

4-2017

Librarian's Report 4-2017

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-lib-reports>

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "Librarian's Report 4-2017" (2017). *Faculty Senate Librarian Reports*. 29.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-lib-reports/29>

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

Senate Librarians Report submitted by Mark R. Welford, Senate Librarian for the April 2017 meeting.

This report includes:

Faculty Research Committee minutes, Jan 18	page 2
Faculty Research Committee minutes, Mar 1	page 4
Graduate Committee minutes, March 9	page 6
GECC meeting minutes, March 22	page 11
Library Committee minutes, March 22	page 15
NCAA Athletic Report	Page 17
Undergraduate Committee minutes, February 14	page 19

Georgia Southern University Faculty Research Committee (2016-17)

January 18, 2017, 10:00 AM Veazey Hall 2001C

- I. Call to order (Chair): The meeting was called to order at 10:05 AM by the Chair - Dr. Kathryn Anderson.
- II. Approval of Agenda/minutes: The agenda was approved by full vote of the committee. Minutes from this meeting will returned to the next stated meeting for approval.

III. Roll Call

Kathryn Anderson – Elected Chair	CHHS	Term expiration	Present
Dustin Anderson	CLASS	2017	Present
John Barkoulas	COBA	2017	Present
James Jupp	COE	2017	Present
Rochani Hareesh	JPHCOPH	2018	Present
Eric Gato	COSM	2018	Present
Jeffrey Mortimore	Library	2018	Present
Jeong Myung	CEIT	2018	Present
Jonathan Hilpert	Senate	2018	Present
Lance McBrayer	Provost Delegate	Ex Off.	Present
Ele Haynes	Provost - Rep	Ex Off.	Present

IV. Award for Excellence in Research and/or Scholarly Activity

- A. 9 applications were reviewed by all committee members. Assigned reviews were completed independently through the online application.
- B. Review rubric rankings were posted to a common spreadsheet. Numeric rankings and reviewer comments were used to narrow the applicant field to 4 candidates.
- C. The final 4 applications were ranked. The top two applicants will be forwarded to the Provost as the committee nominees for the Excellence in Research and/or Creative Scholarly Pursuits awards. The 3rd and 4th place candidates will be held in reserve. Should one of the award winners leave GS, the 3rd and then 4th runner up will receive the award.
- D. Committee members were reminded that the process is confidential. No results may be released prior to the Provost’s announcement at commencement.

V. Application pilot comments.

- A. Suggestions for application improvement
 - i. Add a direction to the applicant to provide access to a full text of the work samples from the last 5 years in pdf or by google drive library. Books must provide a minimum of pdf of the table of contents and abstract. If a book chapter, a pdf may be provided.
 - ii. Links to web locations should be discouraged as the links are not stable or under the control of the applicant. A note will be added reminding the applicant that they are responsible for keeping application links current.
 - iii. Add drop down menus to the app for percent of effort and role on the project.
 - iv. Add a text field for documentation of impact. A word limit of 250 words should be used.
 - v. The note for proceed to the next round or do not proceed should appear in the report to the committee.
 - vi. The most recent set of scores and comments should be visible to the reviewer during re-evaluations.
 - vii. Remove the time out limit on the app.
- B. Suggestions for process improvement.
 - i. Insert a method to require and collect citation for each work sample
 - ii. Method to collect % effort, applicant role on the project and document impact.

- iii. Add an instruction to the letters of support to require at least 1 letter to be from an external source.

VI. Committee Assignments:

- A. Scheduling: The committee voted to assign initial reviewers based upon random selection. Each project will be assigned 3 reviewers by the Provost's rep. The committee will use the guideline rubric to evaluate the projects and assign them to either continue to next round or do not fund categories based upon merit and not budget. A second round of review will be conducted to rank projects for the purpose of funding.
- B. Since all applications will be received electronically the committee will receive an email from committee administration to let them know the pool is open for review. All reviews will be conducted within the application.
- C. All committee assignments must be completed prior to February 24 in preparation for the March 1 evaluation meeting.
 - i. Deadlines
 - 1. January 30, 2016 – Applications submitted to ORSSP
 - 2. February 24, 2017 – Initial review assignments completed for round 1
 - 3. March 1, 2017 – initial review meeting
 - 4. March 7, 2017 – Funding reviews completed.
 - 5. March 8, 2017 – First round funding decision meeting
 - 6. May 1, 2017 – Award letters prepared for recipients
 - 7. July 1, 2017 – No pre-award spending in FY16

