible)
allow colleges to decide on their own. I guess I really and truly don’t see that it is more
beneficial to have the entire university pretty much forced to accept the same standards, I
don’t see how that is going to be beneficial than allowing colleges to make their own decisions
(inaudible) for their colleges.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): (inaudible) President made about (inaudible) and certainly (inaudible) no
way that the faculty know when they (inaudible) so in cases where there is contentious
(inaudible) we would know and be able to solicit that at that time. (inaudible) actually work
(inaudible) to get these outside letters are going to be more work in terms of (inaudible) I’ve
been for getting (inaudible) and again, we are all doing it on some level (inaudible) this to me, I
think some people, I mean, you already have (inaudible) but for some people will need more
(inaudible).

Debbie Allen (CHHS): Can I call the question?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Thank you. You may. The question has been called.

Point of order. Is there a quorum present?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: No one has questioned it up until now, so we have
conducted business already so we’re in good shape. Actually, I was kind of, at least, actually I
believe we’ll get a number if you want to hear it even not counting those that are
administrators. I think we have a quorum. The question has been called. The motion is there on
the screen. All in favor, yes, that’s right we have to vote on calling the question. Our
parliamentarian is not here. All in favor of calling the question, please say aye. All opposed?
Okay the question is called. The motion is there on the screen. All in favor, please say aye? All
opposed? Let’s do show of hands. All in favor raise your hand up very high so I can hear, so I can
see. all opposed? I count 11 yes, and 10 no. Okay.

?? Are you serious?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: I’m serious. There’s 21 that voted. Not everybody
voted.

(too many people talking at one time to hear what was said)
Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Abstentions do not count. We went through this last year. People who do not vote don’t count. Okay. All in favor

?? (inaudible) you are saying yes to the (inaudible).

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: yes

?? (inaudible) correct?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Scrap. A no vote means it stays the way it is. All in favor please say aye, please raise your right hand. All in favor stand up. All opposed please stand up. That time it was 15 to 13.

?? (inaudible)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Yes. 15 No. 13. So the motion is {editor question?) approved or not approved) approved. All right. Is there any unfinished business? Is there any new business?

20. **Unfinished Business:** None

21. **New Business**

Janice Steirn (CLASS): (inaudible) new business or not. At the beginning of March, faculty who are not 12 month contracts and are we under contract in the month of June? Will the Senate consider holding the last meeting of the while we aren’t under contract? I mean, is that in our (inaudible)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Actually, the meeting calendar of the Senate is prescribed in the University *Statutes*.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): (inaudible)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: So that would require amending the University *Statutes* again. The University *Statutes* say the Senate meets three times each semester and once in June.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Yes.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: So we just went through revising the *Statutes*. I don’t know if we want to revise them again.
Janice Steirn (CLASS):  (inaudible) can be brought up. I mean because  (inaudible)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: Something that actually we did have a quorum today. Last year we didn’t. It’s usually kind of close. We can revise the Statutes. I was on the committee that last revised the Statutes. The problem that we have to get enough faculty to vote for approving the revised Statutes, which was a challenge the last time, and then revised Statutes have to be approved by the Board of Regents. I don’t know how much is actually (inaudible) is it just the Chancellor’s staff (inaudible) Board of Regents themselves.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): To do revision you have to (inaudible) the entire (inaudible)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: It still has to be approved by a vote of faculty and the Chancellor’s office.

?? The answer is yes, it can be done.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: It can be done.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Then, (inaudible)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator: There actually is a procedure in the actual Statutes, I believe they are on the President’s Webpage these days, which tells you how to, how they may be amended, and so then submitting a motion to amend. It really goes to the President first, if I remember correctly. Is there any other new business? Any announcements from Vice Presidents? Announcements from the floor? Do I have a motion to adjourn? moved and seconded.

22. Announcements: Vice Presidents

23. Announcements from the Floor
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1) Approval of the Agenda for the September 9, 2015 meeting.

Moved and approved.

2) Approval of the June 2, 2015 Minutes: Li Li (CHHS), former Senate Secretary:

Moved and approved.

3) Librarian’s Reports for September 2015, Jessica Minihan (LIB), Senate Librarian:

Senate Moderator Pat Humphrey (COSM) noted that Senate Librarian Jessica Minihan (LIB) was not yet in attendance and so moved approval of the Librarian’s Report. She further noted that while it contained information from the Faculty Athletic Representative, minutes from the Academic Standards Committee, and some minutes from the ad hoc committee on Student
Ratings of Instruction, it was a short report because most committees had not yet met. The Librarian’s report was accepted.

4) President Jean Bartels – President’s Report:

Latest Enrollment Figures

Good news: We are up 30 students from where we were at this time last year, to 20,547, making us one of only a small handful of institutions in the USG System who are seeing an increase in student numbers. President Bartels credited this achievement to our Admissions staff, our academic advisors/interventionist advisors, and the faculty.

Graduate Program Retention Rates

We are down 75 students, even though our admissions rates are up some. This is an area that we need to focus on in the future.

Retention and Graduation

More good news: Our retention rate is up to 82.4%, from last year’s 80.9%. Our graduation rate from 2014-2015 was stable at 50% for our six-year graduation rate.

Budget Preparations for December Meeting with BOR

We will present our budget request to the Board of Regents in December. Because of our slight increase in enrollment, for the first time in years we may not have to identify a budget reduction for this year. The Chancellor has noted that for three years the System has done a bailout of institutions that have had decreased enrollments and/or have had other financial difficulties. From this point forward, however, institutions with deficits and/or a decrease in enrollment will have to figure out how to work their budgets to accommodate that rather than drawing from other system institutions in better shape. Thus, we do not have to account for a budget reduction in order to help other schools. Our priority this year will be salary compression issues.

Day for Southern – September 15th

The community A Day for Southern is September 15th. President Bartels thanked everybody who participated in A Day for Southern on campus. She especially thanked Anthony Waters, chair for the community effort, and the campus co-chairs, Lisa Leege for the faculty and Robert Meguiar for the staff.

Capital Campaign

Because of the change in the President’s team, the Capital Campaign will continue in its silent phase for the remainder of this academic year. Next Fall, probably sometime around Homecoming, will be the formal launch of the public campaign.
Presidential Search Committee

Prospective committee members for the Search Committee from the campus side had been contacted and were in the process of responding to that invitation. The committee will be charged by the Chancellor and several Regents on September 30th here on campus. Lori Durden, our local Regent, will have oversight of the search, and they have hired Parker as the search firm.

Vice President for External Affairs

President Bartels introduced our new Vice President for External Affairs, Trip Addison, who replaces Russell Keen. He comes to us with a wealth of experience in Georgia government, extraordinarily good connections to things that will impact all of us, and is a “Double Eagle” graduate of Georgia Southern University.

