FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES
September 26, 2018

Present: Nancy Remler (ex officio), CTE; Dina Walker-Devose (chair), CBSS; Allyson PruDe, CAH; Thresa Yancey, CBSS; Amy Jo Riggs, CHP; Lei Chen, CEC; Daniel Chapman, COE; Ji Wu, COSM; Lauren McMillan, LLIB; Logan Cowan, COPH;

Absent: Jackie Eastman, COBA

I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Walker DeVose called the meeting to order on Wednesday, September 26, 2018 at 10:00AM.

II. NEW BUSINESS
Dr. Walker-Devose presented the agenda items for the committee:

A. Select recipients for Development of Instruction Awards

Summary of discussion points:

Motion: Dr. Remler made a motion that the committee first examine Development of Instruction Awards. Dr. Walker-Devose seconded.
Dr. Remler noted that with only five proposals for the Development of Instruction Awards, the committee might have funds left over to apply to the Fall Travel Awards.
The motion was approved.

Motion: Dr. Walker-Devose made a motion that the committee fund or partially fund all Development of Instruction award proposals. Dr. Riggs seconded the motion. There was no discussion.
The motion was approved.

Voting members of the committee assessed the proposals according to the rubric provided by the CTE. All six proposals were funded either fully or partially. The award amounts left the committee with $3315.00 left over to apply to the Fall Faculty Travel Awards.

B. Fall Travel Awards

Motion: Dr. Walker-Devose made a motion that the committee examine award proposals according to their scores. Dr. Remler seconded.

Summary of discussion points
Dr. Walker-Devose noted that an examination of scores from lowest to highest might enable the committee to strike some proposals from consideration or decide to partially fund others. The motion was approved.

Motion: After examination of several proposals, Dr. Wu moved that the committee amend its review process: although examining lower-scored proposals might enable the committee to strike some
proposals from consideration, it might also prohibit the committee from fully funding proposals with higher scores. Dr. Remler observed that the current rubric is imperfect and should serve as a guide. Decisions should not be based on scores alone. Dr. Devose, with the assistance of other committee members totaled the amount of funds available to award. The motion was approved.

The Faculty Development Committee fully funded or partially funded 16 out of the 18 proposals for Fall Travel Awards.

III. OLD BUSINESS
A. Revision of Guidelines and Rubrics: Dr. Remler noted that she has composed a draft of a proposed new set of guidelines for the Excellence in Instruction Awards. That draft is saved in the committee’s Google folder. Drs. Walker-Devose and Riggs agreed to review the draft and give feedback before bringing the revised rubric to the full committee. Drs. Walker-Devose, Riggs and Remler agreed to schedule a meeting in the next two weeks to plan a process for update of all award guidelines and rubrics.

B. Selection of Excellence in Contribution to Instruction Awards: Dr. Remler noted that the deadline for those award applications is December 10, 2018. The committee should meet sometime in December or early January to select those award winners. Dr. Walker-Devose noted that after finals the faculty will be off contract. She advised committee members to expect to attend an award selection meeting during the second or third week of classes, spring semester.

C. Removal of Old Committee Score Sheets: Dr. Riggs stated that score sheets from last academic year are still visible in the committee’s Google folder. She recommended that those score sheets be removed for the sake of confidentiality. Dr. Remler agreed to have those score sheets removed.

IV. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, the meeting adjourned on Wednesday, September 26, 2018 at 12:00 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Nancy Remler, Director, CTE

The minutes were approved Wednesday, September 26, 2018 by the members of the Faculty Development Committee
Faculty Welfare Committee Minutes
August 20, 2018, 11:15am – 12:05pm

Present:

Statesboro Campus: Jim LoBue (COSM/OWG), Jon Hilpert (COE), Samuel Opoku (JPHCOPH), Helen Bland (JPHCOPH), Tim Cairney (COB), Clint Martin (COEC), Jamie Scalera (CBSS), Michelle Haberland (CAH) and Hans Schanz (COSM)

Armstrong Campus: Kristi Smith (LIB), Wayne Johnson (CEC), Alex Collier (COSM), Janet Bradshaw (WCHP) and Wendy Wolfe (CBSS)

Administration: Candace Griffith (Provost's Office) and Cindy Groover (Institutional Effectiveness)

Absent:
Robert Costomiris (CAH), Diana Struges (CHP), Alissa Lee (COB), LindaAnn McCall (COE)

Minutes:

Jim LoBue called the meeting to order and self-introductions of committee members present ensued. Jim introduced the four primary charges of the FWC:

1. conduct an on-going study of campus, University System of Georgia, state and national policies affecting faculty benefits and working conditions;
2. solicit suggestions and concerns related to faculty welfare from individual faculty members and groups of faculty;
3. monitor existing evaluation procedures, instruments, validity, collections and distribution of data;
4. address other specific questions in this area that may be requested by the Senate Executive Committee.

Nominations were taken Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee and Jon Hilpert was unanimously elected for 2018-2019.

An immediate task given to the FWC by Dustin Anderson (Faculty Senate President) was to:

• Review the sections such as 322.03 for updates in the Faculty Handbook. There may be additional areas that do not align with our SACACOC standards.

Candace Griffith from the Provost’s Office gave an explanation and described the interplay between published Faculty Handbook online and a list she provided of courses. Candace suggested updating and strengthening the language of course policies and requirements. Jon Hilpert said that these would be reviewed and approved by subcommittee work.

