

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

3-6-2018

Faculty Senate Minutes

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

"Faculty Senate Minutes" (2018). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 42.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/42>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

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

Voting members in attendance: Cheryl Aasheim; Sam Adeyeye; Rocio Alba-Flores; Heidi Altman; Dustin Anderson; Helen Bland; Christopher Brown; Robert Costomiris; Finbarr Curtis; Marc Cyr; Megan Dove; Michelle Haberland; Alice Hall; Chuck Harter; Allen Henderson for Jorge Suazo; Jonathan Hilpert; Lucas Jensen for Mete Akacoglu; Drew Keane; Mujibur Khan; Barbara King; Jennifer Kowalewski; Hsiang-Jui Kung; Ron MacKinnon; Leticia McGrath; Nicholas Newel for Janice Steirn; Samuel Opoku for Moya Alfonso; Robert Pirro; Marshall Ransom; Hans Jeorg-Schanz; Stephanie Sipe; Fred Smith; Alma Stevenson for Meca Williams-Johnson; Marian Tabi; Linda Thompson; Mark Welford; Hayden Wimmer; Shijun Zheng

Voting members not in attendance: Evans Afriyie-Gyawu; Dragos Amarie; Kelly Berry; Adam Bossler; Ted Brimeyer; Gavin Colquitt; Lisa Denmark; Anoop Desai; Mark Edwards; Ming Fang He; Bob Jackson; Eric Landers; Alisa Leckie; Lili Li; Li Li; Yi Lin; Li Ma; Santanu Majumdar; Ed Mondor; Constantin Ogloblin; Peter Rogers; Ed Rushton; Jake Simons; Chasen Smith; Tharanga Wickramarachchi

Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy
SGA: Grantson Martin

Administrators: Jaimie Hebert; Amy Heaston; Rob Whitaker

Visitors: Kelly Boswell; Rochelle Cote; Candace Griffith; Joshua Kies; Olga Amarie; Terri Flateby; Maura Copeland; Jim LoBue; Michelle Cawthorn

-
1. Approval of the Agenda for the February 7, 2018 meeting.

Moved, seconded, and Approved.

2. Approval of the February 7, 2018 minutes: Marc Cyr (CAH), Senate Secretary.

Moved, seconded, and Approved.

3. Librarian's Reports for March 6, 2018: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian.

Welford Moved approval, it was seconded, Moderator Pirro reminded Senators that the vote would approve the report for accuracy, and the report was Approved.

- a. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee: Fred Smith (Henderson Library)

Michelle Cawthorn (COSM), Chair, being absent, Smith moved Approval, this was seconded, and the report was Approved.

- b. Graduate Committee Report: Dustin Anderson (CAH), Chair:

The Graduate Committee met primarily over some updates that were made to the Handbook. A small committee of Dr. Patricia Holt and Joey Crosby from Armstrong, Anderson himself, and Ashley Walker from the Statesboro campus worked through the Handbook to make sure that all of the policies are aligned and consistent. There were changes, mostly just clarifications, to full-time credit hour status, certificate programs, transfer credit, graduate assistantships, academic dismissal, repeating core courses and reinstatement. The report was moved, seconded, and Approved.

Moderator Pirro (CBSS) introduced Jim LoBue (COSM), chair of the GSU Welfare Committee and co-chair of the Welfare OWG as well. They had been working on the University level language around tenure and promotion for the new consolidated institution and had submitted a report.

- c. Faculty Welfare Committee Report: Jim LoBue (COSM), Chair:

LoBue didn't think that a blow by blow of all of the changes would be appropriate but was prepared to answer any questions. He noted that, because the Handbook can be changed, while they tried to be comprehensive, they did not seek perfection, so it was not a perfect proposal.

Moderator Pirro asked if the language had been taken mostly from our Handbook, and Lobue said that was correct. There was some updating, especially as regards lecturers; one entire section on the first page was eliminated; and there was one entire new section in the report in 2xx, somewhere in the middle of promotion or evaluation of faculty or tenure-promotion guidelines, that deals with extending the lecturer and tenure timelines. The major change was the suggestion that the sixth-year evaluation of a lecturer is not an up or out process, that there are three possibilities: you can be promoted at that stage, or retained but not promoted, or terminated.

Lobue confirmed Moderator Pirro's statement that the Faculty Welfare Committee had voted to approve this proposal. He added that because they had not been sure how advisement stood on all campuses, there might need to be revisions to have advisement still count towards service.

