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Voting members in attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Sam Adyeye, Evans Afriyie, Mete Akcaoglu, Rocio Alba-Flores, Ashley Colquitt for Moya Alfonso, DragosAmarie, Dustin Anderson, Ted Brimeyer, Gavin Colquitt, Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, Mark Edwards, Larisa Elisha, Matthew Flynn, Richard Flynn, Alice Hall, Eric Hall, Ellen Hamilton, Ming Fang He, Jonathan Hilpert, Yi Hu, Bob Jackson, Mujibur Khan, Barbara King, Chung-yean Chiang for Hsiang-Jui Kung, Lili Li, Jim LoBue, Lawrence Locker, Li Ma, Alan Mackelprang, Ron MacKinnon, Santanu Majumdar, Leticia McGrath, Ed Mondor, Lowell Mooney, Constantin Ogloblin, Jorge Suazo for Rob Pirro (after 5:00 p.m.), Peter Rogers, Jake Simons, Fred Smith, Janice Steirn, James Stephens, Linda L. Thompson, Sam Todd, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi, Meca Williams-Johnson, Hans-JorgSchanz for Shijun Zheng

Voting members not in attendance: Lisa Abbott, Kelly Berry, Sarah Bielski, Adam Bossler, Tim Giles, Alina Iacob, Scott Kersey, Eric Landers, Alisa Leckie, Chasen Smith, Valentin Soloiu

Senate Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Student Government Association: EudiahOchieng

Administrators in Attendance: Jaimie Hebert, Jean Bartels, Diana Cone, Rob Whitaker, Martha Abell, Barry Joyner, Curtis Ricker

Visitors: Trent Maurer, Nicholas Sewak, Amanda Klingel, Alexandrea Drake, Lisa Bridges, John W. Stone, Michelle Cawthorn, Candace Griffith, Patrick Novotny, Christine Ludowise, YasarBodur, Olga Amarie, Stephen Vives, Delena Bell Gatch, Amy Ballagh

Approval of the Agenda for the February 7, 2017, meeting.
Moved and Approved.
Approval of the November 28, 2016 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.
Moved and Approved.

Librarian’s Reports for February 2017: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian.
Welford moved approval, but noted that one set of Graduate Committee Minutes had been accidentally omitted. Moderator Flynn said both the November and January minutes would be presented for separate approval at this meeting, so there was no impediment to approving the overall Librarian’s Report. The report was Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report – Ron MacKinnon (COBA), Chair
There had been two meetings of the Undergraduate Committee:

November 15, 2016

- under new business, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, there was one new course, five inactivated courses, one new program. Department of Art had one inactivated course; Department of Communications, one inactivated course; Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology, one revised program; Department of Foreign Languages, three inactivated courses, Department of General Studies two revised programs; Department of History had one new course, two revised courses; Department of Literature and Philosophy, one new course, five inactivated courses; Department of Music, one inactivated program; Department of Sociology and Anthropology, nine new courses, three inactivated courses, 14 revised courses, and one revised program.

- College of Science and Mathematics, Department of Geology and Geography, two new courses, one inactivated course.

- College of Health and Human Sciences, School of Nursing, four new courses, one new program.

- There was an update on CIM [new software from CourseLeaf for the Registrar].

Also, in order to get the meeting minutes to the Senate in time for it to be engaged before the meeting they agreed to have email votes on the approval of the minutes.
January 24, 2017

- The College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, Department Communication Arts, had two inactivated courses; 53 revised courses, six revised programs; Department of Foreign Languages, one inactivated course, 18 revises courses. The Department of History had nine inactivated courses and one revised program. Department of Sociology and Anthropology had four new courses; Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology had one new course, two revised courses; Department of Writing and Linguistics, two special topics, one inactivated program; Department of Literature and Philosophy, one new course, one new program.

- College of Business Administration, School of Accountancy, had three revised courses, one revised program; Department of Marketing, had four revised programs; Department of Finance and Economics, had two revised courses and five revised programs; Department of Management had four revised programs.

- College of Education, Department of Teaching and Learning, one new course, two inactivated courses, 15 revised courses, and two revised programs; Department of Curriculum, Foundations and Reading, one revised course; Department of Leadership, Technology and Human Development, two inactivated courses.

- College of Science and Math; Department of Biology, had one inactivated course; Department of Geology and Geography, four new courses, three inactivated courses, four revised courses, one revised program. Department of Mathematical Sciences, two special topics, and the Department of Physics, two revised programs.

- College of Health and Human Sciences, School of Nursing, one new course, four inactivated courses, one revised course; Department of Health and Kinesiology, two revised courses, and two revised programs.

- College of Engineering and IT, Department of Computer Sciences, two special topics; Department of IT, two revised programs; Department of Civil Engineering and Construction Management, one revised course.

- There was another update on CIM.

The report, including recommendations, was Approved.
There had been two meetings:

**November 10, 2016**

In addition to two other new business items, the committee reviewed, discussed, and approved the following curriculum changes:

- 13 new courses, five from the College of Education
- eight from the College of Science and Mathematics
- 12 course revisions, one from CEIT
- 11 from Education
- two course deletions from CLASS
- one new program from COSM
- and six program revisions: one from CLASS, one from CHHS, and one from COE.

The committee was informed of changes to the Comprehensive Program Review format structure by the VPAA’s office, and the dates for upcoming training sessions for those changes were announced, and they thanked Candace Griffith for organizing the training sessions for that new process. The committee also heard a proposal for a change to graduate credit regarding senior privilege. This proposal was later withdrawn. The committee was also updated of the Prior Learning Assessment Subcommittee’s process based on the questions from the Senate. The subcommittee at that point in time was working with Mr. Whitaker’s office on evaluating models for fee structures at other peer institutions. The committee was also updated on the CIM System issues stemming from CourseLeaf. The committee requested clarification of when items would process through the system to make sure that materials submitted actually went to the appropriate committees for their agendas, as well as downtime operating procedures. An RFI was submitted as follow-up to this request and that RFI and its response were discussed at the November Senate meeting.

**January 19, 2017**

The committee discussed two updated business items. They received a brief update on the Comprehensive Program Reviews and their accompanying workshops. There followed a discussion based on the Content Information Management System update from the Registrar’s office. While that update is fully fleshed out in the minutes, the committee expressed continuing concerns about an absence of procedures to ensure items move from submission to the appropriate agendas, “and a ratio of course systems in which certain fields are edited, a misalignment of courses being available in BANNER, and then departmental and college deadlines from posting schedules and the
management systems works for other USG Systems but not for Georgia Southern. The Registrar’s office responded.” The System was not doing some of the things that the committee thought it would do, and they would have to go back to the drawing board. In the meantime, the Registrar’s office reported to this committee that they would focus on manually inputting information into the catalog.

The committee then reviewed and discussed the following:

- 83 new business items: 15 new courses, two from Public Health, two from CHHS, seven from COE, four from COSM
- 34 course revisions: four from Public Health, one from CEIT, one from CHHS, and two from CLASS, 25 from COE, and one from COSM
- 30 course deletions: one from CLASS, 26 from COE, three from COSM
- three new programs, all from the College of Education
- ten program revisions: five from the College of Public Health, one from CHHS, one from CLASS, two from COE, and one from COSM; and two new program preliminary proposals, one from CLASS and one from COSM.

There were also two additional information items for special topics courses from COSM, and given the amount of new curricular items the committee moved to table any old business items to a following meeting.

The minutes and recommendations therein were Approved.

Core Curriculum and General Education Committee, Michelle Cawthorn (COSM), Chair

[Secretary’s Note: Cawthorn is largely inaudible on the recording.]

Moderator Flynn asked if this report was the same as the written report in the Librarian’s Report, and on being told it was, the report was Approved.

President’s Report: Jaimie Hebert

Consolidation

President Hebert acknowledged that consolidation with Armstrong was creating anxiety, largely as the result of uncertainty about the process. The day before this meeting, he and Armstrong President Linda Bleicken had met with the two consultants who will be guiding the process, and they had received some information re: timelines
and levels of faculty/staff involvement that he hoped would remove some of that uncertainty.

Recommendations from an Operational Working Group (OWG) will go to the Functional Area chair, to determine whether or not we have consensus regarding those recommendations. If there is “unanimous consensus” coming from the OWG’s, those will be placed on a consent agenda with the Consolidation Implementation Committee (CIC). So “when faculty meet and make the decision about academic programs, if there is unanimous agreement amongst the faculty at Georgia Southern and Armstrong on what should be done, those types of recommendations are going to go through a consent agenda process, where they won’t even be discussed at the CIC level.”

We will have over 225 tasks and recommendations that will have to go through this vetting process. There are templates that the OWG’s will use to submit, including consideration of the emotional and the human aspect of what’s going on.

The Consolidation Implementation Committee has twenty members from Georgia Southern, twenty members from Armstrong, and the System has chosen to place one person from Savannah State for the sake of maintaining communication and the established ties between both institutions and Savannah State. The purpose of the Consolidation Implementation Committee is more or less to decide which tasks are next in the timeline. There are some that are set, but the CIC basically governs the timeline and the flow of information, and recommendations will be sent to that committee for final vetting. A vetted recommendation will be submitted to President Hebert and to the Chancellor for final decisions.

The team has identified 26 different functional areas in which we need to be doing work. Those range from organizational structure in academic programs to risk management plans and diversity plans. The team would be meeting Wednesday of the following week -- the Cabinet, as well as a handful of other folks -- to look at possible names, and would be soliciting names for co-chairs for every one of those functional areas. The co-chairs of the functional areas will basically be the governors of the process within those functional areas. Within each of those areas there are sub-areas, ranging from a minimum of 2, like in the organizational area which consists of new org chart and new mission statement, to Business and Finance with sixteen or seventeen.

Every sub-area will have a committee working. There are going to be somewhere between 80 and 100 committees working on very specific tasks and answering very specific questions. Those are the subcommittees which will be referred to as “Operational Working Groups.” We have a person with a military background who is in charge of this at USG, so President Hebert was learning to speak in acronyms. The
OWG’s will be required to prepare recommendations. Those sub-committees will be populated by the people who are impacted. Academic sub-committees will be flush with faculty; there will probably be student representation, some administrators like Deans and Chairs and so forth, but where the rubber hits the road we will need the folks who are impacted working on these recommendations.

Those recommendations will be sent back to the USG consultants: that’s Randy Stuart from Kennesaw State, and Linda Noble who is an employee of the System office now. They will look at those recommendations for consistency. Those will feed into a parallel process which is the development of the SACSCOC [Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges] prospectus. Everything that is going into the SACSCOC prospectus for the new institution will incorporate the recommendations that are coming from the grassroots. Once all of the recommendations have been vetted and cleared, they will work on a draft prospectus for the new institution and the plan is to have that submitted to SACSCOC in September. So the vast majority of the questions, this large complex process, will be handled between now and late June.

If SACSCOC approves the prospectus at their December meeting, then the Board of Regents will have 30 days to act upon that decision. If the BOR also approves, we will legally at that point begin operating as a single institution with three campuses: one in Statesboro, one in Savannah, and one in Liberty County. We would not switch over fiscally or academically until Fall of 2018, but for legal purposes we would be a single institution beginning in January of 2018.

This is going to be a lot of work for a lot of people, but we don’t want these decisions made by people who are not vested in what we are doing as an institution of higher education. President Hebert also felt that the “difficult side to this process” is the emotional and the human side, in Statesboro but especially on the Armstrong campus. But he wanted to note that this is unlike any other consolidation that has occurred in the state of Georgia, and he had heard this from the USG and from the legislature. In previous consolidations, they were really looking to fix something that was broken, and that is not the case here. Armstrong is a very good institution doing a wonderful job with its mission. We are an extraordinary institution, and we have an opportunity to bring these two positives together and an opportunity to create something that we otherwise couldn’t have created in this short time period, and that’s how he hoped we will look at this, as “an opportunity to create not only the fourth largest institution of higher education in the state of Georgia, but the best example of what a higher education institution should be in the state of Georgia.”

President Hebert noted as an example that research has been and always will be a piece of what we do, and that it will be difficult for faculty members at another state university
who are moving into different standards. He asked GSU faculty to access their “human side” while developing new standards of performance. We need to consider how we attract people, and how we grandfather people. There are great faculty on the Armstrong campus who have not been given the opportunity to be productive re: research, and we want to make sure that we have avenues for them to develop. We want to embrace who they are and embrace what we all want to be together. Also, they are rich in traditions, and we want to try and maintain their cultures and their traditions along with our own. We’re going to be nearly 28,000 students, but that large scale and small feel is still our goal. We need to look at the positive side of this and “create one of the most magnificent institutions this state has ever imagined.” He is “scared to death, but [has] a lot of confidence because I know who I’m going in with. It’s you, it’s Cabinet, it’s the good people that work at this institution, and the people who work at the Armstrong institution.” He hoped all would be “willing to roll up your sleeves and do things above and beyond over the next six to eight months so that we can do this right.”

**Provost’s Search**

In all other consolidations that have occurred, the USG have stopped all senior level administrative searches. We were actually given the option to stop or continue, and we will continue, but we will be searching for the Provost of the new institution. That requires rewriting the profile for the advertisement, and we cannot write the profile until we have our new mission statement written. That will be approved at the end of April. We could go forward with the search at the end of April, but that would overcompress the vetting process. President Hebert thought it critical that we wait one year and continue the Provost’s search next year, hiring our full-time Provost for the new institution. We will include faculty members from Armstrong on that search committee. We have had over 100 inquiries already, and he believed the new institution would be even more attractive to applicants. We will appoint an interim from within who will shadow Provost Bartels so that the transition will be as seamless as possible. We will reconvene the search committee in September with members from Armstrong, rewrite the profile at that point, and advertise very early in the Fall with the intention of hiring July 1, 2018.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked about the process if an OWG recommendation is not unanimous.

President Hebert said one of two things will happen. Either it will be sent back to the OWG with a charge that they come up with an alternative recommendation that all members agree on; or it will be left to the CIC to have discussions, and then there will be a looping process between the OWG and the CIC until some consensus is reached. If no
consensus is ever reached on a particular item, his hunch was that the Chancellor will call him and tell him to make a decision.

[Secretary's Note: Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked several mostly inaudible questions. Fragmentary audible bits indicate that some questions were in regard to administrative structure, and some in regard to consolidation of programs and location of programs and what he called “non-negotiables.”]

President Hebert said he would answer the questions “kind of in order.”

He has been named as the President of the new institution. There will be one President. Linda Bleicken will be involved in the consolidation process and they are co-chairs of the Consolidation Implementation Committee, so they are now working very closely together as we go through this process. His first charge is to develop an organization chart. There will be only one Provost. Beyond that, he didn’t know. He had upcoming meetings with three different people at the System office to get some guidance on the organizational structure. He identified some “pillars”: We have to have a fiscal officer. We have to have someone who is working with alumni, advancement, and external relations. We have to have a person who is handling enrollment management and a person handling student services. We have to have a person who is handling IT. He believes in setting up an org chart without people in it, in terms of function, and then going back and populating that org chart.

As for who will be in charge of Armstrong campus, in one of the consolidations they named a dean of a campus, but he didn’t think that would fit us. Just thinking out loud, he thought a Vice Provost for the Savannah and Liberty County campuses would make sense because it’s a primarily academic mission. The person would be located there as a point person, but answering to the Provost, not directly to the President, because you really want to keep the academic mission flowing smoothly amongst those campuses. He and VP for Finance Rob Whitaker had talked about doing an entire facilities team down there, and whether we’d need a vice president for facilities, or do we need a superintendent for the Armstrong campus and a superintendent over at the Liberty Center. Right now, though, they are thinking in terms of function, and he hoped in two weeks to have an organizational chart laid out for the CIC to consider. There will not be multiple vice presidents or multiple provosts or presidents. We may have more vice presidents than we see now on our campus, but probably fewer than Armstrong currently has on their campus. He believes in streamlined administration.

In terms of the academic programs, Provost Bartels is co-chairing that functional area. As for “non-negotiables,” President Hebert called those “lines in the sand” and said there were no such lines. He said there’d been much talk on the order of “Health
Sciences will never leave Savannah” and “Engineering will never leave Statesboro.” No such decisions have been made. He had a good idea about what should and shouldn’t happen in some cases, and thought the vast majority of folks involved in this feel the same way, but those pieces of the recommendation will come up through consensus. But then there will be some areas that are puzzlers. For example, if you have two History programs, do we have two History Departments? If we have one History Department, where will it be located, and do you have one track only, or one track in Statesboro and a different track with a different emphasis in Savannah? This was the kind of situation that needed to be recommended on by an OWG.

Mark Edwards (COSM) asked if such decisions are supposed to be decided by January of 2018.

President Hebert said those are things that are going to be decided by June of 2017. He emphasized, though, that what we do “is not going to be carved in stone for all of eternity. Institutions are dynamic. We’re going to make some mistakes when we go through this process. We have processes we can go through to rectify those problems.” The main thing is to keep students, faculty, and our disciplines in mind.

He also wanted to make another point very clear, one he has made from the Governor’s office to Rotary Clubs: We have a 21:1 teaching student to faculty ratio here, and at Armstrong they have a 19:1. We both struggle to meet our instructional mission. Therefore, “We not losing faculty in this process. We cannot afford to lose faculty in this process, and continue doing what we’re doing at the level or better than we are currently doing.” He would be very surprised if this consolidation didn’t result in additional faulty. As he has said before, any savings we gain from administrative changes, he wants to reinvest in our academic mission. The Chancellor has told him that USG is not expecting a single penny back from us in this consolidation.

Lowell Mooney (COBA) asked if President Hebert will be given a pool of money to implement this, or will it have to come through formula funding, which tends to lag so will we have to bear some financial hardships until the money catches up. And he asked if the kids who finish Armstrong in the spring and summer of 2018 will have the option to choose whether they get a Georgia Southern degree, or an Armstrong degree.

President Hebert said we are not receiving a consolidation budget, but we can identify a pocket of money on campus. He did not think travel and so forth would be that expensive. The biggest expenses will be down the line, involving such things as changing signage, but we will earmark enough money from the savings from the consolidation to address those one-time expenditures. There should be no impact on our current mission. As for students getting diplomas, he did not know; that would have to be a
recommendation. For his part, he will want to err on the side of making those students happy. He went through a similar name change situation when he was an undergraduate and so is sensitive to the issue.

[Secretary's Note: Name inaudible] (CEIT) asked if we are expecting name changes similar to what has occurred in Augusta.

President Hebert said the name has been decided and it will be Georgia Southern University. We may have naming conventions at one or more campuses, not all campuses, but those will be decided via recommendations.

[Secretary's Note: The same unidentified person] asked if the sub-committees will have proportional participation based on the number of faculty and students at the two institutions.

President Hebert did not know, but noted that was not how the Consolidation Implementation Committee was constituted. He projected that for some OWG’s there would be, but not for others.

Alice Hall (CHHS) asked if the June deadline pertained to Athletics given the various sports’ timelines, and about scholarships.

President Hebert said the Operational Working Group for athletics had already been charged. It consists of the two Athletic Directors, the two Faculty Athletic Representatives, so Chris Geyerman’s on there from here in Statesboro, and the NCAA Compliance Officers. Within two weeks they will have their full recommendations and those recommendations will incorporate what we will do for the seasons, how we will handle waivers and exemptions for students, and how we will handle scholarships. He knew that among the coming recommendations would be that any student who has chosen to attend either Armstrong or Georgia Southern on an athletic scholarship, if they lose their scholarship spot, or if their athletic team is abolished, if they choose to stay at the institution, we will convert that over to an academic scholarship. We’ll use athletic scholarship funding, but we will rename it an academic scholarship. It will be subject to the same academic eligibility requirements that they had to maintain for that scholarship when they signed on. And it will be for the duration of their athletic eligibility, if that’s what their scholarship agreement said. Large numbers of student-athletes at Armstrong are already transferring to other institutions, many have been identified by our coaches for open slots here, and others will have their teams play out next season, such as the seniors on the Volleyball team at Armstrong; they don’t have any place to go, and their senior year is coming next fall, so they will play.
Janice Steirn (CLASS) expressed concern that faculty are already fully loaded with work and will be overloaded, trying to complete all this in four months, and that it will negatively impact our mission.

President Hebert said, “Well I can’t, I can’t address whether or not that will affect your teaching or not. That’s ultimately up to you.” He said no one would be required to participate in the process, but added that he had already had a couple dozen faculty contact him and offer their participation, unsolicited. They will go with volunteers, though if we are talking about six or seven hundred folks involved in sub-committees, we may have to do something. Will working in this process impact a faculty member? Yes. Will it impact the quality of teaching or research? In many cases, no. The biggest impact will be personal “because you are going to get two jobs done, kind of like everybody else is doing. Is that fair? Not necessarily.” He noted that consolidation had not been in his job description, but he was now doing it on top of his regular work. He would try very hard to make sure that doing that second job would not negatively impact his first job as President.

Ed Mondor (COSM) expressed shock at the quick timeline. He noted the President’s projection had the detail work starting only in March, that May is finals, and after that many nine-month employees will be gone re: field work or committed to other things. People who want to participate won’t be able to.

President Hebert said, “Yes.”

Jonathan Hilpert (COE) asked if questions related to tenure and promotion and how to sort out programs and the physical divide between the campuses and other such academic decisions will be organized under one functional area and, if so, when those OWG’s will be announced.

President Hebert was not sure about the timing, but was pretty certain all of those will be different sub-points under the academic functional area, though they may be subdivided into different functional groups as well. They hope to have all OWG’s appointed by mid-March. But one OWG will not handle all those issues. Each OWG will have a very specific issue to deal with so it can be worked out quickly.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) noted that we currently have many committees, such as the curriculum committees, working on things that might be rendered irrelevant in four months, and asked if it is fair to keep them doing that work right now.

President Hebert agreed some decisions we’re making now may be rendered moot, but they may not; it depends on the new institution that is created via the process. He
thought we should take the position that we are going to continue functioning as usual because the curriculum committees' work is relevant now and may be needed in future. He also reiterated Provost Bartels' point that much of the consolidation work can be done electronically and telephonically, which can reduce the time and work burden.

Ming Fang He (COE) noted the large number of students of color at Armstrong and rumors that some would go to Savannah State rather than sign on with Georgia Southern. She asked if we had plans to organize an office of diversity to help attract those students.

President Hebert said that Diversity and Title IX are one of the functional areas that will be considered. Armstrong has a very active diversity office, and we have diversity plans, and a handful of people who have responsibility for diversity, but not to the extent that they have in a diversity office. We have to consolidate their function, and our function. How this will be done will come from recommendations from OWG’s. He added that the consolidation is an opportunity for faculty to change the way we have been doing things.

Moderator Flynn reminded everyone that that we did not have a reconvene date.

Barbara King (CLASS) noted that the quick timeline meant that the OWG’s will likely not be able to get much feedback from faculty and was concerned that recommendations will not actually be representative of faculty at both institutions.

President Hebert said some issues will likely require further discussion beyond June, but he didn’t want to hold off everything until July or August re: the September prospectus. But re: a lot of issues, particularly the administrative ones, it's really a matter of just making a decision and moving on.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked if our USG classification as a “comprehensive state university” would be changing.

President Hebert (President) said that hadn’t been announced, but he assumed it would not change.

Matthew Flynn (CLASS) asked when the consolidation plan with all the bullet points would be available for us to view.

President Hebert said the plan will be posted on the consolidation website. It will have every OWG on there, their tasks and milestones listed out. He suggested people look at the Darton/Albany consolidation website as a great example of what we’re trying to emulate.
Lowell Mooney (COBA) asked what impact this would have on our capital campaigns and on fundraising over the next couple of years.