322.03 Statement on Course Requirements

• According to the Standards of the College Delegate Assembly of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, “the process of instruction should be organized so that students and faculty have a clear idea of the aims and requirements of each course and the method of evaluation employed.” In keeping with this philosophy, the Faculty Senate approved (on
June 2, 1982) a statement strongly recommending that a written description of course policies be prepared by each instructor and distributed to each class member very early in the semester.

- Faculty are traditionally granted the right to exercise a great deal of freedom in both methods of teaching and course requirements, and in the spirit of fairness to the student as well as the protection of the faculty member, a written statement might contain any or all of the following: an overview of the content to be studied; a listing of expected student learning outcomes; an explanation of test procedures; a statement of grading standards, procedures, and relative weights given to various assignments and tests; a statement of the attendance policy; and an indication of the time frame when assignments are due if specific dates are not given.

Samual Opoku suggested that the meetings should be digitally recorded on both campuses so that if audio issues prevent either groups ability to hear, then a recording could be reviewed.

Jon Hilpert suggested that the FWC should come up with a comprehensive work plan for the academic year. Items that can be considered could be SRIs and request for Faculty merit/ raises. Additionally, Jon stated that there has been a FWC subcommittee that has been set up to complete any outstanding Faculty Welfare OWG. One issue for this subcommittee with be completion of any materials related to Tenure and Promotion. Composition and purpose of the subcommittee is as follows:

- To ensure all outstanding Faculty Welfare OWG work is completed, I'm creating the following sub-committee (Jonathan Hilpert [Chair], Helen Bland, Robert Costomiris, Alex Collier, and Janet Bradshaw) to review, and, if need be, bring back a clear resolution for any unfinished or inaccurate materials relating to Tenure & Promotion. (Subcommittees are welcome to meet in whatever format will expedite their work.) We will be looking for a report, and ideally a motion request, by our October Senate meeting.

In discussion of SRIs, request were made to see both campuses current SRIs. Jon Hilpert will make a shared Google folder and populate it with pertinent documents for the FWC to review.

Jon Hilpert encouraged each college rep to solicit input from faculty of needs related to the FWC four primary charges.

Mention was made that the Provost wants to conduct faculty climate data.

Meeting was adjoined at 12:03pm.
GENERAL EDUCATION AND CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
MINUTES
General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Meeting Date – Friday, September 28, 2018

Present: Heidi Altman, CBSS; Suzy Carpenter, COSM; Finbarr Curtis, CAH; Ukpongson Favour, VP of Academic Affairs Student Government Association; Delena Gatch, Institutional Effectiveness; Susan Hendrix, CHP; Barb King, CBSS; Alisa Leckie, COE; Christine Ludowise, Office of the Provost; Clinton Martin, CEC; Samuel Opoku, CPH; Pete Rogers, CEP; Stacy Smallwood, CPH; Amy Smith, Enrollment Management; Bill Wells, COB

Guests: Teresa Flateby, Institutional Effectiveness; Jaime O'Connor, Institutional Effectiveness

Absent:* Tony Barilla (ill), COB; Michelle Cawthorn (family emergency), COSM; Daniel Czech, CHP; Amanda Konkle, CAH; Jeff Mortimore, Library; Marshall Ransom, COSM

*Two attendees attempted to join from the Armstrong campus, but were unable to connect via WebEx due to technical difficulties: Leslie Haas, Library; Marla Morris, COE

I. CALL TO ORDER
Substitute Chair Stacy Smallwood (acting on behalf of Chair Michelle Cawthorn) called the meeting to order on Friday, August 24 at 9:04 AM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Barb King made a motion to approve the agenda as written. The motion to approve the agenda was seconded by Bill Wells and passed.

III. CHAIR’S UPDATE
• In Chair Michelle Cawthorn’s absence, the committee was asked to table review of the General Education outcomes and to proceed with discussion of the Core Curriculum Assessment Rubric.

IV. NEW BUSINESS
A. No new business presented at this meeting.

V. OLD BUSINESS
A. Review Core Assessment Rubric
• Stacy Smallwood asked Delena Gatch to review significant changes in the draft of the rubric currently under review; Delena Gatch outlined the following changes:
  o Section B was changed to require a narrative explaining the connection between course content and the Area Student Learning Outcome as suggested by Finbarr Curtis
  o “Targets” section of the previous rubric was removed and embedded into Section F Discussion where it will have more meaning in the context of the overall assessment
  o Section G Action Plans was previously one section but was divided into two sections to allow for past reflection as well as planned future interventions
• Stacy Smallwood opened the floor for discussion of the rubric
• Suzy Carpenter raised the point that in Sections E and F, it was difficult to differentiate between the description of level 3 – acceptable and level 4 – exemplary
  o Delena Gatch explained that the levels of the rubric were additive and briefly explained the additional expectations for an exemplary rating, which included tracking results by year, pointing out trends, analyzing and addressing inter-rater reliability
• Suzy Carpenter raised the point that there was no clear indication in the rubric in Section F Discussion whether results were to be presented by location or aggregated and asked if that was something significant that should be included in the rubric
  o Delena Gatch explained that SACSCOC does require results by location with the goal of ensuring equivalent learning across locations
  o Christine Ludowise stated that if the intention was for results to be presented by location and then overall, the rubric required clarification
Stacy Smallwood asked what information is given to people prior to reviewing a report; Delena Gatch responded that report reviewers have the report template and rubric and that there is also a training session for reviewers; she sent notification to all Chairs, Deans, and Associate Deans to notify them of the courses in their areas that are part of the core curriculum including the report template so that these expectations can be made clear in advance.