II. Adjourn - The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 AM by the Chair - Dr. Kathryn Anderson.

Georgia Southern University Faculty Research Committee (2016-17)

March 1, 2017, 10:00 AM Veazey Hall 2001C

- VII. Call to order (Chair): The meeting was called to order at 10:05 AM by the Chair - Dr. Kathryn Anderson.
- VIII. Approval of Agenda/minutes: The agenda was approved by full vote of the committee. Minutes from this meeting will returned to the next stated meeting for approval.

IX. Roll Call

Kathryn Anderson – Elected Chair	CHHS	Term expiration	Present
Dustin Anderson	CLASS	2017	Present
John Barkoulas	COBA	2017	Present
James Jupp	COE	2017	Present
Rochani Haresh	JPHCOPH	2018	Present
Eric Gato	COSM	2018	Present
Jeffrey Mortimore	Library	2018	Absent
Jeong Myung	CEIT	2018	Present
Jonathan Hilpert	Senate	2018	Present
Lance McBrayer	Provost Delegate	Ex Off.	Present
Ele Haynes	Provost - Rep	Ex Off.	Present

- X. **Research Seed Funding and Scholarly Pursuit Funding Reviews.**
 - A. Committee members reviewed applications for funding based upon random assignment. Each application was reviewed by 3 committee members and scores were entered into the electronic application under round 1. A total of 25 Seed funding applications and 10 Scholarly Pursuit applications were reviewed. Committee comments were recorded in the application.
 - B. Review rubric rankings were posted to a common spreadsheet. Numeric rankings and reviewer comments were used to narrow the applicant field based upon scientific merit. Budget concerns were not included in this round of review.
 - C. The committee voted to move 25 applications into round 2.
 - D. The committee voted unanimously VIA email on Friday, March 3 to remove the top 9 applications from review round 2 and move them to the funded round. The bottom 2 reviews were also moved from round 2 to the not funded round as falling below the available funding mark.
 - E. All committee members were tasked to review the remaining 15 application and input their responses by the close of business on Monday, March 6.
- XI. Application pilot comments were collected but discussion will be deferred until the end of competition reviews.
 - A. Suggestions for application improvement
 - i. For next year the application will be improved to allow for a single upload of the review document instead of section reviews and a separate budget upload to allow for more effective review.
 - B. Suggestions for process improvement.
 - i. None provided at this meeting.
- XII. Committee Assignments:
 - A. Scheduling: The committee voted to move 15 applications forward to round 2 review, accept 9 applications to funded round, and 11 applications were determined to be not fundable. Each committee member will review the applications that they have not yet reviewed and enter their scores and comments into the electronic application program.
 - i. Deadlines
 - 1. January 30, 2016 – Applications submitted to ORSSP

2. February 24, 2017 – Initial review assignments completed for round 1
3. March 1, 2017 – initial review meeting for funding applications – Round 1
4. March 8, 2017 – First round funding decision meeting
5. May 1, 2017 – Award letters prepared for recipients
6. July 1, 2017 – No pre-award spending in FY18

III. Adjourn - The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM by the Chair - Dr. Kathryn Anderson.

GRADUATE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Graduate Committee Meeting Date – March 9, 2017