Recognitions and Highlights

- The School of Nursing received a $40,000 gift from East Georgia Regional Medical Center to add to the scholarship fund that has been created to honor the 5 nursing students who were tragically lost in that accident last spring. That will raise the total of resources collected to just under a $100,000 and we are working to try to increase that amount so that we can award an annual scholarship for 5 students every year to remember those young women.
- School of Nursing was ranked in the top 10 for its online RN-BSN program, which was also ranked 8th in the country for the most affordable competitive college with an online program.
- Researchers from the James H. Oliver, Jr., Institute of Coastal Plain Science (ICPS) at Georgia Southern teamed up Gray’s Reef National Marine Sanctuary on Tuesday, September 1st, to release 50 gallons of a non-toxic red dye into the Altamaha River near Darien, to study how the River’s outflow affects hard bottom reefs offshore.
- In an article entitled “Gender disparities in water, sanitation, and global health,” which was published in The Lancet, one of the world’s leading medical journals, Georgia Southern doctoral student Varadan Sevilimedu and Dr. Isaac Fung, assistant professor of epidemiology in the Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health, found that women are affected by the scarcity of water and sanitation more than men.
- Dr. Eric Hall, Assistant Professor in the Departments of History and Africana Studies in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences was featured nationally in C-SPAN3's American History TV series. Hall’s lecture was titled “A Native Son Comes Home: the Life and Legacy of Arthur Ashe.” It aired on Sunday, August 23rd. He is also the author of the book Arthur Ashe: Tennis and Justice in the Civil Rights Era.
- The Herty Advanced Materials Development Center has launched a new Advanced Chemical Processing pilot facility there. The applications being tested
range from the development of active fibres for water filtration, to nutraceuticals, to the production of biomaterials for automotive and aerospace parts.

- The Betty Foy Sanders Department of Art’s Visual Scholarship and award recipients for 2015-16 have their work on display at the Blick Gallery in Savannah until October 1st.
- Our Department of Music Website features full albums that you can listen to of faculty recordings.

President Bartels then asked if there were questions.

Lowell Mooney (COBA) noted that UGA is hiring over 100 new teachers to lower class sizes and asked if there was going to be similar hiring at other institutions in the System.

President Bartels said UGA has invested about $4-5 million of their own finances in that effort, and if someone rolls around here with $4-5 million we will be happy to follow suit. But there’s no such initiative at the System level that she knows of.

Ming Fang He (COE) asked if we were going to do anything about faculty salary compression.

President Bartels noted that she had already answered that question during her report. She added that the Chancellor, too, has indicated that this is a priority.

5) Provost’s Report – Diana Cone:

Enrollment

Through the year 2020 we expect a decline in the number of high school graduates. We’re going to have a smaller pool of students to draw from, so being creative in how we go out and recruit new students is going to be important. Our Admissions folks have been studying what things bring us the best return for our investment. One thing that our Student Affairs folks stress is that faculty are key in helping to recruit students, such as at open houses, and Provost Cone hoped that faculty will continue to be willing to go this extra mile. Data supports the fact that we are getting a lot of students and their parents interested in Georgia Southern because they feel like they’re going to enjoy a caring environment, and this feeling comes from meeting faculty at some of these functions.

Retention

We are working hard on intervention efforts. We started our intervention advisors two years ago and have some information on how that’s working and what we might change, such as more collaboration with the Academic Success Centers on campus to see how we’re going to get students to the resources earlier. This will require faculty involvement.

QEP

QEP also involves faculty and we will hear that at probably every meeting all this year. QEP is in its inaugural phase. They started with the initial courses. We have had a number of weekend training sessions for the Student Writing Fellows. Provost Cone thanked those faculty in the inaugural program, and noted that other faculty will not get a pass, but will have to become involved in upcoming phases.
**New Academic Building**

The architects are being selected and GSU will be asked to provide input on who will be occupying that building and how the space will be used. The Deans who are involved have been invited to the initial meeting, and they will be working with their Department Chairs and the faculty to determine how to best use this new three-story building. She reminded faculty that about half of the parking lot behind CEIT and ROTC will be used as a construction site once the construction gets started, probably about January 2017.

Provost Cone asked if there were questions.

Mark Welford (COSM) asked if other faculty parking spaces would be made available to make up for the loss.

Provost Cone noted that there is some student parking nearer the Art building, and that might be moved elsewhere. This construction is a challenge. We also will have to move some faculty from Interior Design and Fashion’s two buildings, which will be demolished.

(SECRETARY’S NOTE: FROM THIS POINT ON, THE RECORDING BECOMES AT TIMES ONLY VAGUELY AUDIBLE AND FREQUENTLY WHOLLY INAUDIBLE.)

An unidentifiable person asked if more faculty spots could be designated in the primarily student parking lot on the other side of CEIT. Provost Cone said they’d take that into consideration.

6) **Senate Executive Committee Report** -- Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair:

**Faculty Salaries**

Over the summer, there was a series of articles that started in the Atlanta Journal Constitution about large presidential salary raises in the USG System, specifically at Georgia Tech, Georgia State, and UGA, and more recently about former president Bell from Middle Georgia receiving a several hundred thousand dollar golden parachute when he retired. The USG Faculty Council worked diligently through the summer to write and approve a resolution condemning those raises and encouraging support for items like salary compression relief. Those raises occurred while for the System the state appropriation for merit raises was 3/4 %; GSU added money to make a 2% merit raise pool, which still is not enough to offset things like health care premium increases. If the system and GSU put their money toward merit raises, there’s no money for salary compression, so it’s sort of a Catch-22 unless we get more money from the legislature. The USGFC had yet to get a response from the Board or the Chancellor about that resolution. But the USGFC will be meeting October 31st. Chancellor Huckaby and Vice Chancellor Davis will be there.

**The Agenda**

We had two motion requests, both of which were on the agenda. There were no RFI’s or Discussion Requests. However, the SEC discussed their concerns about the new Marketing and Communications Policy, and so invited Jan Bond to attend and address those concerns.
President Search Committee

Moderator Humphrey had agreed to serve on the committee. The campus chair will be Steve Vives, Professor and Chair of the Biology Department. They intend to have eighteen people on the committee: nine faculty members, five or six alums, a couple of staff people, the SGA President, and representatives from the community and Foundation. She reminded people that by state law, in a search for a president only the finalists’ names can be announced, not the names of others in the pool. After September 30th the committee will start to draft an ad, so she invited comments and suggestions re: desired qualities of a president of Georgia Southern.

Student Ratings of Instruction ad hoc committee

They are sifting through possible questions and plan on doing a pilot of a new instrument this coming December. One thing that they are concerned about is getting faculty cooperation re: administering an experimental SRI form which is going to be much more thoughtful than penciling in the bubbles. Moderator Humphrey asked faculty to please cooperate because we need to have good data to look at the new form.