Pete Rogers asked how the core courses are determined, if that is by department or by overall mapping; Delena Gatch replied that the core courses are identified on an overall map and that those teaching the courses are notified which Area Student Learning Outcome will be assessed based on their courses.

Leslie Haas and Marla Morris submitted a comment by email since they were unable to connect to the WebEx meeting from the Armstrong location. They pointed out that in the general education competencies there was an emphasis on science and there was no specific item for the humanities. They suggested broadening the description of information literacy to include different types of literacies. Stacy Smallwood acknowledged the point and reminded the committee that the discussion of the general education competencies had been tabled and will be included on future agendas. Jaime O’Connor preserved this comment for the record and for future consideration.

Barb King raised a question about the description for Section Di. Assessment Methods I Level 3 Acceptable regarding the expectation for objective test blueprints and item analyses. She asked what resources or training might be available in that regard.

Delena Gatch stated that there is software available in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and within all departments that would enable faculty to conduct an item analysis on objective tests. Office of Institutional Effectiveness offers support and workshops on these tools and processes, the most recent one having taken place on Tuesday in Statesboro.

Pete Rogers mentioned that for a first time reviewer, the amount of detail in certain categories of the rubric could be difficult to interpret. Criteria for Level 2 Developing and Level 4 Exemplary were clear, but for Level 3 Acceptable there were multiple bullet points.

Delena Gatch explained that part of the reason for the level of specificity was that the rubric was developed for two purposes – for scoring and also for educating those writing and reviewing reports. The calibration training for reviewers clarifies the application of the rubric.

Stacy Smallwood concurred that the norming process is instrumental in clarifying the rubric and that although reviewers may interpret criteria differently, there are processes in place that help reviewers to arrive at a consensus on criteria scoring.

Delena Gatch asked to revisit the point raised about clarifying the requirement for results to be presented by location and how the committee preferred to proceed on that recommendation.

Bill Wells stated that he did not think differentiating locations needed to be included in the rubric but should be an operational consideration and suggested a footnote to the rubric.

Chris Ludowise stated that there needed to be clarification of the expectation to report on individual campuses, including Section G Action Plans.

Heidi Altman suggested the inclusion of an instruction sheet that would highlight that requirement to be included with the rubric.

Chris Ludowise questioned whether the expectation for reporting on multiple locations should be in the rubric or if it should be instructional.

Bill Wells stated that including the multiple location reporting expectation in the rubric could give campuses the impression that they are assessing from different perspectives; including an instructional attachment or paragraph could emphasize that everyone should be assessing with the same critical eye regardless of campus location.

Finbarr Curtis suggested that the requirement should be incorporated into the rubric to ensure accountability.

Bill Wells stated that reviewers should not be responsible for policing the process and asked who would be responsible for enforcing this expectation.

Delena Gatch replied that a reviewer might not know where a specific course was offered, but that the Office of Institutional Effectiveness conducts a preliminary check to make sure all campuses are included; this would be a single report, but with results broken out by campus.
Bill Wells asked if one reviewer would look at results from all campuses, and Delena Gatch responded affirmatively.

Finbarr Curtis suggested a bullet point in Section D1 that would ask if all campuses are included; Chris Ludowise suggested that a statement be included in the report narrative that would state which campuses are included in the report.

Bill Wells asked who would enforce the requirement; Chris Ludowise stated that Office of Institutional Effectiveness and the Provost would review but that more effective feedback would come from the peer reviewers.

- Heidi Altman stated that in the program review process it is very clear that information is to be presented by campus.
- Finbarr Curtis pointed out that this could be a binary item; departments either do it or they don’t.
  - Stacy Smallwood mentioned that the previous rubric included yes/no items and asked if that could be helpful for this concern.
  - Delena Gatch offered that a bullet point could be added to applicable items as a yes/no response to reporting by location and across modes of instruction.
  - Suzy Carpenter concurred that the bullet point explanation would be helpful, keeping in mind that one purpose of the rubric is to inform.
  - Finbarr Curtis asked if the bullet point would be required on all items and suggested that it may not be necessary in Section C and D.

- Samuel Opoku suggested that a better strategy might be to include an item at the beginning of the rubric asking whether all locations have been addressed to improve the quality of the report prior to the review. He recommended adding this item in the system to prevent reviewers from going further if this initial condition had not been met.
  - Delena Gatch replied that the institution is making a software transition, and she does not know if the system can function in the way Samuel described.
  - Bill Wells agreed that putting an item at the beginning would save time for reporters and reviewers since that omission might not be caught until later in the report; suggested to add an item to Section B requiring identification of campuses in the early part of the report.

