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GECC minutes
March 26, 2018

Attendance: Delena Gatch, Terri Flateby, Clint Martin, Atin Adhikari, Ruth Baker, Fred Smith, Michelle Cawthorn, Alisa Leckie, Marshall Ransom

I. The committee met to discuss proposed changes to GECC bylaws and Core Course Approval forms. We discussed proposed changes, and modified the documents. Because there is no quorum, the vote on document approval will be held electronically. Richard McGrath at Armstrong also shared the documents with the Armstrong UGCC members.

2. We briefly discussed the assessment process for the CORE going forward. Should we stick with what GSU has historically done, go with what Armstrong has done, or do something completely new? We agreed to discuss further, especially once we fully understand the past Armstrong process.

After the meeting, a formal email was sent out to members at GSU. The vote was unanimous in favor of approving the changes to the bylaws and core course approval process.
I. Purpose
The purpose of this policy is to establish a process by which courses currently listed within Areas A through E of the Core Curriculum and Additional Requirements and courses seeking to be added to these Areas are subject to an institutional-level internal review. The review process ensures that all Core Curriculum courses support Core Curriculum Student Learning Outcomes and include a measurement process that aligns with these outcomes. As a result, courses within the Core Curriculum are structured so that, when needed, sufficient data can be supplied to identify student achievement of Core Curriculum learning outcomes.

II. Policy Statement
A proposal for a new course or the removal of an existing course from the Core Curriculum must go through the procedures outlined below before being submitted to the University System of Georgia’s Board of Regents (BOR). This process allows the institution to engage formally in internal evaluations of its course offerings to ensure that they do, in fact, foster maximum opportunities for student learning and are congruent with the rationale for the Core Curriculum. The rationale is that all undergraduates share a common educational experience. “This experience provides the opportunity to use critical thinking to explore moral, cultural, ethical and aesthetic issues; develop effective communication and creative self-expression; consider the implications of personal responsibility in a democratic, pluralistic society; and apply scientific processes to environments in a complex world” (GECC approved rationale, November 2013, amended March 2018).

III. Exclusions
Core Curriculum Area F—The rationale for excluding Area F is twofold because Area F courses are specific to the major. 1. They may be classes that are in other areas of the Core and will thus undergo Core Course Assessment. 2. They may be a significant piece of Program Assessment. For these two reasons, the committee believes it is unnecessary to require additional assessment of this Area.

IV. Procedures
Process for Initial Approval of Courses for Inclusion in the University Core Curriculum
The process for evaluating courses proposed by faculty for inclusion in the Core Curriculum prior to System review shall be as follows:
1. A request for a new course to be included in the Core Curriculum should begin at the department level. Faculty within the department should insure that the proposed course meets the University’s Core Curriculum Outcomes for the Core Area targeted.
2. Where faculty determine a course to meet the Core Outcomes, a curriculum form should
be submitted to the College Curriculum Committee. The curriculum form shall include clear, concise justification for the course to be added to the Core Area.

3. If approved by the College Curriculum Committee, the curriculum form shall be submitted to the full GECC committee;

4. If approved by the GECC, the GECC will submit the form to the Undergraduate Committee (UGC) for final approval.

**Process for review and assessing existing courses included in the Core Curriculum**

The process for evaluating existing courses in the Core Curriculum prior to System review shall be as follows:

1. Faculty are required to periodically review Core Curriculum courses in their departments. Faculty must determine if course learning outcomes are aligned with the University’s Core Curriculum Outcome for the Area in which the course(s) appear(s).

2. A Core Course Assessment form must be regularly submitted to the GECC. The completed form must document measurement tools, description of data collection, targets, findings, interpretation of results, and action plans, all aligned with the overall Core Curriculum Student Learning Outcome.

3. If the course does not meet the Core Outcomes, the faculty have two options. The option chosen by the faculty must be reported to the GECC.
   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.
RESPONSIBILITIES
The responsibilities of the GENERAL EDUCATION & CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE (GECC) shall be as follows:

1. recommend to the Faculty Senate policy and procedures concerning general education (GE) and core curriculum (CC);
2. propose, coordinate, and document the University’s GE and CC outcomes, i.e., those the faculty expect to be achieved by all of the University’s undergraduate students, regardless of their degree program;
3. coordinate with the Undergraduate Committee and staff agencies, as required, to identify the courses and other student experiences intended to achieve GE and CC outcomes;
4. plan, facilitate, and report the assessment of GE and CC outcomes; findings of assessment report review will be reported first to departments and programs, and then summary findings will be reported to the UGCC;
5. recommend and monitor improvements, based on the results of GE and CC assessment;
6. findings will be reported to the Faculty Senate
7. coordinate with appropriate administrative offices in the creation of program review reports for the CC and GE,
8. address other specific questions in this area that may be requested by the Senate Executive Committee; and
9. report to the Librarian, the Senate Executive Committee, and the Senate as described in Article IV, Sections 3 and 11. (Bylaws, Article IV: SECTION 17.)