President Hebert said that Trip Addison was working on that. They didn’t feel, in talking with our donors, that it is having a negative impact; in fact, there are some folks that are getting really excited about what is to come. Addison was also working closely with the Advancement person at Armstrong; we will be pulling those two efforts together.

Provost’s Report: Jean Bartels

Suspecting that consolidation would lead to a long conversation, she had not prepared any formal remarks. However, that conversation had led her to one item to report, which was that she was wondering why her retirement date had not been December 31st.

Senate Executive Committee Report: Richard Flynn [CLASS], Chair.

The SEC received two RFIs. One asked for information on the effect of the 2016 Revision to the Grade Point Average Policy and one asking about staff involvement in compiling of tenure and promotion documents. Both of these RFIs were referred to the Provost’s office and they are working on them. The first one in particular requires an awful lot of tracking down information.

The SEC Chair requested a written response by Vice President Whitaker about the Student Employment Policy in addition to the comments at the senate meeting on November 28, 2016, but had yet to receive it.

There were two requests for motions. One of them was the revised motion submitted by Ed Mondor/Marc Cyr, which was put on the agenda. The second was discussion of the draft final report by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Student Ratings of Instruction. The SEC voted unanimously that in light of the upcoming consolidation with Armstrong, it would not be appropriate to adopt a new evaluation instrument; rather, one should be adopted in consultation with all faculty in the new institution. Secondarily, while appreciating the very hard work of the ad hoc committee, the SEC also found that the results compiled do not demonstrate a compelling case for widespread support for the proposed instrument. The SEC recommended that we accept the draft report as the final report and make a motion to dissolve the committee. The ad hoc committee objected that it had not completed its work, so the SEC decided that the committee should submit its final report to the March meeting, at which time the Senate may act as specified by Article 4, Section 35 of the Senate Bylaws, which reads “Ad hoc committees shall have the following reporting responsibilities: a. provide an interim report to the Senate
Executive Committee in writing at least once each semester; and b. present a final report in writing to the Senate Executive Committee by the requested due date. The report shall be submitted as a regular agenda item at a meeting of the Faculty Senate by the ad hoc committee chair.” In the meantime, since the draft report has been distributed to the Senate, Senators are encouraged to send feedback to the ad hoc committee and to the SEC in advance of the March meeting. Moderator Flynn assumed that the final report would be submitted by the February 22nd agenda deadline and distributed to senators shortly after that.

Unfinished Business

None

New Business

Resolution to Rescind President Trump’s Immigration Order

Ed Mondor (COSM) noted that President Hebert had spoken earlier about having a human perspective on elements of consolidation, and the impact on people underlies this motion. This was not coming from any political perspective at all, whether Republican, Democrat, or Independent. He had started sending out emails to people “and the only one crazy enough to reply was Marc Cyr.” The whole point was that this policy directly affected people at Georgia Southern. He then read the motion: “The Faculty Senate of Georgia Southern University condemns President Trump’s executive order banning travel by people, including students and scholars, even those with current legal visas, from Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen as detrimental to the principles and functioning of higher education in the United States, and specifically in Georgia. We call upon the University System of Georgia to urge Georgia’s state and federal legislators to work toward getting President Trump to rescind this ill-conceived and ill-implemented order.” Part of his impetus was that he had seen statements from other universities around the US, but hadn’t heard anything from ours or the University of Georgia. He wanted to start a conversation about how that order directly impacts our Eagles right here at Georgia Southern.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said he thought there had been a statement by the President of Georgia State, but he could be wrong about that. However, besides other reports, he noted a report on this in the Chronicle of Higher Education from the day before stating that the judge's order stopping the ban temporarily was supported by statements from the University of Washington and Washington State University, and by a number of high-tech companies, all of whom wrote about the economic damage to the United States and the damage to the functioning of higher education, the interchange of ideas, of scholars and students from here going there, from there coming here, and the
human cost to the families of people like that. It seemed to him that the order was ill-conceived and even more badly implemented and that we ought to make a statement about it because it impacts people that we know, it impacts our students, it impacts all the principles of our profession and what we do.

Ming Fang He (COE) said she belongs to the American Educational Research Association, and that large organization sent out a position statement asking President Trump to rethink this executive order. She wanted GSU to be in solidarity with all the other institutions against this order that she saw as almost violating our Constitution. She noted many scholars worldwide had signed a petition to protest the order by not attending conferences in the US.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) raised a point of order, noting the motion had not been seconded. Mark Welford (COSM) seconded the motion.

(Secretary’s Note: Inaudible name) (Public Health) wanted to tone the language down, wondering if instead of condemn, it could be “we have concerns” or something similar.

Cyr said that the first word he used was “damn,” and thought that anything less than “condemn” was at best mealy-mouthed and cringing.

Mondor (COSM) said he completely agreed with the wording, and noted the resolution did not condemn any political party but only this specific act.

Jake Simons (COBA) shared the concern for potential impact on people at Georgia Southern, but also had concerns about the proposal: First, given that the faculty senate has no direct control of this issue, he thought it was arguably outside the scope of this body. Second, he said “the proposal is likely to be perceived as presumptuous and could be detrimental to our credibility as a group.” Third, he thought the policy’s impact on faculty and others was “sufficiently apparent to the President and the Board of Regents that the proposal is probably not necessary or helpful to their desire or ability to advocate a desirable resolution.”

President Hebert did not want to get in the middle of the discussion, but noted that USG was in the process of preparing a statement; he did not know when it would be released. Also, the system presidents received written notification requesting that they not make public statements regarding this until after USG issues their statement. He added that he did not disagree with the discussion he was hearing because he had looked into this, and we have four students who could potentially be affected by this. They are currently in the US, but they can’t travel home and risk not being able to have their visas renewed to come back in.

Cyr said that this was not a “public statement” in terms of alerting the media, but a statement to be forwarded to the USG, going up through the system, and focused on the educational elements involved with that order.
President Hebert said that even if the motion did not pass, he thought the rationale was great and he would bring it to the System as they prepare their statement. If that statement did not align with the current motion, it could be pursued then if it had not already been passed. He was meeting the Chancellor the following Monday and was hesitant to bring the motion itself forward because “the language would be inflammatory in that audience,” but thought the rationale would be beneficial.

(Secr**etary's Note: Someone from CLASS spoke, but is only audible in fragments. It seems both she and a graduate student in her department were personally affected by the order, and both were anxious because they were unsure of the status of their visas.**)

Lowell Mooney (COBA) reminded everyone that the ban was only temporary; if it were a permanent ban, he would favor the motion. “In respect to all of the Americans whose lives have been inconvenienced forever . . . waiting two or three months for them to get the system revamped is [not] too much to ask or expect.” He thought we should wait and see how the order and the stay on the order turn out.

Ming Fang He (COE) said that even though it is temporary, faculty and students with a green card or a visa will be tracked every time they cross the border. She called the order “a direct threat to anybody who comes from other countries.”

Mark Edwards (COSM) wondered if the authors of the motion would be open to tabling it for a month given that the ban may be struck down, when they might be in a better position if the Board of Regents does craft a statement that they could get behind, at which time they could modify the motion to specify what they did or did not support in the System’s statement. He thought also this would put Dr. Hebert in a stronger position.

[Secr**etary's Note: The recording of the following statement is fragmentary.**] Janice Steirn (CLASS) said she’d be comfortable with that if we knew when the USG statement would come out. Since that could be a long time or never, she wanted the senate to voice disagreement with the order now.

[Secr**etary's Note: The speaker’s name is inaudible, but may be Jake Simons (COBA).**] It was proposed that when the vote came, it be by show of hands. Moderator Flynn agreed.

James Stephens (Public Health) said “if we speak as one voice we have a more powerful voice and a louder voice.” He preferred to wait for the System statement so we would speak as one. He thought waiting for up to a month was a short time.

Hans Schanz (COSM) said he understood this to be a letter to the USG, not a public letter or public statement. We would be expressing our sentiment to the USG, not “going rogue here.”
Marc Cyr (CLASS) agreed, and said the motion might act to bolster or direct the System’s statement.

Jake Simons (COBA) asked if he was correct that the motion would be a recommendation to the President, who would ultimately decide whether or not to send the resolution to the USG.

[Secretary's Note: The following remarks are audible only in fragments.] Moderator Flynn said that was generally the case, but he would have to find out if that process applied to such a resolution. He called for a show of hands vote, and the motion was Approved 29-8. Someone asked for abstentions to be counted, but Flynn noted that “abstentions are not votes” and therefore are not counted.

Announcements: Vice Presidents

Rob Whitaker (Vice President for Business and Finance) noted that he had been asked to prepare a report from the University Athletics Committee on some questions that were proposed. Given the short time left in the meeting, he asked if the senate would prefer that he post them rather than present them. Both Moderator Flynn and the senate representative on the Athletics Committee, Ed Mondor, agreed posting them was the best option.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked where they would be posted. Flynn asked VP Whitaker to send them to him, and he would see they were sent to the Senate Listserv and probably to gsfac as well.

Announcements from the Floor

Ming Fang He (COE) thanked Cyr and Mondor for making their motion, which she said was very important to her and all other foreigners on campus.

Adjournment

Moved and Approved.
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Faculty Senate Minutes  
March 6, 2017  
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.  
Russell Union Ballroom


Voting members not in attendance: Moya Alfonso, Adam Bossler, Gavin Colquitt, Larisa Elisha, Ming Fang He, Alina Iacob, Bob Jackson, Eric Landers, Alisa Leckie, Lili Li, Li Ma, Santanu Majumdar, Constantin Ogloblin, Peter Rogers, Jake Simons, Chasen Smith, Valentin Soloiu, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi, Shijun Zheng

Senate Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Student Government Association: Eudiah Ochieng

Administrators in Attendance: Jaimie Hebert, Jean Bartels, Diana Cone, Teresa Thompson, Rob Whitaker, Martha Abell, Greg Evans, Barry Joyner, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker

Visitors: William Mast, Eben Risper, Trent Maurer, Alexandrea Drake, Amy Ballagh, Christine Ludowise, Chris Caplinger, Jessica Garner

---

1. Approval of the Agenda for the March 6, 2017 meeting.

Moved and Approved.
2. **Approval of the February 7, 2017 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.**

Moved and Approved.

3. **Librarian’s Reports for March 2017: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian.**

Moved and Approved. Janice Steirn (CLASS) then asked if there was a quorum. A handcount showed 37 present, thus a quorum.

Moderator Flynn noted that he had asked the chairs of the curriculum committees to be brief.

**Undergraduate Committee Report – Ron McKinnon (COBA), Chair**

McKinnon said he would be short, but noted the committee minutes were 33 pages, with 138 changes. He gave some numbers: Vice President of Academic Affairs, two changes; First Year Experience, two changes; College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, 46 changes; College of Business Administration, nine changes; College of Education, nine changes; College of Science and Mathematics, five; College of Health and Human Sciences, 19; College of Engineering and IT, 46; College of Public Health, nine.

The report was Approved.

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

[Secretary’s Note: Anderson was mostly inaudible in the recording. Some microphones were found to be not working, we couldn’t get them fixed, and this caused some ongoing difficulties. ]

The report was Approved.

**Core Curriculum and General Education Committee, Michelle Cawthorn, Chair**

Sarah Bielski (CLASS) delivered the GECC report for Michelle Cawthorn. The committee changed a Kinesiology course name from Endurance Jogging to Endurance Running, and “there had been some confusion about having to fill out the form for just a name change, and the body decided that we should have consistency and they should fill out the entire form electronically, so it was rolled back.” The biggest discussion concerned whether and how General Education Outcomes should align with core outcomes. Some General Education Outcomes are unmeasurable, like quality of life, and while faculty have been asked to track this, faculty participation was poor. The committee decided the unmeasured outcomes from General Education should match with core outcomes. “The
GECC body feels tend to move forward on this because of the merger with Armstrong. The discussion of the body revealed the desire to keep the core versus gen ed step for it, and reveal them as a strong recommendation from our committee to Armstrong. Spoiler alert: We sent that to the Dean and it seems like now this General Consensus is to streamline, so moving forward the question was should we set GEO’s next to core outcomes and align them. Some say there’s an inherent difference between the two and some are saying they need to be aligned and/or streamlined.”

The report was Approved.

4. President’s Report: Jaimie Hebert

Consolidation Implementation Committee

The first Consolidation Implementation Committee meeting adopted four recommendations. Two regarded maintaining traditions and legacy at the Armstrong campus, and two regarded athletics.

The first was that the Georgia Southern University campus in Savannah would be named formally the Armstrong Campus; and that in Hinesville would be formally named the Liberty Campus. But they are Georgia Southern University – that is the name of the institution, but the campuses will have those names.

The second was that all edifices which are currently named on the Armstrong campus will maintain their historical names.

The Operational Working Group for athletics was allowed to start a little bit earlier than the other OWG’s because of the implications of transfers and setting season schedules and notifying conferences and so forth. Their first recommendation was, essentially, that any student athlete who was on a scholarship who loses the ability to play, will maintain a scholarship, though it will probably be an academic scholarship, through the duration of their eligibility as long as they maintain the same academic requirements that were associated with their athletic scholarship. The second recommendation was to allow blanket transfers for athletes from Armstrong, so they can transfer to Georgia Southern if they wish, but they can transfer to other universities as they see fit.

Operational Working Groups

The CIC formally named 99 Operational Working Groups. This was more than anticipated, but they were named by the Functional Area Chairs, and these are the areas which our folks and the folks at Armstrong really felt we need to address. Faculty were being assigned and he expected we would begin to see the new institution take shape very shortly.
Mission Statement

CIC-approved recommendations will be included in the prospectus for the new institution that the Board will approve in total next January, provided that SACSCOC approves it first. However, we are required to put a new mission statement in place, and unlike those other individual recommendations it must be approved by the Board of Regents. The mission statement deadline puts us under the gun because it needs to be at the April Board meeting. Therefore, he and President Bleicken tasked Curtis Ricker and Trey Denton, who worked very closely with the Strategic Planning process in composing the current mission statement, to prepare the new one along with two people from Armstrong. They will meld the current, very similar mission statements into a new draft mission statement. That draft will then come to the Senates here and at Armstrong for discussion, and then be forwarded to the System “with the understanding that when we have this new institution in place and when we have an idea of what this new institution really looks like, then we will embark on an honest visioning process and strategic planning process and revisit the mission in that regard, from that perspective.”

http://consolidation.georgiasouthern.edu/

Meeting with Governor Deal

All of the USG and Technical College Presidents had met with Governor Deal that morning. They talked about Complete College Georgia and his desire to have more students who are ready to access higher education and completing it, so that we can have a positive impact on the workforce, but he also discussed concealed carry. He was opposed to this legislation, but he gave no indication about what his actions would be.

5. Provost’s Report: Jean Bartels

No report.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Richard Flynn [CLASS], Chair.

The SEC put on the agenda the report of the ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings of Instruction, but voted not to put the ad hoc Committee’s suggested motions #2 and #3 on the agenda because those recommendations were not part of the Committee’s charge, which was that the ad hoc Committee “draft or recommend for purchase a new Student Rating of Instruction designed to measure teaching effectiveness.” Moderator Flynn and others had “searched high and low” for the charge as printed in the ad hoc Committee’s final report, but they were unable to find it. Pat Humphrey, the previous Senate Moderator, said there was no written charge other than the motion that was made in the Senate to establish the committee. Therefore, Flynn did not know where some things in the report came from, though possibly from the previous ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings that finished its report and was discharged prior to this current committee
being formed, and charged only to come up with the instrument.

The SEC had put a motion on the agenda to accept the committee’s report, discharge them, and forward the report to the relevant consolidation OWG for consideration. However, the SEC also decided to allow the motion of the SRI committee to adopt their instrument to come to the floor after the SEC motion although there was SEC consensus that, given consolidation was underway, this was not the time to adopt a new instrument. Moderator Flynn also noted that the instrument that was piloted met with considerable resistance, as indicated in the committee’s final report, and that the instrument being presented for Senate approval was not the instrument that was pilot tested: It removed the list of SLO’s and added an additional open-ended question.

External Review for Promotion and Tenure

The SEC had charged the Faculty Welfare Committee, headed by Jim LoBue, to examine the language in the Faculty Handbook on external review for promotion and tenure because it is ambiguous, being unclear whether it was just scholarship that was being evaluated, or whether it was the whole package. They discovered that at the department and college levels these decisions are not always the same, but that in light of the consolidation now is not the time to be changing language in the Faculty Handbook.

7. Unfinished Business

Presentation of the final report of the ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings of Instruction: Trent Maurer (CHHS), Chair

Maurer thanked current and former committee members for their work on this “herculean task,” Provost Bartels for her support and guidance, those faculty and chairs who participated in the pilot, and the staffs in the Center for Academic Technology Support and IT. He urged everyone to read the 72 page report in the Librarian’s report.

Maurer said that at its first meeting on March 10, 2015, the committee was charged by Faculty Senate Moderator Humphrey to identify an instrument to replace the current SRI form. The instrument would function primarily as a formative assessment to inform and improve teaching effectiveness (per BOR policy), and be consistent with the recommendations of the 2014 ad hoc Committee on SRI s, namely that it incorporate best practices from the research literature on SRI s; focus on student learning, learning behaviors, and formative feedback; and provide opportunities for students to specify in writing how the instructor promoted learning.

Additionally, the committee was charged by Moderator Humphrey to pilot test the new SRI instrument in classes from every college and of various sizes and levels, revise accordingly, and present it to the Faculty Senate for adoption. Further, they were to propose methods to make the evaluation of teaching effectiveness more equitable and consistently defined, assessed, and used across the university, including developing
guidelines for how SRIs should be used in personnel decisions.

Section 2 of the report provides background information that shows that our current SRI form and the manner in which it is used to evaluate teaching is significantly out-of-step with the best or even justifiable practices in the literature.

Section 3 provides information on the design of the pilot SRI instrument.

Section 4 describes the methodology of both the pilot study and the feedback survey of selected faculty and department chairs.

Section 5 presents analysis of the results of the pilot study.

Section 6 presents a qualitative analysis and the results of the feedback survey of selected faculty and department chairs. The number of responses for both faculty and chairs was very small and represented less than half of all individuals selected for the pilot test for both faculty and chairs. He cautioned people not to extrapolate or generalize from the feedback received to the broader population of faculty and chairs.

Section 7 presents the three recommendations of the committee and their rationales.

Recommendation #1: was that the Faculty Senate adopt the proposed new SRI instrument. He noted that while the instrument proposed for adoption differs from the instrument as pilot tested, the committee believed it to be consistent with their charge and a significant improvement over our current SRI instrument. He further noted that their motion codified the responsibility of the Faculty Senate to determine the content of the SRI instrument and to periodically review the instrument for revision or replacement. This recommendation was on the agenda as a motion.

Recommendation #2 proposed changes to three sections of the Faculty Handbook that concern how SRIs are used in evaluating teaching. He noted that SRI data was currently being misused, and the changes would refocus the use of SRI data to be primarily formative, as dictated by the Board of Regents. He said this was independent of adoption of a new SRI and that the committee was disappointed to see that the motion making this recommendation was not put on the agenda. They were, however, encouraged that their recommendations would be forwarded to the appropriate Operational Working Group, so this recommendation might be achieved as part of the consolidation process or reconsidered by the Senate thereafter.

Recommendation #3 was inspired by President Hebert’s invitation to use the consolidation as an opportunity to envision changes in how Georgia Southern works. One repeated piece of feedback was that the existing SRI administration process was too time-consuming. A centralized model for SRIs with a single office responsible for the entire process would remove that burden from every department and simultaneously reduce inefficiencies and inconsistencies. Again, the committee was disappointed to see
that the motion making this recommendation was not put on the agenda. But he hoped that the forwarding of the committee’s report to the responsible OWG would result in their work resulting in needed and meaningful changes.

Moderator Flynn allotted 15 to 20 minutes for questions.

Dustin Anderson (CLASS) asked why some feedback from chairs was not included in the report.

Maurer said they analyzed feedback for “emergent themes”; they did not attempt verbatim representation of every reply. Every member of the committee read every single comment, and they then selected exemplars of themes.

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) asked if they had considered piloting the current draft of the SRI form because it was different from what was piloted.

Maurer said they had been charged to conduct a pilot, revise on that basis, and present the revision to the Senate, which is what they did. They were not charged to pilot a second time. He said “it’s pretty much accepted standard practice that if all you are doing is deleting quantitative items, but not adding any quantitative items, there’s no need for an additional pilot test. The changes were all deletions of quantitative items, not additions of any quantitative items.”

Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked why all of the SLO’s had been deleted.

Maurer said Section 7 of their report gave a detailed explanation, but the short answer was that it was a technical issue: The Remark Office Software that is used to read this is extremely sensitive to user error. In the pilot, three departments returned entirely unusable data because of user error. Given how many different administrative assistants would have to be trained and the possibility for even a tiny error to make all the data in an entire department unreadable, the committee found the possibility of that type of catastrophic failure unacceptable.

Pirro (CLASS) said deleting the SLO’s only for technical reasons worried him. He thought including SLO’s was problematic because it “is consistent with this model of pushing content to students and then they have to measure whether or not in week 13 or 14 whether they have gotten all the content, and . . . half the students when I ask them what have you learned? They said it takes them a semester or a year or maybe many years to understand fully what they’ve learned in a class, and this idea that in week 13 or 14 or 15 through some set of . . . SLOs they’ll be able to accurately and helpfully assess what we have taught them I think is really problematic.” Another problem was that he could foresee a day when SLOs won’t be chosen by the professor, but people above us, and that would be a major infringement on academic freedom. He hoped that even if the technical difficulties could be overcome, SLO’s would still be omitted.

Mark Edwards (COSM) commented that the Senate could be a very differently
constituted body after consolidation and so he wasn’t sure that were a new SRI adopted now it would have any effect at all.

Alice Hall (CHHS) said her experience on P & T committees made her find the committee’s work and recommendations valuable; they should be kept in mind when the merged institution develops, as she thought it would, a new SRI. She also asked if there are online SRI’s available for purchase.

Moderator Flynn said there were and that Armstrong uses one of those.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) clarified that the upcoming SEC motion was in part to forward the committee’s report to the responsible OWG, so it was not just being thrown away away.

Jim LoBue (COSM) wondered if it was premature to discharge the committee when the SRI issue was going to continue.

Moderator Flynn noted they were being discharged because they had finished their work by submitting their final report.

Maurer totally agreed with Moderator Flynn.

LoBue opined that voting on the proposed SRI seemed to him to be an “inconsequential or premature or not sensible thing to do.”

Moderator Flynn said the whole thing could be tabled, but that the SEC thought the issue was important enough to be put to a vote. He also noted that there was confusion about the charge, which apparently was not put in writing, but which he assumed came from the original SRI committee’s report. He advised that in future the Senate be sure to put ad-hoc committee charges in writing.

Maurer noted that the Librarian’s Report contains the minutes of his committee’s first meeting, on March 10, 2015, where Moderator Humphrey verbally charged them, but agreed that they had not been given a written charge. Essentially, they were told to carry out the recommendations of the 2014 committee, which are all in writing.

Moderator Flynn noted that some of that earlier committee’s recommendations led to changes to the Faculty Handbook, including about how it is inappropriate to make SRIs the sole or even majority factor in personnel decisions. He also noted that Moderator Humphrey had told him something different from what Maurer reported, and he had gone on what she said.

Maurer said he had gone on what could be found in that Librarian’s report.