A motion to approve was put forward and seconded. Moderator Pirro said, "All those in favor of approving the Faculty Welfare Committee report from Jim Lobue, please say aye. Any opposed? Okay, that report is accepted."

4. President's Report: President Jaimie Hebert:

Provost's Search

We had come to an agreement on all terms to be included in the offer letter, and he expected "to have that signed offer letter any moment or day now. And in fact I just reviewed a draft of the announcement that will be going out as soon as I receive that letter. So we have completed that process for all practical purposes, except for the formal announcement." He noted that the candidate insisted on rank and tenure, and insisted on our bringing his laboratory over so that he could bring his NSF grants with him; this told the President that he is a bona fide academic and that is extremely important for us as a university.

Strategic Plan

The committee had met and been charged. He had asked them to, before June, come up with four or five strategic priorities so that we can have open forums and discussions amongst all of our constituencies on our campuses so we can start developing goals within each of those priorities. In June, he wants to charge the Vice Presidents with writing their operational plans for the forthcoming year within that framework. And that will begin a strategic planning process that brings strategic priorities to operations on an annual basis, and which will tie in to our budget request in the forthcoming year.

Eagle Week

Eagle Week for faculty and staff was underway. This was an effort by the institution to provide information for faculty and staff and provide opportunities for socialization. He said to look for "phase 2 of this implementation process. We had a really nice coffee this morning, fairly good turnout, and people are thinking positively in a positive direction as we are moving on with this." The week after spring break would be Eagle Week for students to help them understand the advising and registration processes on our campuses.

Regional Academic Plan

He had had the flu at the time, but two weeks prior our deans and several cabinet members presented the Regional Academic Plan to the System office as agreed upon by the deans in those colleges. It was very well received and we are progressing very well. There are going to be a number of new courses available on all of our campuses this fall and that was one of the promises that we made in this consolidation process, that we would not to diminish the opportunities that students had from an academic perspective and, in fact, increase those opportunities.

IT Group

On February 19th, we brought the two BANNER systems together. That went off without a hitch, and we were progressing very well from an IT perspective.

Robert Costomiris (CAH) asked when the Provost would begin work. President Herbert said his official start date would be July 1st. However, he would be coming to campus on a fairly regular basis to assist us in specific matters.

Ted Brimeyer (CBSS) said he was on his college committee trying to write the new tenure and promotion documents for the new college, and one of the things that kept coming were questions of who was “grandfathered in to old tenure expectations? Who will be responsible for new tenure expectations? When will these new policies go into place?” He asked if faculty could get in writing from the President a policy laying these things out.

President Hebert asked, “Laying things out in terms of your tenure policy?” Brimeyer clarified: “No, in terms of who is going to be grandfathered in to the old systems they were in. . . . Because right now, the fight seems to be at the associate level, you know, are they going to be grandfathered in their entire careers?” His committee was not really able to move forward without this issue resolved, and that resolution had “to come from above, as far as I’m concerned.”

President Hebert asked, “Why would you think those have to come from above?”

Brimeyer said, “Because it seems that we are not going to be able to move forward if we are going to try to fight about things that we really can’t control. We can’t control who is grandfathered in for tenure on Armstrong policies versus our policies, correct?”

President Hebert preferred to see a recommendation come from the faculty and then make a decision on that. He strongly believed that tenure is a decision that lies primarily in the hands of faculty. If Brimeyer’s committee was at a stalemate, he’d be happy to work with them, but he would hate to have to tell any of his colleagues that our P and T policies came from the President.

Jonathan Hilpert (COE), a member of both the Faculty Welfare Committee and the Faculty Welfare OWG, noted that they had “several models of that language . . . on file right now. However, in the Provost’s Report at the last senate meeting, it appeared that she was very clear about how . . . we were supposed to move forward with regards to when people transitioned to new guidelines. So since she made her report at the last Senate meeting, we have essentially stopped all progress on the various models and left them. Would you suggest that we continue to work on those different possibilities? Because one of those possibilities is to transfer all faculty members to the new guidelines on July 1st regardless, the other one is to allow faculty members to continue with the guidelines that they were hired under in perpetuity, and then there are other sorts of models in between, and when the Provost spoke at the last senate meeting she was pretty clear that anybody who had already been tenured and promoted at the

associate level is going to be on new guidelines starting July 1st, and anyone who is still at the associate level was going to be transitioned to new guidelines after they were tenured and promoted under their old guidelines.”

President Hebert said his understanding of the Provost’s report was that anyone who had a forthcoming review, either tenure or promotion, would have it conducted under the standards they are currently under, but once a decision is made, from that point forward people will go with the new standards that are being developed by the faculty.

Brimeyer said that’s what he wanted to clear up: “That’s, you know, you are under old policies until associate and then after associate you go to the new policies. That’s what I’m hearing from you right now, correct?”

President Hebert said that was his understanding of the Provost’s recommendation for this going forward. But the administration would not sign off on anything until they heard it was the faculty’s recommendation.

Marc Cyr (CAH), Senate Secretary, noted that the minutes from the last meeting contained some “hard dates,” and quoted Provost Cone, who was directly quoted on this point in those minutes: *“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.”* Cyr said it would help if the Provost could put that in writing in a memo and send it out to the folks that need to have it.

Moderator Pirro noted that Provost Cone was absent this day at a meeting in Atlanta.

Mark Welford (COSM) noted that what the Provost had said was “just a recommendation. We can ignore it. I mean, I don’t know what the issue is. You should just make your recommendations for the various groups, and then just forward them. I mean, her statement is not policy.”

Cyr (CAH) said that he was suggesting that she put it in writing so that it is policy, and then we’d know who goes up under what at the university level, and that will allow the colleges and departments to craft their stuff to meet that policy.

Brimeyer concurred with Cyr, noting “that if we just leave it to the separate colleges, what if we end up with five different college policies related to this. I know it will be a disaster.”

President Hebert agreed that the transitional policy should be university-wide re: fairness, and thought our legal counsel would agree. We don’t want to have different transitional policies for our different colleges around the university. He also thought that our new tenure and promotion policy should contain a section on transition that has a timeline that talks specifically of this very fact. He thought the Provost’s recommendation needed to be “approved through the policy procedure.”

Hilpert asked for clarification re: if the President wanted to see that in the section of the Faculty Handbook that's devoted to tenure and promotion, or in a stand-alone policy

President Hebert thought we were talking about the Handbook.

Brimeyer too was unclear what policy location we were talking about, but felt "if we had universal expectations of when this transition was going to take place across colleges then we all could be more comfortable writing the policies moving forward."

Hilpert said, "So the statement that we were drafting about transition t & p was separate from the draft Handbook that Jim just put forward. That came from the OWG and the Faculty Welfare Committee. So the language that we had drafted was separate from what we've put forward in the Handbook, reasoning that the Handbook is going to last much longer than transitional policy. That said, there are some models."

Robert Costomiris (CAH) said that when the Provost spoke last time it didn't sound like a proposal; it sounded like "this is the way it is." He thought that if we truly are a faculty-driven institution, then President Hebert's approach, that we devise this approach at the OWG level, and then bring it to the Senate, was the way we need to go, and the Provost maybe could help by providing guidelines, "but perhaps there are a little too already apparently restrictive or give us the sense that there is no wiggle room, and I would prefer at this point that we have that wiggle room and hang on to it before we codify it."

Fred Smith (LIB) wholly concurred with Costomiris.

Welford wanted the three or four models presented to us in the Faculty Senate for a vote on them than then go on.

Moderator Pirro said, "That's something we probably need to do at a future meeting, I'm assuming."

Hilpert preferred that all of this "happen through our normal channels, not through the OWG. I would personally like to get away from the OWGs and back to as close to business as usual, or the way that we have outlined these procedures in our Faculty Handbook . . . I would like to see it be a bottom-up process."

Cyr again read a direct quotation from the Provost's remarks at the last meeting, that he thought pertained to Brimeyer's original question: "*We are not going to change the requirements on folks mid-stream.*" He said departments and colleges were going to develop new policies, but if somebody has been "working for five years on a set of expectations, when do the new expectations descend upon them? And I don't think you want somebody who is coming up this coming fall or even according to this, the fall of 2019, with brand new expectations thrown at them they had no idea they . . . for the last five or six years should have been working towards, and I think that was the issue – not what kind of new policies, but who do the new policies apply to and when?"

President Hebert agreed with Cyr that “that was the spirit of what Diana [Provost Cone] was talking about . . . what’s the fair thing to do in terms of applying the standards under which people were hired . . . and then secondly, from a legal perspective. You know, what is our obligation to in terms of providing standards, and should we switch those mid-stream on folks? . . . I think she was adamant about fairness, more than adamant about policy.”

Moderator Pirro wanted to move on from this discussion, but noted that behind this issue was the fact that our Armstrong colleagues have been on a teaching intensive, less research oriented track, and so he agreed with the sentiments that had been expressed.

5. Senate Executive Committee Report: Moderator Robert Pirro [CBSS]:

Undergraduate Committee Update

Alisa Leckie, Chair of the Undergraduate Committee, had asked Pirro to let the Senate know that they didn’t have a meeting, but she’d been working with Ric McGrath, who is her counterpart at Armstrong, and that the committees were working on crafting bylaws that will allow that committee to bring in Armstrong-based faculty, and that she’d have a report at the next Senate meeting.

a. Update on Consolidation Review Committee

That committee has been charged, and Tony Barilla (COB) is the Chair. At the charging meeting, there was some discussion around what that committee would be doing. Some of the ideas included in twelve to eighteen months having a post-mortem report on any outstanding issues about post-consolidation; and using the committee as a clearing house for issues that faculty, among others, raise about pressing issues that haven’t been settled by consolidation, having some kind of reporting document on the university website that people can use to notify the committee of a “red flag” so the committee can direct them to the appropriate administrator or body. He asked that any questions be directed to Barilla.

b. Correction to supporting documents for Consolidating Senate Membership Motion

In the raft of motions that we passed to consolidate the Senate, one of them was about the apportionment of Senators, and there was an error in one of the supporting documents where the Lane Library staff was listed as having four members to be represented, while in fact there are nine. That change has been made to the supporting documents, but it doesn’t change their representation on the Senate: they will still get one Senator.

On the subject of the Consolidated Senate, he noted that we hadn’t had an election of the Senate President for next year or the President-Elect. Armstrong needs to establish who the senators are for next year and we should have a list by mid-March. Then we’ll know who is eligible, we’ll get nominations for Senate President for next year and the

President-elect, and strive for the election as soon as possible thereafter, partly because the Senate President-elect will have a course release and we don't want to inconvenience students. He noted that if senators have at least one year left, they are eligible for President for next year, and if they have two years, they are eligible for President-Elect. He added that he would help those elected as much as possible, and that he thought the more faculty who had such an experience, the better.

c. Two RFIs on Shooting Sports Education Center budget

The first had received an answer, but the second had not because only recently submitted; Moderator Pirro expected an answer for next meeting. He asked the submitter of both, Robert Costomiris (CAH), to explain what led him to submit the queries.

Costomiris noted that building the Shooting Sports Education Center had been a matter of some debate, whether it was a wise decision to begin with, and there were promises that it would be kind of a cost neutral place. He was asking for some verification of its cost neutrality, and to find out where the money is coming from and how it's being spent because that would tell us a lot about the operation. He submitted the second RFI because in the answer to the first one he had learned there were \$360,000 a year coming from student RAC fees to support the Center. No more money is coming from the Department of Natural Resources, which funded the building. He wanted to know, then, how many students are actually using this facility. He also wanted to know if there was ever a limit on how much money would be spent on the Center. He wanted to know how much students are getting out of it for their investment.

Michelle Haberland (CAH) wanted to know if the Center's relationship with the Georgia Department of Natural Resources has ended. She also mentioned GSU's relationship with Daniel Defense Industries, a manufacturer of firearms – one Daniel Defense weapon was used in the Las Vegas shooting. Our University receives financial support from Daniel Defense Industries. She imagined that our Center “does have and features Daniel Defense Industry firearms.”

d. RFI on Campus Security During a Shooting

This had received a reply. Robert Costomiris (CAH), who had submitted the RFI, noted that among the questions he had asked was one about system redundancies, the answer to which was essentially, “We're looking into it.” It didn't say what they were looking into, though. He believed any safety plan should have multiple redundancies, or it's not safe. He was curious about what they're looking into.

Robert Whitaker (Vice President Finance and Operations) thought he had just heard Costomiris say he'd be willing to sit on the committee that's going to do that analysis and review. He noted, though, that they had asked the University Police Department as well as our Emergency Planning Group to go back and look at all options. One was a voice mechanism around all our campuses, basically loudspeakers, to notify campus of anything that may be happening. They're working on all the different options, costs, how

we would implement them, how we would install, etc. Once they have a full whitepaper type of proposal, that will be shared with the President and his leadership.

Michelle Haberland (CAH) noted that the response to the RFI stated that the Armstrong campus is equipped with door-locking mechanisms, faculty and staff on that campus have been trained on the mechanisms, and information about this locking mechanism has been provided on the Armstrong website. She asked if there are plans to make that more equal across the three campuses.

VP Whitaker said the review group is looking at that. It's going to be costly and take time because right now, on the Statesboro campus, we do not have any of those locking mechanisms. It would be a phase approach. Basically, the mechanism is a flip that allows you to lock your door once you are inside your classroom.

6. Motions

a. Motion on a Joint Resolution on Admissions and Protest

Michelle Haberland (CAH) noted that, nationwide, many high school student “march for their lives” walkouts were planned [to seek laws to help prevent school shootings]. There were school districts across the country that had issued policies that students will receive disciplinary action if they leave the classroom or leave the campus. So high school students want reassurances from colleges and universities that these kinds of penalties that they might suffer in high school and that will be noted on their transcripts as disciplinary infractions will not negatively affect their college applications. She noted that many universities were giving such reassurances and getting good press for doing so, and she named several in Georgia, but none are public universities. She noted she and an Armstrong colleague were working to make this a joint resolution. She also noted that many public universities in the south outside of Georgia had come forward with statements of support for the students, and read a long list. She added that we were talking about supporting students' First Amendment rights.

The motion was moved and seconded.

Marc Cyr (CAH) noted that the motion was generally written so if somebody was concerned that it only applied to lefty liberal gun policy, it did not. It would apply equally to a student who wanted to attend a pro-gun rally. He said maybe we don't need the resolution, “but all you have to do is to have one person in any high school who is in charge of putting together disciplinary reports that go out there, who gets a black mark, who doesn't. All you have to do is have one person enter the Admissions office who decides that they don't like what was done by that student and they are looking at the disciplinary report. This motion . . . lets people know that Georgia Southern won't tolerate that.” He was very much in favor of the motion.

Moderator Pirro asked if President Hebert wanted to speak since if it passed the motion would land in his lap to approve or disapprove. President Hebert did not speak.

Marshall Ransom (COSM) said that students who are minors don't have the right to leave class under compulsory education laws. This was a question for the transcript people in the Admissions Office: If it comes across as a disciplinary item, does it come across in detail showing what the students were protesting, or does it merely say something along the lines of absent without leave, or left class without permission, which are standard things that administrators discipline in high schools. He was not against what the students were doing, was excited to see some energy among these students, but they can't leave school without permission. As Cyr had noted, this was a general motion, and it could open us up to ignoring every disciplinary remark on a transcript.

Haberland agreed that minor students sometimes have their civil liberties restricted, but thought that was beside the point. The big issue was perception. She had called our Admissions office and asked if disciplinary matters were actually considered, and her sense from the answer was it's nowhere on the application; it just asks applicants if they have been guilty of a felony or something like that. That may lead some to think that we don't need a motion like this since obviously Georgia Southern doesn't penalize students who come in with disciplinary things on their record, but this is about the perception by students of us having their backs.

Finbarr Curtis (CAH) said what we'd be doing is reassuring students so that they don't self-censor. It was about student perceptions. Also, the motion was actually consistent with what we were already doing. He supported the motion.

President Hebert invited Maura Copeland (Office of Legal Affairs) to comment: "I will actually say that students will call our Admissions Office and ask this question as I've spent today responding to one such student. So we do have long-standing policies in place. It really isn't anything new for students to engage in behavior that gets dealt with in a high school level often in ways that we may not agree with . . . and so we have had a policy for quite a long time about what happens when we do somehow discover information that a student has been disciplined. . . . when we do have information and there's a whole process for how that information is treated, depending on what the level of the punishment was at the high school level. Our Admissions Office is able then to either clear the applicant or pass it up for further review. . . . so it's really a case-by-case decision at that point as to whether the behavior at the high school level affects admission and if you heard me speak on any issue from a legal standpoint, case-by-case is always the safest way to treat those."

Cyr thought the motion dealt with that case-by-case principle: "You can have a disciplinary report for any number of reasons. This sets up that if in this case, it has to do with exercising a constitutional right to peaceful protest, then we won't count that against them."

The motion was Approved.

7. Unfinished Business

Alice Hall (CBSS) didn't know if this came under this agenda item, but many of her colleagues had been very reassured by the Provost's statement at the last senate meeting about using the guidelines they were hired under, but after the discussion earlier in this meeting she did not understand what the situation was. Was this issue of P & T policies going to come back for a Senate vote this semester?

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) had exactly the same problem.

Heidi Altman (CBSS) wanted clarification on related issues: There's a difference "between someone who's on the tenure track, who is an Assistant, who wants to maintain their hiring standards versus someone who is an Associate who may have been here some length of time and wants to go for full. There's a difference in whether you're grandfathered for your whole career, or whether you are just grandfathered in when you are on the tenure track, and that's not also been made clear."

Moderator Pirro said his sense from the earlier discussion was that we are going through normal procedure, which means that the Faculty Welfare Committee would discuss this and make a decision about this.

President Hebert said "decisions that are being made this year should be under current standards. . . . the reason being is that process began with dossiers being presented in the fall semester, and at that point, the standing standards were in place. . . . I think going forward we need consensus amongst faculty as well as the Provost, as to what that transitional process is going to be."

Jonathan Hilpert (COE) said, "There's no working model that would evaluate past efforts under new guidelines. So all the working models that we have right now would evaluate the time that you served under the old guidelines, under those guidelines. There's just different perspectives about when people should transfer to the new guidelines. And that's where the disagreement is. So I agree with the representatives from CBSS who pointed out that it's not real clear when those transitions will take place for certain faculty members."

Moderator Pirro said, "So just to clarify, Jonathan, . . . there still remains the possibility that someone, say from the Armstrong campus, who's been in a teaching intensive schedule, and expectations, might still go up for tenure and promotion under a different set. I mean, is that what you're saying? That it's possible?"

Hilpert said, "So we had two competing models. The first was to have everyone transition to the new guidelines and for those faculty members who were at the assistant level, they would have to show some indication, you know, of being able to perform under the guidelines . . . at the associate level. . . . Those who are in favor of that model felt like that was the most fair to faculty members who would be evaluating them for tenure and promotion, and to chairs and deans and the Provost who would have to be considering whether or not they were able to perform under the guidelines of the next

level. In some situations, they may not have, if they continue to perform under their existing guidelines, show the potential to move on at the associate level under the new guidelines. . . . The other model was to allow them . . . to earn tenure and promotion under their old guidelines and then switch to the new guidelines, which seems to be the model that the Provost was advocating for. And then there was a third, which was to allow them to continue on with their old guidelines all the way . . . to the end of their career . . . However, I felt like that was not in the spirit with the one-sort-of-university-in-many-places model that we've been trying to develop.”

Heidi Altman (CBSS) noted that, as the University has changed, so have expectations. The expectations she'd been hired under have changed over the course of time. There's no guarantee that you're going to be held to the same standards under which you were hired except for the tenure process.

Dustin Anderson (CAH) sympathized with Hilpert's request that this go back to the standard procedure, but wanted clarification re: whether this process would move from a joint campus OWG to the Statesboro campus Faculty Welfare Committee making the recommendation.

Hall felt a great need to clarify all this soon for people thinking of going up in the fall of 2018 – what guidelines are they going up under? In her old college, the decision had to be made by August 1.

Hilpert agreed with both Hall and Anderson. He was concerned about representation on the Faculty Welfare Committee. As for the models, there was no desire to hurt anyone, only to find the most effective and fair way to transition.

Marc Cyr (CAH) thought the immediate issue was simple: New policies were being worked out, but do people going up this fall or fall of 2019 go up under the current or the new guidelines? He thought that came down to a legal issue that the Provost talked about last time, and President Hebert earlier in this meeting thought that getting an actual policy memo out on those dates was a good idea. Cyr thought that if that policy memo could come out, say, in the next week, it would let faculty relax and focus on creating new guidelines.

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) agreed it was a legal issue, but thought it was different than Cyr was presenting it. “Technically, we're all new hires this year. We all got new contracts right? Yeah, but I mean with the new university, we became new employees. And so what exists today is, I don't know for sure, but I don't think it's when we are hired anymore apparently because we were all just hired with a new university because this university never existed before.”

Cyr said, “I think we may have entered the realm of Zen and that we need just something kind of straightforward written down on paper . . .” Bland concurred: “Absolutely. Something in writing, hopefully a short memo.”

Moderator Pirro could commit to communicating the uncertainty that he was hearing to the Provost and having her get back to us with some language that we can respond to at the next Senate meeting. He thought that the Chief Academic Officer should weigh in on this matter.

8. New Business

None.

9. Announcements: Vice Presidents

None.

10. Announcements from the Floor

None.

11. Adjournment

Moved, seconded, and Approved.

Minutes submitted by Marc Cyr (CAH), Senate Secretary