MEMBERSHIP
Voting membership of the General Education & Core Curriculum Committee shall be composed of senators or senate alternates representing each college and the library, one per unit, appointed by the Senate Executive Committee and faculty members elected by and representing each college and the library, one per unit. Members representing all campuses shall be apportioned according to the Faculty Senate guidelines. Non-voting membership shall be composed of the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs (or his/her delegate), who shall vote in the case of a tie among the voting members of the committee, the Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness (or his/her delegate), the Vice President for Student Affairs), an advisor or advising coordinator designated by the Provost’s Office, and the SGA President or SGA Vice President of Academic Affairs, and representatives from FYE and/or SYE. (Bylaws, Article IV: SECTION 18)
GRADUATE COMMITTEE MINUTES
Graduate Committee Meeting Date – April 12, 2018

Present: Gustavo Molina, CEIT; Dr. Gavin Colquitt, CHHS; Dr. Brandonn Harris, CHHS; Dr. Ted Brimeyer, CLASS; Dr. Dustin Anderson, CLASS; Professor Stephanie Sipe, COB; Dr. Bill Yang, COBA; Dr. Meca Williams-Johnson, COE; Dr. Karin Fisher, COE; Dr. Julie Reagan, JPHCOPH; Ms. Dawn Cannon-Rech, Library; Dr. Sungkyun Lim, [Alternate] CEIT

Guests: Dr. Ashley Walker, COGS; Ms. Mary Jernigan, COGS; Mrs. Jade Brooks, Registrar’s Office; Ms. Candace Griffith, VPAA; Dr. Tracy Linderholm, COE; Dr. David Williams, CEIT; Dr. Lance McBrayer, COSM; Dr. Rand Ressler, COB; Dr. Sharon Radzyminski, CHHS

Absent: Dr. Mujibur Khan, CEIT; Dr. John Stone, COSM; Dr. Michele McGibony, COSM; Dr. Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, JPHCOPH; Mr. Jeffrey Mortimore, Library

I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Dustin Anderson called the meeting to order on Thursday, April 12, 2018 at 9:00 AM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Professor Stephanie Sipe made a motion to approve the agenda as written. A second was made by Dr. Karin Fisher and the motion to approve the agenda was passed.

III. CHAIR’S UPDATE
Dr. Anderson stated he will be rotating off of the committee this year and he thanked the committee for all of the work they have done.

IV. DIRECTOR’S UPDATE
Dr. Ashley Walker shared the following updates:
• COGS has hired Caroline James as the third Graduate Admissions Specialist, and she will begin on April 23. Mrs. James has been working at the university for about 25 years and worked in the Registrar’s Office for a number of those years. She is very knowledgeable with Banner and DegreeWorks.
• The Graduate Student Organization’s annual spring social is tonight at Eagle Creek, from 7-10 PM. Please encourage your students to attend.
• Averitt Award recipients will be announced during the Research Symposium reception, on Thursday, April 19. The reception will be held in Nessmith-Lane Ballroom from 4-5 PM.
• CT2 will be hosting the last spring Graduate Writer’s Boot Camps on Saturday, April 21. Please encourage your students to attend.

V. NEW BUSINESS
A. Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies
Dr. Walker presented the agenda item for the Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies

Full Time Status Exception Process
Dr. Walker provided a brief overview of the process listed below.

Graduate Full-Time Status Exception Process

Requesting a Full-Time Status Exception pertains to higher contact hours for programs that are required to include a practicum, clinical rotation or extended internship. Any program wishing to apply for an exception to the Full-Time Status criteria outlined in the Graduate Catalog must apply through the process outlined below. It is important to note the dates of the Enrollment Management Council (EMC) meetings, and the Graduate Curriculum Committee deadlines for catalog changes when drafting the Full-Time Status Exception proposal. The exception request will follow the curriculum process with the additional review from the
Enrollment Management Council. Program faculty are invited to attend the Enrollment Management Council meeting if questions arise when the program proposal is reviewed.

**Exception Approval Process:**

*Department Curriculum Committee → College Curriculum Committee → Enrollment Management Council → Graduate Curriculum Committee*

In regards to this Exception proposal, two questions will be added on the Program Change form available through Courseleaf. By answering ‘Yes’ to one of the questions, the proposal will be sent to EMC for review:
1. Are program capacity limitations involved in the approval?
2. If the program wishes to request a full-time status exception?

