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Faculty Senate Minutes  
February 7, 2018  
4:00 to 6:00 P.M. 
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting members in attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Sam Adeyye, Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Mete Akcaoglu, Rocío Alba-Flores, Moya Alfonso, Heidi Altman, Dragos Amai, Dustin Anderson, Helen Bland, Ted Brimeyer, Gavin Colquitt, Robert Costomiris, Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, Lisa Denmark, Meghan Dove, Michelle Haberland, Alice Hall, Chuck Harter, Ming Fang He, Jonathan Hilpert, Bob Jackson, Barbara King, Hsiang-Jui Kung, Alisa Leckie, Lili Li, Li Li, Li Ma, Ron MacKinnon, Leticia McGrath, Constantin Ogloblin, Hans Joerg-Schanz, Stephanie Sipe, Chasen Smith, Fred Smith, Janice Steirn, Jorge Suazo, Mark Welford, Meca Williams-Johnson, Hayden Wimmer, Shijung Zheng

Moderator: Robert Pirro  
Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy  
SGA Rep: Avery Pickert

Voting members not in attendance: Kelly Berry, Adam Bossler, Christopher Brown, Anoop Desai, Mark Edwards, Drew Keane, Mujibur Khan, Jennifer Kowalewski, Eric Landers, Yi Lin, Santanu Majumdar, Ed Mondor, Marshall Ransom, Peter Rogers, Ed Rushton, Jake Simons, Marian Tabi, Linda L. Thompson, Tharanga Wickramarachchi

Administrators: Jaimie Hebert, Amy Ballagh, Chris Curtis, Amy Heaston, Geoji Lewis, Rob Whitaker, Mohammad Davoud, Greg Evans, Curtis Ricker

Visitors: John Stone, Matt Williamson, Candace Griffith, Michelle Cawthon, Christine Ludowise, Olga Amai, Ashley Walker, Delena Bell Gatch, Martha Abell, Terri Flateby, Maxine Bryant

Secretary’s Note: The recording is very poor, even after efforts to enhance it. While sometimes recording difficulties are noted in these minutes, readers should understand that much of what else was said throughout the meeting is only patchily and/or barely and/or not at all audible.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the February 7, 2018 meeting: Rob Pirro (CLASS), Moderator

The agenda was Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the November 27, 2017 minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary

The minutes were Moved and Approved.
3. Librarian’s Reports for February 7, 2018: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian:

The second distributed version, the one including the Graduate Committee minutes, was Moved and Approved for accuracy.

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

The GECC met in January but did not have a quorum. They discussed the core process and wanted reassurance that once consolidation is over there will be greater faculty input on the core. Acceptance of the report was Moved and Approved.

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

The Undergraduate Committee had not met and was unsure about what their charge was for this semester given consolidation. Provost Diana Cone recommended that they meet with the Armstrong Undergraduate Committee and develop guidelines on how to proceed regarding Fall semester. Leckie noted that Armstrong had no such committee. Chris Curtis (Vice President for the Armstrong/Liberty Campus) said they did have a committee, and while it had no standing anymore “we could certainly work within that framework going forward.”

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

The Graduate Committee did meet, mostly for informational purposes, and to meet with Patricia Holt, chair of Armstrong’s Graduate Affairs Committee, to do exactly what Dr. Cone was proposing, discuss how the committees will function on both campuses. Other business included updates on when comprehensive program reviews were coming up. Anderson also met with the Registrar’s office to talk about changes in the coming year, and he and Dr. Walker attended a Graduate Affairs meeting at Armstrong.

The report was Approved.

4. President’s Report: President Jaimie Hebert:

Provost’s Search: An offer had been made to a candidate. The candidate wanted to visit the area with their spouse before formally accepting. President Hebert had asked for a decision by the end of the month, and that did not seem to be a problem; indeed, the candidate had indicated they were ready to accept.