Humphrey then introduced Jan Bond, with a note that this discussion would be limited to 15 minutes.

7) Discussion of new Marketing and Communications Policy with Jan Bond, Associate Vice President:

Bond said the purpose of the policy was to make sure that as a University we represent ourselves in a consistent manner to our various audiences via our advertising and marketing materials, and to ensure that those are of the highest standards.

Moderator Humphrey added that she understood part of the plan also is to eliminate possible redundancies, and gave the example of Georgia Southern as an entity placing an ad in a publication and then having a college or department placing an ad in the same edition of that publication; that sort of wastes money.

Bond confirmed this point, saying it would be better to stagger those ads in different editions so that we could get repeat exposure. Coordinated, centralized planning makes for better use of our resources.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) noted that the policy states that press releases will be edited by and released through the office of Marketing and Communications. In the Communication Arts Department, they have practicum students writing press releases. Abbott was concerned that the policy is blocking the work she’s doing with her students, which requires them to contact the media as part of their education as PR majors, as Theatre majors who are doing marketing for theatre, and Journalism majors learning their jobs.

Bond was not aware of those types of projects and offered to speak with Abbott separately about that and in regard to the high volume of work that goes out of Communication Arts because of performances. She said the idea was for Marketing was to make sure that press releases go through one source so they can be timed properly so that they are going to get the attention from the media that we want them to get, and we don’t bombard them with too many.

Abbott noted the policy said Marketing will choose what to release and when to release it. Did that mean, for example, if Music had a written press release for a concert and wanted it to go out on a certain date, they would or would not be able to decide when it would go out?
Bond said Marketing hadn’t really been involved with performances. Abbot asked if that meant they were exempted from the policy. Bond said they’d have to discuss that separately.

Abbott said that was one of the problems with the policy; it lacks clarity in those areas. She added that it is, at the same time, too limiting and too broad.

Mark Edwards (COSM) asked if Bond could succinctly summarize the policy regarding when an entity like a department that wants to make a press release needs to go through Marketing. Because COSM has a Planetarium, they put out lots of things and he didn’t think they had ever sent them through Marketing.

Bond said that each of the colleges has a communication officer who will deal with Marketing regularly re: sending out materials.

Edwards asked how they would know to send it to the officer in the first place.

Bond said she could help the communications officer in their area work with them on that. Edwards was still unclear on that response, so Bond said that anything that gets produced as a printed piece, anything intended for an outside audience and to market or promote the university, should come through Marketing via Marketinga@GeorgiaSouthern.edu.

Edwards said it sounded like there are a lot of exceptions to the policy.

Bond said that right now there are only two exceptions: Athletics materials because of some contracts that we have, and internal communications to students.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) asked how entities can know that their press releases are going to go out. Bond said Marketing is there to promote our programs and events. They want to do that. They do not want a delay.

Abbott said her other concern is the sheer number of items the policy calls to go to Marketing, and how they can hope to meet their promised 48 hour response time. She was concerned that we will bottleneck that will keep us from the kind of communication with the community that we want to achieve.

Bond understood Abbott’s concern, but said the model has been used in the past and it works.

Moderator Pat Humphrey (COSM) noted that President Bartels and Provost Cone had told her that if Marketing can’t make the promised 48-hour turnaround, the initiating entity could send it out or it will go out anyway. She noted that that’s not in the policy, and still wondered how the initiating entity would know if the material had or had not gone out.

Bond said Marketing would respond within 48 hours re: if there’s an issue with the material or if it’s going to go out. But there are two different situations: materials for Marketing to approve prior to printing or online distribution is one thing, while press releases that come through Marketing to disseminate to the media are another. But in either case, Marketing will definitely be responding within 48 hours.

Abbott asked if journalism students who are writing articles need to go through this policy. Bond said no. Abbott felt we need to clarify the exceptions in the policy.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) turned from article II.A to article II.B, which says that faculty contacted by the media “should” contact Marketing. He noted that everything else in the policy is “must,” “will,” etc., and asked what “should” means in this context.

Bond said they prefer to be notified if faculty talk to the media, and would love to know ahead of time so they can help prepare any facts or things like that that might be discussed. They would appreciate a heads-up in case they receive follow-up questions, which happens a lot.
Cyr said his problem was that it’s a policy statement, where everything is “must.” So while this part is a request and not a requirement, since it’s in a policy document he wonders if he would be opening himself to negative consequences should he not follow this request. This section seemed to be asking faculty to voluntarily violate their first amendment rights and their rights under academic freedom, and because it’s in the policy it suggests that faculty could get in trouble if they don’t give up those rights. He thought this section did not belong in the policy.

Moderator Pat Humphrey (COSM) noted that as a statistician she has been contacted by media with questions related to that expertise, but having nothing to do with GSU, and wondered how such situations fit with this policy.

Bond said Marketing would like a call in that situation because there might be more opportunities to have our experts get in the media in relation to that topic.

Cyr pointed out that, the way it is worded, all faculty have to do is contact Marketing, say they have been contacted by the media, and that’s it – not who, not about what, nothing else.

Bond said she was not sure what the process is for modifying a University policy, but Marketing would definitely look at that and make those changes.

Nan LoBue (CLASS) noted that a few days earlier, a student reporter for *The George-Anne* had been walking around the Writing and Linguistics department wanting to interview faculty about a question for an article, and faculty were told that they shouldn’t speak with the student reporter until they had cleared it with Marketing. Was that correct?

Bond said there had been something like that up on the Marketing and Communications site, but it wasn’t a University policy. There was a pretty thick document and that was one of the reasons they created this new policy; it’s more concise.

LoBue was still unclear on the policy and asked, “In this situation, I wouldn’t have to necessarily clear it with you if a student reporter stopped in my office to ask me a few questions?”

Bond said, “Right, according to this University policy we’re just asking that you let us know.”

Moderator Humphrey asked if this pertained only to GSU student media.

Bond said they’d have to add student media as a possible exception.

Humphrey noted the allotted 15 minutes was up, and thanked AVP Bond, further noted that Bond had received feedback on faculty concerns, and hoped Marketing would, as they revise this policy, get faculty input into how things will or won’t work. Bond said, “Certainly.”

8) Elections of Senate Representatives (advance volunteers noted, other nominations from the floor):

Moderator Humphrey (COSM) noted that we had some positions with nominees, and some without.

**Intellectual Property Committee**

Mark Welford (COSM) was a volunteer nominee and was elected.
Athletic Committee

Kelly Berry (CLASS) was a voluntary nominee and was elected.

Parking and Transportation Appeals Committee

Adam Bossler (CLASS) volunteered, but is on leave this semester. Jake Simons (COBA) nominated himself and was elected.