- Clinton Martin asked about the implications of not meeting the expectation of reporting by campus. Would reports be rejected or would scores be lower? Would this justify its own category that would impact the overall score?
  - Bill Wells stated that rejecting the report would present a stronger stance on the expectation.
  - Finbarr Curtis mentioned that a report could handle the presentation by campus inconsistently; perhaps be very thorough on one campus and then resort to copying and pasting instead of treating all campuses with equal attention. He questioned the significance of this inconsistency in terms of the report evaluation.
  - Chris Ludowise stated that she agreed with many of the points being raised and reminded the committee that this is a new process for a large proportion of the faculty. She advocated for erring on the side of being more descriptive, especially since this process is substantially different from what has been done previously.
  - Bill Wells asked how SACSCOC would respond to this expectation and concurred that it would be better to be descriptive now.
  - Samuel Opoku concurred that it is important to set a minimum expectation and stated that it would emphasize that the process will be helpful and beneficial.
  - Chris Ludowise pointed out that lack of clarity regarding assessment expectations in the past was a point of frustration and contention and encouraged clarity and specificity.
  - Terri Flateby added that there is an opportunity during training to not only...
clarify the expectation, but to explain the reasons behind it. This reflects the hallmark of SACSCOC going forward. It can be emphasized and elaborated on in training

- Delena Gatch agreed that the discussion would be beneficial, but also thinks it is important to capture the expectation in the rubric
- Delena Gatch asked how the committee would like to proceed with making revisions to the rubric to reflect this discussion. The committee agreed that Delena Gatch should work with Chair Michelle Cawthorn to develop options for including campuses in the rubric. Delena Gatch asked if a version could be circulated to the committee prior to the next meeting to ensure that all training materials are up-to-date before report review training takes place. The committee agreed to review and approve via email.
- Stacy Smallwood stated that anyone wishing to make suggestions or contribute to the process should contact Delena Gatch or Chair Michelle Cawthorn.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Delena Gatch reminded the committee that notifications have gone out regarding the submission deadline prior to February 1. Departments are expected to submit assessment plans that include unified cycles across campuses with Assessment Rubric Sections A-D completed.

B. Ukpongson Favour, Vice President of Academic Affairs Student Government Association representative introduced herself to the committee and thanked everyone for including her in the meeting.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on September 28, 2018 at 9:49 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jaime O'Connor, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved 10.5.2018 by electronic vote of Committee Members
GRADUATE COMMITTEE MINUTES
Graduate Committee Meeting Date – September 13, 2018

Present: Dr. Marcel Ilie, CEC; Dr. Jennifer Kowalewski, CAH; Dr. Richard Flynn, CAH; Dr. Ted Brimeyer, CBSS; Dr. Stephanie Sipe, COB; Dr. Constantin Ogloblin, COB; Dr. Meca Williams-Johnson, COE; Dr. Alma Stevenson, COE; Dr. Andrew Hansen, JPHCOPH; Dr. Julie Reagan, JPHCOPH; Dr. Gina Crabb, WCHP; Dr. Brandonn Harris, WCHP; Mrs. Lori Gwinett, Library; Mrs. Nikki Cannon-Rech, Library; Dr. Checo Colon Gaud, [Alternate] COSM

Guests: Ms. Candace Griffith, VPAA; Mrs. Cindy Groover, Institutional Effectiveness; Dr. Ashley Walker, COGS; Mrs. Audie Graham, COGS; Mrs. Naronda Wright, COGS; Mrs. Wendy Sikora, COGS; Mrs. McKenzie Peterman, COGS; Ms. Randi Sykora-McCurdy, COGS; Mrs. Caroline James, COGS; Ms. Doris Mack, Registrar’s Office; Mr. Matthew Miceli, GSO Representative; Dr. Tracy Linderholm, COE; Dr. Stephen Rossi, WCHP; Dr. Brian Koehler, COSM; Dr. Lance McBryar, COSM; Dr. Rand Ressler, COB; Dr. Jolyon Hughes, CAH; Dr. Brenda Blackwell, CBSS

Absent: Dr. Rocio Albra-Flores, CEC; Dr. Chad Posick, CBSS; Dr. Shijun Zheng, COSM; Dr. Michele McGibony, COSM

I. CALL TO ORDER
Mrs. Audie Graham called the meeting to order on Thursday, September 13, 2018 at 9:04 AM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Dr. Meca Williams-Johnson made a motion to approve the agenda as written. A second was made by Dr. Richard Flynn and the motion to approve the agenda was passed.

III. ELECTION OF GRADUATE COMMITTEE CHAIR
Mrs. Graham asked for nominations for the election of the 2018-2019 Graduate Committee Chair. Dr. Williams-Johnson nominated Dr. Brandonn Harris to serve as Chair, and a second was made by Dr. Flynn. No other nominations were made. With no objections, the committee approved to elect Dr. Harris to serve as Chair for the 2018-2019 Graduate Committee meetings.