Policies: In the accelerated processes that we have been through to develop the prospectus “we probably did skirt the edges on policies and we are very liberal in our interpretation of those policies and so forth. By all means, we should be following our policies from this point forward. We need to make every effort to insure that we are following policies. Now there are some situations that have been brought to my attention where the policies aren’t clear because a Faculty Handbook exists here. We also have a Faculty Handbook that exists on
Strategic Planning: Members of a strategic planning committee had been identified and the committee would soon meet and be charged. The process had already begun, however, with SWOT analyses presented by Cabinet, Deans, the Faculty Senates, the Student Government Associations, and the Staff Councils. The SPC’s first draft will prioritize the information from those analyses and develop strategies to deal with problems and pursue opportunities.

RFP [Compensation] Process: A committee comprised of faculty and staff was being formed that would be involved in selecting an outside agency to study the issue.

Communication: A number of folks were making great efforts to enhance communication between the campuses. For example, the President’s Cabinet was meeting on the Armstrong campus one Monday, the Statesboro campus the other Monday, and rotating back and forth so that everyone feels a presence of a cabinet on all of the campuses. A lot of the colleges and VPs were doing the same thing.

5. Provost’s Report: Provost Diana Cone:

Directories: Deans had been asked to prepare a full combined directory for their colleges so that we can all know who is who, where they’re located, and who reports to whom. Note, however, that the space committee was still finalizing some office assignments.

Promotion and Tenure: “We are not going to change the requirements on folks mid-stream.” Those going up for review in fall of 2018 will follow the guidelines that are in place at their separate departments, colleges, and institutions. Folks going up in fall 2019 were hired under certain guidelines and will follow those. New hires who come on board in fall of 2018 will follow the new guidelines that will be part of the combined institution. Those guidelines have not yet been set. The Faculty Welfare Committee has been tasked with combining the information from the two Faculty Handbooks, including promotion and tenure policies. Their work will come forward as a CIC recommendation and then will be brought to the Senate. Once we have the University guidelines, colleges and departments will create their own guidelines moving forward. The problem is that we need to have those in place. Some faculty have complained that their department chair or dean is forming a committee to talk about promotion and tenure guidelines. They are doing that in an effort to have something in place as they interview prospective candidates for positions for fall of 2018: Candidates want to know what the promotion and tenure guidelines for the department are.

Current Bylaws: A related issue complained about is that deans and chairs are not following the current bylaws of the department or the college. We are in a period of transition and don’t have bylaws by the department because the bylaws in a department on the Statesboro campus probably are not matching the bylaws of the department on
the Armstrong campus. So the chairs have been trying to put some committees together to start having these discussions so they can create the bylaws. Provost Cone reiterated her comments about who will follow what guidelines when. However, if someone’s assignment changes – for example, a different ratio of teaching and research emphases – that will require an individual conversation with the department chair re: how that individual will be evaluated going forward.

Chris Curtis (Vice President for the Armstrong/Liberty Campus) reinforced Provost Cone’s point that we have a lot of work that needs to get done this semester. P & T guidelines must be a faculty-driven process, and faculty on all of the campuses and all of the departments need to be included in these discussions. But these guidelines need to be in place this semester.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked a question that did not record. Provost Cone answered that moving forward Steirn’s department will be one department with one set of promotion and tenure guidelines. Different people might have differing loads and emphases, but the guidelines should address such differential loads. She added that the University requirements typically fall in line with the Board of Regents, so we don’t have a lot of leeway. Also, the University guidelines are generally more “generic so that they apply to all colleges and that’s typically what the Board of Regents guidelines are as far as timeline and so forth where the departments can be more specific as it relates to their discipline.”

In response to further inaudible questions or comments by unidentifiable people, Provost Cone said, “They will follow, if they can go up by the fall of 18, they should follow the guidelines that they are under at this time. . . . If they are promoted in the fall of ’18 then with the post-tenure review in five years they would follow (inaudible) guidelines.”

Chris Curtis (Vice President for the Armstrong/Liberty Campus) said it was in our best interests as a University for us to get to one standard across the board. There will no doubt be necessary adjustments in the next couple of years; these can be addressed at the levels concerned.

Provost Cone then noted an issue that had been raised, but what that issue was is inaudible, though she noted it was a legal issue. Moira Copeland was not present to address it. Chris Curtis (Vice President for the Armstrong/Liberty Campus) reinforced that whatever this issue was, it was important: “I mean, I think that’s important (inaudible), certainly want to continue to follow this (inaudible) We can look around the room and we know we’re going to be dealing with (inaudible) next two, three, four years (inaudible). And what we want to do is have . . . fair and open processes that people can engage in and know what is expected of them before they go up and have a conversation (inaudible), you know, as we make those decisions (inaudible) transparent (inaudible) on what we’re creating right now. That’s why we need to create it right now.”