Student Government Association

Moderator Humphrey (COSM) said that last year this position was successfully shared between Ellen Hamilton of CHHS and Marian Tabi, also of CHHS. Hamilton was willing to continue, but that she and the SEC would like to have somebody else to split the job with since SGA meets every Wednesday. No one else came forward, so Hamilton was elected alone, and Humphrey said we’d see about getting her a partner at the next senate meeting.

Senate Parliamentarian

Last year’s parliamentarian, Karen McCurdy, was willing to continue in that role. She was elected.

Faculty Athletics Representative

Humphrey noted that last year the Senate approved a motion that the FAR can succeed him- or herself for as many 6-year terms as he or she is willing to serve and the Senate is willing to elect him or her to. Current representative Chris Geyerman was willing to continue, no other nominees came forward, and Geyerman was elected.

9) Motion: Enforcing Summer Registration Policy – Richard Flynn, CLASS:

Flynn noted that Moderator Humphrey had informed him that day that the policy that he took off of the Registrar’s “Summer FAQ” site is no longer the policy, that actually students can take 7 hours each summer term. Hence, he modified his motion, moving that the Senate request that the Registrar and academic advisors develop a mechanism to ensure enforcement of the policy on maximum summer credit hours that a student can take in a single term, and in a single summer. He said he has had students enrolled in 12 hours in a single summer term, and this is not humanly possible. He had asked the Literature and Philosophy Academic Advisor about this and she said she didn’t know the policy and that the students can sign up for hours without having to consult with their advisors as long as they don’t exceed the maximum for the summer.

The motion was seconded. Moderator Humphrey clarified that the policy is supposed to be 7 hours for an Undergraduate per short term, but EIP students, because they take GSU 1220 and English Composition and one other class, are allowed to take 8. In corresponding with Registrar Velma Burden, Humphrey learned that BANNER is set up so that it registers or recognizes 12
hours as a max for the summer term, but that’s not allocated to either Term A or Term B, just for the term as a whole, and so BANNER/WINGS does not make any distinction, so it will allow students to sign up for say 12 hours all in Term A.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) wondered if we need to clarify that it is 6 hours per short term and 12 for the total summer. Humphrey again clarified that it’s 7-8 per short term, except for EIP students, and 12 maximum for the whole summer. Flynn reiterated that this is not what is on the Registrar’s website, and Humphrey said she’d check on that.

Jake Simons (COBA) took it that Humphrey was saying the WINGS system could not distinguish between summer terms, so the Registrar has no automated means of being able to support the policy, and therefore the motion is a request that they manually verify compliance. He also asked if the Registrar has investigated this issue.

Humphrey did not know if the Registrar actually ever investigated. Then she commented, as an old computer programmer, that a fix should take about two “if” statements.

Simons agreed, but wondered about getting permission to do it.

Jayne Perkins Brown said the Registrar reports under her, and with the current BANNER system it would take a modification to a baseline product. She and Registrar Burden were looking at having conversations with our IT folks to determine the feasibility of that.

Flynn said he wanted a serious effort to enforce the policy. And if students can go into the system and register for however many hours, that’s a problem. He thought that it would be the Registrar’s job to program BANNER in such a manner that it wouldn’t allow students to do that.

Perkins Brown noted that BANNER has the semester with the overriding guidelines. And then within that there are multiple terms. The BANNER baseline product does not accommodate that situation, and one of the ITS commitments for the University is to follow the baseline product and minimize customizations. She thought this problem warranted review in determining the feasibility of customization.

Jim Harris (CEIT) said he had taught software engineering for 30 years and you should never make policies based on what software can and cannot do. It is the Registrar’s problem to implement the policy.

Perkins Brown said she was well aware of the challenges of software and to not let technology drive what we do, so they would continue to review the feasibility of whether this can be programmed.

Flynn said he wanted the Senate to direct the Registrar to make this policy work.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said we have rules in place, but they are not being enforced: “If it has to be done by hand, written on napkins by people in the Registrar’s Office, the rule needs to be in place because we’ve got students melting down.” How the Registrar would go about adhering to the policy was not the issue before the Senate.

Mujibur Khan (CEIT) noted that there was also a problem with students getting registered in courses without the needed prerequisites.

Moderator Humphrey added that the system will allow students to register for a course if they are enrolled in a prerequisite, but if they don’t pass the prerequisite, she was not sure what happens.

Ming Fang He (COE) noted that graduate students can get advisor permission to take four classes, and that this has been very workable.
Humphrey noted this motion was strictly about the undergraduate limits. She then asked Flynn if he would like to make an amendment to the motion to have the Registrar and the VP for IT Services report back on feasibility by the following month.

Flynn said he was concerned only with enforcement of the policy. They had to make it work, and that was all.

Someone called the question. This motion was approved. Flynn’s motion was then voted on and passed unanimously.

9) Motion: Approval of Proposed Revision to the Intellectual Property Policy re: the IP Committee – Don McLemore, Interim VP Research:

VP McLemore noted that last year we reinstated and reenergized the Intellectual Property Committee. That Committee is fairly broad and has many more members than are required by the policy of the Board of Regents. As Moderator Humphrey had just pointed out, the current policy on Intellectual Property was 17 years old and in need of serious revision. Our local policy must exist within the constraints of the University Regents Policy. The IP committee included many more definitions, and tried to reach clarity as they looked at different issues that would come from different parts of the University. For example, Arts and Performing Arts, and Sciences and Engineering have very different requirements. They made a concerted effort to provide clarity to the committee, which then has the responsibility for making decisions. Such decisions are rare, but arise in a couple of circumstances. One is when there is a desire to monetize a piece of work, be that Art or a scientific invention; or when there is a desire to capture the value of an invention in the form of a patent, and then dealing with the tension that arises between patent law, which has restrictions on publications and time and all sorts of things, and the desire of faculty to be able to publish. And so what is not in the policy and is not intended to be in the policy is the commitment from the Intellectual Property Committee to work rapidly to try to keep the faculty members out of those timelines where possible. McLemore noted that they looked at diverse similar policies across the System and found that of Georgia State seemed to be one that without a lot of revision would meet our needs, and so a lot of what is in the proposed GSU policy reflects the Georgia State University IP policy.

Jake Simons (COBA) pointed out what he suspected was a very significant typo at the bottom of page 6: He believed it should refer to section 4.A, not section 5.A. McLemore said Simons was probably right, and they’d re-check it to make sure that it was the correct reference.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that McLemore had dwelt on the “tension” that can be created when publication is delayed. Cyr said that area of the policy was what had troubled him too because promotion and tenure decisions can hinge on publications. He wondered if provisions could be made to protect faculty when there is a delay in publication that is in no way their fault.