IV. DIRECTOR’S UPDATE
Dr. Ashley Walker shared the following updates:
- The Graduate Student Organization now has two councils, one on the Statesboro campus and the other on the Armstrong campus. Each council has its own faculty advisor: Statesboro Campus - Dr. Thresa Yancey, tyancey@georgiasouthern.edu; Armstrong Campus - Dr. Dziyana Nazaruk, dnazaruk@georgiasouthern.edu. Both GSO councils will be awarding travel and research grants. The fall deadlines are September 17 and November 15, and the spring deadlines are February 15 and April 1. COGS will be sending emails reminders to students. Please encourage your students to apply. Maximum travel grant is $625 (Masters candidates) or $850 (Doctoral and Specialist candidates); and Maximum research grant is $850 (Masters candidates) or $1,000 (Doctoral and Specialist candidates). The Graduate Student Organization will be hosting their annual Homecoming Tailgate for graduate students and graduate faculty on Saturday, October 6, 2018. COGS will be sending an email out to students with details. Students are asked to bring their Eagle ID.
- The Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) and the College of Graduate Studies will continue to offer the Graduate Writer’s Boot Camps this fall semester. Lunch and swag items will be provided by COGS and the Graduate Student Organization. The Graduate Writer's Boot Camps will be held on the following Saturdays: September 29, October 20, and November 10. They will be scheduled from 9:30 AM – 4:15 PM. Students must register in order to attend. COGS will be sending email reminders to graduate students related to these events. For more information, contact Linda Baffo at lb05279@georgiasouthern.edu.
Dr. Checo Colon Gaud asked for clarification on the GSO budget, now that there are two councils. Dr. Walker stated this fiscal year the two councils will operate with separate budgets, and each council received the same funding as they did the previous year. Mrs. Graham is maintaining both budgets.

Dr. Williams-Johnson asked who reviews the GSO grant proposals. Dr. Walker said the GSO council reviews them and each council will review their own campus submissions, and it is a blind review process.

Dr. Lance McBrayer asked what the rationale is for the grant award amount being less for Masters candidates. Dr. Walker said the GSO sets the award levels and a request can be brought to the council for review of the funding level.

V. APPROVAL OF 2018-2019 GRADUATE COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE

Dr. Ted Brimeyer made a motion to approve the 2018-2019 Graduate Committee meeting schedule. A second was made by Dr. Constantin Ogloblin and the motion to approve the schedule was passed.

There was a brief discussion of how agenda items would be handled if a meeting had to be cancelled due to inclement weather. Mrs. Graham explained that she will send an email to notify everyone if a meeting is cancelled due to a period of university closure. The meeting will be rescheduled, if needed, or the agenda items will be moved to the next scheduled meeting.

There was a question of what the deadline is to defend a comprehensive exam. Dr. Walker stated the deadline is listed on the academic calendar.

Dr. Harris said in the past if a meeting had to be rescheduled we have been able to postpone deadlines of when curriculum items are due.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies
   Dr. Walker presented the information item for the Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies.
   Information Item:
   Enrollment Management Council Meetings

Dr. Walker reviewed the meeting schedule for the 2018-2019 Enrollment Management Council (EMC). The membership list below was sent from Mrs. Ava Percell. Dr. Walker stated some of the names and titles of the council members have changed. The EMC handouts that were distributed during the meeting are below.

Georgia Southern University
Enrollment Management Council
Remaining 2018-2019 Meetings

Note: Meetings are scheduled every first Friday from 10:00 AM – 12 PM, and they alternate between Statesboro and Armstrong Campuses.

October 5, 2018 – Location: Statesboro Campus, Williams Center Conference Room
November 2, 2018 – Location: Armstrong Campus, TBD
December 7, 2018 – Location: Statesboro Campus, TBD
January 4, 2019 – Location: Armstrong Campus, TBD
February 1, 2019 – Location: Statesboro Campus, TBD
March 1, 2019 – Location: Armstrong Campus, TBD
April 5, 2019 – Location: Statesboro Campus, TBD
May 3, 2019 – Location: Armstrong Campus, TBD
June 7, 2019 – Location: Statesboro Campus, TBD
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ballagh, Amy</td>
<td>Interim VP, Enrollment Management</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bluetreich, Peter</td>
<td>Executive Director, University Housing</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringman, David</td>
<td>Chair, Armstrong Faculty Senate</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burden, Velma</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camacho, Holley</td>
<td>Associate Director, Strategic Research &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caplingter, Chris</td>
<td>Director, First Year Experience</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cone, Diana</td>
<td>Interim Provost</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis, Chris</td>
<td>Vice President, Armstrong &amp; Liberty Campus Operations</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daCruz, Becky</td>
<td>Interim Associate Provost for Student Engagement &amp; Success</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dies, Andrew</td>
<td>Interim Assistant VP/Dean of Students-Armstrong</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durden, Cindy</td>
<td>Director, Bursar's Office</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frierson, Tobe</td>
<td>Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutto, Samantha</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Financial Aid</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janney, Justin</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Finance</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempson, Dorothy</td>
<td>Director, Liberty Campus</td>
<td>Hinesville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerner, Patrice</td>
<td>Project Coordinator, Office of VP for Armstrong &amp; Liberty Campus Operations</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, Georj</td>
<td>Vice President, Student Affairs</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ludowise, Christine</td>
<td>Associate Provost</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mills, Laura</td>
<td>Director, Strategic Research &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mingo, Tracey</td>
<td>Director, Financial Aid</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody, Tim</td>
<td>Chief Information Officer-Armstrong</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nivens, Delana</td>
<td>Dean, College of Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts-Cooper, Cathy</td>
<td>Director, Academic Success Center</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrader, Nick</td>
<td>Director, University Housing-Armstrong</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Amy</td>
<td>Director, Undergraduate Admissions</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Sarah</td>
<td>Executive Assistant, Strategic Reporting, Admissions</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern, Jan</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Marketing</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor, Mark</td>
<td>Director, Academic Advising and Support</td>
<td>Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Kim</td>
<td>Associate Vice President, Operations</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker, Ashley</td>
<td>Director, Graduate Studies</td>
<td>Statesboro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dr. Walker said there are currently nine graduate programs listed in the graduate catalog that have full time enrollment status different than the nine credit hours. Dr. Walker reminded programs moving forward for the 2019-2020 academic year, they will need to submit a new proposal to request approval to continue the full time exception. The programs will have to receive approval from the EMC before the item can be reviewed by the Graduate Committee.