**Full-Time Status Exception proposals must include:**
- A justification for the exception (why is it necessary?)
- A degree map for the program that includes total credit hours and contact hours per semester
- If a higher number of contact hours is a part of the justification, an explanation for the need for these additional contact hours must be included (i.e. accreditation, licensure, or certification requirements)
- The number of students impacted by the proposed exception
- Impact analysis and accompanying mitigation strategies on the following:
  - Student progression and graduation
  - Student debt load
- Graduate assistantship availability

Exception requests that primarily use the following justifications are more likely to be denied:
- Graduate assistants (requiring nine credit hours) being out of sync with a program cohort model based on six credit hours per semester
- Lowering the full time status requirement in order for students to be eligible for federal financial aid with fewer credit hours
- Graduate programs degree maps intentionally structured where students are expected to take less than nine credit hours and are within normal contact hours (i.e. cohort model programs for working professionals)
- Graduate programs degree maps intentionally structured where students take fewer credit hours in the final semester, creating federal financial aid eligibility issues during that final semester

Dr. Walker stated she spoke with Dr. Anderson and Dr. Patricia Holt and they all agreed that this needs to be in the graduate catalog as a process to follow under the full-time graduate student requirement. The process will be managed through the EMC. Dr. Walker said Dr. Amy Ballagh was unable to attend today’s meeting, but she is open to receiving questions that can be discussed at EMC.

There was a brief discussion of contact hours.

Dr. Lance McBrayer asked for clarification on the second bullet item at the bottom section of the process. Dr. Walker explained the intent for this bullet and said this language should be reworded. The following edits were made and are listed in bold below.

- Lowering the full time status requirement only in order for students to be eligible for federal financial aid with fewer credit hours

There was a discussion of graduate assistantship requirements and retention issues.

Dr. Tracy Linderholm and Dr. McBrayer suggested having a discussion about graduate assistants appealing to take less hours other than in their last semester. The committee agreed that it would be beneficial to continue this discussion in the September Graduate Committee meeting. Dr. Anderson suggested to Dr.
Linderholm and Dr. McBrayer that having something in writing to share with the committee would be helpful. He also encouraged people with these ideas to draft them out and talk with Dr. Walker in the interim. Dr. Linderholm said she would review the policy and draft something up and send it to Dr. Walker and Dr. McBrayer for their review.

There was a brief discussion of how the EMC meeting schedule should be published so that all stakeholders are aware of the meeting details.

B. College of Education

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

Course Revision:
ESED 7090 – Special Topics
   ➢ Modify the variable credit hour

MOTION: Dr. Ted Brimeyer made a motion to approve the agenda item submitted by the College of Education. A second was made by Dr. Gustavo Molina. The motion to approve the Course Revision was approved.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Discussion of issues related to ongoing assessment of alumni – Dr. Anderson stated we are still moving forward on the schedule for this item. Mrs. Megan Murray is working on this and we hope to have an update on this during the fall meetings.

B. Registrar's Update

Mrs. Jade Brooks provided an update on the following items:
- The Registrar's Office has been working on a lot of data corrections so that students would be able to register for courses.
- The objective is to publish the catalog by July 1. She said this deadline is optimistic.
- By the end of fall the Banner bridge will be implemented.
- The Registrar’s Office hopes to have the CIM forms available for use by mid-August. Mrs. Brooks explained the course information in CIM will be a clean set of data, which is the consolidated data between Georgia Southern and Armstrong. She said once CIM is open departments need to look at the courses and review the equivalencies. If something is missing the department will need to submit the information as a revision. She said if departments are able to identify this before fall then they can submit the information to the Registrar’s Office and they will work on entering the information into the system.

Dr. Linderholm asked when catalog review will begin. Mrs. Brooks said the catalog will be open for edits in late May.

Mrs. Brooks briefly discussed how the transition to new URLs in CIM will be handled.

Dr. Anderson thanked Mrs. Brooks for all of the work she has done this last year.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Tentative 2018-2019 Graduate Committee Meeting Schedule - Dr. Anderson reminded everyone of the meeting schedule included in the agenda. He stated the meeting locations are currently listed as TBD, because we have not figured out how the physical meetings will go for next year. We are waiting on the final number of committee members and some technology solution will be discussed. We anticipate that at least one meeting will be held on the Armstrong campus. Once the locations have been identified Mrs. Audie Graham will send out a revised schedule.

Mrs. Brooks stated there have been discussion of making the February meeting the final deadline for catalog revisions.