- Present: Dr. Mujibur Khan, CEIT; Dr. Dustin Anderson, CLASS; Dr. Constantin Ogloblin, COBA; Dr. Bill Yang, COBA; Dr. Meca Williams-Johnson, COE; Dr. Ming Fang He, COE; Mr. Lili Li, Library; Mr. Jeffrey Mortimore, Library; Dr. Thomas Koballa, Dean, COE [Academic Affairs]; Dr. Yunfeng Chen, [Alternate] CEIT; Dr. Manuela Caciula, [Alternate] CHHS; Dr. Li, [Alternate] CHHS; Dr. Eric Gato, [Alternate] COSM; Dr. Samuel Opoku, [Alternate], JPHCOPH; Dr. Diana Cone, VPAA/COGS; Mrs. Audie Graham, COGS
- Guests: Ms. Candace Griffith, VPAA; Mrs. Naronda Wright, COGS; Mrs. Randi Sykora-McCurdy, COGS; Mrs. Wendy Sikora, COGS; Ms. Cindy Groover, Institutional Effectiveness; Mr. Wayne Smith, Registrar's Office; Ms. Doris Mack, Registrar's Office; Dr. Tracy Linderholm, COE; Dr. Christine Ludowise, Dr. Brian Koehler, COSM; Dr. Lance McBrayer, COSM; Dr. David Williams, CEIT; Dr. Dan Bauer, CLASS; Dr. Jessica Brooks, CLASS
- Absent: Dr. Gustavo Molina, CEIT; Dr. Gavin Colquitt, CHHS; Dr. Brandon Harris, CHHS; Dr. Richard Flynn, CLASS; Dr. Scott Kersey, COSM; Dr. Colton Magnant, COSM; Dr. Bill Mase, JPHCOPH; Dr. Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, JPHCOPH

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Dustin Anderson called the meeting to order on Thursday, March 9, 2017 at 9:00 AM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Ming Fang He made a motion to approve the agenda as written. A second was made by Dr. Constantin Ogloblin and the motion to approve the agenda was passed.

III. CHAIR'S UPDATE

A. Comprehensive Program Review – Dr. Anderson stated all rubric scores for the Comprehensive Program Reviews have been received, and they have all either met or met with recommendations. Dr. Anderson said he has received four out of the seven reports, and he will normalize them and include them in the April Graduate Committee agenda. This will allow members to read the reports in advance and questions will be addressed during the April meeting.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. College of Education

Dr. Tracy Linderholm presented the agenda item for the College of Education.

Department of Teaching and Learning

Information Item:

Collaborative MAT Program

JUSTIFICATION:

Disband the collaborative online MAT program with Columbus State University, Valdosta State University, and Georgia Southern University.

No action required for information only item.

B. College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences

Dr. Dan Bauer presented the agenda items for the Department of Writing and Linguistics.

Department of Writing and Linguistics

New Course:

WRIT 5231G - Advanced Screenwriting

JUSTIFICATION:

WRIT/LING has proposed changing WRIT 4232 to WRIT 5231 to make the course consistent with the numbering of the other "Advanced" courses offered in our Creative Writing emphasis. Proposing a 5231G course brings further consistency to the Creative Writing offerings and allows students to take the course for graduate credit.

Dr. Anderson asked for clarification of the catalog description regarding the additional coursework graduate students will be responsible for completing. Dr. Bauer said it depends on the student, and the catalog description was vague because the department did not want to limit the instructor. Dr. Bauer suggesting altering the sentence in the description to read as "Graduate students will do work in addition to undergraduates to further enrich and develop their projects".

MOTION: Dr. Meca Williams-Johnson made a motion to approve the agenda item submitted by the Department of Writing and Linguistics, with the revision to the catalog description. A second was made by Dr. He. The motion to approve the New Course was approved.

Dr. Jessica Brooks presented the agenda items for the Department of Psychology.

Department of Psychology

Course Revision(s):

PSYC 7235 - Group & Family Therapy

JUSTIFICATION:

Changes are being proposed in response to feedback from practicum supervisors and internship directors to improve student preparation for clinical work.

PSYC 7433 - Foundations & Skills II

JUSTIFICATION:

Changes are being proposed in response to feedback from practicum supervisors and internship directors to improve student preparation for clinical work.

Program Revision:

Clinical Psychology Psy.D.

JUSTIFICATION:

Changes are being proposed in response to feedback from practicum supervisors and internship directors to improve student preparation for clinical work. The revision also updates the dissertation credit hours, which were incorrectly listed in the current catalog.

Dr. Anderson stated he spoke with Dr. Thresa Yancey and she stated the Program and Course Revisions have to do with accreditation. He asked for clarification from the Registrar's Office if the effective date for these items can be changed to Fall 2017, rather than Fall 2018. Mr. Wayne Smith stated the Registrar's Office approved of the effective date change.

MOTION: Dr. He made a motion to approve the agenda items submitted by the Department of Psychology, with the understanding that the effective date be changed to Fall 2017 due to accreditation. A second was made by Dr. Ogloblin. The motion to approve the Course Revisions and Program Revision was approved.

C. Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies

Mrs. Naronda Wright presented the agenda item for the Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies.

Information Item:

International Transcript Evaluations

Mrs. Naronda Wright stated the College of Graduate Studies (COGS) has been completing international transcript evaluations in-house for the past three to four years. Mrs. Wright said the workload for this has steadily increased and the college is not staffed to continue to support this service. She said due to the increased workload and increase of applications COGS will no longer perform the transcript evaluations

in-house. Students will be required to have their transcripts evaluated by a member of the National Association of Credential Evaluations Services, Inc. (NACES).

Dr. Ogloblin asked what if the applicant is not using credentials from one of the institutions they have attended. Mrs. Wright said we require transcripts from all universities attended. Dr. Diana Cone stated this is a SACSCOC policy, both undergraduate and graduate level applicants are required to show proof of all institutions they have attended.

Dr. Cone said while this change is due to the workload issue, it also is a process to send a staff member for additional training to ensure transcript evaluations are being performed correctly.

Dr. Anderson asked how this would impact our international applications. Mrs. Wright stated she did not think there would be much of a change. She said a lot of students already submit the transcript evaluations, because they are applying to multiple schools.

Ms. Candace Griffith stated another advantage to this is when a Georgia Southern student becomes a graduate teaching assistant, she has to request official transcripts as well as external evaluations for foreign degrees. In the past, Ms. Griffith was able to accept a copy of the external evaluations submitted to COGS. She said when COGS did not have the external evaluation, the student would then have to pay to have this done.

Dr. Eric Gato asked if students will be required to go through WES for the transcript evaluations. Mrs. Wright said anyone who is NACES accredited will be acceptable.

No action required for information only item.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. Prior Learning Assessment – Dr. Thomas Koballa asked the committee to think about the PLA policy in two pieces. One would be the policy, and the other would be the funding associated with it. Dr. Koballa stated the Graduate Committee and Faculty Senate has never engaged in setting tuition or fee rates. He asked the committee to separate the two areas as they continue the PLA discussion. Dr. Koballa distributed a handout of the current transfer credit policy that is listed in the graduate catalog, which states there is a maximum of six credit hours. Dr. Koballa said the proposed PLA policy lists nine hours as the maximum, and he suggested amending the number of credit hours listed in the PLA policy to six.

Dr. Koballa said two areas of funding has been discussed by the committee. One is the income associated with the evaluation charge, and the second is how faculty get paid for conducting the assessment. Dr. Koballa said Mr. Rob Whitaker has recommended the language “evaluation charge” be used in the PLA policy, rather than “fee”. Dr. Koballa stated he would argue against setting the evaluation charge the same as the tuition rate. He referred to another handout with the proficiency exam section from the undergraduate catalog. Dr. Koballa said the fee listed in proficiency exam policy is only \$15.00. Dr. Koballa said if the PLA policy is approved, then the President and President’s Cabinet would need to address the funding. Dr. Koballa explained why he would argue against charging the tuition rate. He said faculty effort related to assessment is different than teaching a course. Dr. Koballa encouraged the committee to allow the President and the President’s Cabinet to evaluate the evaluation charge and what options are available to provide appropriate compensation to faculty.

There was a brief discussion of transfer courses and how they relate to PLA credit. If a student receives PLA credit it would remain on their transcript and would be listed as “K” credit.

Dr. David Williams asked how you deal with the credentials of the instruction. Dr. Koballa said you would not deal with the credentials, you would focus on the evidence that the student brings forward.

Dr. Gato suggested having a committee conduct the assessment, rather than one faculty member.

Dr. Koballa said if the PLA policy is supported by the Graduate Committee, then there is a possibility that the Undergraduate Committee may choose to revisit the proficiency exams section.

Dr. Koballa reviewed the PLA policy and procedures. After a brief discussion the following revisions were recommended for the committee's consideration.

- 1) Change maximum credit hours from 9 to 6 credit hours.
- 2) Revise Item #6 of the procedures to read as "The student will receive notification of performance results within a timeframe established by the program."

MOTION: Mr. Jeffrey Mortimore made a motion to approve the Prior Learning Assessment policy with the suggested amendments listed above. A second was made by Dr. Ogloblin, and the motion was approved.