Dr. Williams-Johnson thanked Dr. Walker for sharing the information with the committee. She said she appreciates the transparency.

Dr. Flynn asked Dr. Walker if the committee could receive a copy of the revised EMC membership list. Dr. Walker said she would request a revised copy from Dr. Amy Ballagh and Mrs. Percell.

B. Comprehensive Program Reviews – Candace Griffith
Ms. Griffith stated the Graduate Committee has five programs to review. She said the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has purchased Campus Labs to operate in concert with Compliance Assist. The program reviews will now be put into Campus Labs, in a program review module. There will be some training provided to the program, Department Chairs, and Deans to facilitate the review. Ms. Griffith will eventually need the names of two or three reviewers for each program from the Graduate Committee. The committee members will also need to complete the training in order to conduct the program reviews. Ms. Griffith will receive program reviews February 1, and the information will be shared with the Graduate Committee. The committee will have February and March to review and will report out during the April meeting. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will provide training for Campus Labs January and rubric training in February.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Discussion of issues related to ongoing assessment of alumni – Dr. Walker said Mrs. Megan Murray will ask Campus Management if there is a way to reach out to alumni. Career Services conducts a survey specific to job placement. Dr. Walker is scheduled to meet with them in a couple of weeks, and she will see what information Career Services has available that programs may be able to use.

B. Prior Learning Assessment Update – Dr. Tracy Linderholm stated when this policy was developed it allowed for six credit hours of PLA, to be aligned with the transfer credit policy. Dr. Linderholm asked if this policy could be revised to increase the PLA hours to nine since the transfer credit policy is now nine credits. Dr. Flynn stated the policy change would have to be approved by Graduate Committee and the Faculty Senate. Dr. Walker suggested that Dr. Linderholm submit a recommendation to change the policy. Dr. Linderholm said she will bring this forward at the next meeting.

Dr. Linderholm said the College of Education pilot tested the PLA program this summer, and they now have one person who was awarded K credit. It was a program decision, and they decided that two courses would qualify for PLA. The program developed assessments, study guides, and deadlines. The person who participated in the program will begin the Master’s program in the spring. Dr. Linderholm said she thinks this could be an effective recruitment tool.

Dr. Walker said there is a PLA form on the College of Graduate Studies website page, [https://cogs.georgiasouthern.edu/students/forms/](https://cogs.georgiasouthern.edu/students/forms/). She encouraged people to contact Dr. Linderholm or Dr. Alisa Leckie if they are interested in learning more about the PLA program. Dr. Linderholm will email Mrs. Graham the link with their program’s PLA information.

Dr. Walker said there was a fee attached to the initial PLA proposal, but the proposed fee was not approved.

C. Registrar’s Update – Ms. Doris Mack said the Registrar’s Office has almost finished the catalog. Today they will submit a request to CourseLeaf for them to upload the link. Once the information is live their office will send an email out asking people to review the information for edits. The Registrar’s Office will allow everyone a week to review the catalog information. Ms. Mack said they will only update items that have been approved. The Curriculum Inventory Management (CIM) training was scheduled to take place this week, but CourseLeaf cancelled due to inclement weather. They are hoping to reschedule the training on the following dates: September 25 (Statesboro campus) and September 26 (Armstrong campus). A webinar will be available for people who are unable to attend on those training dates. Details on the trainings will be sent out within the next week.
The Registrar’s Office has sent a spreadsheet to Associate Deans to request roles in CIM. The information will then be loaded into CIM, so that people will have CIM access. Dr. Linderholm asked if people could be added into the workflow at a later date, and Ms. Mack said yes.

Dr. Harris asked what programs should do if they are ready to submit curriculum changes. He asked if people should complete the old paper documents. Ms. Mack said they are hoping to have the CIM forms available next week, and she suggested that programs wait to enter the curriculum into CIM instead of filling out the paper forms.

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS — Dr. Harris asked everyone to be mindful of the due dates for curriculum and business items. Dr. Harris expressed gratitude for the work Dr. Dustin Anderson has done in the past when serving as the Chair of the Graduate Committee. Dr. Harris stated he plans to continue to have the committee function efficiently, and said he appreciates the opportunity to continue to work with the committee.

Mrs. Graham stated September 20 is the deadline to submit curriculum items to the Registrar’s Office for the October meeting. She asked Ms. Mack how this will be handled since CIM is currently unavailable. Ms. Mack said the Registrar’s Office will have to extend the deadline. The Registrar’s Office will notify everyone once the deadlines are revised.