McLemore said that is a constant struggle. For example, they then had before them a couple of inventions that could well lead to reasonably valuable patents, and they wondered if the committee could work with the home department, the dean, the chair, to inform them that such is going on, to provide them perhaps with copies of the patent applications or whatever else might help keep that faculty member who’s been creative and doing good work out of this bind. They had yet to come up with a good answer to that other than to say the committee is certainly willing to provide that kind of feedback on behalf of the faculty member. If there are good solutions to this that could be adopted in written policy they were open to hearing them.
Cyr said he understood that to mean that perhaps departments or colleges needed to generate their own policies to solve this problem. McLemore thought that was right, given that different colleges have different tenure and promotion criteria. The IP committee would love the opportunity to work with those departments on solutions, but had no authority to reach into those entities’ policies uninvited.

Mark Edwards (COSM) said his reading of the revised policy was that there had been no change re: the allocation of equity, i.e. who gets what share of the money. McLemore said that was correct, and noted “The one catchall phrase is . . . everything’s negotiable.”

Jake Simons (COBA) followed up on his earlier point about that important typo, and offered its correction as a friendly amendment. The amendment was voted on and accepted.

Someone called the question, but Moderator Humphrey pointed out that she had been on the verge of calling for a vote on the amended motion, so calling the question was moot.

The motion was approved.

10) Unfinished Business
None.

11) New Business
None.

12) Announcements: Vice Presidents
None.

13) Announcements from the Floor
None.

14) Adjournment.
Moved and approved.

Submitted by Marc Cyr, Senate Secretary

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Moya Alfonso, Gavin Colquitt, John Dyer, Ellen Hamilton, Devon Jensen, Mujibur Khan, Lili Li, Li Ma, John Peden, Valentin Soloiu, Jim Stephens, Tiffanie Townsend, Jianqiang Zhao, Chris Geyerman, Faculty Athletic Representative to the NCAA

Administrators Present: Trip Addison, Salinda Arthur, Diana Cone, Don McLemore, Teresa Thompson, Mohammad Davoud, Greg Evans, Barry Joyner, Thomas Koballa, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker Visitors: Dustin Anderson, Michelle Cawthorn, Chung-Yean Chiang, Sam Chambers (SGA CEIT), Candace Griffith, Steven Harper, KeShawn Harris (SGA at-large), Yi Hu, Christopher Johnston, Beulah Narendrapurapu, Dominique Quarles, Jason Slone, CK Tataw (SGA COGS), Steve Vives, Meca Williams-Johnson

1. Approval of the Agenda for the October 6, 2015 meeting.

Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the September 9, 2015 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

With three changes to the attendance roster, the minutes were Moved and Approved.

3. Librarian’s Reports for September 2015, Jessica Minihan (LIB), Senate Librarian.

Because the only committee minutes received for this report were the Undergraduate and Graduate minutes, which receive separate consideration, there was no need to approve the Librarian’s report as a whole so Moderator Humphrey moved to the Undergraduate Committee report.
Undergraduate Committee Report – Cheryl Aasheim (CEIT), Chair:

They approved one selected topics course and two prerequisite changes and cross-listed a course in the catalog, with the Graduate Curriculum Committee also meeting about that cross-listing. The minutes along with the curriculum changes were Moved and Approved.

Graduate Committee Report – Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair:

They had two items of new business. One from the College of Engineering and Information Technology for a new course, adding a G section to an existing course. That was approved by the committee. They considered some items from the College of Education. One was related to a new program in Teaching Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students. This was tabled until the next meeting. Another was revisions to the Department of Leadership, Technology & Learning, including one new course and revisions to eight courses to bring them in line with the new Georgia Professional Standards Commission on Educational Leadership. There also was a new Teaching Leadership Endorsement proposed for candidates already holding a Master’s degree, and a revision to the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership to bring them to match standards with the Chief Council of State School Officers and the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium and the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. All of those were approved by the committee. The minutes were Moved and Approved.

4. President’s Report: Jean Bartels –

No report. Dr. Bartels was at a USG President’s meeting.

5. Provost’s Report: Diana Cone --

Enrollment: Enrollment is down 45 compared to last year, mostly due to unmet financial needs -- their financial aid package just doesn’t cover the cost of them being at Georgia Southern, and so, despite being given a grace period, their schedules were cancelled. Part of the downturn is impacted by our difficulty in predicting how many transient students will come to us from East Georgia College. Graduate enrollment was down about 11 students. However, student credit hours are up 35; though we have fewer students, they are taking more hours.

OIE and QEP: 14 programs were the inaugural QEP programs this Fall and will have courses in Spring. We need to identify what courses from those 14 programs will be offered for year two. And the Deans have been asked to try to work with those programs to identify those courses, so we can get faculty trained and get the student fellows identified. In addition, in year two we need to identify within each college which programs will be utilizing the QEP intensive programs for next year, and then
what courses within those programs. The QEP has a three-year implementation, and the goal is that 60% of all programs on campus will be involved, with several courses within each program initiated in year one, year two, and year three, so that all students should be getting some QEP intensive courses. By January 1st, we hope that we have the year two courses of the programs and courses identified. We had a bit of lag this first year in that some of the students didn’t get trained until August and so we weren’t really up to speed on day one of classes.

**Programs:** The Provost’s Office is working on the Academic Forecast that the System asks us for each year to identify what new programs Georgia Southern might like to propose. The template this year was dominated by what we would like to do and how we propose and how we propose to do it over a three-year period. This year the System said don’t send forward any duplicate programs that another institution is offering unless we have a different niche, and don’t send anything that hasn’t already been sent as a formal proposal to the System office. Therefore, we had very little that we could send forward. The Provost asked each of the colleges not to let that limit their thinking, so the Deans have been thinking in terms of what kind of programs could get through this new three-year-mindset process.

**Budget:** As for the budget, the System sent us the template, and Dr. Bartels has each of the VP units working on their budget requests. Because last year’s enrollment was stable we have not been asked to plan for a reduction. We have had little indication that there’s going to be a lot of new money, but we have a couple of opportunities where we can send forth requests for some new funding. The System did ask us to think about staff and faculty salary compression, so the Provost has been working with the colleges to come up with amounts needed based on accrediting bodies, standards, salaries for various ranks, or CUPA standard national data. Our budget plan will go up later this month and in early December the President will go to the System Office and meet with the Chancellor to discuss our plan. The Deans have sent the Provost $18+ million worth of requests; that figure will have to be pared down and priorities determined to find what we can realistically ask for. Provost Cone then asked if there were any questions.

Allen Mackelprang (COBA) said that in several faculty searches going on, many of the most qualified require H1B sponsorship. He asked for clarification of the University’s policy on that issue.