B. Discussion of Degree Description – Dr. Lance McBrayer stated the College of Science and Mathematics (COSM) would like for degrees to reflect a thesis degree versus a non-thesis degree. He said the college would like to add a description to the transcript to better reflect what the student actually did. Dr. McBrayer explained how other institutions add the title of the thesis to the transcript so that any reviewer of the transcript would have an idea what the research component was over.

Dr. Anderson asked if the idea is to enhance student's marketability across the board, or for one side or the other. Dr. McBrayer said it would be across the board, and that adding the title as the description would be the most beneficial to the students.

Dr. Khan asked if description would be on the diploma. Dr. McBrayer said no, the description would only be on the transcript.

There was a brief discussion of whether Master of Arts would be an option, rather than the Master of Science. Ms. Griffith said she was not sure if it would be feasible to rename degrees, because of the approval process and workload.

Ms. Griffith said as a reviewer of faculty transcripts, she finds it extremely helpful to have non-thesis or thesis description added.

Dr. McBrayer said he spoke to the Department Chairs and Program Directors in their college and all of them are in support of this. He said they would have to work with the Registrar's Office to see what the stipulations would be to add the descriptions.

Mr. Wayne Smith suggested the committee make the request and then the Registrar's Office would review and determine what will be needed to make this change.

Dr. Anderson suggested that each college who is interested in this undertake the same approach as COSM has.

MOTION: Mr. Mortimore made a motion to approve a degree description be added to the COSM student's transcripts. A second was made by Dr. Williams-Johnson. The motion to approve the request by COSM was passed.

Dr. Anderson stated Dr. McBrayer will work with the Registrar's Office to have the descriptions added. Dr. Anderson asked Dr. McBrayer if he could come back with a follow up of how the process went, because it might expedite the process for other colleges. Dr. McBrayer agreed.

C. Curriculum Inventory Management Update – Ms. Doris Mack stated there was no updates at this time for CIM.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. Anderson thanked Randi Sykora-McCurdy for working with the Deans and Associate Deans on disseminating information to Program Directors about changes to federal financial aid.

Dr. Anderson reminded everyone to watch for announcements on the upcoming Research Symposium in April.

Mrs. Audie Graham stated the deadline to submit nominations for the Averitt Awards is March 14.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on March 9, 2017 at 9:58 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Audie Graham, Recording Secretary

Minutes were approved March 20, 2017 by
electronic vote of Committee Members

GECCC Minutes 2/28/17

In attendance: Michelle Cawthorn, Delena Bell Gatch, Chris Ludowise for Curtis Ricker, Alan Woodrum, Eudiah Ochieng, Ruth Baker, Jake Simons, Clint Martin, Jim Lo Bue, William Amponsah, Rocio Alba-Flores, Terri Flateby, Julie Garlen, Yasor Bodur, Jingjing Yin, Isaac Chun Hai Fung

- I. Approval of previous month's meeting: Michelle makes a motion to approve previous meetings minutes. Seconded by William Amponsah.

Approved.

- II. Old news: Michelle reported that A.J. Riggs of kinesiology reported that courses (CORE courses in CIM) that we had rolled back are not getting the feedback from this committee, so they didn't know they needed to change anything. They are withdrawing courses for now and will resubmit next year.

- III. Review of GEN ED Outcomes: Do we need two sets? How are we going to reconcile them? Michelle provided a crosswalk of GSU's Gen Ed outcomes, the CORE outcomes, and Gen Ed outcomes from our peer institutions. The following conversation occurred:

- Jake Simons: Argue in favor of condensing to a single set of outcomes. 1) We have large percentage of academic community that does not recognize the distinction 2) We don't have a curricular structure to support this. 3) It is redundant. We would be better served if they would dovetail into each other.

Some agreement from around the table.

- Michelle: Many of our peer institutions don't make a distinction between GEN ED and CORE. They have broad stems (often skill based) from which specific outcomes branch off. Also, some are measuring student at beginning and end of academic career as freshmen and as seniors.

EX: App State has a rubric to assess as each trait at each level (freshman, sophomore, etc.)

Terri Flateby explained the VALUE rubrics published by the AAC&U.

Jake Simons: Could we get away without defining specific outcomes?