Provost Cone then noted that we have 106 searches that were launched in the fall across all colleges. There are about 30 requested searches that have not been launched for
various reasons, but primarily because in order to be competitive we need more dollars on the line and those were not available in the fall. We will still be looking at those throughout the spring and into next fall to potentially launch those across the three campuses.

Provost Cone then introduced Maxine Bryant, Interim Associate Provost, Office of Diversity. Provost Cone noted that each campus had an Office of Diversity/Title IX/Equal Opportunity – they have been called different things, but doing the same types of work. We will still have our office of Equal Opportunity/Title IX, with Joel Wright, and services on all campuses, housed here on the Statesboro campus, but we have now split off Diversity under Dr. Bryant.

Bryant noted that she had a temporary office on the Armstrong campus, and the space committee was looking for space for her that would be visible and accessible for students, faculty, and staff on all three campuses.

The President’s Diversity Advisement Council [PDAC] had been established and had its first meeting in Statesboro the day before. It is comprised of faculty, staff, and student representation from all campuses. They have formed what’s called a BIRT, Bias Incident Response Team, that is comprised of Bryant, Joel Wright on this campus, Dr. Patrice Jackson, and Andrew Dies on the Armstrong campus. This is for first-level vetting of incidents that can be reported by students, by faculty, by staff, whoever, in any situation where they feel that something has been said or done that makes them feel uncomfortable. If BIRT deems it is discriminatory in nature, it’s actually a compliance or Title IX issue, that automatically goes to Wright. If it is anything other than that, then depending on who reported it, then either Bryant, Jackson, or Dies will handle that and intervene. In the past, no matter what the situation was, many times it went straight to Wright, and he became inundated with situations that did not belong in equity or Title IX; this will change that.

Bryant said they will develop a diversity SWOT. Faculty would shortly receive electronically a survey from Qualtrics for necessary feedback to identify the needs across all three campuses as they relate to diversity, particularly diversity education.

She invited all to attend Poets Respond to Race the following week.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked something inaudible about the PDAC. Bryant said they have representation from all three campuses, and are trying for diverse representation in all areas. They have looked at gender, ethnicity, and race; they have the dean of the Health Professions college; representation from the Office of Multicultural Affairs and Student Governments. Currently, there are nineteen members, but they want to reduce that number, and maybe have representatives from each college. Only that day, she had found out the membership of the Diversity Council. She would be reaching out to deans in order to get involved in job searches. She also wanted to make sure the LGBTQ community is represented and has identified a current member of the council who is “a trusted faculty person to that community.”
Someone unidentifiable asked an inaudible question. Bryant responded, “Absolutely, as a matter of fact, that came up in our conversation yesterday, was an activity (inaudible) for the council, so, yes, when we speak about diversity . . . speaking across the board, not just ethnicity and gender and all of that, but faith, veterans, your nontraditional students, abilities across the board. So we will be addressing all of those types of issues.”

President Hebert noted that we will still have the Ethics Hotline and TRIAGE in place, but felt a need to establish BIRT because it allows us to go beyond issues of compliance and lets us engage in larger scale discussions about the culture of our institution.

Bryant noted that there will be a bias incident reporting form that will be primarily on the website for the Office of Diversity and Faculty Development.

Someone unidentifiable asked an inaudible question. President Hebert said, “Yes, both of those are avenues through which people can pursue, I (inaudible) complaint, and file complaints or file concerns and, you know, for me, you can’t have too many opportunities available at once. And they will funnel all into the same group. . . .”

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Robert Pirro [CLASS],
   Moderator:

   The Chancellor said that there there were no expectations that there would be any major items in this legislative session that would be concerning other than budget.

   Moderator Pirro had talked to a couple of Senate faculty presidents about their experience with merging Faculty Senates, one at University of North Georgia, the other at the consolidation of Kennesaw State and SBSU. In one case, they meet physically together, and in another, because of the distance between the campuses, they meet electronically, but in both cases they felt that consolidating senates was the way to go.