Dr. Flynn asked what the deadline is to submit business items to be included on agendas. Mrs. Graham said non-curriculum items can be emailed directly to her at least two weeks prior to the committee meeting.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on September 13, 2018 at 9:42 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Audie Graham, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved September 25, 2018
by electronic vote of Committee Members
Present: Stephanie Jones; College of Education; Kristi Smith, Lane Library; Christian Hanna, Waters College of Health Professionals; Donna Mullenax, College of Science & Mathematics; Alissa Lee, College of Business; Natalie James, College of Arts & Humanities; Meghan Dove, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences; W. Bede Mitchell, Dean of the GS Libraries; Quentin Fang, College of Science & Mathematics; Ruth Whitworth, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health; John R. O'Malley, College of Engineering & Computing; Ruth Whitworth, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health

Guests: Douglas Frazier, Director of Lane Library & Associate Dean of the GS Libraries; Ann Fuller, Head of Circulation & ILL Lane Library; Debra Skinner; Head of Collection & Resources Services Henderson Library; David Lowder; Head of Library Systems and Technologies Henderson Library; Leslie Hass; Head of Research Services Henderson Library; Jeff Mortimore; Discovery Services Librarian Henderson Library; Jessica Minihan; Continuing Resources Librarian Henderson Library; Megan Bouchillon, Marketing Specialist Marketing & Communications Department of GS; Rebecca Hunnicutt, Temporary Catalog Metadata Librarian Henderson Library.

Absent: All members were present.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Stephanie Jones called the meeting to order on Monday, September 17th at 2:00PM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Stephanie Jones made a motion to approve the agenda as written. All were in favor and the motion to approve the agenda passed.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. GS Libraries Marketing Plan Presentation

Dr. Mitchell recognized the Library Faculty Senate Committee members’ desire to help with promoting the libraries to faculty colleagues, students and others with information about library services, library resources, and new policy changes. Dr. Mitchell wanted to share with the committee the ongoing efforts the library makes in these areas. Dr. Mitchell shared with the committee members a handout on the rollout process for new, updated, and cancelled resources created by Jeff Mortimore.

Dr. Mitchell then introduced Megan Bouchillon from the Marketing & Communications Department. Megan presented a first draft marketing plan of strategies to bring to the attention of students and faculty general awareness of the two GS Libraries to all three campuses.

a. First Theme; “I am the Creative Force of My Success”; the idea is to let the student know that they have what it takes to succeed and the libraries are here to help with resources.

b. Second theme; “Did You know...”; pop-up themes that will “pop-up” around campus throughout the semester, highlighting resources at the libraries that students and faculty might have not known were available, with related art work.

c. Third Theme; “The Time is Now...”; indicate what things the libraries can help them with right now such as “the time is now to write you best paper”, etc.

d. Fourth Theme “I ♥ the Library”; have student create hashtags with why they love the libraries, have promotional “I ♥ the Library” t-shirts, and ads with students stating why they love the libraries.

Megan then opened the floor for questions, suggestions and comments. Dr. Stephanie Jones asked how the messages were going to be disseminated. Megan stated that she has put together a campaign plan. The distribution will depend on the theme chosen and the target audience. The campaign could include online marketing, sharing on the Georgia Southern social media platforms, (for example if the Libraries’ have a Facebook page, they would share from the Georgia Southern page to drive traffic to the Libraries’ page), and creating an extension Facebook page for Faculty highlighting what resources are available for faculty. The campaign could also include paid advertising, website improvements,
advertising on and off campuses with student organizations, themed videos, and themed email ads, putting out a cohesive and recognizable theme to all the students. There is a long list of possible options open to the libraries and it can be worked out to fit with their needs and budget.

Natalie James noted that the first theme was eye catching but the samples presented did not make it immediately clear that this was related to the GS Libraries. She liked the second the theme because it indicated clearly that is was about the GS Libraries. She feels it is important to make sure the themes' relation to the Libraries is clear. She would also like to see an emphasis on the newness of both the consolidation of the libraries and the resources that are continually updated and obtained. A few other members also preferred the second theme and felt it would relate well to both students and staff. Some members liked the first theme for incoming freshmen.

The question was asked who would be in charge of coming up with the “Do You Know” topics. Dr. Mitchell stated that there is a bottomless well of possibilities for this theme. He asked how quickly each “Did You Know” could be developed and what would the rate of turnover be. He would also like to develop enough of them to put in rotation, since every few months we have new students and faculty come onto the campuses. Megan stated that a good place to start would be to develop a list of what the GS Libraries presently have that they would like to highlight right now, including what they believed most people did not know and new resources that the Libraries have. She also stated that they could work in phases, coming back to review every six months and see what is working and what is not. She also suggested that within these phases items of the campaign should change, for example the color scheme, so that the target audience’s attention is kept. She would also like everyone to consider how the effectiveness of the campaign is to be evaluated.

Dr. Mitchell suggested that Megan and her associates have created a set of official GS Libraries nameplates; a general GS Libraries nameplate, and two specific to Henderson and Lane. Megan acknowledged that all of the advertising would be addressed in a way to identify the libraries and include these nameplates as well somewhere in the advertisement. The themes presented are simply rough drafts.

Dr. Mitchell suggested that a next step would be for the libraries’ faculty to provide Megan a list of things to promote under the “Do You Know’ theme. Then the marketing teams can draft up some examples of what the advisements would look like using those items. Megan agreed.

B. Suggestions for Outreach to Faculty
Presently the libraries have a program assigning each librarian liaison responsibilities with particular academics units. The library liaisons reach out to the faculty of those units, introduce themselves, and find out what the faculty needs and are and how the libraries can assist them. However, the libraries are having issues getting the word out to faculty on new resources. The main means of sending out announcements is through email on GSFAC. There are faculty who do not read emails from GSFAC. Sometimes Dr. Mitchell will distribute important information to the deans and have them send it through the college specific listservs. Dr. Mitchell asked for suggestions on getting the word out to faculty about the Library resources.