Provost Cone said that last year Dr. Bartels decided that we would seek faculty that already had visa status and were authorized to work in the US for the duration of their appointments unless that particular program could provide a justification that Georgia Southern needs to sponsor them. The difficulty is that we’ve had a number of faculty that needed sponsorships in the past to get approved, and they were not eligible to start working in August because their visa status had not been approved. Also, it is very costly for Georgia Southern to sponsor these international faculty. GSU realizes
that in some areas we have a difficult time attracting candidates who are not international, hence Dr. Bartels’ decision that a Dean could request a waiver and that then Georgia Southern would sponsor these candidates. But in many areas we have a large enough pool of candidates that are already qualified to work in the US, so we should seek to hire from that pool as a time and cost savings measure, and to ensure that we have folks ready to teach in the Fall. We have some that have not started teaching yet this Fall because their visa status hasn’t come through.

Mackelprang asked if it is more likely that a waiver will be granted if the college offers to cover the cost.

Provost Cone noted that it’s not just the cost, but the time intensive work, especially for Legal Affairs.

Ming Fang HE (COE) noted she benefited from GSU’s help sixteen years ago to get her H1B status, and that all of GSU’s job ads say the University is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer. This means we cannot discriminate against people on the basis of nationality. So that ad statement is not consistent with the University’s policy as it had just been stated.

Provost Cone did not think we were discriminating against nationality, noting that this policy went through Legal Affairs and it was their recommendation that we were following our Affirmative Action policy and could put that statement in our ads; they wrote the statement. She would have to defer that question to Legal Affairs if the Senate would like this question answered further.

Ming Fang He requested that the question be pursued further because she wasn’t convinced that we should have our current policy.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that at the last Senate the Provost had mentioned that she was working with the colleges and departments who were intended to occupy the new three-story building. He asked who this was.

Provost Cone these are the Deans of the buildings that are going to be vacated. They are being asked who will best be able to occupy that space or if they have other considerations from their colleges. The two colleges that are going to be vacating space are CLASS and CHHS. But it may not be the people vacating current space that will move into the new building. The deans may have other plans for how that new space might be better utilized. So it has not yet been determined who will be moving where.

Ming Fang He (COE) asked if the President’s Cabinet or Provost’s Office have any specific plans to resolve the salary compression/inversion problem. She might want to
request the Senate to organize a kind of a task force for this issue. She believed that we are losing and will continue to lose good faculty until this problem is solved.

Provost Cone noted that when discussing the FY 17 budget plan, the President’s Cabinet decided that the number one need from all divisions was to work on salary compression for both faculty and staff. This will be part of our budget submission to the System re: what our needs are and how we arrived at whatever dollar amount comes forward. She reiterated what she had said in her report earlier regarding what comparatives and standards are being used. Without funding, we can’t move forward on this unless via some kind of redirection of funds already on campus, taking from one pot and moving it somewhere else. At a Vice Presidential orientation in Atlanta two weeks earlier, Provost Cone told the System Office person who talked to them about budgets that when the Chancellor spoke to the Vice Presidents at a Summer meeting, he said his number one initiative this year was to work on salary compression for faculty and staff, and she asked how he plans to do that in working with the legislatures. She told Provost Cone that the Chancellor will advocate for that because he realizes that we are losing good people within all of the institutions. She also said his second initiative will be looking at unmet need for students so that we could retain students. So it’s on the radar screen, whether we have any legs to get funding for it or not. And if we do get some dollars put toward compression we’re not going to reach our goal in one year’s time, especially given that we’ve gone a number of years without salary increases. But President Bartels and Provost Cone ask about this problem at every meeting. As for a senate task force, she believed that was something to ask the Senate Executive Committee.

[An unidentifiable person asked an inaudible question. The Provost’s response suggests it had to do with visas.]

Provost Cone said that if someone needs help with H1B visas to continue working, then they are not authorized to work for the duration of their appointment, and the statement on the search ad says that the person “must be authorized to work for the duration of your employment at Georgia Southern.” If they are not so authorized and have to seek assistance that would limit their participation in the search.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair –

No Motion or Information or Discussion requests were received by this meeting’s deadline.

Humphrey had received many contacts in the past month about the constitution of the Presidential Search Committee, particularly about why there were no members from COE or CEIT. The committee was named out of Atlanta. In terms of suggesting members for the committee, the SEC got together and suggested people, including faculty from every college. There were also questions about why COSM is heavily
represented. She thought there were likely many reasons: she is the Faculty Senate Moderator; Mark Edwards is a Senator, he’s an alumnus, and he’s an endowed chair; Steve Vives was suggested by the SEC to be an administrative committee member and was actually named as the chair; Lissa Leege has tie-ins with Sustainability; Todd Deal used to be in the Chemistry department but is now in the office of Student Leadership and his name probably came up from the solicitation to SGA. These are, however, guesses only. Of the about 20 people that the SEC suggested, only 5 were actually named on the Search Committee.

In September, Humphrey, along with Raleigh Way and Pam Deal, went to a meeting called by the BOR in Atlanta on New Learning Models 2030. She had no idea how that stuff is going to come down to possibly affect us. Most of the talk was about giving people credit for learning by any means, for example, not sticking to a rigid schedule in terms of an online class, but allowing people to zoom through parts of curriculum that they may already know something about and spend more time on the parts that they don’t. The feeling she, Way, and Deal had was that it was a sort of a tech prep hands-on kind of initiative. It’s all tied into the Governor and the Chancellor’s idea of getting more college graduates for Georgia one way or another. One of their “Classic Programs” that this might work with was in Nursing; when Humphrey discussed it with Dr. Bartels, she said we already have here at Georgia Southern mechanisms where people who are, for example, LPN’s wanting to be an RN can exempt out of some of the early courses in that program – but, she said, nobody does. There’s also talk about a sort of limited grade forgiveness for students, like our limited withdrawal policy now.

The USG Faculty Council will meet in Savannah on October 24th. Humphrey cannot attend, so Lisa Abbott from the SEC will attend for her. Humphrey was sure that salary compression would be a hot item on their agenda because every time the Chancellor talks to USGFC, he talks about salary compression being a high priority for him. Last year whatever raise money we had went toward merit raises, so possibly this year raise money might go towards compression and not merit. She called for questions.

Ming Fang He (COE) asked that, since the Search Committee for the Presidential Search Committee lacks representation from some of the colleges, that senators and faculty be encouraged to actively participate in candidate forums.

Humphrey said she was 100% in support of every Senator and faculty member attending the forums.