Jonathan Hilpert (COE) asked, were the new SRI approved, when it would go into effect because he thought it likely implementation would require some training.

Maurer said the motion would implement it this coming Fall. However, now that it was a one-size-fits-all form, training would be minimal.
Barbara King (CLASS) said that question 18, which asks “how interesting was the subject matter of this course,” had been moved from evaluation of the instructor to evaluation of the course, “yet the question as it pertains to instructor offering a before and after essentially, or the equivalent, that seems to generate much more information than the information we currently have in question 18.” She asked him to comment.

Maurer was not clear on her question. He rephrased it: “What you’re saying is that on the current form there are two questions. One asks about their interest in the course before they took the course, and one asks about the interest of the courses at the end of the course, both of which are asked at the end of the course. Whereas on the proposed measure we ask one question about interest in the course and that’s what you’re asking me to comment on.”

King said, “Sort of.” She really wanted to know why the proposed new SRI asked this about the course rather than the instructor.

Maurer said it did not: “Section 2, the course question 7, how difficult was the subject matter? Question 8, how interesting was the subject matter? That’s in the course, that’s not in the instructor.” King said, “Right, but currently I believe it was the instructor.” Maurer said, “If I’m not mistaken, it’s after question 18, in the stand-alone section in our current form.”

Moderator Flynn said this discussion would be more appropriate when the actual motion was debated.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) wondered whether, should the SRI motion fail, the report would be forwarded to the OWG. Moderator Flynn said that should the SEC motion pass, the committee’s report would go to the OWG whether the SRI motion passed or failed.

8. New Business

SEC Motion to Discharge the ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings of Instruction

Moderator Flynn read the motion:

The SEC moves that now that the ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings of Instruction has completed its charge "to draft or recommend for purchase a new Student Rating of Instruction designed to measure teaching effectiveness" and has presented its report to the Senate, the committee be dissolved with our thanks and that the final report of the committee be forwarded to the appropriate Operational Working Group under Faculty Affairs to consider in their consolidation of faculty evaluation policies in the Georgia Southern-Armstrong Consolidation.

The motion was moved and seconded.
Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) asked if only the first motion proposed by the ad hoc committee would be forwarded, or all three.

Moderator Flynn clarified that not the motions, but the entire 72 page report would be forwarded to the Operational Working Group.

Curtis asked if that meant that the OWG could then consider the other best practices issues even though those weren’t in the charge of the ad hoc committee.

Moderator Flynn hoped they would.

Curtis liked the first part of the motion, but given that the senate might vote against the SRI motion, he opposed voting to send it to the OWG no matter what.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) clarified that the whole report, not just the proposed SRI form, would be sent to the OWG so that they have this research.

Ted Brimeyer (CLASS) feared that forwarding the report would be interpreted by the OWG as signifying Senate approval of its recommendations.

Moderator Flynn thought the motion did not make that implication.

Jonathan Hilpert (COE) said that while that might be true, the motion doesn’t offer senators the opportunity to split their votes regarding the motion’s two parts, discharging the committee and forwarding their report. He offered a friendly amendment to split the motion into two to allow a more “nuanced” vote.

Moderator Flynn asked if Hilpert wanted to make that motion.

[Name unintelligible] (CLASS) said the motion on the floor had to be dealt with first, adding that forwarding the report would only give the OWG valuable information to work with; its recommendations would not be rubber stamped as “final decisions.”

Hilpert (COE) understood that, but still wanted senators to have the opportunity to vote to dissolve the committee, and a separate vote against moving the document forward to the Organizational Working Group.

Karen McCurdy (Parliamentarian) said that if it was the will of the Senate to have two votes on the two clauses of the current motion, a motion to amend would need to be made and passed, and then the two motions voted on separately.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said he understood that, but thought the split was an odd move given that there was nothing in the current singular motion directing that the OWG do anything with the report, and that not forwarding it would simply deprive them of three years’ worth of information gathering.
Hilpert said Cyr might find it odd, but others might not, and moved to split the motion. He noted that he intended to vote “yes” on both sections, but liked the idea of separating them.

The motion to amend was seconded and Approved without opposition.

The motion to discharge the committee was Approved without further discussion.

Flynn then put the motion to forward the ad hoc committee’s report to the OWG up for discussion.

Barbara King (CLASS) suggested a further amendment, that the report be forwarded with any reservations that the Senate might have. Someone unidentifiable noted that not all had reservations. King said the amendment could be to vote on sending it with or without reservations.

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) said the upcoming discussion and vote on whether to adopt the proposed new SRI would provide information to the OWG. Flynn noted, though, that only people at GSU currently had access to the minutes.

King made her motion and it was seconded. She asked for a hand count vote. Moderator Flynn agreed.

Matthew Flynn (CLASS) asked if the report was already publicly available information.

Moderator Flynn said yes; it was up on the current business of the Senate website and you can get a copy that is not password protected.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) was unclear if they were about to vote on forwarding the report, period, or on whether or not we would forward it with or without reservations.

Moderator Flynn said, first, it was just to forward it, then corrected that to being on whether to forward with or without reservations noted. Then King said, “Basically it’s one of two options: complete forward or just forward with reservation, a vote between those two options.” Karen McCurdy (Parliamentarian) said, “You must decide, Barbara, which way you want it because we can’t vote on either/or. The body must have something to vote on, so you have to choose how you want the wording of the amendment to be, and then the Senate will vote on that wording.”

[Secretary’s note: Portions of the discussion at this point are inaudible, so the recording is fragmentary.]

King said, “I’d like to amend the motion that it be forwarded without an official endorsement, is that [inaudible] for informational purposes.” It was seconded.
[Secretary’s note: At this point, some speakers fail to identify themselves and some portions are inaudible, so the recording is fragmentary.]

A hand-count vote on the amendment gave 10 in favor, an unexpressed number opposed, and Moderator Flynn declared the motion to amend to have failed.

He read the next proposed motion: “The final report of the ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings of Instruction will be forwarded to the appropriate Operational Working Group under Faculty Affairs to consider in their consolidation of faculty evaluation policies in the Georgia Southern-Armstrong Consolidation.” A hand-count voted showed 26 in favor, 6 opposed. The motion was Approved.

ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings of Instruction motion to adopt new Student Ratings of Instruction instrument

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) said that given the current circumstances with consolidation, it would be unfair to our future colleagues at Armstrong and Liberty to introduce any kind of instrument without their input. She opposed the motion.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that the motion had not been seconded. Moderator Flynn said he had been trying to get the motion properly presented. It was duly Moved and Seconded. Abbott said her point remained.

Jim LoBue (COSM) asked Trent Maurer if the proposed instrument was essentially the same that was tested except for the removal of some components.

Maurer said the old Section 1 of the SLOs had been removed. There was one addition, a new third open-ended question specifically about student learning because they had removed all of the questions about SLOs.

Moderator Flynn noted that the new question was, “What is the one important thing you learned in this course?” Maurer said that was correct. Flynn said that was actually two questions. Maurer said, “Fair enough.”

Janice Steirn (CLASS) said because of consolidation we would only use this instrument for a short period of time, and she thought to use it for 18 months then switch to a new one would cause a lot of confusion. She opposed the motion.

A hand-count vote showed 3 in favor of the motion, 33 opposed. The motion failed.

9. Announcements: Vice Presidents
Provost Bartels asked that any deans present stick around for a second so she could talk with them for a minute.

10. Announcements from the Floor

None

11. Adjournment

Moved and Approved.
Faculty Senate Minutes  
April 3, 2017  
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.  
Russell Union Ballroom


**Voting members not in attendance:** Mete Akcaoglu, Rocio Alba-Flores, Moya Alfonso, Dragos Amarie, Mark Edwards, Tim Giles, Yi Hu, Scott Kersey, Jim LoBue, Li Ma, Allen Mackelprang, Santanu Majumdar, Chasen Smith, Valentin Soloiu, Sam Todd

**Senate Parliamentarian:** Karen McCurdy

**Student Government Association:** Eudiah Ochieng

**Administrators in Attendance:** Jaimie Hebert, Teresa Thompson, Martha Abell, Barry Joyner, Thomas Koballa, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker

**Visitors:** Karelle Aiken, Diana Cone, Christine Ludowise, Olga Amarie. Jayne Perkins-Brown, Nick Sewak, Amy Ballagh, Brendan Ward, Stephanie Light, Granville Winkjer

---

1. Approval of the Agenda for the April 3, 2017 meeting: 
   Richard Flynn (CLASS), Moderator

Moved and Approved.
2. Approval of the March 6, 2017 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary:

Moved and Approved.

3. Librarian’s Reports for April 2017: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian:

Moved and Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report – Ron McKinnon (COBA), Chair:

❖ College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences: two revised courses, four new programs, five revised programs, one inactivated course.
❖ College of Science and Mathematics: two revised programs
❖ College of Engineering and IT: one inactivated program,

The report was Approved.

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

March 9th meeting: one program inactivation, one new course, two course revisions, one program revision, one update on comprehensive program reviews to be executed at the upcoming April meeting, one announcement from the College of Graduate Studies on international transcript evaluations.

Two items of old business: The first was a change in degree descriptions for COSM, and the second was on Prior Learning Assessment. The subcommittee had brought back an updated proposal for that based on the request of the Faculty Senate from the end of last term, as well as discussions from Mr. Whitaker’s office.

Moderator Flynn noted that the minutes reflect the changes in the Prior Learning Assessment that was brought before the Senate previously, so the Senate would be approving the Prior Learning Assessment Report when they approved these minutes.

The report was Approved.
Core Curriculum and General Education Committee: Sarah Bielski (CLASS):

At the February 28th meeting there were no motions and no new business. They had a continuing conversation about whether to condense/align [Gen Ed] in core outcomes, condense [GenEd] and core outcomes to a single set, condense just the [Gen Ed] outcomes, or expand the core, or produce new sets. Bielski wondered aloud, “Can we be more vague?” She noted that many institutions use these two terms interchangeably, but they have a much broader core. Other schools with leaner core outcomes that assess students earlier see general education outcomes as those for a student for their entire career. Of note, it was mentioned that some of our Gen Ed outcomes are not being evaluated or are hard to evaluate. Curriculum mapping was mentioned as a model to deal with this problem. There was a concern that more core specificity would make it hard for students to change majors without having to repeat core classes. A strong point was made that critical thinking and synthesis of information should be core outcomes. A suggestion was made to form a subcommittee to craft a proposal to the consolidation committee on Gen Ed. This subcommittee was formed and met on March 10th and 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 approved this recommendation on March 22, 2017.

Moderator Flynn asked for clarification about whether the meeting just reported on was the one whose minutes were in the Librarian’s report, noting that only minutes in that report would be voted on re: approval. Bielski said the committee had met twice before the prior senate meeting and she had reported on one of those meetings at the last senate meeting. She said Michelle Cawthorn had told her the appropriate minutes were in the Librarian’s report.

The committee’s report was Approved.
4. President’s Report: President Jaimie Hebert:

Legislative Session

We did quite well. Construction funding: We received $4.9 million for planning and design for our new engineering facility and $5 million for planning, design, and construction of renovations in Hanner for academic use, including our concussion laboratory. The $4.9 million in planning and design for engineering, while it’s not a guarantee, usually is an indication that we will receive full construction funding in the subsequent year. There was also $22 million approved for construction of a Health Sciences facility at the Armstrong campus. We also had a 2 percent merit [pay] increase approved in the budget. All of these were waiting for the Governor’s signature. Our revenue is actually defined by the USG and not necessarily by the legislature, but as soon as the revenue stream becomes a little bit clearer, we can talk about what our budget priorities will be next year. But they will be predominantly academic.

Concealed Carry

This measure passed and was awaiting signature from the Governor. If signed, we will first seek an interpretation of some of the language within that bill because some of it is a little confusing and depends on interpretation on how it would be implemented. There was a USG meeting scheduled for the end of April for the Vice Presidents of Student Services, Deans of Students, and Conduct Officers to talk about implementation. If signed, the measure will be law on July 1st, and anyone restricting carry, including President Hebert, would be in violation of law and not just policy. He thought it likely that it would be signed, and it would be something that we will have to work with. He noted that Chancellor Wrigley shared our concerns, and would help us with implementation.

Consolidation

At the last CIC meeting there was only one recommendation that went through and that was a consent recommendation that athletics would cease on the Armstrong campus at the end of spring 2017. This was largely the decision of Armstrong personnel.

The mission statement: We had a mission statement that was largely approved by consensus here, but was not at Armstrong. It was returned to the OWG for further consideration and this senate now had another draft before it. He anticipated that at the upcoming CIC meeting all recommendations from this Senate, from the Armstrong
Senate, and from everyone concerned would be discussed and they would leave the meeting with a mission statement, but “It may not be until midnight.” The Board is expecting one. He thanked Curtis Ricker and Trey Denton for their hard work on this thankless task.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) noted that at the last senate meeting, President Hebert had said that the Presidents had met with the Governor, who said he opposed Campus Carry. Now President Hebert sounded pessimistic, and Pirro asked if we were basically just waiting for the Governor to sign it now.

President Hebert noted this new bill incorporated the elements whose absence had led to Governor Deal’s previous veto of Campus Carry. He noted that while he was in Texas, concealed carry passed with far fewer restrictions than existed in this bill. Without conceding, he said if it was inevitable that we have campus carry, he was glad it would have this many restrictions. That was the only win he could see in this.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) confirmed with President Hebert that guns won’t be allowed in residence halls, and noted we’ll have students who can’t take their guns up to their rooms. She assumed that they will be locking them in their cars, and so asked if we are going to have increased security around all of our parking because people will know there are guns in the trunk or under the seats.

President Hebert said such considerations were why the USG would meet toward the end of April to talk about the complexities of implementation. He noted that implementation took a year and a half in Texas.

Mark Welford (COSM), in regard to the number of high school students that we have on campus taking classes, asked if federal law restricted their exposure to guns.

In reply, President Hebert produced and read, with on-the-fly edits and comments, from a copy of the legislation:

“Being enacted by the General Assembly of Georgia, Part 3 of Article 4 of Chapter 11 of Title 16 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to carrying and possession of firearms, is amended in Code Section such and such relating to carrying weapons within school safety zones, at school functions, or on a bus or other transportation furnished by a school, by revising Paragraph 2, except as provided. . . . There’s a little more in there, but it’s all, you know, the legal verbiage, except as provided in Paragraph 20 of Subsection C of this Code. I’m trying to make, I want to make sure I’m following this in order here. Any weapons carry license holder when he or she is in any building or on a real property owned
by or leased to any public technical school, vocational school, college, or university or other public institution of postsecondary education provided, however, that such exceptions shall not apply to buildings or property used for athletic sporting events, or student housing, including, but not limited to, fraternity and sorority houses, not applied to any preschool or child care space, located within such buildings or real property, not applied to any room or space being used for classes related to a college or career academy or other specialized school as provided under certain code here, not applied to any room or space being used for classes in which high school students are enrolled through a dual-enrollment program including, but not limited to classes related to the Move On When Ready Act, not applied to faculty, staff, or administrative offices or rooms where disciplinary proceedings are conducted, only applied to the carrying of handguns which a licensee is licensed to carry pursuant to and it gives the government code there. Only applied to the carrying of handguns which are concealed. So those are the limitations that are included in there, but some of those are actually subject to interpretation. For example, when it says the classrooms where dual-enrollment students may take classes. I mean, in theory every one of our classes could be. I don’t think that’s the intention of the legislation, and so we are going to have to wait for an interpretation on exactly what that means.”

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) thought we would need gun checks put in front of every building because of the number of restrictions. She noted this comment was just to get in the minutes how ridiculous this was.

5. Provost’s Report: Jean Bartels

Historical Marker

There would be an unveiling of an historical marker on Sweetheart Circle that commemorates the integration of Georgia Southern University. This would occur in conjunction with the release of a book composed by the members of the First 500, a group comprised of the first 500 African-American students on this campus.

Honors Day

She reminded faculty about the Honors Day Award Celebration the following Wednesday, and encouraged all to attend.
Final Exam Week

Final exam week would be May 1-4. All courses are required to hold an exam or its equivalent in the timeframe. She stressed that grades are due 48 hours after that final is given. That is critically important for many reasons, not the least of which is what happens with students and their financial aid.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Richard Flynn [CLASS], Moderator

The SEC voted to include on the agenda the one motion request it received, and Moderator Flynn added the mission statement once he received the revised version. He noted that he had attended the USG Faculty Council meeting the previous Friday. There was a lot of tension, particularly from some of our colleagues at Armstrong, and so it was not a pleasant meeting, and nothing much was accomplished.

7. Unfinished Business Revised Mission Statement

Moderator Flynn noted that he had sent out the revised version to Senate over the weekend, and had heard from more than one person concerns about the lack of emphasis on research in the statement, and he shared those concerns.

Moderator Flynn wondered if he needed to make a motion, Jake Simons (COBA) said something inaudible, and Moderator Flynn agreed with whatever that was.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked if the senate would vote on it that day.

Moderator Flynn said we needed to vote re: sending it forward to the CIC because President Hebert needed to get a new statement, whatever it was, in place in order for us to proceed with the consolidation, and it was not put on the CIC agenda at the last meeting because of disagreements. Yet it had to go forward “come hell or high water.”

Cyr asked if the Senate had to vote to approve or just vote to send it forward.

Moderator Flynn said it had to be a vote to approve, but it could be discussed. James Stephens (JPHCOPH) made the motion, and was seconded.

Ed Mondor (COSM) said he was likely one of the first to express displeasure with the version then before the senate. The first had little about research, and this had virtually none. He was very concerned that the direction we were going was to being a teaching
college, which was fine if that’s what people wanted – he would turn his lab into a gun storage facility. Jokes aside, though, he could not vote to approve the statement.

Adam Bossler (CLASS) said disagreements over the mission statement match the problem we have had at this University for the entire nine years he has been here, which is the question of what is a public comprehensive university, especially when we have the designation of a Carnegie Doctoral Research University. His general comment was that Georgia Southern is a Carnegie Doctoral Research University, designated a public comprehensive University, while Armstrong is a teaching college. He felt we were in negotiations with Armstrong on what should be the mission of the University, but that if we retain the designation of University, the very first sentence, which drives the whole, should say that Georgia Southern is a Carnegie Doctoral Research University designated as a public comprehensive university that values research, teaching, and service. He also noted that besides research, other types of scholarly contribution should be added.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) agreed, saying creative work must be noted since we have departments dedicated to that.

Moderator Flynn said he calls his own work “scholarship” and felt current wording was heavily geared towards not-humanities, not-arts based kinds of work, and that needed to be corrected.

(Secretary’s Note: Someone said something inaudible to which Moderator Flynn replied inaudibly.)

President Hebert (President) said that, technically, the CIC, the Consolidation Implementation Committee, would forward a recommendation based on consensus during their meeting. What he sought were strong statements from the faculty. In a couple of other consolidations the CIC itself was charged with writing the new mission statement. He did not feel that was appropriate, despite the current composition process’s complications. He felt the Senates at both institutions, as representatives of their faculties, should provide input. He thought the stronger the statement coming from the GSU Senate about maintaining mention of the doctoral research classification in that statement, clearly saying something about research, cultural enrichment, and creative efforts will send a strong message to the CIC that this is how the faculty at Georgia Southern feel. He thought that would carry a lot of weight in that discussion.

(Secretary’s Note: There is more inaudible material, though it seems to be a back and forth between President Hebert and Lowell Mooney of COBA.)
Moderator Flynn said this might be a point of order for our parliamentarian: He wondered if it might not be wise to pass this motion, but defeat it with our suggestions.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked if the motion was take it or leave it, or if we could amend it.

President Hebert said it could be revised and approved as amended.

Cyr suggested removing “personal attention” in the first sentence, and to the end of that sentence adding “academic excellence in teaching, research, scholarship, creative work, and service.” He thought we could leave the rest of the statement as it was until we could come back to it in the next couple of years.

Moderator Flynn noted that many people wanted the Carnegie Doctoral Research designation back in the statement.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) thought we needed to identify ourselves before we started talking about the mission.

Ming Fang He (COE) thought “diversity” needed to be mentioned, and agreed we needed to mention our status as a comprehensive university and that our graduate program has Carnegie Doctoral Research status.

Moderator Flynn and Provost Bartels both noted the Carnegie classification is for our entire institution, not just the graduate program.

Ming Fang He also noted that “personal attention is a very weak statement” and that she did not understand what was meant by “time-honored commitments.”

Eudiah Ochieng (SGA Vice President, Academic Affairs) said the SGA would appreciate a description, in the first sentence, of the student population as diverse.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) realized she might get thrown out for saying this, but she did not care much about calling ourselves a Carnegie Doctoral institution because that was just something coming from higher up down, but it bothered Armstrong a lot because they were already defensive. She said GSU had had an identity crisis for years: Are we a research institution? Are we a teaching institution? We don’t know how to do promotion and tenure, and now in this statement we had to try to figure out who we are and how to say this, plus add in another whole university. She hoped we could make clear we are the collective result of the research, the teaching, the everything, from faculty who make individual contributions; individuals don’t have to do everything individually.
Adam Bossler (CLASS) agreed with Steirn, but wondered what “Carnegie Doctoral Research University, designated a public comprehensive university” meant re: how much we should emphasize teaching and research and service and teaching loads. He felt we should not run away from the designation, but needed to figure out what it means in practice, and consolidation was problematic without clearly understanding and stating that.

Jake Simons (COBA) said something that is inaudible.

James Stephens (JPHCOPH) noted that his college has four doctoral programs, and his department has 69 doctoral students, so they were very concerned that we include the Carnegie designation in the language.

Mark Welford (COSM) asked if we could make an amendment in which we proposed the original document that we had. Or, alternatively, whether if we turned down this one, it automatically would revert back to the one we previously approved.

Moderator Flynn asked President Hebert what negotiating position it would put him in if the senate voted disapproval, given how much was being said against the present proposal.

President Hebert said he would take the discussion back to the CIC. He said he understood the consensus to be that the senate was reluctant to approve a mission statement that does not contain the phrase “Carnegie Doctoral Research,” a clear indication of research and creative activity as part of the mission. He noted that he had often talked of the fact that to his mind we are a comprehensive, doctoral research institution, and what that means is that we balance the teacher/scholar model. That’s who we are, and he thought that’s who we want to continue to be. He did not want a mission statement that doesn’t say that. That was what he would take to the CIC, along with the addition of diversity, and he further felt that adding technological innovation, scientific discovery, education, health services, cultural enrichment, maybe something about creativity might say enough about research to get through the next year or so until we revisit this, though he would have preferred something stronger.

Mujibur Khan (CEIT) agreed that inclusion of our status as a research and doctoral institution was important if we hoped to increase our number of doctoral programs.

President Hebert also suggested we needed to remove the word “select” from the statement because we do offer a broad range of degrees in a broad range of disciplines.
Lisa Abbott (CLASS) asked what, specifically, in the original version had been objected to by the people at Armstrong.

Moderator Flynn had a list, which he would distribute if wanted, but noted that they objected primarily to the fact that it looked like just a slight revision of Georgia Southern’s current mission statement. It sent the message that it was an absorption rather than a consolidation. President Hebert agreed that was the issue.

Provost Bartels observed that, re: language, over and over the Armstrong faculty’s concerns centered on that “personal attention” statement. She thought Armstrong truly rests their accomplishments on the fact that they are student-centered, take care of their students, and worry about them personally. We pointed out many times that we would say the same thing about our approach to student teaching and learning, but that’s where the language gets slanted in order to preserve that personal attention to “student phenomena,” as they put it.