Delena Gatch: (After the AAC&U conference on General Education that she and Terri attended in February): Many of these institutions have less limited core (they have hundreds of classes); these institutions tend to view Gen Ed and the Core as one and the same. Other institutions have a leaner CORE, and they tend to view the Core as specific to early students and Gen Ed for

all students, especially at the end of their college career, as we do. Many people were assessing both, but doing it continuously.

Delena Gatch also presented an analysis of which programs in our colleges were emphasizing outcomes similar to our Gen Ed outcomes as another way to approach measuring Gen Ed outcomes. Mapping of outcomes is colored by discipline of person doing it. If these outcomes are being measured in specific programs, then we could pull information from the program reports to support documentation of measuring Gen Ed outcomes, retaining at least some of the Gen Ed outcomes and the CORE outcomes. She presented a rough summary of colleges on campus that have over half of their programs including something similar to a Gen Ed outcome (i.e., critical thinking). Of these, effective communication, critical analysis and synthesis of information, and problem solving were the most common.

Terri Flateby: We should be condensing GEN ED outcomes, but not eliminating them.

Delena Gatch: The only outcome that is not being measured in over half the programs of at least one college is Quality of Life. This did appear in some programs, mostly in CLASS.

We have tried to determine how to measure Quality of Life with help from student affairs without much success. We also tried to use an assignment from the Health classes at one point.

Jake Simons: Mapping then presents problems if we continue with Gen Ed outcomes because we don't know specifics about curricula.

Others at table expressed concern about same thing, especially with consolidation looming.

Delena: Programs take the mapping back to their department to map with outcomes (not all, but a portion), a full story could be told.

Some agreement around table.

Jim Lo Bue: There is a suggestion that programs could delegate specific core classes for their students, perhaps eliminating, for example, repetition in math classes for math majors.

Alan Woodrum: mentioned student major changes. As often as students change majors, having CORE specificity would mean that many students would have to start the CORE over (or at least catch up) every time they changed a major. Further, because CORE is a BOR mandate, we would have to insure that students were not missing areas of the CORE.

The group then looked at outcomes from our peer institutions. Discussion across table about how vague the outcomes are from peer institutions and issues that they can be interpreted so differently.

Jim Lo Bue: Hesitant to reduce number of outcomes before we talk with Armstrong.

Point made from quite a few that critical thinking, synthesis of information and others should be in CORE. BOR set CORE. But, other USG schools have them, perhaps as part of Institutional Options (Area B).

Terri Flateby and Christine Ludowise strongly agree that it is not effective to have extremely defined (technical) outcomes.

Jake Simons: What would this look like?

Terri Flateby: Don't know yet.

Jake Simons: The more SLOs we have, the more work we have in assessing them. Can some assess over time and others immediately.

Michelle Cawthorn: If we have it, it must be assessed.

Delena Gatch: Need to look at how we define the outcomes, where they are embedded in curriculum and how we assess them.

Suggestion to move it forward is seconded but there is concern about timeline. Suggested a sub-committee meet and craft some proposals to present to the consolidation committee on General Education.

There is a suggestion from the floor that a representative of each college be a part of the subcommittee. However, when the Chair asked for volunteers, there were not representatives from each college (there weren't volunteers from each college).

Sub - Committee is formed that consists of:

Rocio, Jake, Delena, Sarah, Terri will meet and discuss Friday, March 10th at 2:30.

Meeting adjourned at 9:02.

Addendum:

The ad hoc subcommittee met on March 10, 2017 and discussed the General Education outcomes and the separate CORE outcomes. They suggested the following recommendation:

The GECC recommends the following be forwarded to the consolidation Operational Working Group that is dealing with the CORE: *GSU's current General Education outcomes should be part of the discussion in constructing new outcomes/CORE of the consolidated university.* In particular, the committee believes that outcomes associated with critical thinking, problem solving, information literacy, and ethical and informed decision making are important and perhaps not captured in the current Core outcomes.

The full committee voted on and approved this recommendation on March 22, 2017.

Faculty Senate Library Committee
March 22, 2017
Essence Notes

Attending: Bede Mitchell, Russell Thackston, Fred Smith, Elizabeth Downs, Timothy Giles, Rebecca Kennerly, Linda Kimsey (by phone), Harvey Moody, Laxman Pandey, Ursula Pritham, Jessica Minihan, Paolo Gujilde, Debra Skinner, Alva Britt.

