

10-13-2017

Librarian's Report 10-2017

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 10-2017" (2017). *Faculty Senate Librarian's Reports*. 33.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-lib-reports/33>

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's 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 Oct 2017 meeting.

This report includes:

Gen Ed/Core Curriculum Meeting, Aug 31 page 2

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative Report page 5

8/31 Gen Ed/Core Curriculum Meeting

In Attendance: Fred Smith, Cheryl Metrejean, Julie Garlen, Clint Martin, Bridget Melton, Dan Czech (by conference call), Jake Simons, Ruth Baker, Rocio Alba, Melissa Gayan, Alisa Leckie, Stacy Smallwood, Heidi Altman, Michelle Cawthorn

Non-voting members: Curtis Ricker, Delena Gatch

Not in attendance: Andrew Hansen, Marshall Ransom (teaching conflict)

I. Introductions

II. Purpose of Gen Ed/Core Curriculum Committee:

- a. Ensure that general education outcomes are being assessed. Not as well addressed in the last 2 years because comprehensive review of core was higher priority.
- b. Review core curriculum assessment plans.
- c. Also in official workflow for approval of new Core Courses or changes to existing Core Courses. Any proposed changes should come to this committee BEFORE going to undergraduate committee.

III. With consolidation, still overseeing assessment of core. Receiving assessment reports from each Core Class by 9/15.

- a. Two members of committee review report using the rubric, meet and reconcile scores and then send reports back to classes. Reports will be available in Chalk and Wire (online program). Double review occurs.
- b. Current reports not showing as anonymous. Appropriate reps are working with Chalk and Wire to change the settings to insure anonymity. Further instructions will go out to appropriate people.
- c. Rubric norming always occurs. Need to schedule sessions for this need. How to use rubric, score it, ask any questions about it, etc.
- d. Timeline: Reports due 9/15. Goal to have assessing done and back to departments before Thanksgiving.

IV. Additional responsibility: review core courses. With consolidation, no firm answer but according to work flow, we should have courses to review. Extra meetings will be necessary. Not a good idea to skip this committee as undergraduate one is already overworked.

- a. Discussion from members:
 - i. Still need to review courses which were previously approved and in which changes probably have not occurred?
 1. Yes. Even courses previous reviewed could be changed.
 2. Some courses may change: ex. learning outcomes. Some core courses don't have learning outcomes.
 - ii. Is there anyone from Armstrong on this committee?
 1. Not at this time.
 - iii. The directions for full review of all classes in programs is coming from the registrar's office (and perhaps the BOR).

1. No blending of courses with middle grades program with Armstrong due to Armstrong not having program. Classes still need to be approved by Armstrong (and vice versa). Learning outcomes must be reviewed and approved.
 - iv. Why resubmit paperwork even if already on file with no changes and already accepted. Does this have to happen on both campuses if courses not changing?
 1. Don't know answer.
 - v. Trying to understand. Why can't we do this with one institution?
 1. Because still separate institutions.
 - b. Most work done on departmental level for departments who don't have counterpart at Armstrong. It is a lot of work.
- V. Back to our goals and reviewing assessment reports.
- a. Anticipating 61 reviews to be doubled reviewed. 7.6 reviews per person
 - b. Gen Ed vs. Core Definitions
 - c. On GSU campus:
 - i. Gen Ed: overall goals for the 4 year university
 - ii. Core: 1st 2 year courses
 - d. Distinctly different on Southern campus. Interchangeable on Regents level.
 - e. Focus has been the core for this committee, Gen Ed still needs attention
 - i. until this committee is part of consolidated university, some issues have to wait.
- VI. Proposal for spring: after fall work, need to reexamine rubric. Are we comfortable with what rubric aims asking? Need to revise? Haven't revised in several years. Some clear areas of problems with core class assessment reports may suggest revision needs. Feedback from assessment workshops with responsible faculty from departments.
- VII. We need a chair for the committee.
- i. Fred nominates Michelle; other seconded.
 - ii. Group votes Michelle for chair.
- VIII. Next meeting: last Thursday on calendar in September.
- i. Michelle: if workload increases, suggests Friday afternoon meetings. Others counter that Thursdays may be better, so the committee decides if necessary to schedule extra meetings on Thursdays at the same time. Let's get this on the calendar. Always try to meet as close to middle of campus as possible.
- IX. Any general sense of how we should examine core post consolidation, i.e. Reconstructing. Consolidated core is a bridge (requirements could change). At faculty senate, proposal was made to form an ad hoc committee to review the proposed core.
- a. worry about committee would get shut out from process based on faculty senate discussion

- b. Concerns undergraduate committee would be getting more information/duties, etc. to detriment of committee. Need to play larger role with pulling in more representation from campus and taking some workload off of undergraduate committee.
 - c. Plea to committee senators to not let this committee to be left out of process. Committee formed to take some workload off of undergraduate committee.
 - i. maybe invite members of UG to these meetings.
 - ii. Armstrong UG chair believes core belongs to faculty.
 - iii. Armstrong does not have separate committee like GSU.
- X. No idea about what Armstrong is doing about assessment.
- XI. In the coming year, ask departments to work with Armstrong to plan assessment process for coming year 2018-2019. There will be SINGLE reports, SINGLE outcomes, etc. Data presented by campus but reports combined. Currently there are separate departments, but need to talk ahead of time. Get ahead of the game before final reports in September 2018.
- a. Core outcomes need to be reached.
 - b. Cores around country vary greatly. What do we want students to get out of core and what do we want core to be?
 - c. Timeline difficulties in past have resulted in lenient reviews; assessment needs to be ensuring that outcomes are met, and we need to help to ensure that outcomes are indeed being met.
- XII. Next meeting: Thursday, September 28th, 8:00-9:00am, place TBD

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

Submitted by
Chris Geyerman, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative

1. The link to access NCAA Academic Progress Rate (APR), the NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR) and Federal Graduation Rate for Georgia Southern University (click on the first Tab “Academic Progress Rate Search”):
<http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/research/academic-progress-rate-apr>

2. [The most recent GSR and Federal Graduation Rate data were released on November 4, 2015. Below are links to the information released by the NCAA:](#)

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,”](http://thedrakegroup.org/) whose mission “is to defend academic integrity in higher education from the corrosive aspects of commercialized college sports.”
<http://thedrakegroup.org/>