The tentative meeting schedule is below.
## Tentative Schedule of Meetings
### Graduate Committee (GC)
#### 2018-2019 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Meeting Time</th>
<th>Meeting Location</th>
<th>Agenda Items Due to Registrar’s Office</th>
<th>Agenda Items Due to GC Recording Secretary</th>
<th>Agenda Items Posted on Web and Sent to GC Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 13, 2018</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>August 23, 2018</td>
<td>August 30, 2018</td>
<td>September 6, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11, 2018</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>September 20, 2018</td>
<td>September 27, 2018</td>
<td>October 4, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 8, 2018</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>October 18, 2018</td>
<td>October 25, 2018</td>
<td>November 1, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 24, 2019</strong></td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>November 16, 2018</td>
<td>January 10, 2019</td>
<td>January 17, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14, 2019</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>January 24, 2019</td>
<td>January 31, 2019</td>
<td>February 7, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14, 2019</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>February 21, 2019</td>
<td>February 28, 2019</td>
<td>March 7, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 11, 2019</td>
<td>9:00 a.m.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>March 21, 2019</td>
<td>March 28, 2019</td>
<td>April 4, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Last meeting for items to be approved to be included in the 2019-2020 Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs.

Items approved at the February, March, and April meetings will be approved for Fall 2020. Consideration will be given only for items that affect Accreditation, SACSCOC and USG mandates.

Note: Items requiring Board of Regents/System Office approval may not be included in the catalog if they are still pending Board of Regents/System Office approval.
Dr. Meca Williams-Johnson stated the Research Symposium is Thursday, April 19, 2018. She encouraged everyone to attend.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on April 12, 2018 at 10:05 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Audie Graham, Recording Secretary

Minutes were approved May 7, 2018 by electronic vote of Committee Members

ADDENDUM: The College of Education needs to bring forward 2 small, but vital items as a result of a change in external accreditation requirements. These changes were imposed after the internal deadline for catalog changes. The committee has, in situations dealing with accrediting bodies, been able to work in tandem with the Registrar's Office to include changes externally imposed outside of the normal timeline. These changes are necessary to allow incoming students to gain the appropriate certification with the Georgia Professional Standards Commission.

MOTION: Dr. Dustin Anderson made the motion: "The committee approves of revisions to the COE Educational Leadership M.Ed program page and Educational Leadership Tier I Certificate program." The motion was seconded by Dr. Julie Reagan. The vote was unanimous in support of the motion.
I. **CALL TO ORDER**

**Voting Members Present:** Dr. Cheryl Aasheim, Dr. Dragos Amarie, Mrs. Dawn Cannon-Rech, Dr. Isaac Fung, Mrs. Lori Gwinett, Dr. Chuck Harter, Dr. Lindsay Larson, Dr. Alisa Leckie, Dr. Pidi Zhang

**Non-Voting Members Present:** Miss Tori Brannen, Mr. Martin Grantson, Ms. Candace Griffith, Ms. Doris Mack, Mr. Wayne Smith

**Visitors:** Dr. Deborah Thomas

**Absent:** Miss Ruth Baker, Dr. Adrian Gardner, Dr. Amanda Glaze, Dr. Rami Haddad, Dr. Barbara Hendry, Dr. Raymona Lawrence, Dr. Ed Mondor, Dr. Peggy Mossholder, Dr. Edward Rushton Dr. Marian Tabi

*Dr. Alisa Leckie called the meeting to order at 3:39 p.m.*

II. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

*A Fung/Amarie motion to approve the agenda was passed unanimously.*

III. **CHAIR’S UPDATE**

*Dr. Alisa Leckie stressed that members need to make sure either they or an alternate can attend the meetings for the 2018-2019 term.*

IV. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. **College of Education**

Refer to the [Curriculum Site](#) for details

*An Aasheim/Amarie motion to approve the following accreditation-related course revision was passed unanimously.*

**Course Revisions**

ESED 4090

B. **OTHER BUSINESS**

A. **Undergraduate Committee Bylaws**

*Dr. Alisa Leckie explained that the membership bylaws were set forth by the Faculty Senate (Article 4, Section 10) and if they change their bylaws, it will change the membership bylaws of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. Dr. Pidi Zhang, on behalf of Dr. Barbara Hendry, suggested that the word “Committee” needed to be inserted into the formal name in the bylaws. It was clarified that the name is determined solely by Faculty Senate. Dr. Zhang also suggested for Dr. Hendry that the membership section needs to be reorganized or formatted for a better flow, article 4 needs to be changed to an activate voice, and it needs to be elaborated on who will notify committee members.*

*A Harter/Amarie motion to approve the undergraduate committee bylaws was passed*
unanimously.