7. Election of Senate Liaison with SGA:

Humphrey noted we are still looking for somebody to help Ellen Hamilton as our SGA representative. There had been no volunteers, and none came forward at this point. Humphrey said we would revisit the issue again.
8. Presentation from AVP Christopher Johnston on Foundation plans re: Trusts, Estates, & Gift Planning

AVP Johnston emphasized faculty members’ relationships with students and alumni. He offered as an example Samantha Grovenstein-Lee (2005) who endowed the Professor Susan Rebstock Williams Business Technology Scholarship because, she said, Professor Williams was the best mentor that a woman in a technology program could ever ask for, and she wanted to provide other women with the same chance that she had. In regard to Trusts, Estates & Gift Planning, he distinguished between lifetime giving, which is typically current annual fund donations, our Day for Southern, and major gifts; and legacy giving, which is gifts given shortly prior to, or immediately following, the donor’s death. This can be a complex situation, involving as it does attorneys, financial advisors, medical advisors, family and heirs, and so GSU tries to keep it as simple and effortless as possible. Typical estate gifts can include cash, securities, property, real estate, life insurance, IRAs, and private family foundations. Estate giving allows donors to reserve their resources during their lives, because even though they are fairly comfortable with the resources that they have available, they can’t be completely sure what’s in the future, such as medical costs, family issues, and other things which keep them from providing a current gift during their lifetime. The Foundation has a website [georgiasouthern.giftplans.org] and with Marketing and Communications is developing newsletters, brochures, and postcards. Johnston also is meeting with professional advisors, not only to help them with their clients and to bring new clients to Georgia Southern, but also to help our alumni with their professional advisors who provide resources that make it easy to provide a gift to this University. We also have the Soaring Eagles Legacy Society, which will meet on October 30th, to steward our donors who have provided former planned gifts to the University. Johnston is also doing “lunch and learn” sessions, and seminars talking to people about different estate gift options that are available to them. He ended with the story of Gladys, who was passionate about the University, but hadn’t made many gifts and didn’t look like she was very wealthy. It turned out she indeed had wealth and wanted to donate to GSU, but wanted also to reserve it for possible lifetime emergencies. Johnston got to know her well and was able to make arrangements that, at her death, brought a gift of $5 million to COE.

Moderator Humphrey noted that faculty would bear that in mind just as soon as we get raises.
9. Report and Q&A on Presidential Search, Steve Vives (COSM), Search Committee chair:

The campus committee had been charged just a few days before, so little had yet been done. Lori Durden, our Board of Regents representative, is chairing the 7-person Special Regents Search Committee. She asked committee members to state what we are looking for in a President and, with 18 people on the committee, Vives believed nothing was left off of the list. The Chancellor and the Executive Vice Chancellor Steve Wrigley, to whom Vives will report, asked them to quickly get an advertisement out to maximize the time that we had to develop a strong applicant pool. They emphasized actively encouraging nominations from the University community and listening to all the stakeholders, not just peers. The Chancellor used Vives as an example, noting he wasn’t there just to represent Biology. He also emphasized the importance in confidentiality; there are state laws that apply, and they were in place for the last presidential search, so this one will run similarly. After the screening and interviews, the campus committee will provide a list of three to five names to the Special Regents Search Committee, probably by the end of February, early March. That list will be unranked and then the Special Regents Search Committee will conduct their own interview and evaluation process. They asked that any names submitted be those of people any of whom we would happy to have as President. The Board of Regents and Chancellor’s office personnel then left, and the committee met with the Search Firm, Parker Executive Search, and they all started developing a timeline and advertisements. The timeline is still being finalized, but the current goal is to by October have the advertisement posted; in October to November get stakeholder input on how to go through and evaluate applications; in January to February conduct airport interviews in Atlanta with a group of 8 to 12 applicants; in February bring a subset to campus; in March turn over an unranked list of candidates to the Regents Committee. He urged faculty to email campus committee members with input on leadership qualities that should be listed in the advertisement, and later to participate in the focus groups designed to gather input on how applications should be evaluated, and certainly to participate when the candidates are on campus interviewing. We’re not only interviewing them, they are interviewing us, so a good turnout will be very helpful. The committee is developing a webpage that will be up shortly. It will list the Search Committee members’ names and email addresses and information will be added to the page as the search progresses.

Mark Edwards (COSM), one of the search committee members, expanded on the emphasis everyone put on confidentiality. Most of the people who apply for the President’s job are in some high position themselves, and they are probably applying without their current institutions knowing about it, so if it comes out that their name is under consideration here, then they’ll just withdraw and we could lose a strong applicant from the pool.
Moderator Humphrey (COSM) reiterated the restrictions of state law as well, and noted that we can’t release any names until those candidates are actually coming to campus. Vives confirmed this, adding we can’t even call them “finalists”; only the Special Regents Committee can do that.

Mark Welford (COSM) asked if the Special Regents Committee have the right to bring in someone who was not part of our evaluation here at the University.

Vives said they asked Search Firm that and they said they couldn’t imagine a scenario where that would happen, and the Chancellor indicated that they will look at the group that the campus committee submits, and, if there are any issues with that group, they’ll just ask the committee to go back to work.

10. Unfinished Business

None.

11. New Business

None.

12. Announcements: Vice Presidents

None.

13. Announcements from the Floor

None.

14. Adjournment

Moved and Approved.
Faculty Senate Minutes
November 16, 2015
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
**Russell Union Ballroom**


*Secretary’s Note:* The alternates who attended for Larisa Elisha and Steven Elisha initialed the Senators’ sheet, but we can’t figure out who they were. *Note: One of the names has been clarified.* Tom Pearsall substituted for Larisa Elisha.

Senator Moderator and Chair Senate Executive Committee: Patricia Humphrey
Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

**Voting members not in attendance:** Sam Adeyeye, Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Moya Alfonso, William Amponsah, Kelly Berry, Sarah Bielski, Adam Bossler, Finbarr Curtis, John Dyer, Larisa Elisha, Steven Elisha, Devon Jensen, Scott Kersey, Mujibur Kahn, Barbara King, Li Li, Lili Li, Li Ma, Ron MacKinnon, Alan Mackelprang, Bryan Miller, Maria Morris, Joe Ruhland, Jake Simons, Valentin Soloiu, Tiffanie Townsend, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi, Jianquiang Zhao.

**Administrators:** Martha Abell, Steve Burrell, Diana Cone, Mohammad Davoud, Steven Harper, Devon Jensen, Barry Joyner, Tom Koballa, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker, Jason Slone, Teresa Thompson, Steve Vives

**Visitors:** Candace Griffith, Michelle Cawthorn, Yi Hu, Enka Lakuriqi, Marian Tabi, Leigh Ann Williams

1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 16, 2015 meeting.

Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the October 6, 2015 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary:
Cyr received some corrections from Associate VP Christopher Johnston to the version of his presentation. Most of those corrections were entered in an online revision already. There was...
one further clarification: Regarding the example that he gave of the donor of $5 million to the College of Education, that was not at Georgia Southern, but at his previous institution. Cyr also thanked VP Johnston for prompting him to look at that section again because it was embarrassingly full of typos, and for supplying Cyr with the gratification of knowing that somebody reads the minutes. The minutes were Approved.