Some of the members like the idea of sending the information through the deans. Another good option mentioned was to have the library liaisons send out the information from their email address, since the liaisons have a rapport with the individual college faculties. The importance of having the liaisons attend one or two faculty meetings of the colleges was also suggested so that faculty could put a face with the name. Another alternative to GSFAC was for email announcements to be college specific. For example an email with a title of “New Library resources for the College of Art and Humanities”.

Other suggestions were:
1. Providing options for the faculty to have their students do work at the library utilizing the resources that they did not have available at the colleges.

2. Have the liaisons attend the semester’s first faculty meetings and make a small presentation about the resources available. Dean Mitchell noted that they do try but sometimes the agendas are too full and they are denied. The librarians do participation in the new faculty orientations and have them meet their liaisons.

C. New, Updated, and Cancelled Resources Handout

Dr. Mitchell asked for suggestions regarding the new, updated, and cancelled resources roll out procedures provided by Jeff Mortimore in the handout. A clarification of the abbreviation C&RS (Collection & Resources Services) was given. Another member noted that she did not know there was a blog. Dr. Mitchell stated that most people do not go to the library webpage unless they need to look up something.

Jeff Mortimore outlined the goals of the roll out process:

1. As C&RS becomes aware of changes, updates and cancellations of databases and other resources that liaisons are promptly notified so that they can then reach out to their liaisons areas and communicate that information.
2. The blog posts and the GSFAC listserv are important to provide a communication of record. GSFAC insures that every faculty member has had at least one email informing them of changes while the blogpost records a public communication record.

Dr. Fang noted that even if students and faculty do not physically come to the library they are utilizing the online resources that are provided by the GS libraries. This is especially true of graduate students. He feels this is a major important resource provided by the GS libraries.

D. GS Libraries Budget

Dr. Mitchell shared with the members a handout which was primarily based on Henderson Library’s allocations and expenditures from FY18. He wanted them to get a basic idea of how the libraries’ budget tends to be divided up. There are some important and significant changes to the FY19 budget. Henderson and Lane Libraries budgets are now consolidated. The total budgetary allocation for FY19 (not including foundation account dollars) is almost 6.8 million dollars. Of that amount 4.5 million dollars is for salaries, benefits and student wages. 10% is for general operation expenses. 23% of the budget is for library collections (purchases and subscriptions). That is about 1.6 million dollars. However, last year we spent more than 3.4 million dollars on information resources. This is closer to the actual cost of the subscription and purchase commitments that the libraries presently have. In order to meet those commitments we were given approximately 1.5 million dollars in year-end funding. Two thirds to three fourths of the libraries overall expenditures goes to subscriptions of various types (periodicals, electronic databases, and full text resources). The prices of these resources increase at a minimum rate of about 6% annually.

In order to try meet the doctoral research needs of a university such as Georgia Southern University the GS Libraries have had to spend more money than allocated. At the end of the fiscal year Georgia Southern University makes up the difference with end of year funding. Many universities and their libraries operate this way because of the way subscription prices continue to rise. This model however is not sustainable over a long period of time. A point will be reached where the amount of year-end funding available will not be sufficient to cover costs. When that happens the GS Libraries will have to reduce some of its commitments. This is difficult to do. Many of the subscriptions are parts of packages. There are instances where the majority of the use can be attributed to two or three titles in the package. Canceling the database and subscribing to just the titles in use more often than not costs more. In preparation for the time when subscription cuts are unavoidable, we continually review overall usage of our databases and calculate the cost per transaction. If such costs for a particular database or electronic journal title exceed $30 per transaction, which is the processing and staff cost of obtaining a desired article through interlibrary loan, then the database or electronic journal subscription will undergo careful scrutiny for possible elimination.

It is very difficult to predict how much year-end funding will be available from year to year. This then makes it difficult to be strategic in spending. This causes frustrations when new faculty are hired and are needing new resources for new courses. The GS Libraries do not receive new funding when new courses are added. Usually the only way to purchase new resources is to cut resources elsewhere. But
what the requesting department thinks could be cut may be an essential resource for another
department. When the time comes to reduce expenses, the Faculty Senate Library Committee
members’ advisement will be important.

Dr. Stephanie Jones asked about the line in the budget report reflecting online funds. She asked if this
amount of money allocated was increasing as more students are taking online classes. Dr. Mitchell
explained that while those lines appear in the budget for FY18, these lines are actually not available in
FY19. The lines labeled graduate online and the undergraduate online tuition lines have been
eliminated in the FY19 budget. This is the result of the student fee review required by the Board of
Regents. The Board of Regents did an audit on the fees being charged to online students. Many years
ago when these fees were approved for online classes, the provost at the time allocated a certain
amount for the library’s online resources since they are critically important to online students. For FY19
these funds have been taken away. As a result the libraries’ combined budget for FY19 is less than it
would have been had the libraries’ budget of Lane Library and Henderson Library been combined at the
amounts allocated to each library in FY18.

Dr. Mitchell asked if there any other questions, comments, or other business. There was none.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. The next Faculty Senate Library Committee Meeting was set tentatively for Monday, October
8th, 2018 at 2:00PM.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on Monday, September 17th, 2018 at 2:53PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lizette Cruz, Recording Coordinator