Subscription Review Update:

Bede shared the results of the subscription review survey with the committee. The survey received good response; of the 50 departments, schools, or centers surveyed, 21 responses were received. The responses were sorted into two categories:

- 1) Not needed - drop resource. This category reflects \$194,119 of possible savings if cancelled.
- 2) No response received. This category reflects \$35,612 of possible savings if cancelled.

The cancellation of these two categories would reflect a cut into our current deficit of 20%. Bede stated that if the library does not received any year-end funding, this may not be enough to address our deficit and we would have to go back and review those resources identified as “desirables”. He anticipates that we should be receiving information on our budget and possible year-end funds within the next month. It was the consensus of the group to share the survey data with the campus now and once our budget information is made available, a final decision can be made and a new update released. Bede will draft a cover message from himself and the Library Committee that will accompany the survey results providing a link to the table of resources, but omitting the department's' responses. A copy of the cover letter will be included in today's minutes. Bede stated that if we cancel the resources in the two categories identified it may be possible to add some of the resources on our Wish List. Jessica will prepare a listing of those resources identified showing how they were ranked (desirable, critical, etc.) and their cost for the committee's review.

The group discussed the need to continue such a survey on a regular basis, perhaps on a smaller scale requesting faculty review a more limited listing such as those indicated as desirables. A broader survey could be done possibly every three years or so.

Bede stated that our budget for resources will also be affected by the consolidation stipulation that programs being offered on both campuses will be continued through 2022. This will necessitate the need to renegotiate our licenses and subscriptions to extend to the Savannah campus. Once Armstrong's budget dollars directed per FTE students, are combined with our current FTE of \$303, the amount will drop to \$290 per FTE student.

Consolidation Update:

Bede reported that the OWG (Organizational Work Group) has begun meeting and they are looking into models of organizational structures. They have submitted their requisite planning

package to the Board of Regents for their review. When the document is finalized he will forward to the committee for their review. He stated that the document is a set of bulleted tasks that have to be addressed before consolidation is completed. He briefly touched on a couple of the tasks.

The next meeting of the Library's OWG will be a half day retreat on Friday, March 31. He added that the group may come up with a plan that will involve creating additional sub-committees of representatives from both campuses to start addressing some of the huge tasks such as merging the operations and services of the two libraries,. He stated that he will be feeding the Library Committee a lot of the charges as they are developed so they can act as our faculty sounding board for feedback.

New Business:

Paolo stated three ways in which faculty can request new titles:

- A request made via the subject liaison.
- Emailing Paolo Gujilde at pgujilde@georgiasouthern.edu
- Completing the "Purchase Request" form located on the Library's website.

Requests are reviewed and approval depends on cost and purpose.

The committee was invited to check out two new study chairs placed on the fourth floor by a manufacturer who wishes to have our opinion on the chair. The fourth floor is a dedicated quiet study floor and the chair is designed for individual quiet study. A lot of the current furniture on fourth floor is not designed for individual study and creates problems on that floor.

Next Meeting:

The group will correspondence via email regarding consolidation and other matters and will only meet again should the need arise.

**NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative Report to the Faculty Senate
Georgia Southern University
April, 2017**

Submitted by
Chris Geyerman, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative

1. The C.S.C.A.A. conferred upon the GSU Women's Swimming and Diving Team its "Scholar All-America Award" for Fall Semester. Congratulations to Coach Thomas, her assistants and the student-athletes on the team.

2. GSR and Federal Graduation Rate (please click on links below):

[GSR Searchable Database](#)

[Trends in GSR and Federal Graduation Rates PowerPoint](#)

[GSR Report – Overall Division I Report](#)

[GSR Report – Football Bowl Subdivision](#)

[GSR Report – Football Championship Subdivision](#)

[GSR Report – Division I \(Nonfootball\)](#)

[Federal Graduation Rate Report – Overall Division I Report](#)

[Federal Graduation Rate Report – Football Bowl Subdivision](#)

[Federal Graduation Rate Report – Football Championship Subdivision](#)

[Federal Graduation Rate Report – Division I \(Nonfootball\)](#)

3. [Below is a link to the "Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics," the goal of which is "to ensure that intercollegiate athletics programs operate within the educational mission of their colleges and universities."](#)
<http://www.knightcommission.org/>

4. [Below is a link to "The Drake Group," whose mission "is to defend academic integrity in higher education from the corrosive aspects of commercialized college sports."](#)
<http://thedrakegroup.org/>

[Of particular note from its 2017 Newsletter #1, the "The Drake Group continues its lobbying effort to pass H.R. 2731, The National Collegiate Athletes Accountability Act.](#)

Interested parties can read the bill here:

<http://files.constantcontact.com/da010ce0501/45e3c796-1acb-461d-b354-80ff3551ce8a.pdf>

UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE
MINUTES
MARCH 7, 2017
3:30 P.M.
IT BUILDING, ROOM 1005

I. CALL TO ORDER

Voting Members Present: Dr. Cheryl Aasheim, Dr. Bettye Apenteng, Dr. Dragos Amarie, Miss Ruth Baker, Dr. Adrian Gardiner, Dr. Barbara Hendry, Dr. Alisa Leckie, Dr. Ron MacKinnon, Dr. Ed Mondor, Dr. Judi Robbins, Dr. Marian Tabi,

Non-Voting Members Present: Ms. Candace Griffith, Ms. Doris Mack, Mr. Justin Willoughby

Guests: Dr. Bradley Edwards, Dr. Delena Bell Gatch, Dr. Brian Koehler, Dr. Christine Ludowise, Dr. Rebecca Ryan, Dr. David Williams

Absent: N/A

Dr. Ron MacKinnon called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A Gardiner/Mondor motion to approve the agenda was passed unanimously.

III. CHAIR'S UPDATE

IV. NEW BUSINESS

*Note: Due to current system limitations, course numbers and subjects may not be accurately reflected on the CIM proposals for new courses/number changes. Please refer to this agenda as the approved subject and/or course number is listed below.

A. College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences

A Gardiner/Mondor motion to approve the revised course was passed unanimously.

Department of Art

Revised Course

[ART 1030: 3D Art and Design Foundations](#)

A Gardiner/Mondor motion to approve the new and revised programs was passed unanimously.

Department of Foreign Languages

New Programs

[: Modern Languages B.A. \(Concentration in Arabic\)](#)

[: Modern Languages B.A. \(Concentration in Chinese\)](#)

[: Modern Languages B.A. \(Concentration in Japanese\)](#)

[: Modern Languages B.A. \(Concentration in Latin\)](#)

Revised Programs

[BA-MDLA/FR: Modern Languages B.A. \(Concentration in French\)](#)

[BA-MDLA/GR: Modern Languages B.A. \(Concentration in German\)](#)

[BA-MDLA/SP: Modern Languages B.A. \(Concentration in Spanish\)](#)

A Gardiner/Mondor motion to approve the revised program was passed unanimously.

Department of Psychology

Revised Program

[BS-PSYCH: Psychology B.S.](#)

A Gardiner/Mondor motion to approve the revised course was passed unanimously.

Department of Writing and Linguistics

Revised Course

[WRIT 5231: Advanced Screenwriting](#)

A Gardiner/Mondor motion to approve the inactivated course and revised program was passed unanimously.

Department of Literature and Philosophy

Inactivated Course

[ENGL 2132: Writing and Literary Research](#)

Revised Program

[BA-ENGL: English B.A.](#)

B. College of Science and Mathematics

A Gardiner/Mondor motion to approve the revised programs was passed unanimously.

Department of Biology

Revised Programs
[BA-BIOL: Biology B.A.](#)
[BSB-BIOL: Biology B.S.B.](#)

C. College of Engineering and Information Technology

A Gardiner/Mondor motion to approve the inactivated program was passed unanimously.

Department of Computer Sciences
Inactivated Program
[IT27: Computer Science Second Discipline Concentration](#)

V. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Program Review

B. Feedback

Dr. Brian Koehler suggested that the Registrar's Office include justifications for each proposal on the agenda as well as the minutes.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee, a Gardiner/Mondor motion to adjourn the meeting at 3:54 p.m. passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,



Tori Brannen
Office of the Registrar