   Our Senate SWOT analysis was conducted by inviting all faculty to give feedback to their Senate Executive Committee members. One SEC member did a Qualtrics study of her college. Further, Moderator Pirro had heard from faculty groups and incorporated their feedback as well.

7. Motions
   a. [Commemorating Senate Service of Dr. Candy Schille]
      Attachment: Candy Schille Memorial

   Moderator Pirro noted that this formal commemoration had come at the request of many people and had been passed at the November meeting. It not only commemorates Dr. Candy Schille’s service to the Senate, but the importance of the Senate itself. Approximately half of her faculty career was spent as a Senator, often in leadership roles, as Secretary many times and Moderator for two terms. The motion was Moved and Approved.
b. **To fold the Consolidated Core Review Committee into the Consolidation Review Committee**

The Consolidated Core Review Committee was approved by the Senate in Fall 2017 because of serious concerns about problems created by the compressed process. Later that semester, we approved formation of a committee to reviews consolidation problems more generally. Moderator Pirro had found it hard to staff both committees, and noted that there is overlap in their jurisdictions. He said another difficulty was that he could not arrange any staffing from Armstrong. When he met with those Statesboro faculty who had come forward for the Core Review committee, they agreed that combining the two committees made sense.

Someone unidentifiable asked an inaudible question. Moderator Pirro responded, “To answer your question, the Consolidated Core Review Committee was . . . drawn from the two Undergraduate and Core Committee[s], so (inaudible) in all colleges.”

The motion was Moved and Approved.

Moderator Pirro noted that the next four items were part of a menu of motions that was put together by the OWG that was concerned with the two Senates, co-chaired by Richard Flynn and with Meca Williams-Johnson as a member. We passed two of those motions at our November meeting, but did not have time for these four. He proposed that we discuss items c and d together because they seemed likely to raise similar concerns and questions, but vote on them separately. He noted that both of the committees in question have existed at Armstrong. The Student Success Committee would be looking at ways that policies could be tweaked to help students stay in school and progress. The second one – the Planning, Budget, and Facilities Committee – is a faculty committee that regularly reports from the VP office of Finance to afford faculty the opportunity of asking questions about the budget, and also to develop expertise about budgets so that they can bring that to the Senate.

   c. **New standing committee – Student Success Committee**

   d. **New Standing Committee – Planning, Budget, and Facilities Committee**

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) noted that the OWG was of the opinion that the Student Success Committee would benefit all of our students by using analytics to produce data to guide informed decisions. At Armstrong, this has increased retention rates, and the committee was also instrumental in their course withdrawal policy and their course repeat policy. They would work closely with the new VP for Enrollment Management.

There were one or more inaudible comments.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said that he liked both of these committees, noting that we have administrative functions working right now towards student success, but he didn’t think we had a coordinated faculty effort to help. He was also “very fond” of the Budget committee proposal, noting that when he was Moderator in 2004, we got something like this through the Senate, and then President Grube “torpedoed” it. He liked the idea of
“the faculty having some notion of what the hell is going on with all those magic buckets” of money.

Moderator Pirro noted that the committee would not give faculty any statutory budget authority. But it would give faculty the ability “to ask questions of representatives from the VP Finance and also ask questions that might be stupid, but still worth asking and eventually building up the expertise [so] that the questions have . . . more nuance . . . because sometimes we get material from Finance that we don’t understand. It would be good to have people in this room who really have a better sense of [the issues].”

Williams-Johnson noted that similar committees exist at other USG institutions, such as Kennesaw, Valdosta, Columbus State, UGA, UGA, and North Georgia. An Armstrong faculty member had noted to her that the committee helped communication and transparency between administration and faculty regarding budgeting and facilities.

Dustin Anderson (CLASS) wanted reassurance on membership, that it would be staffed from the Faculty Senate and not appointed outside the Senate.

Williams-Johnson said a Senate faculty member will be on this committee, but its members will come from the colleges. The VP for Finance will also be on it.