3. Librarians Reports for November 2015, Jessica Minihan (LIB), Senate Librarian:

Marc Cyr (CLASS) had a question for Chris Geyerman, the faculty NCAA Representative, but Geyerman was not present, so Cyr said he’d send those questions to Geyerman and ask him to address them at the next meeting. The Librarian’s Report was Approved.

a. Undergraduate Committee Report – Cheryl Aasheim (CEIT), Chair:

Biology made several catalog description changes to reflect updates made to their course content and lab content. CLASS revised two concentrations and the Department of History added a course, deleted a course, and revised their program accordingly. The College of Education added four courses, revised five courses, and added a new program in Bachelor of Science in Education and Secondary Education with concentrations in Math Education, Biology Education, Chemistry Education, and Physics Education. The report was Moved and Approved.

b. Graduate Committee Report – Richard Flynn (CLASS):

In the absence of chair Dustin Anderson, member Richard Flynn gave the Graduate Committee Report. The Committee approved a course revision and a program modification from the Department of History; a new course, a course revision, and a program modification in the Department of Curriculum, Foundations, and Reading; a program revision in the Department of Leadership, Technology and Learning; a program clarification for the M. Ed. Counselor Education; and took off the table and passed the items that were tabled at the September 10th meeting. The report was Moved and Approved.

c. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report – Michelle Cawthorn (COSM), Chair:

The Committee had been discussing how to review core course assessment reports. They reviewed rubrics and tried to make sure that everybody knew what the rubrics were doing and were scoring rubrics the same, and were in the process of reviewing reports. The reports were to be ready to go back to departments in December.

4. President’s Report (Jean Bartels) – no report. Dr. Bartels was out of town.
5. Provost’s Report: (Diana Cone):

Health Services Center
The ribbon cutting has been scheduled for January 8th at 2:00.

Military Science Building
We had the groundbreaking for the Military Science Building.

Multipurpose Academic Building
The architects were to be on campus later in the week for a two-day session with the Deans that are involved, who will discuss information they have already sent forward about what they need in order to vacate the existing buildings. This year will be the planning phase, and when the Military Science Building is finished we will begin construction on the new Academic Building.

Board of Regents
The primary news coming from the Board office was the consolidation of Darton College and Albany State. That merged entity will be called Albany State, and they have direct appointed a president for that institution. President Bartels will be presenting to the Chancellor our request for our FY 17 budget in early December.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked if the programs that were cut at Albany State prior to the merger would be restored. Provost Cone had no information on that.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that such consolidations were supposed to save money and asked if we had any information on how much has been saved by these consolidations. Provost Cone had no such information and said that would be a question for the System office.

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

Request for Information: Parking Fines and Procedures
Re: an RFI from Robert Costomiris about parking violations, specifically tickets that are valued initially at $35 for failure to correctly display a hang tag and the time period to appeal such tickets, Humphrey met with Costomiris and Kristy Bryant from Parking. One of Costomiris’s questions was about checking license plates to determine authorized parking; the handheld unit used by ticket writers cannot identify license plates, so if you don’t have your hang tag you will get a ticket. However, if you do not have your tag with you, you can get a freebie temporary if you go to the Parking office. Furthermore, if you get a ticket for not having your hang tag, if you appeal it within 7 days it will be waived at least for the first two. If you get a third or more ticket, as long as you appeal it within 7 days that $35 goes down to $5. Parking is trying to move to a
new system where they can read license plates, and we can eliminate hang tags. The problem is upgrading our gates; they are extremely expensive to replace.

**Missing Class Due to Academic and Sports Reasons**

SGA wants a policy granting mandatory forgiveness of student absences due to academic and sports reasons. The difficulty is how this could be made into policy, especially given that there are cases where a student might miss class for a day that includes a required element that can’t be duplicated. Errol Spence of SGA hopes to have something for February.

**SEC Discussion**

The SEC discussed a revision to policy 210 to try to clarify the P & T appeals process, specifically appeals that might culminate at the Provost’s level, and to gain clarity re: what happens at the Provost and President levels. Humphrey also noted that she had been talking with the SRI Committee, specifically Trent Mauer. They are not on track for a pilot study this semester. They had been trying to work with a vendor, but it turned out the vendor only worked online, which the Senate has voted against. Furthermore, this vendor’s SRI’s are actually even more comparative to norms than what we currently have. So the SRI Committee is now working to totally design our own from the ground up. Nan LoBue (CLASS), a member of the SRI Committee, said they have some good models and hope to pilot a new instrument in Spring.

Mark Edwards (COSM) asked why the parking RFI was an academic matter fit to come before the Faculty Senate. It sounded to him like somebody got a parking ticket and wanted it fixed.

Moderator Humphrey noted it was several parking tickets, and the faculty member hadn’t appealed them in time. She added that the reason for the 7 day appeal period is because they use student workers and, if a ticket is appealed, they ask the student worker about the circumstances, and students can’t remember something for longer than a week. It became a matter for Faculty Senate when the person filed a Senate RFI.

Edwards said the SEC has the ability to not respond to things if they are not an academic matter.

Humphrey said the Senate deals with more than purely academic matters, and the SEC thought this issue pertained to faculty welfare generally, which is a Senate purview.

Ming Fang He (COE): “I appreciated last time . . .” [Secretary’s Note: Only these four words recorded; the rest of her remarks are inaudible. From Moderator Humphrey’s response, apparently they pertain to forums about desirable attributes of the next President of GSU.]
Humphrey said that the last forum for faculty input was scheduled in this same room immediately after the current Senate meeting. After that, faculty input would be limited to nominating or urging self-nomination of people that they may know who would be candidates for President, the “soft deadline” for that being January 28th. After January 28th, the Search and Screen Committee will be getting those applications to review and starting the screening and interviewing process. That committee is supposed to have a recommendation to the BOR of no less than three and no more than five names by the end of March. She reminded everyone that this is a semi-open/semi-closed search. The only people who will actually know who all the applicants are, are the Search and Screen Committee. Everyone else will only know the names of those invited to campus for interviews. That’s state law for that type of search.

Ming Fang He (COE): [Secretary’s Note: Many of her remarks are, again, inaudible on the recording.] She felt it was important that the status of Georgia Southern be addressed by a new President, and that the new President be committed to real shared governance.

Humphrey noted this discussion was not appropriate for the current Senate meeting, but rather appropriate for the Presidential Search forum that would follow immediately after adjournment of this particular meeting.

7. **Election of Senate Moderator for 2016-2017: Richard Flynn (CLASS) 2016-2017 Senate Moderator.**

Richard Flynn (CLASS) was the sole nominee. He was elected by acclaim and will be the 2016-17 SEC Chair and Senate Moderator.

8. **Unfinished Business**

None.

9. **New Business**

None.

10. **Announcements: Vice Presidents**

None

11. **Announcements from the Floor**

None

12. **Adjournment**

Moved and Approved.