Ed Mondor (COSM) agreed with where he saw President Hebert going with the statement. He did not see the research issue as an us-against-them situation because he knew several faculty members in the Department of Biology at Armstrong who do very good research. He wondered if Armstrong is having the same identity crisis there as we’re having here; trying to meld it all together was the tricky part.

Barbara King (CLASS), on the personal attention issue, said some of our faculty members had noted the disappearance of the “large scale, small feel” orientation, and it seemed to her that that captures some of the aspects of personal attention that are very much part of our identity, and now that Armstrong is also to be large-scale, will be part of their identity as well.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) said she was concerned that we don’t know who we are, yet the people at Armstrong feel like they’re getting us shoved down their throats. If the mission statement says we are a research institution, it must also make clear that not every individual contributes to that part of the mission. We don’t want a mission statement that makes people feel they will be forced to do research. We could lose good Armstrong faculty who will feel they don’t belong.

Moderator Flynn said he thought the following language from the proposed statement covered much of Steirn’s concern: “Deploying the shared resources of its multiple locations, the University creates vibrant learning environments that foster an inclusive, student-centered culture of engagement designed to prepare students for lifelong service as scholars, leaders, and responsible stewards of their communities.”
Steirn said she read that as saying, “here’s the environment we are building for our students, not here’s what we expect from our faculty. And I think the reactions we’re getting are from the faculty. They are not from the students.”

James Stephens (JPHCOPH) said we depend on our doctoral students to bring in grants, and we have a lot of grant funding coming in. The doctoral program in his college is very important and should be mentioned in the mission statement. The Carnegie Doctoral designation means a lot to his college.

Moderator Flynn said he saw that, with one or two exceptions, as the consensus of the Senate.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) called the question. After some explanation of that parliamentary procedure, the Senate voted to call the question and vote on the motion to approve the mission statement.

By unanimous vote, the motion was Not Approved.

8. New Business

Election of Secretary and Librarian.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) had agreed to run for Secretary and Mark Welford (COSM) to run for Librarian for 2017-18. There were no other nominations. Cyr and Welford were elected by acclamation to serve in those offices.

Motion: Inclusion of Senate Vote on proposed SRI with final SRI report

Barbara King (CLASS) was concerned that the consolidation Operational Working Group (OWG) to which the SRI committee’s report was being forwarded for informational purposes only would not recognize that, since we formally voted down only one of the report’s recommendations, we had rejected all of the report’s recommendations. She thought this needed to be made clear as part of a full relay of information to the OWG. Just forwarding the report was not forwarding full information because it would not relay the faculty input provided by the Senate discussion, particularly misgivings about the SRI instrument itself.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that King had raised something like this during the last meeting, but it got lost in the donnybrook of discussion. He thought her motion sought to forward to the OWG a clearer version of what occurred, and he thought that was a good idea.
Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) agreed with the basic motion. At the last meeting, we had said we did not want to make recommendations to the OWG that would develop an SRI for both GSU and Armstrong, but just forwarding the report could send the wrong message. A note that we have strong reservations should accompany the report.

Moderator Flynn asked if inclusion of the results of the senate vote would accomplish that goal.

King said that would be a start.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) wanted to include the vote, but also a paragraph saying that this was discussed at length and there were several reservations.

Moderator Flynn asked if they wanted to send the minutes or a reference to the minutes, or would that accomplish more than they were asking for.

Alice Hall (CHHS) noted that consolidation had formed part of the discussion, and wondered if we had voted the measure down because we did not like it, or because of consolidation. She thought forwarding the minutes would be important to show how we arrived at the vote.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) said the overwhelming consensus was we didn’t like the new measure, and that needed to be communicated.

King was also concerned that the OWG would not be able to tell how many people voted against it because they didn’t like it, how many did so because of consolidation, and how many used consolidation as a way of not having to be mean.

Cyr said that issue was cloudy and that was a reason to send the minutes to the OWG, so they could see for themselves what was said.

Moderator Flynn noted at this point that the motion had not been formally made, so King made it: to include the Senate vote on the proposed SRI with the forwarded SRI Report. It was seconded.

Jake Simons (COBA) said something inaudible, but it appears to have been a suggestion that the motion be amended to include the minutes of the SRI discussion. After some discussion of how amendments work, Mark Welford (COSM) formally moved an amendment that we include the minutes of the discussion along with the SRI committee’s report in the material forwarded to the OWG. He was seconded.
Adam Bossler (CLASS) was concerned that just forwarding the minutes would not make clear how strongly faculty were against the new SRI, regardless of consolidation. The OWG might want to take some of the recommendations from the report and try to implement them even though we were strongly opposed to them.

Moderator Flynn asked if Bossler was clear on the fact that the amended motion would forward both the minutes and the result of the vote.

Bossler said he understood that, but noted that some people had said the minutes weren’t very clear about whether we voted it down because we were against it, or whether we were just trying to be nice by saying we rejected it because of the consolidation. He thought we should be much clearer about why it was rejected.

Cyr thought Bossler’s suggestion would have to bring up an entire new discussion in which we would have to gauge how much we hate it. He wasn’t sure that there was any reason to do that right now. He thought the amended motion sent as much clarity as we could achieve.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) did not think sending the report forward would result in its being accepted and implemented. She thought there would be much more discussion even with forwarding the minutes that included Senators’ objections to the report.

The amendment was voted on and Approved. The amended motion was then voted on and Approved.

9. Announcements: Vice Presidents

None

10. Announcements from the Floor

James Stephens (JPHCOPH) announced, “My wife and I on April 3rd have been married 41 years. And she’s, I love her very much, she’s a good woman. That’s all I had to say.”

Moderator Flynn called this the “Best announcement ever.”

Mark Welford (COSM) announced that the AAUP and the Provost would host a reception honoring the recently promoted and tenured faculty on Friday, April 21st, at Eagle Creek Brewery.
Lisa Abbott (CLASS) reminded faculty that their closing show of the year was *Chicago*, running April 27th through the 30th.

11. Adjournment

Moved and Approved.
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Faculty Senate Minutes
June 7, 2017
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Nessmith-Lane Ballroom


Voting members not in attendance: Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Mete Akcaoglu, Rocio Alba-Flores, Moya Alfonso, Dragos Amarie, Dustin Anderson, Sarah Bielski, Adam Bossler, Mark Edwards, Eric Hall, Ellen Hamilton, Jonathan Hilpert, Alina Iacob, Mujibur Khan, Eric Landers, Li Ma, Ron MacKinnon, Santanu Majumdar, Lowell Mooney, Constantin Ogloblin, Peter Rogers, Chasen Smith, Valentin Soloiu, James Stephens, Linda Thompson, Sam Todd, Shijun Zheng, Eudiah Ochieng

Senate Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Administrators in Attendance: Jaimie Hebert, Jean Bartels, Diana Cone, Trip Addison, Teresa Thompson, Rob Whitaker, Martha Abell, Thomas Koballa, Curtis Ricker

Visitors: Andrew Hansen, Candace Griffith, Johanne Lewis, Delena Bell Gaten, Rebecca Ziegler, Ashley Walker, Jayne Perkins Brown, Amy Ballagh, Christine Ludowise, Danielle Smith, Michael Nielsen, Robert Farber, Emily Eisenhart, Lisa P. Smith

1. Approval of the Agenda for the June 7, 2017 meeting.
Moved and Approved.
2. Approval of the April 3, 2017 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary

Moved and Approved.

3. Librarian’s Reports for June 2017: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian.

Moved and Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report – Ron McKinnon (COBA), Chair (Cheryl Aasheim [CEIT] presenting for Ron MacKinnon)

For April 11th: one revision to a course in COBA; three revised courses and one new program in COSM; one revised course in CHHS; fourteen revised courses and four new courses in CEIT. In addition, the committee approved the Comprehensive Program Review reports for eight different programs, and Robert Farber, Chair of the Art Department, made recommendations for improving that Comprehensive Program Review process; those recommendations are in the minutes. The report was Moved and Approved.

Graduate Committee Report – Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) for Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair

On April 13, 2017, the committee discussed three topics in addition to the approval of the 2017-2018 Meeting Schedule: 2 brief updates, 42 New Business Items, and 1 Old Business Item:

Two areas of new business: Curriculum Items and Comprehensive Program Reviews. Regarding curriculum, the committee had 1 Discussion Item from COE on a Change in the Full-Time Enrollment Graduate Assistant Eligibility Requirement, which was tabled until that item can go through the Enrollment Management Committee this fall. The committee also approved:

• 12 New Courses and 1 Program Revision from CEIT
• 12 Course Revisions from CHHS
• 10 Course Revisions from COBA
The committee also delivered their reports on the Comprehensive Program Reviews.

All seven of the Programs reviewed either Meet Expectations, or Meet Expectations with Recommendations. With no objections, all Comprehensive Program Reviews were approved to move forward to the Provost’s Office.

Old Business Mrs. Jade Brooks from the Registrar’s Office presented on the Curriculum Inventory Management (CIM) system, which currently has an unknown future. As of now, the Registrar’s Office is operating under the assumption that they will continue with CourseLeaf for the catalog and CIM for curriculum.

The report was Moved and Approved.

Michelle Cawthorn being absent, there was no report from the General Education and Core Curriculum Committee.

4. President’s Report: Jaimie Hebert

Campus Carry

Now that USG had published their guidelines and an update to those guidelines, GSU was forming a task force with faculty, Staff Council, and student representation, along with Facilities, Law Enforcement, and Public Safety to develop local implementation procedures within those guidelines and to work on other issues related to campus carry.

Trip Addison (VP for University Advancement and External Relations) noted the website http://www.usg.edu/hb280 where USG is responding to questions submitted from faculty, staff, students, and parents. Once the task force was formed, he encouraged faculty to submit questions to the Faculty Representative to ensure that all questions relative to our campus are being asked.

Consolidation

The entire senior leadership had been appointed, including direct reports for the new institution. Everyone within that leadership group now had been charged with fully developing the organizational structure within their areas and had received HR protocols on vetting appointments into those areas.
He noted that the now-approved academic structure with colleges had required that the recommendation be pulled to allow further discussion and that it did not end up in a way that a lot of faculty had hoped it would, but he felt the process had forced us to have a discussion which brought about an awareness of the interdisciplinary programs, about the synergy and the importance of maintaining the synergy amongst the two groups [Arts and Humanities, and the Social Sciences]. He would continue to support the synergy and the interdisciplinary activity between those two colleges.

So far, nearly two hundred recommendations had been approved. Another 85 recommendations had come forward. The new institution is really taking shape. He thanked all who were working on OWGs.

With regard to department chairs, we cannot have department chairs on both campuses. We have to have single department chairs. But any time we have a critical mass of students or faculty on any campus, it will be imperative that we have a lead person who has some authority in that location to make decisions for students or faculty who are in a critical situation. So we will have leads, whether called department chairs or associate chairs or senior faculty or something else. We will have the appropriate personnel in place to address critical situations, not just public safety emergencies, but from an academic perspective.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) asked if there would be an expectation that department chairs will travel back and forth between the two campuses.

President Hebert said that would largely be up to the Deans. There might be some departments that have a traveling department chair. There may be some departments with a department chair in one place and an associate chair in another place. It’s going to depend on the volume of students, the magnitude, the size of the faculty, and other factors. We’re going to allow ourselves the flexibility to do what’s right and what’s necessary.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted, in regard to campus carry, that USG said they would not pay for things like signage or gun lockers. This made him wonder if President Hebert had heard that they are expecting changes to that law because of the complications that the badly written law has created.

VP Trip Addison fielded that question, saying he did not think at this time we can speculate as to whether a new bill would come in the future. We’ve got to focus on implementing the existing law.
Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked if we will be allowed to put signs on our doors, even if it is simply a printout of the law with restricted areas highlighted.

VP Addison thought that was a question to be submitted to the Faculty Senate representative on the Implementation Committee, so it can be sent out to USG, although he thought the answer might already be in the guidelines.

Moderator Flynn said it was not in the guidelines, but offered that somebody’s Second Amendment Rights did not negate his First Amendment rights, so he planned to post something like what Steirn had suggested.

Ming Fang He (COE) remembered that during an interview while he was being hired, President Hebert had been asked about his perspective on campus carry, and she recalled that he said one reason he wanted to leave his current position was because they allowed campus carry. She asked how he felt now. She also asked whether he had seen a message sent by Michelle Haberland containing questions about campus carry.

President Hebert said he had read a large number of emails but could not say whether or not he had read that one specifically. As for why he left Texas, it was not because of campus carry, but because he wanted to be at Georgia Southern University. He did oppose campus carry as a Provost in the state of Texas, as did all of the other Provosts in the state. It was implemented nonetheless, and he was part of the implementation team. Here in Georgia, he had joined Chancellor Wrigley in his opposition to the incoming law, but as of July 1st that will be the law in Georgia, and so his priority now was to implement current Georgia law in a way that

- maintains the safety of our students;
- maintains the safety of our faculty;
- does not diminish the educational mission of the institution. He said this was exactly the interview response he gave about Texas, and that was the approach they took there, too.
- Safety first, and then don’t diminish the academic mission.

Moderator Flynn suggested that further campus carry discussion be reserved for the time scheduled for that subject later in the agenda.

Matthew Flynn (CLASS) asked if the dean for the new College of Social Sciences being created will be a direct appointment or if there would be a national search.
President Hebert would encourage a national search, but whether there is time to do such a search immediately will be part of the decision-making process. We may appoint an interim while we’re doing a national search.

Flynn asked how input from chairs and faculty would be incorporated regarding an interim appointment or national search.

President Hebert imagined there will be discussion amongst the Provost and the Chairs in that regard.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) asked if there will actually be two Dean searches, given that there will be two new colleges.

President Hebert said, “. . . if we have two people who are sitting in comparable positions say, on two institutions, not only for deans . . . What the supervisor will be required to do under our HR protocol is to solicit letters of intent in abbreviated resumes from both of those people and then use whatever mechanism is necessary to make their decision to appoint. In a dean position, I think it would go the same way. If there are sitting deans . . . if there are two competitors there needs to be a decision-making process in place there. Whether or not it’s a national search, is another question. In one of the situations that we’re talking about you have an open position where there is no one currently, and that one would certainly require an open search.”

Jake Simons (COBA) asked what President Hebert considered the greatest remaining challenges for us regarding consolidation.

President Hebert did not see “any distinct obstacles any longer.” The hardest things were the academic structure and the organizational structure, and with those in place we now have real traction. The biggest challenge is just keeping the momentum going.

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) was concerned about heightened anxiety given the issues of consolidation and campus carry. She asked if we had a way to make sure that faculty have the information necessary accessible for understanding what a campus lockdown should look like. She knew people were suffering from frustration and depression, and some students had thoughts of suicide.

Rob Whitaker (VP Business and Finance) noted that our Chief of Police had very recently attended a training session with the USG Chief of Police, Bruce Holmes. In that training they provided an outline of training that could be taken back to campuses. VP Whitaker had found out about that information just that day. He recommended that the campus carry implementation committee be provided that documentation, that we turn
it into a Georgia Southern version, and share that with the entire campus so that all will have the resources and information necessary to know how to handle a situation that may come up.

5. **Provost’s Report: Jean Bartels**

Provost Bartels took this opportunity of her last report to thank the Senate for the support that she always felt in terms of academic progress on this campus.

6. **Senate Executive Committee Report: (Richard Flynn [CLASS], Chair.)**

Moderator Flynn said no motion requests had been submitted, but the SEC had decided to include on the agenda discussion of campus carry.

7. **Unfinished Business**

None.

8. **New Business**

**Discussion of campus carry policies/questions for USG**

https://www.usg.edu/assets/usg/docs/USG_HB_280_Guidance_%2803%29.pdf

http://www.usg.edu/hb280/additional_information

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) asked what, if any, plans there were for educating students on the parameters of the law and how to report guns in places they are not allowed.

Teresa Thompson (VP Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) said we had started putting materials together and talking to other states that have gone through this. The USG is also helping out. We will put a video out for our students. They’ll all receive it and additional information. We’ll work with them through SGA as soon as they come back, but we will send the video and the other information before they get to campus. It will also be in all of their materials if they are moving into University housing since guns will not be allowed in Housing no matter what. We’ll also have smaller group discussions as they get to campus and have those conversations with them throughout the entire semester.

Mark Welford (COSM) asked if we could also have similar workshops for faculty so we will know what we are allowed to do and what not.
VP Trip Addison said that was an excellent idea for the faculty representative to bring to the implementation committee.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) had a question from the Director of the Psychology Clinic, and knew the answer would be “send it to our representative,” but she still wanted to bring it up here. She noted that no kind of mental health facility is mentioned as a restricted area. That means our counseling center and our psychology clinic are not exceptions. She did not think we should have guns in those centers, particularly given that families and children are frequently there. The only place with children that is an exception is a child care facility that has a front desk with somebody there or a metal detector. She was concerned that “this is going to go live and what we’re being told is it is what it is. You can’t ask anybody if they are carrying. You can’t do this, you can’t do that. But there are places that, you know, the bill doesn’t cover and I mean are they going to listen or are we going to bring up questions and then have them say it’s already been passed?”

VP Thompson said, “They can bring into the counseling center and they can also bring them into the Psychology Center. We did check immediately and we were told that those were zones that they could bring [firearms] into those places, and it is the law.”

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked for a clarification: “If I understand the law correctly, guns are not allowed in faculty offices, administrative offices, or staff offices. Does that effectively mean administrators, staff, and faculty are precluded, if they do have a carry permit, from actually having their concealed carry weapon in their own offices?”

President Hebert replied, “The manner in which the law is written, that is correct.”

Cyr noted that this provision did not bother him because when the issue of allowing guns on campus had come up some years back, he had looked around the Faculty Senate and asked himself, “Do you want this group armed?”

Ming Fang He (COE) asked if we had parameters regarding children in relation to this law She also asked how we will articulate this law to visiting scholars, especially those from other countries.

Alice Hall (CHHS) said the Child Development Center right now currently is locked so that students who have classes in there have access with their ID card, as do parents picking up their children. There is no metal detector. She thought the Director from the Child Development Center should be on the implementation committee.
Steirn said the measures in place re: children work for the inside only and only as long as there’s a front desk staffed. But anywhere outside, like the play area, would not be protected.

Moderator Flynn noted that some of those questions, for instance about whether children are protected where they are just running around campus, were answered on the USG site already, though not in a way he liked.

Abbott asked what the timeline was for the committee to be formed, meet, and begin implementation. She noted we had only a month to go.

President Hebert said he had requested that all of the vice presidents send him recommendations by the upcoming Friday, when he hoped to set that committee and let the campus know its members. He added, “We need to have protocols in place for July 1st. Absolutely imperative.”

Moderator Flynn allowed Emily Eisenhart (Director of the Center for Addiction Recovery, JPHCOPH) to speak from the visitors’ gallery. She had been following HB 280 closely, partly because she works with students who are in recovery from substance use disorders, and who have other mental health conditions, and currently they will be allowed to carry guns in the spaces where served. She nominated herself for the implementation committee because she knows a lot about this issue, being a public health professional. She also had some specific questions so far not answered by USG. While faculty offices are places where guns cannot be carried, as she understood it hallways and landings onto which faculty offices open are places where guns can be carried. In theory, could a student shoot her through her glass front office while she could not shoot back because she could not have a gun in her office?

President Hebert said, “Actually, no. It is against the law to fire a firearm. . . . I’m not being facetious there, but, well, I am, but you’re right. There, it seems illogical. . . . that’s the way the law is written, that a person who has a concealed handgun license can carry that concealed weapon up and down that hallway.”

Eisenhart asked if we will be allowed to set parameters such as no backpacks or bags allowed inside of our offices. [Secretary’s Note: Somehow she received a “No” to this question.] She then sought clarification on whether or not we would be able to talk to students about the laws inside our classroom, or set classroom behavior.

VP Addison believed that was already addressed in the guidance by USG and that they would further address language that can be added to syllabi because that was a question that had come up from another university.
Eisenhart asked a last question: The Center for Addiction Recovery is located in Veazey Hall. There are two big classroom spaces, and within the classrooms they built offices, so there are enclosed offices within the classrooms. There’s one office that’s completely enclosed within the classroom, and then in the other classroom there are desks for student GAs, and that’s effectively their office. Was that considered an office so the entire space would be exempt from carrying?

VP Addison thought that a valid question to submit to the committee: What defines an office? Is a desk in a room considered an office or a classroom? He thought that would probably be defined as a classroom.

Andrew Hansen (JPHCOPH) noted that some faculty members, in order to control for cheating, ask for backpacks to be left at the front of the classroom. If they cannot do this, they will just give up and do all online testing. He also wondered if we will educate students on the ramifications, especially legal ones, of an accidental discharge.

VP Thompson said they had had such discussions with the other universities and, yes, they need to understand the consequences. They may have a right to carry that weapon, but they’re still going to be held to the same standard if it is discharged in any shape, form, or fashion. We will have all of those consequences on the sheets and hopefully the video, too, that we are producing with USG.

Steirn (CLASS) noted her agreement with President Hebert that it was illogical that a student could carry a gun in the hallway but not into a faculty office. If she asks a student to enter her office to discuss something, she will make the student a lawbreaker, or the student will have to stand in the hall to ask questions.

President Hebert noted that it is incumbent upon that person to be aware of what those laws are and to follow them. The implications Steirn described were right. She could go into the hall to talk to such a student, or the student would have to leave the building and safely house the firearm before returning. Where that safe housing would be, he did not know.

Provost Bartels wondered if, should she see a firearm, i.e. it’s not concealed, it is her right or even obligation to notify campus police.

VP Addison said the answer to that question is included in the material Chief McCullough recently received. VP Whitaker added that no one on our campus other than the Chief had yet seen this very recently acquired material. Once it runs through
the committee, they will get out information about when you should report something to University Police.

VP Thompson reiterated that they have not been sitting back. We have been “gathering information from other universities, at Texas, at Oklahoma, and Colorado. We wanted to know what they had done, what had been their problems, how did they educate their students, and faculty, and all those type things, so we have got some plans in place, but we had to wait until the USG gave us our instructions to move forward and we are now just receiving those, so I think that may help some folks understand there’s been a lot of things happening, we just could not do anything until we got the final okay from USG.”

Mark Welford (COSM) asked if faculty could go to online student/teacher meetings. He added, “. . . because that’s what I intend to do. I don’t intend to meet with students anymore in my office. So, what you’re saying is it is just up to us then really. You’re not discouraging or encouraging.”

President Hebert wanted to leave that specific issue to the Provost because it was an academic matter: “You have to weigh the consequences of safety with the consequences of the academic mission on all of these things and have those discussions and come to decisions.”

Ed Mondor (COSM) thought some of these policies were inherently dangerous. For example, weapons in laboratories where they work with compounds that will literally melt contact lenses to your eyes. He said such compounds can cause a shell to go off in someone’s pocket. He asked if there was a way to address, through revisions, such key issues.

VP Addison said the way was via the legislative process. That is the only way to revise the law. We cannot interpret things that would be exempt, like a counseling center or some other scenario, because they aren’t exempt within the law. He did not advocate for, but only mentioned that communication through appropriate channels with local legislators as a concerned citizen would be one action that could be taken.

Moderator Flynn allowed Mike Nielsen, Chair of the Psychology Department, to speak from the gallery. Nielsen noted that because of some things that happened in his department, they arranged for panic buttons in offices and some other spaces. He asked if the University considered adding those more thoroughly to campus.

VP Whitaker said departments could make that decision, and noted that department funds would need to be used to pay for such panic buttons up front. That was how it was
done now. He thought it was less than a hundred dollars a button. Moderator Flynn thought the implementation committee might recommend it campus-wide.

Karen McCurdy (CLASS) wondered if we had statistics on, in states that already have campus carry, how many students choose to do so.

VP Thompson said they had asked similar questions, but she wasn’t sure that data was even available because no one can ask if someone is carrying a concealed weapon.

Welford asked if this incoming law had impacted recruitment of students for this Fall. VP Thompson said she could not know that because it’s state law and it’s every institution in the state of Georgia. Welford clarified that he was just asking if we were seeing a downturn in students coming in next year. Thompson said we were about even right now, but that across the state and the nation recruitment was down because of a lowering of the birth rate. She did not think campus carry had had any impact on this.

Abbott cited reports that schools with campus carry had seen an increase in suicides, but not an increase in violent crimes, and a small increase in car break-ins.

Lettie McGrath (CLASS) asked if there was a safety issue with leaving guns in cars. VP Addison answered that current state law already allows a person to leave a gun in a car on campus. McGrath clarified that her concern was the heat and humidity of south Georgia causing a discharge. Addison was unaware of any such problems.

Matthew Flynn (CLASS) asked about the recruitment numbers for out-of-state students this year compared to last year.

VP Thompson said we’re seeing about the same number of out-of-state students, but that international students are down, to say the least, nationwide.

President Hebert, in closing with this, said he appreciated this discussion and that it helped to continue asking these questions and pushing them to the point of testing the logic of everything out there. But we have to implement; there’s no doubt about that.

Ted Brimeyer (CLASS) asked if studies had been done in Texas, Oklahoma, or Colorado to see if this has affected grading.

VP Thompson said it had not come up in her conversations with them.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said, “It’s really very simple: .22 is a C, .38 is a B, .45 is an A.”
President Hebert said, “On second thought, maybe we want to limit discussion,” and Moderator Flynn ended it on that note.

President Hebert (President) thanked Moderator Flynn for completing his year in that position, and for being invaluable to him personally during his first year as President. He presented Flynn with a plaque in appreciation.

9. **Announcements: Vice Presidents**

None.

10. **Announcements from the Floor**

Ming Fang He (COE) thanked Provost Bartels for her service over these years.

11. **Adjournment**

Moved and Approved.
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Faculty Senate Minutes
August 23, 2017
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Nessmith-Lane Ballroom

NOTE: This was a special called meeting to consider approval of various recommendations re: the consolidation of Georgia Southern and Armstrong Universities.


Senate Moderator: Rob Pirro

Student Government Association: Grantson Martin

Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Voting members not in attendance: Sam Adeye, Mete Akcaoglu, Moya Alfonso, Adam Bossler, Anoop Desai, Hsiang-Jui Kung, Eric Landers, Yi Lin, Peter Rogers, Chasen Smith

Administrators: Jaimie Hebert, Diana Cone, Amy Ballagh, Martha Abell, Greg Evans, Barry Joyner, Christine Ludowise

Visitors: Asli Aslan, Timothy Cairney, Jessica Garner, Billy Glasco, Axel Grossman, Andrew Hansen, Natalie James, Lucas Jensen, Shainaz, Landge, John Stone, Beth
Secretary’s Note: Due to an organizational hitch on the part of the recording crew, there is no recording until 15-30 minutes into the meeting, i.e. until some way into the Core Curriculum and General Education Committee report and discussion.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the August 23, 2017 meeting.

Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the June 7, 2017 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

Moved and Approved.

3. Librarian’s Reports for August 2017: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian.

Moved and Approved re: accuracy.

Core Curriculum and General Education Committee: Heidi Altman (CLASS).

Secretary’s Note: Prior to the following remarks by Finbarr Curtis, other concerns had been raised about the core curriculum proposed re: consolidation and approved/recommended by the CCGE Committee.

Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) noted that when students come in, whatever catalog they come in under is binding for their four years. He asked whether, if major problems with the core are found and we make changes, will students coming in under the flawed core be able to opt for the revised core under a later catalog?

Heidi Altman (CLASS) said her understanding was that the students go in under the catalog that they enroll under but then can opt to take other catalog years later in the program, which is how it has always been.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) was concerned about the drop in the number of hours required for undergraduate degrees.

Moderator Pirro noted we would talk about this during the Undergraduate Committee report, and this was a reduction of institutional hours from 126 to 124.

Steirn had been confused by the note that they had actually discussed dropping it to 120, but then recommended 124.
Altman said that the OWG recommended 120, but it had been raised to 124; that may or may not be approved by the BOR.

Provost Diana Cone said 120 is what the University System requires for a new student in the System to graduate with a Bachelor’s degree. In the Academic Affairs OWG retreat the System Liaisons indicated that the Chancellor is very much in favor of 120 because we are trying to work on retention and get students graduated. They heard our plan to put in our freshman orientation course and a health and wellness part of that, and that we couldn’t move any of those to Area B because we had proposed a sophomore year experience in the core. They were very excited about the sophomore year experience so they said they could probably get us to 124 without any problems at the University System office. More than 124 would, they said, likely lead to directions to make it 120.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) had concerns with the e-Core class called “portfolio.” There is no indication how this work will be graded, who will be doing the grading, or how people will be paid. He thought this needed clarification before approving it as part of the core. He also questioned the need for diaspora studies amongst the core options.

Altman did not want to address those classes specifically, but said that in committee it was said repeatedly that this core is a bridge from one status to another, and once we’re at the other status we can go back and ask these kinds of questions.

Jake Simons (COBA), a member of the GECC Committee, said they knew that there were going to be multiple concerns about the core, and also knew that the undergrad committee was going to be wrestling with many of the same issues. He tried to focus on the student learning outcomes for the areas, to see whether they were sufficiently consistent with and comprehensive of our Gen Ed and Core Curriculum requirements, and only to look at the courses in terms of whether we would be able to assess those learning outcomes. He and, he thought, the majority of committee members felt that we would be able to. But they did not attempt to justify each individual course.

Steirn (CLASS) was concerned that the hour change will affect Financial Aid for students because we closely track which hours fit into degrees; the more we change or mess with them the worse off we’ll be.

Moderator Pirro asked if the GECC had discussed Financial Aid.

Altman said no; they received all this stuff from the OWG and there was no discussion of anything except “This is what we have and we have to vote on it.”
Costomiris realized that committees may not have dealt with these matters, but it seemed to him a matter of some urgency to decide who is going to be responsible for core 2000, who is going to grade core 2000, and how they’re going to be compensated for grading core 2000. If it became part of the core, it would do so right away and we had no plan.

Simons said CLASS Dean Curtis Ricker was present for their meeting and shared that within the OWG there were concerns about the effect of new courses. Dean Ricker noted to them that even if an item is approved for the curriculum, the courses would have to be scheduled by department chairs, and Simons thought Ricker’s belief was that some of these issues will be policed by departments not offering the courses unless or until they were satisfied that they had those issues sorted out.

President Jaimie Hebert noted that none of this would be effective until Fall of 2018, so we will have implementation time. And Provost Cone had reminded him that the specific course under discussion is a sophomore-level course, so really wouldn’t be on the books until 2019.

Steirn pointed out that if a sophomore transfers in for Fall 2018, that sophomore will be under the 2018 curriculum and so would need that course.

Costomiris decided “to beat this a little harder” and reiterate his question about how and how much faculty will be paid for some of these core classes.

Ted Brimeyer (CLASS) was concerned that no one could answer that question. He noted we do not have much time to figure this out.

Provost Cone said that the OWG discussed this along with FYE and there are different payment models right now on both campuses. During implementation in early Fall those committees will work to come up with a plan that will have to get approved by the President’s Cabinet if funding is needed. If it is a model similar to FYE, where we pay faculty extra money or pay them in the form of travel or equipment, then that would be needed. If it’s determined that it would be in load, then it would go to the Deans’ Council to determine if they could be handled as in-load courses; instead of a faculty member teaching an extra course in his/her discipline, he/she might teach a course in one of these areas. If we determine during implementation that these specific recommendations are not a good idea, we can go back and make revised recommendations to the CIC.
Michelle Haberland (CLASS) said it sounded like this decision will be made in the President’s Cabinet, or begin to be made at the President’s Cabinet. She asked if there is faculty representation on the President’s Cabinet.

President Hebert said the decision would be made at President’s Cabinet only if it required the allocation of resources. He said that if the Provost says that we need resources to implement this, we’ll to work to find the resources to implement this.

Ed Mondor (COSM) had many issues with all of this, he thought as the result of a lack of understanding as to why some of these decisions were made for the core. For example, Environmental Bio is now in two different sections. One has a lab, one doesn’t have a lab. He saw this as a nightmare for advisors – if students decide to switch majors but didn’t take the lab before, they might get right to the end of their degree programs and need a one-credit hour lab. He noted a “Study Abroad” in the core but guessed that’s not what we think of as Study Abroad. It seemed to him that the only reason we were trying to approve this now was because of a SACSCOC deadline. Nobody was happy with this. He asked if we could ask for a SACSCOC deadline extension on this, but then guessed from the headshaking he saw that this was not in the cards. Moderator Pirro confirmed that President Hebert had “nodded no to that question.”

Costomiris asked if anyone had, indeed, asked SACSCOC if we could have an extension.

President Hebert said he hadn’t asked SACSCOC directly, and was not sure if anyone at USG had asked. What he did know was if the consolidation is going to go forward, and that is what’s required by the System office, that’s the constraint that has been imposed on us: SACSCOC requires that the prospectus be submitted by September 1 for consideration at the December board meeting.

Mark Welford (COSM) asked if Global Citizenship had been removed from consideration, and, if so, what would happen to First-Year Experience, which has been very successful.

Chris Caplinger (Director, First-Year Experience) said FYE will continue with the changes to the First-Year Seminar on both campuses, though doing some other things. FYE was not directly a part of the OWG that considered this issue, but the expansion of Area B to include seven hours focusing on Global Issues was in keeping with the goal of Global Citizenship.

Steirn asked what would happen if the Senate voted down the core proposal.
Provost Cone noted that the President has the authority to approve it even if the Senate does not. Mark Edwards (COSM), for the benefit of new senators, noted that the Statutes make clear that the Senate is only advisory to the President.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that the subject of the core would come up again later in the meeting with the Undergraduate Committee report. He said the UGC’s motion in their report makes it clear that nobody likes this core proposal, and that “the only reason to vote for it is because if we don’t the SACSCOC monster will come out of its cave and lay waste the land.” He said the UGC motion was also clear in calling for coming back with a faculty/administration working committee to revise it. Cyr said he wanted to vote against the core proposal, but not the other two proposals [those re: programs and number of hours] but likely would vote Yes because of SACSCOC. He did note if President Hebert approves the motion, he would also be approving the process for revising the core.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) thought more yes votes would be secured if a statement about that revision process were in the motion. Ron MacKinnon (COBA), chair of the Undergraduate Committee, said the statement already was in the motion they would be putting forward, as Cyr had noted.

Simons said that without constraints he would not be keen on the proposal, but noted that the OWG’s had a lot of faculty representatives on them and he viewed the proposal as “kind of a best shot that they could give us to go forward with and . . . I’d rather get it back in our hands by approving it so that we are in a position to be able to handle it normally rather than having a lot of external influence on what we come up with. And to me the most expeditious way to do that is to approve.”

Moderator Pirro noted the original OWG proposal was changed in response to complaints that the public speaking class was very important, so it was put back in. So the OWG did try to address some of the ongoing concerns.

Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) asked if what would be adopted by approval this day would definitely be the version in the Fall 2018 catalog, or if we could continue to revise it before that catalog is set.

President Hebert said that once we get into the implementation phase we will revert to our standard curriculum processes, which offer careful assessment and, if necessary, modification of all of our courses, not only in the core, but in all of our programs.

Mondor asked if we need to tell SACSOC that we are planning on changing this as soon as possible.
President Hebert noted that as part of the prospectus, we also have to put in an assessment plan for the core. He believed there was “an understanding” that we are going to assess and revise in future using our standard processes.

Costomiriris said that assessing a core curriculum presumes that it will have been implemented, and that meant we were actually going to put this thing into action. He thought approval would ride on the revision process. He wanted to know when this revision would take place, and thought we’d just wind up tinkering with it rather than doing a wholesale revision.

Cyr thought a lot of this discussion, including Costomiriris’s point, would be more appropriate during discussion of the Undergraduate Committee motion because that was what would actually approve the core to go forward. He thought the Senate needed to be looking at the language of that motion in order to properly consider what Mondor and Costomiriris were talking about. He thought the senate should move on.

Simons agreed. He also noted that at this point no one can say what changes would be made.

Moderator Pirro conducted a vote by show of hands: 37 Yes, 10 No. The report of the GECC Committee was Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report: Ron MacKinnon (COBA), Chair

Ron MacKinnon (COBA) noted they “were given two urgent meetings on the 11th and the 17th, and the discussion you heard around this room, we heard it two or three times ourselves.” On August 11 they received from the CIC the recommendation that 126 hours go to 124 and this was approved by the UGC. The second CIC recommendation was for approval of all programs [not courses] they’d looked at at Armstrong and Georgia Southern; the UGC approved these recommendations. MacKinnon moved approval of those two items.

Robert Costomiriris (CLASS) asked where the two hour reduction was being made.

MacKinnon said that was a hard question to answer: “We just received a report, we look at it, we vote on it, we pass it on. Who did the thing in the first place? I’m not exactly sure; some of the guilty people might be in this room, but . . . my understanding is they had a sensitive discussion on it [and] their best judgment [was] that we should agree with the Board of Regents – when they say it is 124 hours, it’s going to be 124 hours.”
Provost Cone said two hours of the four [above 120] will be in the freshman experience orientation class, while the other two will be from Health and Physical Activity.

Moderator Pirro called for a voice vote. All but one vote was Yes, so the motions re: programs and hours were Approved.

Regarding the core, MacKinnon said that on August 11th, the UGC had had the same discussion as had just taken place in the senate. They didn’t like it either, so they sent some members to attend a GECC meeting to see if they could come back with a recommendation, and that was what they were presenting as their motion in the report:

“We move to approve the Core Curriculum Work Group Recommendations as a starting place until a critical look can be taken with more faculty input. This motion is made with the understanding that an ad-hoc committee consisting of faculty members from both GECC, UGCC and all campuses to take a close and critical look at the core post-consolidation.”

He thought it would be quite appropriate to put a time frame in there via an amendment.

Mark Edwards (COSM) asked what this committee would do after they took this close and critical look at the core.

MacKinnon hoped that they would make positive recommendations that would improve the situation.

Edwards asked how those recommendations would be implemented.

MacKinnon guessed they’d be handled in the ordinary way, via the UGC and Senate.

Edwards asked what the time frame for that would be.

MacKinnon noted the motion did not mention a time frame; the UGC was open to amendments on that point. He thought that would perhaps satisfy a lot of faculty.

Jake Simons (COBA) called a timeline “a bit of a sticky wicket.” Everybody wanted this done expeditiously, but on the other hand everybody wanted to make sure it is done right, and the subject of much of our earlier discussion had been that we were operating under a time constraint. He did not object to a timeline, but said this would boil down to what we do as faculty, and he hoped that an imposed timeline would not preclude
continued refinement of proposals if they for some reason did not get in to the committee before a deadline.

Heidi Altman (CLASS) wanted at least to see a certain date for beginning the process, and set dates for parts of the process, such as calls for proposals, so that we know we are actually moving on this and not just letting it stay like it is.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said the motion calls for inter-campus and inter-committee cooperation, and thought the Senate Executive Committee would be responsible for giving them a charge that would include a start date.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) wondered if we couldn’t just put such a date in the motion.

Moderator Pirro noted we were not yet combined with Armstrong and the motion would require action on both campuses; he did not think we could commit them to action, so we needed a proviso that we have to get cooperation from Armstrong.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) agreed, saying that if we don’t like this core, likely they don’t either. He added that since we have a 2018 Fall deadline, we should propose meetings in this Fall before we “get things into cement for the catalog that comes out in the Fall [2018],” which he said is usually before the end of Fall semester, or early January. He hoped the group could come up with something better this term.

Simons asked whether, if such a group were to begin meeting and discussing this term, it would duplicate or complicate or perhaps dovetail in a synergistic way with the implementation part of the plan.

President Hebert thought it would not complicate, but dovetail.

Moderator Pirro called for a motion to amend. Jake Simons (COBA) moved we append the words “beginning in Fall Semester 2017.” This was seconded.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) thought we needed to add something about this process continuing through post-consolidation. Simons was okay with that.

Pirro thought December 1 was the deadline for submitting courses for the following year. That would be a tight deadline and once again create a situation in which people on the committee would be acting under pressure. He suggested people keep that in mind if asked to serve on the committee.
Marc Cyr (CLASS) thought if they began this term we’d be lucky if by the end of Spring there would be something actionable. He thought if we approved the core proposal then before the Senate, that would be in the next catalog as is. He thought if we started working on revising the core this term, we would have something better by 2019 “if we’re lucky.”

Costomiris thought it imperative that the process get started, and while it could take two years or more, or never be resolved, we might resolve at least some of the problems by this December.

Cyr agreed but doubted “the timeline partly because we’ve basically been complaining about what somebody in one set of minutes called an ‘aggressive deadline’ and I think that right now we are now setting aggressive deadlines on ourselves, doing exactly the same sort of thing that we’ve been complaining about having done to us. . . . But I agree, let’s get it started now, but if we don’t have something in two or three weeks . . . let us realize that that’s just the way it is.”

Moderator Pirro had Mackinnon read the motion again. On Altman’s suggestion, “post-consolidation” was removed and “beginning Fall 2017” added. Haberland suggested we include language that would have the committee report to the Senate in November so we would not lose track of the issue, and Moderator Pirro modified that to “reporting on a regular basis to the Faculty Senate.” The amended language was Approved by voice vote.

Provost Cone asked if the SEC will appoint the committee. Cyr said so far as he could tell, yes, because it would be a Senate committee, but we would consult with Armstrong.

Moderator Pirro called for a vote on the amended motion. All who voted said Yes, except for one No. The amended motion to approve the core was Approved.

Graduate Committee Report: Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair

Dustin Anderson (CLASS) apologized for the brevity of his report, and offered to lengthen it if anyone wanted him to. They had two items of business on August 17: First were the CIC recommendations, a degree roster presented by representatives from the Provost’s office and which the committee approved. The second was a series of questions for the committee to consider: One was about establishing a clear-cut communication process for how the curriculum would be approved going forward between the campuses. A second was about a starting date for when the curriculum committees would be consolidated through all campuses. Another was not reflected in the minutes but was sent in in response to other minutes, and was about how the current catalog that will be up for 2018 will be submitted, and wondering whether all
programs, even those having no changes, or courses having no changes, will need to be resubmitted to the curriculum committees in addition to those requiring changes.

Provost Cone said that Academic Affairs and the Registrar had just sent out that afternoon a plan that outlined the process for curriculum, so those departments that already were consolidating their curriculum could begin to start putting that in. We will be briefly using the old paper process because we are not all using the same electronic cataloging system right now, but we will in future use the CIM System. We anticipate a large number of changes that need to happen this Fall in a short period of time. AA asked the Registrar’s office to schedule undergraduate and graduate committee meetings every two weeks starting in September through the first of November because we have a short timeline to get all of the curriculum changes through in order to make the catalog for Fall and in order to get the courses loaded in BANNER so students can pre-register in March for those courses. So there will be more frequent committee meetings, but still the regular process. The deadline to have all those through the Undergraduate Committee is December 1st. All the paper copies will be put into the CourseLeaf system. As for how the committees from both campuses are going to be joined, that will be worked out during implementation.

Ted Brimeyer (CLASS) noted that we keep hearing that someone at Armstrong has to approve these things, and wondered, “Who is this mythical person?”

Provost Cone said it’s not a person; if something goes through the GSU Undergraduate or Graduate committee, it goes through the same committee at Armstrong.

Brimeyer asked whether, in theory, their Undergraduate Committee could stall programs, or we could. In theory. There was no response.

Moderator Pirro called for a vote, noting that approving the report would also approve the Graduate programs for the new consolidated institution. The motion was Approved.

4. President’s Report: Jaimie Hebert

President Hebert thanked all faculty and staff for their work over summer, including many faculty who weren’t required to be here over that period, but continued to work on consolidation. He also expressed gratitude for the flexibility faculty have shown re: processes, the present meeting being an example. He said that under normal circumstances, we would never, ever try to expedite something like curriculum review, but these are extraordinary times. He noted the reluctance to approve some of these recommendations. As Jake Simons had said earlier, much of what comes from the CIC is the result of compromise in bringing these two institutions together, but it is a starting point. People at the System offices had told him these are recommendations used to put
together an institution, but institutions are dynamic. Once we begin the implementation post-consolidation, we have processes in place to review our functions, our organization, and our curriculum, and we can begin modifying and making those changes using our regular policies and procedures. What we had now was not etched in stone, and neither was it written with sand to just blow away, but we were at an intermediate place from which to move forward.

President Hebert added that Provost Cone had been “a little humble in talking about the 124 requirement.” The USG had been clear that we needed to hit 120, and it took a lot of compelling argument by Provost Cone, Chris Curtis at Armstrong, and many others to get 124.

Lastly, he said he appreciated Mark Edwards’ earlier comment that the Senate is only advisory to the President, but wanted to emphasize that “that advice is critical to me.”

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) said she had heard in a department meeting that GSU had had a problem related to Financial Aid that resulted in significant fines, and that as a result folks are considering that summer incentive money might be redirected to pay these significant fines owed to the Federal Government. She asked President Hebert to clarify what was going on.

President Hebert said all institutions throughout the nation were audited for Financial Aid purposes, and asked Amy Ballagh to clarify where we were re: that situation.

Amy Ballagh (Interim VP for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) said we had submitted additional information to the Department of Education and were waiting for a response to that. Haberland asked if that meant no fines have yet been assessed, but we expect fines to be assessed. President Hebert said it was hard to tell: The Department of Education was holding fines over the heads of literally hundreds of institutions around the country and it was being discussed at the federal, state, and local levels. At that moment, it was a wait and see situation.

*Secretary’s Note: There was no separate report from the Provost.*

5. Senate Executive Committee Report: Robert Pirro [CLASS], Chair.

The SEC discussed the core and the compression of the consolidation process. They also discussed the question of combining the Senates. Richard Flynn is one of the co-chairs of the OWG dealing with this issue, and he will report in October. The SEC, Flynn, and the moderator at Armstrong are consulting, and Moderator Pirro thought it might be useful in our September meeting to have some preliminary discussion to get a sense of the room in terms of what Senators would like to see, but that was not a firm discussion item for the next agenda.
6. Unfinished Business
None.

7. New Business
None.

8. Announcements: Vice Presidents
None.

9. Announcements from the Floor
None.

Adjournment
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Faculty Senate Minutes
September 6, 2017
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Nessmith-Lane Ballroom


Senate Moderator: Rob Pirro

Student Government Association: Grantson Martin

Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Voting members not in attendance: Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Rocio Alba-Flores, Heidi Altman, Adam Bossler, Anoop Desai, Chuck Harter, Barbara King, Eric Landers, Yi Lin, Li Ma, Santanu Majumdar, Marshall Ransom, Ed Rushton, Chasen Smith, Linda L. Thompson, Shijun Zheng

Administrators: Diana Cone, Martha Abell, Greg Evans, Curtis Ricker, Christine Ludowise

Visitors: Timothy Cairney, Candace Griffith, Amanda Hedrick, Ashley Walker

1. Approval of the Agenda for the September 6, 2017 meeting.

Moderator Rob Pirro noted that President Hebert had been called to a meeting with a Regent in Savannah, and so was unable to attend and report. With that amendment, the agenda was Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the August 23, 2017 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

Moved and Approved.
3. Librarian’s Reports for September 2017: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian.

Moved and Approved for accuracy.

Core Curriculum and General Education Committee: Michelle Cawthorn (COSM), Chair

No report

Undergraduate Committee Report: Ron MacKinnon (COBA), Chair

No report

Graduate Committee Report: Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair

Anderson had no report but had received three queries from committee members asking whether there would be any changes to procedures for curriculum submissions given the differences, at the last senate meeting, between the Undergraduate Committee’s report and what had come out of the Registrar’s office.

Provost Diana Cone said the unusual procedure was due to everything going through the Undergraduate and Graduate committees needing to come to Senate in November in order to meet the December 1 deadline for the upcoming catalog. One other item came out of “the President’s Cabinet with a recommendation by the President himself . . . Armstrong had already said they were going to eliminate approval by the college-level committees because those college committees will not be in place for the new institution and this is curriculum for next fall, so what we were asked to do is to ask the Deans that have been selected as Deans in the new institution to put together a college-level committee that incorporates folks from Armstrong and Statesboro campuses for the approval so that we will have a departmental approval process, a college-level approval process, then onto the Undergraduate and Graduate and Senate, so that is the one thing that’s been a little bit different, but the Deans have been putting those college-level committees in place.” She asked Anderson if that covered all the changes he referred to.

Anderson’s one other point “was about the totality of programs being resubmitted. At one point, courses that were not changed, programs that were not changed, weren’t going through. We had questions about whether that was still the case or not, whether those had to be totally resubmitted because the most recent message seemed to indicate that they were.”

Christine Ludowise (Interim Vice Provost) said they were working on that: “What the intention was because all of the programs will be new to the new institution. Program pages go through. The course spreadsheets, though, do not necessarily have to if there
are not any consolidation going on, and so what we’re working on [is] if you’re not making any changes there does not need to be a spreadsheet. [The Registrar’s office] would like to see complete spreadsheets, but I think we are going to try and make sure that we’re very clear on whether you need to do a spreadsheet if you’re not changing anything with any of your courses.” She noted that she was “advocating very strongly for the less paperwork the better.” Anderson commended her dedication to that principle.

4. Provost’s Report: Diana Cone

IAB Building

The IAB Building is progressing well, though severe rain had put it behind schedule; it is back on track for next Fall. She added that consolidation would not bring any changes in the faculty slated to occupy the building.

Consolidation

This has consumed much focus and time. Administration was still making sure that we have all of the organizational charts in order to send forward to HR for the final blessing. The boxes had all been drafted and all staff notified that they had positions or were competing for positions. Faculty were in big boxes merging the faculty list from Armstrong with our faculty list to create what the faculty will look like for each of the departments in every college in the new institution. One problem was that some faculty weren’t placed where they needed to be re: budgets. The plan is that in late “September faculty will get a letter saying that you have your position in the new institution and you will be retaining your same salary that you have now plus any applicable merit pay or promotions that happen between now and next Fall. Staff will be getting a letter from HR saying basically the same thing, that they have their position as Senior Admin Secretary or whatever their title is at whatever their current salary is. The issue that we’re facing now is to determine which folks will be effective January 1st, which ones will be July 1st, and which ones will be August 1st. Academic Affairs is not scheduled to move until next Fall. Our twelve-month folks will move on July 1st. Faculty effective for Fall 2018, so that will be on August 1st, but we do have some groups that need to move effective January 1st, because they’re shifting from one division to another and those divisions, all the rest of the campus divisions are going to be transferring their people on January 1st. So Academic Success Centers, for example, they will be moved to Academic Affairs in the new institution. They are currently in Academic Affairs on the Armstrong campus, but Student Affairs here because Student Affairs merges on January 1st, we will absorb Academic Affairs January 1st, so we’re also looking at each individual person to see are they moving from another unit to Academic Affairs, making sure that their letters are going to say January 1, July 1, or August 1.” That was the plan “unless, of course, we get word that they have changed the plans on us.”
Weather

Provost Cone had just left an Emergency Management Team meeting re: the weather [Hurricane Irma]. She noted that the Governor had declared a state of emergency for parts of Georgia, including the Savannah area. Everything was pending on the state government’s decisions.

Ted Brimeyer (CLASS) said a lot of students were saying they would not receive their Financial Aid in time and would be kicked out of school.

Provost Cone said the people in the Emergency Management Meeting were talking about how they were texting Tracy Mingo, the Director of Financial Aid, to see if they would have the information input by the next day so they could run the checks earlier than planned should we be closed on Friday. She knew no more about it and no one was present who could supply further information.

Brimeyer asked if we had agreed on new admission standards for the new university.

Provost Cone noted that the admissions standards were approved by the CIC earlier this summer. Brimeyer asked what they were. She did not have them in hand, but noted that “ours will be coming down a little bit and Armstrong’s will be coming up.” She referred Brimeyer to the CIC webpage. ([http://consolidation.georgiasouthern.edu/wp-content/uploads/8-7-17-Recommendations-Consent-Agenda.pdf](http://consolidation.georgiasouthern.edu/wp-content/uploads/8-7-17-Recommendations-Consent-Agenda.pdf), page 4)

Brimeyer then asked about an August 28 email in which staff were told they could apply for jobs that were open. GSU employees were informed that they could go through training for job openings, and at the bottom it said Armstrong State University had already conducted similar training sessions for its employees. He wondered why workers at Armstrong were notified before workers at Georgia Southern.

Provost Cone said all our staff were informed via PeopleAdmin, and maybe Armstrong was on a different system so there was a different link. Brimeyer still wondered why their HR could do this training before our HR: “Does the email travel faster in Savannah?” Provost Cone did not know the answer to either question and suggested Brimeyer ask Rebecca Carroll, Director of HR.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked, “Will Forest Drive be demolished?”

Provost Cone requested clarification: “The building or the drive?”

Costomiris clarified: “The building.”

Provost Cone said it would go once the new academic building was operational, and promised Costomiris “you can be there to watch the destruction.”
Moderator Pirro noted that, at Brimeyer’s request, he had asked President Hebert about those training issues, and the President had no specific knowledge as to why Armstrong had done this training first. Pirro had told the President that there was "a narrative out there that [it] seems as though Armstrong is ahead of the curve in many cases, and we seem to be a little bit behind the curve."

**Georgia Southern Signs in front of Confederate Flag Display**

*(Secretary’s Note: Prior to the start of the meeting, Michelle Haberland [CLASS] had placed at every seat photographs of these signs at this location along I-16.)*

The SEC received a Discussion Item request from Michelle Haberland (CLASS) about GSU’s signage on I-16 near Confederate flags. Moderator Pirro contacted Trip Addison (VP for University Advancement and External Affairs), who directed him to Roger Purcell, chair of Civil Engineering and Construction Management. Purcell explained that a Biologist at Georgia Southern, who was doing research on wild grasses and flowers on highway margins, had been working with the Georgia Department of Transportation and a faculty member in Purcell’s department to find an appropriate site for experimental plantings. The criteria for choosing a site included such factors as distance from the highway, visibility, and safety. The placement near the Confederate and religious symbols was not in any way intended to link Georgia Southern with neo-confederate ideology. The signage was removed within days of it being noticed by commuting GSU faculty and staff. The SEC concluded the issue should have been put forward as a Request for Information rather than a Discussion item, so it was not put on the agenda to be discussed, though questions could be raised.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked when the signs were installed.

Pirro didn’t know, noted that she had noticed them on August 24, and that on August 29 he himself noticed that they were gone. President Hebert said that when he found out about them from VP Addison, “they felt highly motivated to remove the signage as soon as it could be done.” He noted that Dr. Purcell had told him that when there are collaborations between the Department of Transportation and another entity like the University the policy is to have a sign indicating that collaboration.

Haberland asked who ordered the signs to be made. Pirro said his understanding was that was the state DOT. Haberland found it “funny” that our Marketing and Communications department was minimally involved given how protective they are of our emblem – somehow the DOT got the emblem from them but they didn’t ask where the signs would be located.

Haberland then asked if there had been any contact between the property owner and any Georgia Southern University employee, faculty, or students. Pirro did not know.
Haberland pointed out that one of the photos shows irrigation hoses and wondered where the water came from. She was concerned that we had a connection with that farm and would like to see that connection severed. She also asked how we got into this situation and whether the DOT knew that these signs were placed under Confederate flags and religious symbols. Pirro did not know.

Haberland asked if Pirro knew of any processes being put in place to avoid such situations occurring again. Pirro said we could ask President Hebert that question at the next meeting he attends.

Haberland wondered if we can estimate how many students saw those signs under those flags; she estimated hundreds. She thought it was a problem that only two people complained about the signs. She found it “strange” that Marketing was so concerned with our public image, and yet this had happened. She thought it harmed our university.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked if somebody from Marketing was present who could answer those questions. Nobody was, so Pirro suggested we invite someone to the next meeting or pursue the answer via an RFI.

Jake Simons (COBA) raised a point of order. It was his understanding that this was not supposed to be a discussion item on the agenda and wanted to determine whether we should therefore be discussing it.

Moderator Pirro agreed with the objection and wanted to move on.

Ted Brimeyer (CLASS) said he would like such an RFI to look at GSU licensing agreements and wondered if University policies considered such licenses “in terms of morality or putting, you know, confederate symbols on t-shirts along with the Georgia Southern symbol.”

Peter Rogers (CEIT) knew the researcher involved in this project and so had some first-hand knowledge of the project: GDOT selected that project site, and there are multiple such sites. The researcher did have some liberty in terms of where in that @ 120 foot long plot to put signs, but GDOT had requested that they put up the signs to announce the project, and also to keep people from interfering with the project. As far as Rogers knew, they had no contact with the property owner; the land was GDOT right-of-way.

Haberland asked if he knew anything about the irrigation. Rogers did not.

Haberland then wondered if the faculty member somehow hadn’t seen the flags, or did but “didn’t hesitate and say maybe we should think this through.”

Rogers said the researcher was not from the United States, but from “a country . . . where they don’t necessarily think so much about religious sensitivities and so forth.” The researcher simply followed GDOT’s requirements without understanding the significance of the Confederate Flag, or without thinking much about it.

Haberland (CLASS) wanted “us to all think about for a moment what would have happened if this went to social media . . . how damaged our University would have been.
And how all that work that we have done to redefine that word ‘Southern’ right, and make it what it should be and I just, I mean, given the restrictions in placing signs on your office door, it just struck me as a really amazing colossal mistake... we need to insure it never happens again.”

**New Consolidated College Structure**

Moderator Pirro noted a second Request for Discussion item on whether we should be heading toward an Arts and Sciences model, rather than smaller, more specialized colleges. The SEC decided to hold off on that discussion for the time being, even though there was consensus that this is a discussion worth having. He noted this issue predated consolidation, going back to the splitting off of the sciences from the arts, humanities, and social sciences.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked if the SEC had in mind a good time for that discussion.

Ted Brimeyer (CLASS), an SEC member, said he had opined that we would be “beating a dead horse in terms of talking about this stuff” at this time, so maybe after consolidation, when we might have “more local control.”

**Consolidation Review Committee**

Moderator Pirro turned to SEC discussion of the motion passed at the last meeting for an ad-hoc committee to review and revise the disliked but nevertheless passed (because of a consolidation deadline) new core curriculum. The motion called for the committee to be formed from members of both the Undergraduate and GECC Committees in Statesboro and the Curriculum Committee at Armstrong and charged this fall. Pirro had suggested to the SEC that the committee’s role be expanded to take on all consolidation issues, but the SEC believed the motion committed us to limiting that committee’s purview to the core. Pirro had reached out to the Chair of the GECC for interested faculty and four members of the GECC volunteered, including two who also sit on the Undergraduate Committee; a UGC member from COBA also volunteered. So far, we had two members from COSM, and one each from COBA, the Library, and COE. The Chair of the Curriculum Committee at Armstrong was on board with this plan, but thought Spring would be a better time to begin because his committee was focused on the program matters that have to be completed by December 1st. One member of the GECC wondered why we need an ad hoc committee if the GECC has the expertise to take on this responsibility. Unless the SEC gets other direction from the Senate, he hoped to complete membership of the ad hoc committee and charge it sometime this Fall.

Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) noted one reason for the ad-hoc committee was concern that not all stakeholder departments had been involved in constructing the new core.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) was concerned that we were planning to deal with consolidation issues when it will be too late because everything will be settled. She thought the time to deal with these issues was during, not after the consolidation process.
Moderator Pirro pointed out that, in the case of the splitting of CLASS into two colleges, we had tried to do such work during the process, but had failed.

Dustin Anderson (CLASS) asked Pirro to reiterate the ad-hoc committee membership so far. Pirro did so and added that the GECC chair had suggested expanding the membership to include faculty so far not “implicated” with the core to gain objectivity.

Anderson noted that there was no CLASS member and asked how large the committee would be. Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) said that to this point, there had been only a few people in a room making these plans and suggested a committee representing every discipline teaching in the core, even though this might impede efficiency.

Moderator Pirro next noted two other items discussed by the SEC: He had suggested that the Senate discuss how to consolidate our Senate with Armstrong’s, but an SEC member who is also on that OWG suggested we wait until the OWG brings concrete proposals, and the SEC agreed. Pirro then reported on an aspect of the Provost Search: Jim Lobue had been appointed as Senate representative, but he had rotated off the Senate, so the SEC was asked to choose someone else. Pirro pointed out to the Provost and President that Lobue had been appointed without consulting the Senate, and that this should not have happened. The SEC selected Robert Costomiris because of his experience on the Senate, including a term as Moderator.

6. Unfinished Business

Jonathan Hilpert (COE) did not know if this was the right spot for his question, but noting that our current college-level curriculum committees are being replaced by committees with joint Statesboro-Armstrong representation, he asked what policies and procedures we will have to ensure Statesboro has adequate representation at that level.

Provost Cone replied, “The only change for the curriculum process will be at the college level so that we do have a college representation of what the new colleges will look like. The departmental will be still the same, and then college will be the combined, and then the Undergraduate/Graduate will be each campus will have to do that, and through the Senate, but we do have to get both campuses to approve all the way through all the processes before it can go into the catalog.”

Alice Hall (CHHS) also didn’t know if this was the right time to ask, but she wondered, given that she will be moving into a new college, if her term as Senator would end in January. Meca Williams-Johnson (COE), a member of the senate consolidation OWG, said Hall’s term would end at the beginning of Fall.

7. New Business

None.
8. Announcements: Vice Presidents

None.

9. Announcements from the Floor

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) announced a statewide conference call on September 14 at 8:00 p.m. for all faculty affected by the new campus carry law. The call was to feature a panel of legal experts, the USGFC President, and the AAUP Georgia Conference President.

10. Adjournment

Moved and Approved.
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Faculty Senate Minutes  
October 16, 2017  
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.  
Nesssmith-Lane Ballroom

Secretary's Note: Because of a technical malfunction, the recording equipment did not work at all. We were able to get two hand-held microphones to pass around to speakers, but these provided only amplification, not a recording. Moderator Rob Pirro suggested we try recording on a cell phone, and we thank Meca Williams-Johnson for letting us use hers. Ginger Malphrus did her heroic best to suss out the sound, but there are gaps that I have attempted to fill with my notes.


Voting members not in attendance:  Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Moya Alfonso, Kelly Berry, Adam Bossler, Anoop Desai, Meghan Dove, Mark Edwards, Chuck Harter, Drew Keane, Mujibur Khan, Barbara King, Hsiang-Jui Kung, Eric Landers, Li Li, Yi Lin, Constantin Ogloblin, Chasen Smith, Fred Smith, Marian Tabi, Shijun Zheng

Senate Moderator: Rob Pirro

Student Government Association: Amber Monkou for Grantson Martin

Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Administrators:  Jaimie Hebert, Amy Ballagh, Martha Abell, Greg Evans, Christine Ludowise

Visitors:  David Calamas, Candace Griffith, Ashley Walker
1. Approval of the Agenda for the October 16, 2017, meeting.

Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the September 6, 2017, Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Secretary

Moved and Approved.

3. Librarian’s Report for October 2017: Mark Welford (COSM), Librarian

Moved and Approved for accuracy.

   a. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee

Jake Simons (COBA) noted that there were no curricular proposals; that the GECC supported the motion passed at the last senate meeting to create a core revision committee with which the GECC would coordinate; and that they discussed the need to consult Armstrong about an assessment rubric.

   b. Undergraduate Committee

Alisa Leckie (COE), Chair: They had not yet met but would shortly be reviewing 79 programs, not to judge content, but to assure that rules are covered. Leckie had met with her Armstrong counterpart, Richard McGrath, and they will continue to meet with their focus for programs being (a) 124 hours in the program, (b) 39 upper division hours, (c) avoiding “hidden” prerequisites, and (d) a clear path to completion for students.

   c. Graduate Committee

Dustin Anderson (CLASS) Chair: They had no curricular proposals. Their meeting on the 28th was mostly organizational.

4. President’s Report: Jaime Hebert, President:

   a. Budget

Per USG methods, we are preparing a “budget narrative,” which basically is a write-up of the highlights of what we did with new funds last year. Armstrong is writing a similar narrative, and then we will pull these together into a joint narrative. In the spring we go forward before the Board and present a single request.
b. Enrollment

Every institution that has gone through consolidation has seen a decline in enrollment. We have seen very little impact thanks to the efforts of folks in enrollment management and the entire academic community on both campuses assuring our students that we are going to take care of them as we move forward. As a combined institution, we are down only -1.3%, or about 354 students, from Fall 2016. That is 1.2% in Statesboro and 1.9% in Savannah. The great news is that our semester credit hour production is down only 1%, and that’s what impacts funding, so we’ll be able to absorb it. He believed the budget impact of consolidation is going to be negligible, and that we’ll move in a positive direction next year.

c. Consolidation

Through the summer the CIC approved roughly 500 recommendations from the Operational Working Groups. Our prospectus has been submitted to SACS. The hard work of implementing those 500 recommendations begins now. Some of the nuts and bolts issues:

1. Space Reallocation Plan

Physical Plant is working with Deans, departments, and other offices to map space over the two institutions, so we understand impacts in terms of reallocation of space.

2. Hiring and Recruiting

We were down to only 41 people on both campuses who had not been slotted, and there were 160 positions available in the new institution. He hoped that within a week the process would be complete and everyone who had applied would be slotted into the new University.

3. Tuition Fee Model

We want to keep costs neutral on both campuses in the early going of the consolidation and over time move to a common tuition fee model for all of our campuses. We want over time to increase costs on the other campuses. Right now the plan is to take the total cost for an Armstrong student, reduce fees, but increase tuition, so that the overall cost of attendance will stay the same, but the tuition cost will be equivalent to what our students are paying here. If we can first equalize tuition across all campuses, then we can work at increasing the fees over the next couple of years to an appropriate level.

4. Searches

We have two key searches going on at the cabinet level, for Provost and (just launched) a Vice President for Enrollment Management. The Provost search had over 50
applications already. We are working with the search firm MyersMcCrae, and President Hebert had worked with them in the past; they tell him applicants “are very intrigued by the opportunities that lie before us through this consolidation.”

5. Evaluations

We are in the process of developing rubrics right now for an evaluation process. In consolidation, we don’t do the typical HR evaluations for administrators or for staff, where you have a six-month probationary period, but we will be doing from President down through associate director level. We will be doing three-month evaluations of all administrators who have been placed in the new University, and then we will do a follow-up at six months of those evaluations.

6. Academic Plan

He and the deans were meeting frequently on a strategic plan.

7. Enrollment Retention Plan

We have been holding counselor breakfasts and lunches around the state to explain to high school counselors what consolidation means to their students; we hope to prevent any “bleed” that we might have because of “myths associated with the consolidation.” It seemed to be paying off. Although we were still early in the process, year-to-date we were up 18% in applications.

8. Early Initiatives

His office has been busy coming up with early initiatives to fund through consolidation savings. All of those will be associated with student success and academics.

9. Centralized Advising

We have centralized advising on the Georgia Southern campus; they did not have centralized advising on the Armstrong campus. We will make a quick investment in this at Armstrong with consolidation savings because that should help with retention and student success. Then we will enhance the centralized advisement that we have here on this campus.

What keeps President Hebert awake at night is working through the issues that may arise as we begin to implement, the threats out there in terms of compromising our mission, what we want to accomplish academically at our institution and on the Armstrong campus. He had asked the cabinet, as a start, to conduct SWOT analysis, that is, looking for Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats in their divisions. They would meet on these the next week, bringing in a facilitator from the outside to “hold our feet to the fire and really talk in honest terms about not only what those
opportunities are, but what the real threats are to our new institution.” The deans were beginning their work on SWOT analyses, and they will work with departments to do SWOT analyses with faculty input from the discipline perspective. He asked the Senate to conduct a SWOT analysis from a faculty perspective, and he had asked the Armstrong Senate to do the same. He recognized that right now Threats were uppermost in our minds, but wanted Faculty to take a look at opportunities as well, and be honest with our strengths and weaknesses, where we need to be investing, and where we are already invested. He was going to ask the Student Government to do SWOT analyses on both campuses, as well as Staff Councils, Alumni Associations, and members of the community, hoping by mid-spring to compile all of these SWOT analyses, get a small group together, and look for common themes. We also will look at national trends in higher education, at the USG and the state of Georgia, and compile and publish “a true environmental statement, a real look at where we stand in terms of strengths and weaknesses, where we stand in terms of opportunities and threats with regard to this new landscape that we find ourselves in.” That will put us in position to begin a true strategic planning process that allows us to address the threats that we identify and move in the direction of the opportunities that we identify.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) noted faculty would be doing departmental SWOT analyses, and wondered if he wanted Senators to do their SWOT analysis wearing a “different hat.” President Hebert thought that looking from within a discipline would be different from looking for the perspective of the faculty as a whole, for example re: synergy throughout colleges and overall faculty morale.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked, re: budget, how areas to receive support from cost savings will be identified. He also noted that consolidation seemed to be costing, not saving money.

President Hebert said consolidation savings will be looked at independently of our budget process, so no one’s budget will be negatively impacted by that aspect. At this point, we have only captured salary-related consolidation savings, but that is millions of dollars, primarily from administrative savings – not having two cabinets, not having two presidents, not having 14 deans, so forth and so on.

Costomiris asked what additional, unexpected costs were arising.

President Hebert said there would be costs re: signage and such like, but “The millions are net.”

Costomiris noted that he is on the Provost search committee and was concerned about the quick deadline to conclude the search, a timeline that created problems for faculty to interact with candidates.

President Hebert hoped we would set up those schedules to allow faculty to interact with those Provost candidates, which he considered critical. But they were trying to get a Provost’s name to coincide with the announcement of the new institution. He would not push this timeline, however, if they did not have a bona-fide pool, but of the 50 applicants so far, the search firm says well over 20 are viable.
Costomiris expressed doubts that with Thanksgiving and the revised Finals schedule we will be able to have sufficient faculty interaction with candidates. He also thought it odd that we’re looking to have the new Provost start the job January 1, in the middle of the academic year; he’d never heard of that happening.

President Hebert admitted it was rare, but he’d seen it before. He also noted, though, that while he wanted the person named in January, he or she might not start actual work until later, though he or she could be involved in the planning process; he thought that was crucial given that we hope to hit the ground running in January.

Mark Welford (COSM) wondered if the SWOT analyses would pay attention to salary compression at both campuses. He noted that “we are frequently told” that there is no money to bring up Armstrong salaries, which are lower than ours.

President Hebert thought that was a Threat that needs to be addressed. He said, though, that the salary disparity is discipline specific, and that some Armstrong faculty make higher salaries than GSU faculty; the same holds for staff. We will hold salaries constant during the initial implementation of the consolidation. When he was Provost at Sam Houston, they had similar issues, and to take out bias he hired a third party to come in and do a salary assessment. They laid out their priorities and put together a five-year plan, and every year resolved one of the priorities. He would like to do the same thing here, making not only internal comparisons, but also external ones re: marketability both for faculty and staff.

Welford said he’d been part of a similar study here in 2013, and 40% of people got some kind of compression relief. He would like to see this done on a continuing, yearly basis. He said this likely would involve substantial money in the immediate future, and also opined that the previous attempt at relief had provided little.

President Hebert said that without knowing the fiscal landscape of the USG over the next several years, he did not want to make a fiscal commitment, but said that salary equity is a top priority.

Heidi Altman (CLASS) asked where we were re: promotion and tenure standards across the institution.

Provost Diana Cone said that the Faculty Welfare Committee OWG has been tasked with that and are working diligently. Such guidelines percolate up from the faculty to give the University guidelines, and then colleges and departments create their own, with greater specificity at each lower level.

Ming Fang He (College of Education) asked if we had a group working on diversity for recruitment, retention, and progression for faculty. She noted that Armstrong has done much successful work in this area, while GSU has just one Title IX officer.

President Hebert agreed, and went further, saying he did not think the Title IX officer or the EEO officer should be the diversity officer. Those are accountability activities, and diversity action needs to be progressive and visionary. We will have a separate diversity
and faculty development officer at the associate provost level in the new institution. One of President Hebert’s priorities will be to enhance the diversity of our faculty.

5. Provost’s Report

Provost Cone noted that the colleges and departments have been working furiously to get those programs in the curriculum together. The deans say it is going well. The Undergraduate and Graduate Committees would be getting a lot of work in the next week or two.

The IAB Building is on schedule. The Space Steering Committee will be looking at a little bit of space in that building now that the College of Liberal Arts is being split, especially to see if that’s still the best place to put the Advisement Center. Most of the other space is dedicated to programs, and they will remain in that new building as we move forward.

The process for educational leave at GSU usually has the faculty member make a request to the department chair. If the chair feels they can support it, then they send it forward to the dean, and if the dean supports it, on up to the Provost, and on to the President for final approval. Armstrong does it differently, having a university-wide committee that must approve the application in between the dean and provost levels. Their application timetable is also different. Because of the differences, GSU and Armstrong are putting a hold on educational leave for fall 2018 – and ONLY for Fall 2018; leaves will resume in Spring 2019 – in order to develop a joint process and timetable. This will also help department chairs staff classes, given the potential confusion re: new curriculums. However, if there is “just a very unique opportunity to go work with some special group” for an individual, there may be some exceptions made.

Mark Welford (COSM) was distressed at the prospect of an additional layer of administration, but wanted more faculty involvement.

Provost Cone was trying to find out how the Armstrong committee worked, whether it was a Senate committee or one appointed by the President or Provost. But she thought it was a faculty committee, at any rate.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) thought that, especially with our increased size, it would be critical for local and lower-level administrators to be involved because members of a university-side committee would be hard-pressed to judge vastly different opportunities.

Provost Cone agreed, and said her understanding was that proposals had first to go through chairs and deans. She also said it would be up to faculty to decide if we should use a university-wide committee. She added that in reviewing proposals in the Provost’s Office, sometimes they had to go back for clarification because to an outside person they didn’t look like they merited leave.

Ming Fang He (COE) asked what plans we had for the consolidated institution to continue the GSU tradition of celebrating faculty productivity and scholarship. She noted, though, that in recent years such celebration – which she believed helped to advance scholarship – had become much diminished.
Provost Cone agreed that we have folks doing outstanding work, and she remembered the annual book celebration. She too hoped we would revive such traditions.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Rob Pirro (CLASS), Moderator

RFI: Taskforce for Campus Implementation of HB 280

There were two RFIs. One from Michelle Haberland had questions about the Task Force for Campus Implementation of HB 280, which is the campus carry law; the response had been posted.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) noted she had received the official response but “also Maura Copeland kindly responded to my July 25th, August 3rd, August 9th, and August 31st emails.” She directed a further question to President Hebert, one she had asked of the Campus Carry Implementation Committee, but to which she received no response: Other campuses in USG had held informational forums to give guidance and in which questions could be asked, and she wanted to know why we had not done so. She also wanted to know what our overall approach to this new law was because, given her difficulties in getting any questions answered by anybody, it seemed to be “just stop talking about it and we’ll pretend like it’s not happening.”

President Hebert said we sought guidance from the University System of Georgia on how to implement the new law on campus, and how to share information, and what we were told was to refer everyone to the information page of the USG. And that’s what we did. We didn’t have a forum because we couldn’t provide any information beyond that.

A second RFI was on whether or not our movement from ADP to a new system meant that faculty will have the option of getting paid in 12 monthly installments instead of 10. The answer from VP Whitaker was that this question hasn’t been settled yet, and he will let us know when he finds out.

President Hebert asked whether there was a general faculty preference for 10 or 12. (Secretary’s Note: There was some kind of response to this question, but inaudible.)

Moderator Pirro said Ginger Malphrus had sent him a report done 7 or 8 years ago on this subject, and he gathered the justification for the 10 installment plan was some kind of tax advantage.

Bob Jackson (COBA), an Accounting professor, gave his professional opinion: “B.S.”

As an update on the ad-hoc committee to review the consolidated core, Moderator Pirro said we have six Georgia Southern faculty members and one administrator, who will sit as a non-voting member. We have coverage of all the affected colleges, and they’ve all agreed to serve. He was in the process of gathering three faculty from Armstrong, but hadn’t heard back yet from their Moderator. There was also a question about whether we could put Armstrong faculty on a GSU committee prior to official consolidation.
Jake Simons (COBA) wanted to make sure that the GECC and Undergraduate Committee were involved. Moderator Pirro said most committee members are from those two committees. He hoped to announce final membership in November.

Someone unidentifiable asked whether that committee would report up through those two standing committees, or to the SEC, or somehow up through the colleges.

Moderator Pirro called that a good question and noted that the motion didn’t contain that aspect.

Simons thought that as a senate ad-hoc committee it would report to the Senate. Pirro hoped to clarify that in the charge to the committee.

7. Motion: Consolidation Review Committee

Bob Jackson (COBA): “To form a Consolidation Review Committee to review potential problems related to consolidation that require immediate action and make recommendations to the President.” The motion was seconded.

President Hebert said this motion was brought to his attention by “someone not in here [who] said maybe you’re concerned about this.” And he was, thinking the mission was not broad enough, looking only at potential problems. He wanted this committee, should the motion pass, to do a SWOT analysis, looking at strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities as well. He said if the senate didn’t approve this committee, he’d appoint one to act as a “kind of set of faculty eyes on the entire landscape of what’s going on here.” So he fully supported the motion if the committee had this expanded mission.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) appreciated the President’s position, but preferred to keep the committee’s focus on problems undiluted. He thought of their work as “troubleshooting.”

President Hebert agreed that the threats would be the primary thing they would look at, but wanted opportunities included in their charge. This would be part of the SWOT analyses he wanted from everyone in mid-Spring. He thought this committee a good one to do that for the Senate.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) wanted clarification re: how this committee’s charge would differ from that of the Core revision committee.

Moderator Pirro said he’d raised that question with the SEC, and that he didn’t want just a bunch of committees getting nothing done. He had wanted to combine the committees, but we were already committed by the motion to the core review committee being just that, and he didn’t want to give up the idea of a broader look.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) agreed with Cyr because she thought the kind of issues that will come before this committee would be ones without easy solutions, otherwise they wouldn’t come to them in the first place. She saw the committee as a contact point if something is going wrong or someone sees a potential problem coming. She asked,
though, if this would be one big committee, or if there would be separate ones for the different campuses.

Bob Jackson (COBA) said since it will be a post-consolidation committee, his idea was that it would be one committee with representation from all campuses.

Moderator Pirro noted that the Senates will not consolidate until Fall 2018, and given that Armstrong has been asked by President Hebert to form a senate SWOT committee and the motion doesn’t specify membership, it might be that we won’t have Armstrong members until Fall.

Cyr didn’t think we should be getting caught up in petty process details. If Armstrong knows about this committee, he thought they’d want to be on it, and he didn’t think “that we are going to have the GS police force at the campus edge stopping them from getting to a meeting. And if they wanted to just come and kibitz, I think they would be invited anyway. So I think that if we’re going to get into that kind of pettifogging detail I think we’ve got a problem.”

(Secretary’s Note: Your secretary was gratified to have the opportunity to use the word “pettifogging” during Senate discussion. He was even more deeply gratified when he got home, looked it up, and found that he had used it correctly.)

Moderator Pirro wanted to offer an amendment to the motion, but Parliamentarian Karen McCurdy pointed out that as Moderator he could not do so. She suggested getting someone from the floor to move his amendment.

Before that could happen, someone unidentified called the question. The vote Approved calling the question.

The original motion was put to a vote and Approved.

8. Unfinished Business

There was a follow-up question about Office of Marketing and Communication oversight of GSU signage on I-16 in close proximity to Confederate flags. Jan Southern, Associate VP of Marketing, said that that project signage plan was reviewed and okayed by her office. However, they did not know that there were several sites on I-16 and that it would be put at that particular site. Once she was made aware of the location, she immediately asked that that particular sign be removed.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) said she had also asked other questions that weren’t addressed by this answer. The first one was whether there had been any contact between the property owner and Georgia Southern University employees or students.

Moderator Pirro said he had not asked that question of Southern. Someone unidentified said the land was state property. Haberland agreed, but noted that the research site has irrigation going to it, and she suspected it might come from the private farm on which the flags are located, and she had asked about this.
Moderator Pirro hadn’t asked that question of Southern.

Haberland had a third question, about whether anyone had spoken to the student involved, whom she understood was African-American. She wondered if anyone had “reached out” to him, separately from the faculty member, to find out how he is doing.

Moderator Pirro said that to his knowledge, that had not happened.

Haberland said, “Maybe I’m the only one that cares about this. . . . we don’t care anymore.”

Moderator Pirro said, “I’m the moderator; I can't care.” He moved on, asking Meca Williams-Johnson for a quick update on the senate consolidation process.

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) said the OWG for Senate consolidation met on October 12 to draft recommendations for consolidation of the Bylaws for the new institutional senate. They discussed the changes in the Bylaws, how they might affect faculty membership, and also a possible schedule. They intended to provide details and a motion to the Senate for the November meeting.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked if we were required to merge our Senates.

Williams-Johnson said yes because we will be one institution.

Costomiris asked where this requirement came from.

Williams-Johnson said it was not written anywhere, but that we will be one institution is written in many places, and one institution would have one faculty senate.

Costomiris opined that there could be a branch senate in Savannah, so they would have one where they are, and we would have one where we are.

Williams-Johnson said the OWG felt that to attain a campus culture, to provide the sense that we are growing together, it would be in our interest to provide opportunities for us to meet together and share our ideas and concerns on both campuses.

Costomiris thought the logistics will be “horrific.” Williams-Johnson said that, with everything else we’ll be doing, she agreed.

Moderator Pirro said that, as he understood it, the OWG would be sending a copy of the proposed revised Bylaws to the Faculty Senate before the November meeting, and that we’ll need a two-thirds majority vote to pass new Bylaws. Richard Flynn, head of that OWG, would discuss the concrete ramifications of the revisions.
9. New Business

All the Faculty Senate Moderators of the USG system will be meeting with the chancellor on December 1st. He asked anyone who has any concerns they want him to raise with the chancellor to email him, and he would raise them.

10. Announcements: Vice Presidents

None

11. Announcements from the floor

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) announced that an Educators conference call about guns on campus had been postponed due to the hurricane and would take place on Thursday, October 19, at 8:00 p.m. They hoped this would be a first step to creating a group of faculty who could perhaps thwart the efforts that they knew were being planned to expand campus carry with additional legislation in the next session. She had distributed flyers prior to the meeting that showed how to sign up for the call, which they hoped would make it troll-free.

12. Adjournment

Moved and Approved.

Minutes submitted by Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary
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Faculty Senate Minutes  
November 27, 2017  
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.  
Nessmith-Lane Ballroom


Voting members not in attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Moya Alfonso, Heidi Altman, Adam Bossler, Christopher Brown, Anoop Desai, Chuck Harter, Bob Jackson, Barbara King, Hsiang-Jui Kung, Li Li, Yi Lin, Li Ma, Santanu Majumdar, Jake Simons, Stephanie Sipe, Chasen Smith, Hayden Wimmer

Administrators in attendance: Jaimie Hebert, Amy Ballagh, Barry Joyner, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker

Visitors: Richard Flynn, Steven Harper, Ashley Walker Colquitt, Candace Griffith, Christine Ludowise, Barry Balleck, Delena Bell Gatch, Bruxanne Hein, Olga Amarie, Robert Yarbrough

Agenda:

1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 27, 2017 meeting.

Before calling for the approval of the agenda, Rob Pirro (CLASS) Senate Moderator and Chair of the Senate Executive Committee, noted that over Thanksgiving Break three members of our community had passed away: Candy Schille was a faculty member with over 30 years at Georgia Southern, and had been a frequently re-elected senator. Also, two brothers, Jack Deacon and Garrett Harris, were killed in a car accident, which Moderator Pirro noted must be a heartbreaking loss for their family and friends. [Note: Their father, Jack, was a football player under Erk Russell in the late 80s.]

The agenda was Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the October 16, 2017, Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.
Before moving approval, Cyr noted that Candy Schille had been the first full-time moderator of this senate, a position she held for two years, and was also the founding head of the Women’s and Gender Studies program. He further noted that she was his former wife.

The minutes were Moved and Approved.

3. Librarian’s Reports for November 2017: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian.

Welford noted that because of late submissions three versions had been distributed; he Moved the latest version and it was Approved for accuracy.

   a. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee: Heidi Altman (CLASS):

Altman said they had met once re: issues of evaluation of the core reports, and a second time re: what to do about the BOR Gen Ed Committee objections to our core plan. They decided to hold any action pending the outcome of the OWG meeting. Ultimately, they received word that there was not a lot done that we would have objection to – for example, no course changes – so the committee decided to hold off consideration until their next meeting.

   b. Undergraduate Committee Report: Alisa Leckie (COE), Chair:

   ● On October 17, they approved 11 master’s degree programs and two minors across three colleges.
   ● On October 31, they revised and approved 40 bachelor’s degree programs; 14 were tabled pending revisions. All of the minors and certificate programs submitted for that meeting were tabled because the committee needed more time to review.
   ● On November 18, they reviewed 82 bachelor’s degree programs and approved all of them with 13 of those approvals pending minor adjustments. They also reviewed and approved 67 minors, 5 certificate programs, and 1 endorsement. Of the approved minors, 12 were pending minor revisions.
   ● In total, over 200 programs were reviewed and approved since the last Senate meeting. She commended the support of our Registrar’s office, Jade Brooks and Wayne Smith in particular, and Dr. Ludowise from the Provost’s office.

Mark Edwards (COSM) asked what committee members had done with all their free time. Leckie said she had met with her Armstrong counterpart to sync up curriculums for simultaneous approval at their respective meetings.
The report was Moved and it and its recommendations Approved.

c. Graduate Committee Report: Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair:

The Graduate Committee had met four times this year: September 28th, October 12th, October 26th, and November 9th.

- The first meeting was largely organizational, but with one revision to a course in Engineering.
- The second meeting had some test cases for curriculum that were submitted by Brian Koehler and Lance McBrayer, and Anderson offered special thanks to them for helping the committee to blaze that trail and work out the bugs for that curriculum process.
- The third meeting had items from COSM and the curriculum from the College of Public Health. They also discussed enrollment hours and some questions from the Enrollment Management Council. He thanked Dr. Ballagh for offering to work through some issues the committee had concerns about.
- At their final meeting on November 9th, they approved all of the graduate curriculum that remained pending minor revisions. He seconded Lisa Leckie’s praise of Jade Brooks.

Moderator Pirro asked if our committee had coordinated with Armstrong. Anderson said that they had not done so to the extent of the Undergraduate Committee because the graduate programs often did not align. When programs and colleges required follow-up, then they consulted Armstrong.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked for clarification on course numbering, specifically whether undergraduate courses stopped at the 4000 level or could go to 5000.

Alisa Leckie (COE) said undergraduate courses can have a 5000 level designation if they are listed concurrently with graduate levels. Dustin Anderson (CLASS) added that syncing numbers and letters in the new curriculum was close to a “byzantine” exercise.

The report was Moved and Approved.

4. President’s Report: Jaimie Hebert:

Consolidation Updates

Our joint Enrollment Task Force, which includes people from Enrollment and Communications on both of the campuses, had done a remarkable job. Going into the summer, we were down about 14% in applications, something common in most consolidations. Their hard work over the summer resulted in us coming in only 1.5% down in enrollment. They are working with high school counselors around the state to build the identity of our new university as Georgia Southern, and deserve much praise.
We have a space allocation committee working with people on both campuses to map out space. We are going by tiers. Our number one tier is academics, and they are looking at space needs for housing various offices, and then they will tier down to facilities and so forth.

Just about everyone should have received appointment letters in the new University right before break: 1,850 staff and 1,050 faculty.

Consolidation savings will be in the millions and they are working on allocating those funds. He has asked the System to be allowed to take 2/3 of all of those savings and put them directly into student success initiatives, i.e. enhancing advising, mentoring, and tutoring services on all of our campuses. He has asked to put the other 1/3 into faculty lines to support the growth that is coming. We were promised that’s what we would be able to use this money for. It could be somewhere between 4 and 8 million dollars.

**Strategic Planning:**

President Hebert acknowledged how accelerated this consolidation process has been, and noted that such accelerated timelines will also be in place for producing our initial strategic plan. The prospectus that we turned in to SACS will define “the landscape that we’re going to find ourselves in. . . . Where we do control is how we navigate that landscape. . . . it’s virtually impossible to gather data right now because everything’s new. So we’re going to have to base our initial plan on our prospectus and our perceptions of where we need to go . . . so it’s critical that we get as many perspectives as possible when we define these perceptions. We’re going to have to look for what are the major threats that we are facing in the spring and prioritize those threats. We’re going to have to look at the major opportunities that we have, and we’re going to have to prioritize those opportunities. . . . We need to make it measurable, we need to be able to establish benchmarks in this first year as we go through this, and this plan . . . is going to be fluid for these at least the first three years. We come back after a year and look at those benchmarks and determine then start collecting data and modifying that plan on an annual basis and modifying our course through this landscape to make sure that we are really heading toward the opportunities we want to be heading toward as a University.”

The President’s Cabinet had already conducted SWOT analyses; the deans would present their SWOT analyses on December 11; and he was asking the Faculty Senates, the Student Government Associations, and the Staff Councils to present SWOT analyses so that we can pull these different prospectuses together. Then a steering committee will draft an initial strategic plan to help us move forward beginning next summer.

President Hebert believes in tying the strategic planning process to the budget allocation process; once we have benchmarks we are going to work to attach our budget allocation process to that strategic planning process. Our prioritized opportunities always will have academics at the center, and budgeting will be tied to those same priorities.
President Hebert acknowledged that for faculty this probably had been and would continue to be one of the most trying times in our careers, both professionally and personally. He thanked faculty for not letting this negatively impact students this year.

Dustin Anderson (CLASS) said he would “hate to make an ass” of himself right after such a gracious comment, but did so anyway by requesting that investment in student success not focus only on one-time expenditures but consider recurrent costs, such as for graduate fellowships and assistantships.

President Hebert said, “Absolutely.” He noted as an example that in his previous position as Provost they paid graduate assistants to tutor, thus getting a simultaneous win-win re: student success and graduate support.

Anderson then asked if, down to the program level, the new strategic plan would change assessment timetables.

President Hebert did not want to redo our assessment timelines. He noted his own history of frustration of having to do different assessments for different bodies at different times, and hoped that “if we really have well defined goals and benchmarks associated with those, those assessments should satisfy everything that we’re doing. I don’t want to reinvent the wheel.”

Mark Edwards (COSM) asked if any of that one-third of savings will be used to address faculty salary compression and inversion.

President Hebert said that in the spring, we’re going to launch a comprehensive salary study re: both faculty and staff. He thought it important to hire a third party to conduct that study. He noted that Armstrong had done such a study and laid out a five-year plan to address the problems that were found there. We were told that we cannot use consolidation savings specifically to address that, but we can lay out a plan to use other funds to do that over time.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) noted that the President had referred to the prospectus that we had no control over and asked who was making it and whether faculty could see it.

President Hebert said the prospectus – mostly defining university structure – was developed and approved by the CIC over the summer, and was submitted to SACSCOC on September 1st; it was scheduled for approval in the week following this meeting. He said he would ask whether or not it was available for public consumption.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) wondered why faculty wouldn’t be allowed to see it, given that it shows the landscape we’re required to navigate. President Hebert thought the only reason might be that SACSCOC was still deliberating on the issue, but he agreed that faculty needed to see it. [NOTE: The prospectus was distributed a few days later.]

Mark Welford (COSM) said our new contracts bore no mention of where each of us would be housed, and noted, “We had some indication that we would have some kind of
statement like that, and that we would be retained to specific destinations, but if we just
had a contract without that [it] means that you could move us around willy-nilly.”

Provost Cone said, “Faculty letters did not specify, nor did the staff letters specify. If you
were hired on the Statesboro campus, your contract is on the Statesboro campus, and
you will be teaching on the Statesboro campus. There could be opportunities for faculty
to teach on another campus if they work with their chairs. We’ve had a number of
faculty ask could they be moved to another campus. You were hired on the Statesboro
campus, and the intent is that you will teach here. We have faculty currently who teach
in Savannah at the Coastal Center as part of the degree programs that are offered
through their departments and so if there’s an opportunity where your expertise might
be needed on another campus, your department chair may ask [if] you would be willing
to, would you like to teach a course on another campus, but right now you’re contracted
on the Statesboro campus just as those on the Armstrong or the Hinesville campuses
will be teaching on those respective campuses. We are not moving faculty around.”

Ming Fang He (COE) noted that in response to her concerns expressed at the last senate
meeting, President Hebert had said he would hire a VP for diversity. She asked if a
diversity council would be established. She also asked how our graduate programs
would be run, noting that we no longer have a VP or Dean with that specific duty.

President Hebert said those will both be Associate Vice President positions within
Academic Affairs, and we will have a university-wide diversity council.

Dustin Anderson (CLASS) asked, re: department job searches, whether new job ads
would designate a particular campus for new hires.

Provost Cone said the ads will specify the campus where the position will be housed.
Armstrong currently advertises positions that say that you will be teaching on multiple
campuses, primarily for those folks that have to teach a course or two in Hinesville, and
this practice may continue. She was unaware of any such split-location situations arising
for the Statesboro campus.

Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) asked if the current Armstrong searches were advertising three-
three or four-four teaching loads.

Provost Cone noted that searches had only just been approved and no ads yet posted.
Faculty workloads would be dependent on whatever comes forth from the Welfare
Committee along with department chair input on teaching load. She added that we don’t
typically put loads in our ads anyway.

Hans Schanz (COSM) asked if there were discussions happening re: the federal proposal
to tax tuition waivers.

President Hebert said that was the subject of a lot of discussion and that Chancellor
Wrigley had written a letter on behalf of the entire University System very much
opposed to that proposal.
Ted Brimeyer (CLASS) asked, re: space allocation, if faculty, administrators, etc., who are on multiple campuses will have office space on those multiple campuses.

President Hebert said that would be on a case-by-case basis, and there might be exceptions, but the general answer was no.

Provost Cone said her space committee was working to identify some “landing spots” so that, for example, if you’re going to be on that campus one afternoon a week and you need a place to set up, there will be some places where faculty or chairs can do so. For administrators who are going to be there more often, they’re trying to identify spots for them, but if you just happen to teach a class over there, there’s not space enough for faculty to have dual offices. Many of the chairs will not have dual offices, but there may be within an office suite an office space they can use. It may be used by others as well during the off times. Such “flex space” they’re calling “landing spots.”

Brimeyer said he was concerned about faculty having space to talk to students privately.

President Hebert said we have that kind of “confidential space where [students] can visit with faculty.” Provost Cone noted that some Armstrong buildings have a lot of conference rooms, so we’re trying to preserve all of those spaces so that there would be opportunities for either faculty to meet with students or a chair and a faculty member to have a spot so that they could meet.

5. **Provost’s Report: (Diana Cone):**

**IAB Work:** We are on target to get that building finished in the summer and have classes there next fall.

**Letters of Notification:** All faculty letters went out and should have matched the contracts received in summer. A couple of faculty were surprised that the letters showed an increase in salary, but likely they just hadn’t looked at their summer-received contracts because no such increases were given. Nor was there any mention of moving anybody.

Once the letters of notification went out, they were able to identify what vacant faculty lines we have in every department: roughly 100 vacant lines in Statesboro and about 35 at Armstrong. Deans have been asked to prioritize those vacant lines and to confirm what the market salary needs to be to be competitive to fill those lines. We don’t have any additional dollars to put on those lines at this time, so we authorized the searches that we could afford. Search committees, even if the position is on Statesboro campus or the Armstrong campus, have been asked to have faculty from both campuses. Should we get any additional dollars to bring lines up to the market level, then we may be able to do a second round of searches. At Armstrong, out of 25 lines that have 38 to 42 thousand dollars on the line, to be competitive they need 25 or 30 thousand dollars more on each of those lines, which we don’t have, so she anticipated some unhappiness
that we’ll have to hire temps into those lines, and some deans may wait on searches until next year.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked whether search committee membership would be evenly split between campuses or proportional to the number of faculty on each campus.

Provost Cone said HR and our legal team were undecided, so to be safe they had asked for equal representation this year whenever possible.

Costomiris thought the committees should have proportional representation, that equal numbers no matter the number of faculty on each campus was unfair.

Provost Cone said that since the System had asked for equal representation re: internal searches and competitions, Legal Affairs and HR agreed that to be safe we should have equal representation right now for external searches.

Hans Schanz (COSM) wondered about potential conflicts of interest, for example if the same position is advertised on both campuses and one applicant applies for both, and whether in such a situation there would be one or two committees.

Provost Cone didn’t quite understand the question but said two identical positions on separate campuses would be advertised separately, and while one committee might review all applicants, if somebody wanted to be considered for both they’d have to apply for both positions.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) noted that the same department on different campuses will likely have different needs and was concerned that equal representation on hiring committees will mean half the people have a different eye than those of the people from the campus involved. She wondered if that made sense.

Provost Cone thought a different eye could be a good thing; in the past at GSU we required outside members on hiring committees in order to get a different perspective. She also noted that committees only make recommendations; chairs and deans make the final decisions.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked if, in future, search committees would have proportional representation.

Provost Cone said the equal representation configuration was for this fall only. She thought in future it would be a little different situation.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Moderator Robert Pirro

Because of the packed agenda, some items having a December 1st deadline for passage, he would hold discussion of the four RFIs until Unfinished Business.

Recently, the SEC met with Jim LoBue, chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee, who gave a report on promotion and tenure discussions in the OWG, on SRIs, and on some
other information in the posted answer to the RFI on promotion and tenure. The SEC also talked about a SWOT analysis that the President has asked to be done by the Faculty Senate, and whether or not the post-consolidation review committee would take on that charge, and the consensus was that because the timing is so compressed the SEC will do the SWOT analysis for the Senate, so the SEC was inviting feedback from the Senate and the faculty in general on the question of faculty governance and looking at the way the consolidation looks to us now and giving us feedback on strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. Pirro then called for nominations or self-nominations for people to serve on the post-consolidation review committee; at that point we had nominations from Public Health and from the Health Sciences College.

Pirro then moved on to four motions from the Academic Standards Committee and noted that committee member Mark Edwards (COSM) was present to answer questions.

7. **Motions**

a. **Revised Policy for Course Withdrawal**  
   Attachment: Dropping or Withdrawing from Courses

Pirro noted that this and the following motions were worked out with the equivalent committee at Armstrong. The motion: “The Academic Standards Committee recommends that the University adopt a revised policy for course withdrawals.” The rationale: “OWG 6-6 recommends that the new Institution adopt a policy on limiting individual course withdrawals that is modeled after the current Georgia Southern University policy on limiting individual course withdrawals. It also recommended that the new Institution adopt a policy on withdrawing from courses that incorporates both the Georgia Southern and Armstrong State current procedures. The Academic Standards Committee along with our counterparts from Armstrong was charged with drafting these policies for the new Georgia Southern. The attached policy drafts have been co-created with our colleagues and passed by at least a majority voted by both voting bodies as policy drafts to move forward to our respective Faculty Senate.”

Mark Edwards (COSM) said the main difference was that the number of withdrawals has been increased to six from five.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked if that number included summer withdrawals. Edwards said it did.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) noted that only withdrawals incurred at Georgia Southern University count towards the maximum number of withdrawals; withdrawals incurred prior to the implementation date (Fall 2018) will not count toward students’ number of allowed withdrawals. He wanted to know what that meant in practice: Could a student have 10 or 11 withdrawals?

Christine Ludowise (Provost’s office) noted that in the past when we have changed policies it has resulted in a “reset” for all students so that none would be negatively
impacted by the change; “this policy will take effect in fall and all previous withdrawals will be on their transcript, but will not count towards their limited withdrawal.”

Costomiris said this recommendation seemed to conflate current and future policies unnecessarily.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said that if he understood the issue correctly, the reset is being done in fairness to currently enrolled students who are working under two different policies, but that after x amount of time all students at Georgia Southern, no matter where they are, will work under one policy. For those currently enrolled who want to withdraw from classes, it’s like “they won a minor lottery.”

Costomiris said, “Thank you, Dr. Cyr. But, again, we are talking out of both sides of our mouths.” He thought current students should have to abide by the current system.

Ludowise said that would negatively impact Armstrong and Hinesville/Liberty Center campus students. Withdrawals have not been counted against them so they might move forward with no opportunities to withdraw left to them.

Steirn disagreed, saying that if we maintain current policies current Armstrong students would continue not having withdrawals counted against them, while Statesboro students would know how many withdrawals they have under current policies. New students would come in under the new policy. She noted that one reason for GSU’s current policy was to stop students from shopping for classes and thereby preventing other students from getting classes they need, and she thought this practice might revive if the motion passes.

Ludowise said that BANNER experts have said that once the two BANNER systems merge, we can’t differentiate between students, so either we hold everybody to five or we reset everybody.

Costomiris said, “It always gets down to BANNER.” Ludowise said, “It does.”

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) was concerned about the “unfortunate impression” that could be given that as a consequence of consolidation students were using HOPE money to shop for classes.

Ludowise said this had been discussed, but we had been assured that HOPE looks at attempted hours and withdrawals count in attempted hours, so it shouldn’t affect HOPE but could impact the students’ financial aid.

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) wondered “what’s wrong with hitting the reset button every once in awhile.” Costomiris said, “RPG.”

The motion was Approved.

b. New Policy for Limited Grade Forgiveness

Attachment: Limited Grade Forgiveness Policy
“The Academic Standards Committee recommends that the University adopt a policy for limited grade forgiveness.” The rationale: “OWG 6-6 recommend that the new Institution adopt a policy on repeating courses that is modeled after the current Armstrong State University policy on repeating courses. OWG 6-6 also recommended the new Institution formulate recommendations for a limited grade replacement policy. The Academic Standards Committee along with our counterparts from Armstrong was charged with drafting these policies for the new Georgia Southern and its attached policy draft.”

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) said he hadn’t been able to download the attachment and asked Moderator Pirro to read it, which he did:

“Under the conditions outlined below, undergraduate students who have retaken courses and earned a higher grade may request to have the first grade excluded from their institutional GPA. If the request is approved, the Office of the Registrar will make appropriate notations next to the original course and the retaken course on the student's official transcript. Grades for all attempts at the course will appear on the student's official transcript regardless of whether or not the grade has been excluded from the student's GPA. * This policy has no effect on any GPA requirements set by state or federal laws/regulations (such as the GPA requirements set by the HOPE scholarship program). A copy of the request and approval will become part of the student's permanent record file. The attempt to repeat must be made in Spring 2019 or thereafter. Students who have repeated courses prior to this date will not be allowed to delete earlier attempts from their GPA calculation.

An undergraduate student may request to have a grade excluded from GPA computation under the following conditions:

• Only courses in Areas A through E of the University CORE are eligible for grade forgiveness.

• Only courses taken at Georgia Southern University are eligible for grade forgiveness.

• No more than a total of five course grades (from five different courses) may be replaced and excluded from the student's GPA calculations.

• Before requesting to apply the limited grade forgiveness policy, a student must have either retaken the same undergraduate course (or the renumbered substitute for that course) or taken a course that satisfies the same CORE requirement and earned a higher grade in the course retaken.

• Once a request has been approved the request cannot be revoked or reversed.

• Only grades of D, F, and WF may be forgiven.

• This policy does not apply if the original grade was assigned as a result of a violation of the Student Code of Conduct.
• The Limited Grade Forgiveness Policy applies only to degree-seeking students pursuing their first undergraduate degree at Georgia Southern University.

*Courses that do not count towards GPA calculations cannot count towards degree requirements. Financial Aid Implications: The granting of limited grade forgiveness does not supersede financial aid policies regarding Satisfactory Academic Progress."

Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked if this meant that those who did not pass a particular course could replace that grade by passing a different course in the same area.

Both Mark Edwards (COSM) and Moderator Pirro said that was correct.

Heidi Altman (CLASS) understood this to mean that students could fail almost a quarter of their core and replace it.

Edwards noted that failed courses are not erased from the transcript; they are still there. Moderator Pirro added that this impacts only calculation of the GPA.

Costomiris asked where this was coming from, Armstrong or GSU. Moderator Pirro said the motion says it is based on an Armstrong template.

Christine Ludowise (Provost’s office) noted that Georgia Southern used to have an unlimited grade forgiveness policy, which we jettisoned. Armstrong has some version of it that uses a Georgia State or a Georgia Tech model, so this recommendation is not what we used to have, and it’s not what Armstrong has, but is a hybrid. In response to a question from Moderator Pirro, Ludowise noted GSU’s old policy was unlimited: Students could replace any grade in any course at any time, and we went from that to no grade forgiveness at all. Pirro said that the recommendation would allow five.

Steirn (CLASS) noted that currently if they retake a course, it has to be the same course, and both courses now are considered in the GPA. This would not be so under the new proposal, and for many places we report GPA, not full transcripts. She thought this was an unfair representation of the kind of work the student does. If she were somebody thinking of hiring the student she would want to know that they’ve got to do everything twice in order to get it.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said he had been part of the group that fought to get that adjusted GPA thrown out for the very reasons stated. But this recommendation was limited to the core, not to major classes, and limited in number. Students’ graduation GPA will have two more years of grades where they can’t do that kind of grade replacement. He thought the recommendation was a kind of a middle ground. He had hated our previous adjusted GPA policy, but thought we could work with this one because it gives struggling students a chance to get themselves grounded as University students.

Alice Hall (CHHS) noted she had been on Academic Standards when the old policy was changed, and it was to improve the rigor of the institution and less about shopping: Students were withdrawing over and over, and we were just taking their money, and
their GPAs were inaccurate. She didn’t know if the current recommendation was a bad thing or not.

Heidi Altman (CLASS) noted that in terms of RPG, this policy would add an extra semester just for the forgiveness courses, and if they now have 11 withdrawals, this means adding a lot of time to their core and even major program. She thought we were compounding problems.

Mark Welford (COSM) wanted to emphasize the money: One of the reasons we got rid of the old policy was that students who really couldn’t make it in college were spending lots and lots of money. Even with just five potential classes, that is a whole semester and a significant financial burden we should not be putting on our students.

Edwards noted that no one will force students to do this. It will be up to them.

Haberland echoed Hall’s concern about increasing student debt, especially given our population.

Alisa Leckie (COE) seconded Cyr’s comments about how some students stumble as freshmen, and it takes a little bit to get their legs under them. She noted that COE has had students apply who can’t get in because of their GPA, so they have to take additional courses to raise it to COE standards. She thought that allowing students the opportunity to retake courses in the core as they’re figuring out their world as university students might be beneficial overall.

Steirn noted that we have early alerts and a last day to withdraw without academic penalty, and if those and other factors don’t get them to withdraw before penalty, she wondered when such students would ever “find their feet.” She didn’t think we needed all that plus forgiveness of six withdrawals.

Provost Cone noted that when she was on the System-wide Academic Renewal Committee, they were talking about giving students a fresh start and about withdrawals and grade forgiveness. The members from the other System schools were appalled: Georgia Southern was the most rigid of all the schools in the System on academic forgiveness. They couldn’t believe that we didn’t allow students to do that, and noted that most of our sister institutions allow some type of grade forgiveness.

Chris Brown (CLASS) asked whether we had to approve or disapprove the motion, or whether we could recommend changes.

Moderator Pirro thought it was either approve or not approve because these same recommendations were being voted on by Armstrong’s senate as well. He called for a vote: 25 in favor, 8 opposed. The motion was Approved.

c. **Revised Policy for Withdrawing from the University**

Attachment: **Withdrawing from the University**
“The Academic Standards Committee recommends that the University adopt a revised policy for withdrawing from the University. Following a recommendation from OWG 6-6, this policy incorporates both the Georgia Southern and Armstrong State current policies, presenting the information in a format that is easy to read.”

Christine Ludowise (Provost’s office) noted that, except for some changes in language – for example, “retroactive withdrawals” will be called “hardship withdrawals” – this was the same as our current policy. It also gave students clear guidance on what they need to do in order to apply for such a withdrawal, unlike our current policy.

Mark Edwards (COSM) noted it also contained some notations for things like military withdrawal that were current at Armstrong.

The motion was Approved.

d. Revised Academic Standing Policy
Attachments: Academic Standing Policy Visual
Academic Standing Policy

“The Academic Standards Committee recommends that the University adopt a revised Academic Standing Policy.” Moderator Pirro then read the rationale:

“OWG 6-6 recommend that the new Institution: (1) create a task force to review the current Academic Standing Policies of Georgia Southern University and Armstrong State University in order to create a new Academic Standing Policy; (2) create a new Academic Standing Policy within an abbreviated timeframe to facilitate full implementation in Fall 2018; (3) develop an Academic Standing Policy that holds students accountable without imposing excessively punitive requirements for continued enrollment at the institution; (4) create an Academic Standing policy that rewards students who are making on-going progress, each term, towards good academic standing.”

Moderator Pirro said it seemed the motion was not about changing anything right now, but putting in motion the processes that will lead to a revised academic standing policy.

Mark Edwards (COSM) seemed to confirm that. Most elements would be the same as current policy, for example re: warnings and what leads to and constitutes probation one and probation two and so forth. The big difference would be the GPA students would need to achieve if their grades after the next semester don’t put them at 2.0; they have to make a 2.25 (confirmed by Christine Ludowise) in order to go another semester.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) was unclear whether we would be voting to approve these elements or to establish a task force to study the proposal.

Edwards clarified that the senate would be voting on a revision of our current policy of warnings, probations, and reinstatement.
Christine Ludowise (Provost’s office) said the Academic Standing Committee and the Student Success Committee at Armstrong were the Task Force.

Moderator Pirro then confirmed that this vote would be on a change in policy.

Ted Brimeyer (CLASS) said this seemed like another policy to keep students around to take their money. If students get over a 2.25 they can stay, but for students who have done really badly in one semester, that 2.25 likely will never get them over the 2.0 threshold to graduate.

Ludowise responded that COSM and CLASS have data that demonstrates that students who earn at least a 2.25 over consecutive semesters do bring their GPA up. Our current policy excluded students whether making progress or not, so if a student had a bad first semester, they could still be excluded at a 1.98 two semesters later. Most of those students did not come back. 25% of Georgia Southern students end up on some kind of academic warning or probation at some point in their career here. The committee was trying to make sure that students who are making progress had incentive to continue making that progress via a little bit of a soft landing net.

Steirn asked if there was a limit on how many semesters students can take to raise their GPA; a 2.25 could not raise a very low GPA in, say, two semesters.

Ludowise said there was no time limit. Scott Beck from the College of Education had done some calculations that showed a student who had a 2.25 their first semester, if they earned at least a 2.25 each consecutive semester would end after 8 semesters with almost exactly 2.0. Success would also be dependent on a strong intervention policy.

Steirn wondered if this plan made students less independent, and was concerned about sending out into the world as a representative of a GSU graduate someone who needed 8 semesters of all that support to eke out a 2.0.

Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) thought exactly 2.25 in each of 8 semesters an unlikely scenario, opined that they would likely earn higher, and so wasn’t worried about the proposal.

Brimeyer liked the fact that someone actually used evidence to support this proposal rather than just saying we like this, so let’s do it. He hoped other motions would be similarly supported by evidence.

The motion was Approved.

e. **Addition of Senate Executive officer President-Elect**

Moderator Pirro asked Richard Flynn (CLASS) to discuss this motion.

Flynn said the four motions re: the Senate were the product of OWG 5-1 on Faculty Governance, which contained four members from Armstrong and four from GSU. They
put Armstrong’s Bylaws alongside ours and tried to pick the best things from both. The first item was the addition of the Office of President-Elect and the second the changing of the title from Moderator to Senate President. Having a President-Elect allows that person to shadow the President for an entire year so they will really know the ropes when they assume office. It also allows that person to take a meeting if the President has to be absent, and it gets two people in the individual meetings with the President and Provost that occur before Senate meetings.

Moderator Pirro added that this formalized what we’ve been doing informally for years.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) was concerned with how this limited who could come forward to be Moderator. That person must be a sitting Senator. Given our three year term limits, the current system made 2/3 of Senators eligible, but this proposed system would limit it to 1/3 because only those with two years left in their terms would be eligible. He also thought that requiring a two-year commitment could be a disincentive for people to come forward to serve. He thought this limitation of choice could be a problem, but we would find that out over time; he did not think it was a “deal-breaker.”

Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked if we knew yet where Senate meetings would be held. Moderator Pirro noted that item was in an upcoming motion. Steirn said she had asked because this would be a concern re: traveling if the President and President-Elect were from different campuses.

Jonathan Hilpert (COE) had questions about term limits and how those will be reconciled with a combined Senate, but first asked if the OWG had sent these recommendations to the CIC for approval before bringing them to the Senate.

Flynn said the OWG sent five governance recommendations to the CIC, the fifth of which did not pertain to the present motion. The first was a resolution to have a combined senate and the CIC approved this. A second was that the bylaws be reconciled and rewritten, and that was approved by the CIC. Part of that motion was to send suggestions to the Senate Executive Committee; the copy of the bylaws with “all of the red stuff” that was distributed was what the OWG sent to the SEC. The SEC made some revisions which resulted in these motions. The change of title from Senate Moderator to Senate President wasn’t something that went through the CIC, nor was the President-Elect; those resulted from the CIC direction that the bylaws be reconciled and passed by both existing Senates. The upcoming motions re: two standing committees were things the OWG liked in the Armstrong structure and wanted for Georgia Southern.

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE, and a member of both the OWG and the SEC) noted re: term limitations that we will increase the number of Faculty Senators for the first year by 24 people, which they hoped would help re: the problem of terms for the President-Elect. She noted the President-Elect idea came from the Armstrong bylaws, and that the issue of who will be on the Senate and travel would be addressed in upcoming motions.

Flynn added that member apportionment and the meeting structure were worked out by the OWG and the SEC.
Hilpert (COE) echoed Cyr’s concerns about term limits restricting eligibility. He thought this could lead to inexperienced senators becoming President-Elect. He also commented that some of these recommendations went to the CIC, some to the SEC, and that the process seemed arbitrary.

Flynn noted that some things, like revising meeting schedules, were approved in principle by the CIC but with directions for the Senates to work out the details.

Dustin Anderson (CLASS) asked how many of these motions were approved unanimously by the OWG.

Flynn said the President-elect provision, change in title, and two standing committees were approved unanimously. He added that membership apportionment was based on the belief that we needed to have representation from the Armstrong campus, so once we’re one institution there needs to be at least one college senator from each campus, and each college has two guaranteed senators. But for the transition period there will be 23 senators from Armstrong and one from Liberty.

Moderator Pirro requested that we come to a decision re: this first motion.

Flynn then noted that to serve as an officer, you have to have had a year on senate.

Cyr noted, however, that the officers would be elected during their first year.

Pirro said yes, but service in that office would start after a senator’s first year. He reiterated that the motion would formalize the current but informal arrangement, but would limit eligibility to 1/3 of senators.

Anderson asked whether, given Flynn’s comments, we were looking at these items individually or as a combined motion.

Moderator Pirro clarified that we would take them one at a time.

Hilpert asked Williams-Johnson if new bylaws would change term limits. She said no, but Flynn added that anyone can propose such a change.

The motion was Approved with one no vote.

Flynn noted that it was now 5:54 and said that Moderator Pirro could call a vote to extend the meeting. Pirro noted that we were losing senators at this point and we would soon lack a quorum, but thought we could get through the next motion in the time left.

**f. Change title of Senate Moderator to Senate President**

Richard Flynn (CLASS) said the Moderator at Armstrong is called the Senate President. The OWG thought the name has meaning, and it is not an unusual title; for example, Kennesaw has President and President-elect, and it does not violate BOR rules.
Marc Cyr (CLASS) objected on the grounds that he had proposed “El Supremo,” but nobody else on the SEC would go for it.

The motion was Approved.

Moderator Pirro noted that we still had a quorum. Someone moved for a time extension to the meeting. Robert Costomiris (CLASS) objected because he did not want to rush through things. Moderator Pirro noted that there was no firm deadline for the remaining motions, so they could be done at the first meeting of the new term. Flynn said we needed a motion to hold elections in early spring, probably February since there is no regular January meeting. Moderator Pirro said we could call a special January meeting to take care of the unfinished business, or do that in February and hold elections in March. Allen Henderson (CLASS) noted the agenda did not contain a motion to hold early elections. Flynn said such a motion needed to be on the agenda and reminded us that we have to coordinate everything with the Armstrong Senate, who supposedly were acting on these same motions sometime this month.

Moderator Pirro agreed but did not want to rush through the upcoming, relatively complicated motions. Saying they would all come forward as unfinished business at the next meeting, he asked if someone would call for adjournment. This was moved and Approved.

Secretary’s Note: The following items of this meeting’s agenda were not reached and dealt with:

g. New standing committee – Student Success Committee
h. New Standing Committee – Planning, Budget, and Facilities Committee
i. Consolidated Senate Apportionment and Membership for New Georgia Southern
   Attachment: Consolidating Senate Membership – Motion 5 11.3.2017
j. New GSU Senate Meeting Structure
   Attachment: Senate Meeting Structure Motion 6 11.2.2017

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