B. Undergraduate Committee Procedures
Dr. Leckie mentioned that she had broached the subject of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee having their own recording secretary (not a representative from the Registrar’s Office) with Dr. Jamie Herbert (Georgia Southern University President) after the last Faculty Senate meeting.

A Harter/Amarie motion to approve the undergraduate committee procedures was passed unanimously.

C. 2018-2019 Undergraduate Committee Meeting Schedule
The voting members were presented with four options for the meetings schedule for the 2018-2019 term: Tuesdays at 10:00 A.M., Tuesdays at 3:30 P.M., Thursday at 3:30 P.M., and Friday at 2:00 P.M. The members voted unanimously to continue with the undergraduate committee meetings on Tuesday afternoons at 3:30 P.M. Dr. Aasheim suggested that instead of the SEC asking for membership preferences, they appoint whoever can attend all the meetings based on their fall class schedule. At the spring mid-point, the undergraduate committee chair would send an email to the college deans asking them to not schedule member classes during the committee meeting times.

V. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business to come before the committee, an Aasheim/Amarie motion to adjourn the meeting at 4:08 p.m. was passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

[Signature]

Jade Brooks
Recording Secretary
I. Name

The name of this committee, as denoted in the Faculty Senate Bylaws, shall be the Undergraduate Committee—a standing committee of Georgia Southern University’s Faculty Senate.

II. Membership

A. Voting membership of the Undergraduate Committee shall be comprised of senators and/or senate alternates, representing each college and the University libraries (Article 4, Section 10 Faculty Senate Bylaws). Members are either appointed by the Senate Executive Committee or elected by the colleges and libraries. Non-voting membership shall consist of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, or his/her designee, who shall vote in the case of a tie among the voting members of the committee; the Student Government Association President or Vice President of Academic Affairs; and a representative from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.

B. The chair shall be a senator elected by the voting members of the committee.

C. Alternates

When Undergraduate Committee members are unable to attend committee meetings, they will send a college or library elected alternate in their place, as applicable. Both members and alternates should arrange with their department chair to get a teaching schedule that allows them to serve throughout the term of their service.

III. Duties and Responsibilities

The Undergraduate Committee operates according to the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate. The committee shall

A. serve as a strong advocate for academic distinction in the University’s undergraduate programs and curricula;
B. recommend to the Faculty Senate policy and procedures concerning undergraduate programs and curricula;
C. review and approve all changes in undergraduate courses, major and minor programs, emphases, concentrations, and degrees;
D. consider all proposals for new degree programs, majors, and/or minors and make recommendations to the Senate for action;
E. review all actions of the college curriculum committees and be the body of the University to which any college or autonomous department/program makes recommendations concerning undergraduate curricular matters;
F. report to the Librarian, the Senate Executive Committee, and the Senate; and
G. maintain continuous review of all undergraduate programs through the university-level Comprehensive Program Review process with the exception of general education which shall become the domain of the General Education and Core Curriculum Committee.

IV. Duties of the Chair

Duties of the Chair of the Undergraduate Committee:

• In conjunction with the Registrar, set the agenda and conduct all meetings.
• Designate a committee member to serve as acting chair in his/her absence.
• Assign committee members to ad hoc subcommittees.
• Appoint chairs of ad hoc subcommittees.
• Provide the Senate Librarian with reports of each committee meeting within 10 working days of such meetings for inclusion in the Librarian’s Report.
• Submit within 10 working days to the Senate Executive Committee a prioritized list of actionable items to be included as agenda items for consideration by the Senate.
• Submit to the Faculty Senate a summary of achievements for the academic year and goals for the next academic year.
• Present the minutes of the Undergraduate Committee to the Senate as a regular agenda item.

Participation in the Comprehensive Program Review Process:

The BoR requires these self-study reports as part of the comprehensive review process. Members of the BoR are not experts in the fields, so reports need to be organized and comprehensible to the lay person.

• Review will consist of the quality of the report not of the program. Many programs have their own external accreditation bodies that provide the programmatic review aspect of the CPR process for the university
• The Undergraduate Committee will serve as another set of eyes to ensure the program reports submitted to the BoR are of high quality
  o If the Undergraduate Committee reviewers determine that a report does not meet standards, then programs will revise according to the feedback before submitting to the BoR
• By reviewing self-study reports, the Undergraduate Committee remains in line with evaluation processes used by the General Education and Core Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Committee
• The Undergraduate Committee can decide which committee members will review various program reports, as long as reviewers are from a different program but can be from the same college.