The motions having been Moved separately were both Approved separately.

e. Consolidated Senate Apportionment and Membership for New Georgia Southern
Attachment: Consolidating Senate Membership – Motion 5 11.3.2017

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) said the OWG on Faculty Governance discussed several possibilities for consolidating the senate and arrived at “consolidation of the two faculty senates with additional seats and designated to represent the Armstrong and Liberty campuses based on Georgia Southern’s current method of apportionment . . .there will be approximately twenty additional senators designated to represent the Armstrong and Liberty campuses.” This will increase Senate membership to about 80 senators.

One comment that she received from Katherine at Kennesaw University, who also served on the OWG, was that moving through consolidation is tough, but if it was not broken, don’t fix it, which means that if apportionment worked at the largest institution we should stick with it.

Someone unidentifiable and mostly inaudibly supported the motion.

Williams-Johnson said, “Thank you, and I just (inaudible) so for the first year we wanted to make sure that it was clearly indicated where these new senators (inaudible) to make sure they (inaudible) understand that by majority voting that they might not be (inaudible). Every college, several colleges run their election differently so to make sure that they have seats available. Then the following year in 2019 we (inaudible) the colleges vote as they (inaudible).”
**Moderator** Pirro said he thought that, especially given that some people will be teaching on both campuses, this will help create the organic feeling that all are part of one university.

The motion having been moved was Approved.

**f.** [New GSU Senate Meeting Structure](#)

Attachment: [Senate Meeting Structure Motion 6 11.2.2017](#)

Williams-Johnson noted the OWG recommended this “hybrid model . . . to reduce travel, decrease cost, increase convenience and safety, yet foster participation from a unified faculty senate although we are physically in different locations. By using a hybrid approach, the GSU senate can continue to conduct one meeting to address faculty issues and university concerns.” This model would have the Senate meet as a large group twice a year, once in Statesboro and once in Savannah, and then via online conference for the other meetings.

Moderator Pirro asked where the President, Provost, and Moderator would be for the online meetings.

Williams-Johnson said they could be wherever works best for them. Video conferencing will allow for that. Moderator Pirro thought the Moderator should be where the majority of Senators were present.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that he was currently Senate Secretary and had performed that role many times over the years. He liked the plan but only if “we have (inaudible) on the technological end is worked out before. I can’t count how many times, this is no more difficult [than] karaoke and we have had numerous (inaudible) trying to get this set-up to work. How is this going to be broadcast? Where are the cameras going to be placed? (inaudible) How is the recording going to be made from which a transcript can be produced? Those things, I think, definitely have to be worked out. They have to be worked out, I think, by the President’s (inaudible) and if we don’t, if you don’t work it out, I don’t think it will be (inaudible) and that really [will] take some doing.”

Williams-Johnson said, “(inaudible) questions (inaudible) I did want the senate members to know that we have started the ball rolling on this (inaudible) what it might take (inaudible) talk to our (inaudible) on this campus as well as the young gentleman, Jeffrey, who is the person audiovisual (inaudible) make sure that there (inaudible) hot and told me that it will take some equipment, not the visual, but the audio in terms of (inaudible).”

Someone identifiable only as Jonathan said something inaudible.

Williams-Johnson said that “Jeffrey, who is the lead audiovisual staff member for the Russell Union, has done this, so he has put our documents together for us to review and if interested (inaudible).”
Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked, “Where is the money (inaudible)?”

President Hebert responded, “We have an end of year budgeting process where we’ll prioritize the expenditures with end of year funds and I’m certain this will be a very (inaudible).”

Moderator Pirro noted, “I should add, by the way, that one of the Senate, (inaudible) there’s nothing, (inaudible) North Georgia said the, this is a quote now, ‘the University invested heavily in virtual teleconferencing communication software.’”

Someone unidentifiable noted that, even with alternates available, faculty should check the upcoming schedule of Senate meetings to make sure they can attend before they run for senate.

There was an inaudible exchange between Janice Stiern (CLASS) and Moderator Pirro. It may have been to do with the Moderator and the Senate President-Elect being at separate locations for teleconferenced meetings given that Fred Smith (LIB) then said, “This may be the second person we were talking about, sort of an Apprentice President, that take that role,” and Moderator Pirro said he assumed that there might be issues that will have to be worked out over the first year or two.

Ming Fang He (COE) said something inaudible to which Moderator Pirro replied, “I think there would have to be a room dedicated to this, whatever, this is not going to be (inaudible) this is why I think that in all likelihood we will probably be meeting in this larger group, I can’t think of a room that can hold all of us in rows, so anyway.”

The motion having been moved, was Approved.

    g. Motion to follow existing university policies and procedures during the development of new, consolidated faculty governance documents

The motion was moved and seconded.

Someone unidentifiable said, “I agree with the motion. (inaudible) Because I anticipate being (inaudible) college (inaudible) Bylaws. (inaudible) Election (inaudible), so it makes very good sense (inaudible).”

The motion was Approved.

   8. Unfinished Business

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked something inaudible. Associate Provost, Office of Diversity, Maxine Bryant replied that there are faculty, staff, and students from all three campuses represented.

   9. New Business
Ming Fang He (COE) asked something inaudible, but likely to do with the compensation study since Provost Cone noted that President Hebert did mention that they are sending a request to get a consultant in to do that.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked something inaudible. Moderator Pirro said it hadn’t been submitted as a motion, but she could do so for a future meeting unless she wanted to bring it forward now under New Business. Haberland’s response was inaudible. Moderator Pirro noted that whatever it was Haberland had asked about had been included in the SWOT analysis.

10. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Rob Whitaker, Vice President for Finance and Operations, said, apparently regarding campus safety and security issues, “We’ve been talking about the SWOT Analysis, and so as kind of a response and an information item to this group, faculty on the Armstrong campus, as well as (inaudible), I just wanted to give you all a little insight into some of the things we have done in the last year (inaudible). I want to try to (inaudible) on all campuses in the next few months all officers (inaudible) training (inaudible) officers are not (inaudible). Another thing we’ve done is we’ve actually (inaudible) The other thing that we are doing is we’re also going to be is (inaudible) training of officers (inaudible) take classes (inaudible) alcohol awareness (inaudible). On the Statesboro campus, (inaudible) blue lights, (inaudible) call boxes around campus (inaudible) all boxes (inaudible) technology (inaudible) working on a project (inaudible) Armstrong. On the Armstrong campus, we added 34 cameras throughout campus. We (inaudible) and then we are also working on a project (inaudible). At Liberty, the first thing that we are going to work on is a (inaudible) number of students (inaudible) that location. We also are talking to (inaudible) department, and they are also (inaudible). The last item (inaudible) donation (inaudible) our K-9 (inaudible) Georgia Southern. We have one of those right now (inaudible) We’ve been offered another donation for a police K-9 unit (inaudible).”

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked a question regarding methods for alerting the campus when a security situation arises. He seemed to suggest current methods were insufficient and/or inefficient.

VP Whitaker said “we” felt that the Eagle Alert system in place was effective.

Costomiris suggested a supplemental public address system that could warn people of the presence and whereabouts of a dangerous person would help. He did not think it was an either/or situation, either Eagle Alert or some other method.

Dustin Anderson (CLASS) asked about parking between campuses. Some Armstrong campus faculty had been ticketed for parking in spaces that they were told previously were okay.

VP Whitaker said the policy for spring semester is the same policy that we have had in place: during consolidation, faculty and staff who have a sticker for any campus can
park in any campus’s faculty and staff lots as well as student lots. Faculty who have received a ticket can resolve it by going to the parking office. He noted a webpage with all pertinent information:

https://www.georgiasouthern.edu/essential-services-information-for-all-faculty-staff/

Moderator Pirro asked whether we could have a shuttle system between campuses.

VP Whitaker said this had been discussed and was included in the SWOT analysis, but the biggest concern was “(inaudible).”

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that years ago, when the school was set to pave large portions of the campus for parking, this Senate, led by Moderator David Allen, raised a public outcry and militated for shuttle buses on campus. We were told it wouldn’t work, yet we seem to have a working shuttle system. Cyr had “absolute confidence” in VP Whitaker to figure it out.

Moderator Pirro added that it would be good for our new university to be distinguished by a “more green status,” and an inter-campus shuttle system would help reduce our carbon footprint.

VP Whitaker said this would be part of budget considerations.

11. Announcements from the Floor

None.

12. Adjournment

Moved and Approved.

Minutes submitted by Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary