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Faculty Development Committee Meeting
Meeting Minutes January 23, 2019


Excused: Lei Chen

I. Excellence in Instruction Award: Having read application packages ahead of time and submitting scores to the chair, the committee reviewed score averages. Two applicants’ scores were high enough to render them the award winners without there being a motion. The committee agreed unanimously to recommend the two highest scoring applicants for the award.

II. Spring Travel Awards: Having read application packages ahead of time and submitting scores to the chair, the committee reviewed score averages. The group agreed that if we funded all applications that scored 16 or higher, the committee would not have spent the entire budget. Jackie Eastman moved that the committee fund all applications that scored 14 or higher. Lauren McMillan seconded. The motion carried with 7 affirmative, 2 negative.

The committee noticed that proposal number 28 should be disqualified because the applicant identified him/herself—according to application guidelines, self-identification results in disqualification. Daniel Chapman moved that the committee remove application number 28 from consideration. Jackie Eastman seconded. The motion passed with 6 affirmative and 3 negative.

After calculating the remaining funds available the group reviewed the remaining proposals.

Daniel Chapman moved that the committee also fund proposal number 8. Jackie Eastman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Daniel Chapman moved that the committee partially fund proposal number 7 in the amount of $1642.50. Jackie Eastman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Jackie Eastman moved that the committee fund proposal #6 fully in the amount of $956.00. Lauren McMillan seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Daniel Chapman moved that the committee fund proposal #20 partially in the amount of $1869.00. Jackie Eastman seconded the motion. Discussion included observations that the funding would enable the applicant to travel to receive the training needed to implement the experiential learning project he/she had proposed. The motion carried
unanimously.

The committee funded proposals so that it made use of all budgeted funds.

III. Committee members asked for a summary of all fully and partially-funded proposals. They were as follows:

**Fully Funded Proposals:** 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 18, 22, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35

**Partially-Funded Proposals:** 7, 20

IV. Rubrics Subcommittee: Now that the committee has worked its review process through two travel awards cycles and the cycle for excellence in instruction awards, the rubrics subcommittee can now revisit the process of revising application forms and rubrics for those awards.

V. Summer Travel and Summer Stipend Awards: Nancy Remler said that she would consult with Patricia Hendrix regarding timelines for those awards. The deadline for the summer stipend award is February 4th. The deadline for Summer Travel Awards is March 15th.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 PM
Respectfully submitted,
Nancy Remler
I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Li Li called the meeting to order on <<Wednesday>>, <<11/28/18>> at <<12>> AM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Marina Eremeeva made a motion to approve the agenda as written. A second was made by Dr. Amanda Glaze and the motion to approve the agenda was passed.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Chad Posick made a motion to approve the minutes of 11/7/18 as written. A second was made by Dr. Brian Feltman and the motion to approve the minutes was passed. Minutes will be submitted to the Senate Librarian.

IV. CHAIR’S UPDATE

Please record your comments for improvement of the Excellence award competition for updates to the committee process as you use the rubric and tools. We will collect comments at the close of the award process to improve the next year’s competition.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Faculty Research Internal Funding Awards will be due 1/27/18. A reminder will be sent out to the campus via GSFAC.
   i. Seed Guidelines
      1. Application-
      2. Guidelines for submission
      3. Return on Investment
      4. Deadlines
         a. January 28, 2018 – Applications submitted to ORSSP
b. May 1, 2019 – Award letters prepared for recipients
c. July 1, 2019 – No pre-award spending in FY19

ii. Scholarly Pursuit Guidelines
   1. Application - [http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orsssp/internal-funding-forms/](http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orsssp/internal-funding-forms/)
   2. Guidelines for submission
   3. Return on Investment
   4. Deadlines
      a. January 28, 2018 – Applications submitted to ORSSP
      b. May 1, 2019 – Award letters prepared for recipients
      c. July 1, 2019 – No pre-award spending in FY19

VI. OLD BUSINESS
A. Excellence in Research and/or Scholarly Pursuits Award -- All voting committee members completed the evaluation rubric for each application including a determination of their top 5 choices to move to the second round of review. Based upon the numeric rubric rankings and the overall rankings by the committee member a field of 8 candidates was forwarded for more extensive review. Committee members were instructed to bring comments to the next meeting to assist in refining the committee decisions. Committee members will rank the remaining candidates 1 – 8 for the 12/12/18 meeting.

B. The committee agreed that all of the candidates in the cohort exhibited excellence in their fields. The process is difficult in that the committee is required to identify the best of a very high quality field.

C. The committee will narrow the list to 2 award winners and a first and second runner up. In the event that one of the winners is not on contract in the fall of 2019, the runner up will advance.

D. Award for Excellence in Research
   a. Guidelines
   b. Application - [http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orsssp/internal-funding-forms/](http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orsssp/internal-funding-forms/)
   c. Rubric - [http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orsssp/excellence-research/](http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orsssp/excellence-research/)

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS
A. <<None>>

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on <<11/28/18>> at <<1:00>>PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Ele Haynes, Recording [Coordinator](#)

Minutes were approved <<12/12/18>> by vote of Committee Members

Note to Recording [Coordinator](#): Attach Comprehensive Program Reviews and Rubrics.

Attachment: None
I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Li Li called the meeting to order on <<Wednesday>>, <<12/12/18>> at <<10>> AM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Chad Posick made a motion to approve the agenda as written. A second was made by Dr. Brian Feltman and the motion to approve the agenda was passed.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Dr. Chad Posick made a motion to approve the minutes of 11/28/18 as written. A second was made by Dr. Jamie Roberts and the motion to approve the minutes was passed. Minutes will be submitted to the Senate Librarian.

IV. CHAIR’S UPDATE

Reminder to the committee – the committee discussions and deliberations are confidential. You should not share information discussed in the meetings with colleagues or applicants or indicate who is still in the competition at any stage. The excellence award winners will be announced at spring graduation by the Provost. The funding award winners will be notified after the final budget allocation has been approved by the Provost’s office for the fiscal year.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Faculty Research Internal Funding Award applications are due 1/28/18. 2 reminders were sent out to the campus via GSFAC prior to graduation.
   i. The committee will meet again on January 31, 2019.
ii. Funding award preliminary review will be assigned to 3 committee members on a random basis to equalize the cross discipline review error and conflict of interest factors.

iii. Seed Guidelines
   1. Application - http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/internal-funding-forms/
   2. Guidelines for submission
   3. Return on Investment
   4. Deadlines
      a. January 28, 2018 – Applications submitted to ORSSP
      b. May 1, 2019 – Award letters prepared for recipients
      c. July 1, 2019 – No pre-award spending in FY19

iv. Scholarly Pursuit Guidelines
   1. Application - http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/internal-funding-forms/
   2. Guidelines for submission
   3. Return on Investment
   4. Deadlines
      a. January 28, 2018 – Applications submitted to ORSSP
      b. May 1, 2019 – Award letters prepared for recipients
      c. July 1, 2019 – No pre-award spending in FY19

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Excellence in Research/Creative Scholarly Activity Award – All committee members completed their final ranking of the top 8 candidates for the excellence award. After discussion of the merits of the candidates and committee member ranking perspectives, the top 2 candidate names will be forwarded to the Provost in recommendation for the 2019-2020 Excellence in Research/Creative Scholarly Activity Award. The 3rd highest ranking candidate will be held as the first runner up and the 4th highest ranking candidate will be held as the 2nd runner up. Should either of the award winners not be on contract for the 2019-20 academic year, the runners up will advance.

B. The committee discussed the review process in light of updating the guidelines for the next year.
   1) While useful in the early review of the application packages, the rubric is restrictive in comparing candidates across disciplines. The committee agreed that the rubric should be used as a starting point for discussion and not as an objective measure. Site instructions will be updated accordingly.
   2) The committee discussed the need to consider teaching as an evaluation point for this award. There is a teaching award to evaluate excellence in teaching. Research should be evaluated independent of external commitments similarly to the evaluation of publication acceptance. The evaluation of teaching load as a factor varies by discipline and college in course number, prep requirements and student load. Line 12 of the rubric may not be a useful part of the evaluation for this process.
   3) The committee discussed the need to update the instructions to assist applicants in making a case for their independent research record in contrast to continuation of mentored collaborations or reuse of dissertation product. Language in line 8 of the rubric will be changed to insert the term independent into the language.
   4) As the application questions and guidelines interact with the rubric to affect a complete application, subcommittee members will include these factors in their evaluation.
5) Motion: A subcommittee will evaluate the rubric and application process to determine changes necessary in the rubric, application questions and instructions to make it a more effective tool in evaluating and comparing candidates. The subcommittee will report back to the committee at the next meeting, 1/31/19.

6) Subcommittee members are Jamie Roberts (chair), Marinna Eremeva, Chad Posick, Lucas Jensen and Amanda Glaze. Moved: Jamie Roberts; Second: Brian Feltman, Modification: Li Li; Unanimous approval.

C. The committee agreed that all of the candidates in the cohort exhibited excellence in their fields. The process is difficult in that the committee is required to identify the best of a very high quality field. The differences between discipline expectations remains a difficulty in comparison of research records.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. <<Next meeting date will be January 31, 2019 in Veazey 2001C>>

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on <<12/12/18>> at <<11:31>>AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Ele Haynes, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved <<12/14/18>> by email vote of Committee Members

Note to Recording Coordinator: Attach Comprehensive Program Reviews and Rubrics.

Attachment: None
Faculty Welfare Committee
Meeting Minutes (11/12/18)
2018-2019 FWC

Attendance: Clinton Martin <cdmartin@georgiasouthern.edu>, Wendy Wolfe <wlwolfe@georgiasouthern.edu>, Jonathan Hulpert <jhilpert@georgiasouthern.edu>, Alexander Collier <acollier@georgiasouthern.edu>, Jessica Garner <jgarner@georgiasouthern.edu>, Samuel Opoku <sopoku@georgiasouthern.edu>, Wayne Johnson <wmjohnson@georgiasouthern.edu>, Michelle Haberland <mah@georgiasouthern.edu>, Jamie Scalera <jscalera@georgiasouthern.edu>, Allissa Lee <alee@georgiasouthern.edu>, Hans-Joerg Schanz <hschanz@georgiasouthern.edu>, Kristi Smith <klsmith@georgiasouthern.edu>, Janet Bradshaw <jbradshaw@georgiasouthern.edu>, Jim LoBue <jlobue@georgiasouthern.edu>

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the Minutes (unanimous in favor)
3. Approval of Agenda (unanimous in favor; no corrections)
4. Faculty Welfare Actions (from 10/22/18)
   a. FYI on 322.02 and 322.03 – chair announced to the committee that FWC approved revisions to these policies have been submitted to faculty senate for discussion and vote for the November meeting.
   b. FYI on Transitional T and P policy -- chair announced to the committee that revisions to the transitional t and p policy has been submitted to faculty senate as a discussion item for the November meeting.
5. Action Items
   a. Handbook changes to 315 Principal Lecturer (discussion and vote) – The committee discussed revisions to section 313 and 101 to include the principal lecturer line in the faculty handbook. Motion to approve Schanz. Second Lobue. Unanimous in favor.
   b. Handbook changes to 321.03 Educational Leave (discussion and vote) – The committee discussed revisions to section 321.03 to align the educational leave policy with the BOR policy. Motion to approve Lobue. Second Scalera. Unanimous in favor.
   c. Motion: Campus Announcements – Discussion ensured regarding the campus announcement motion regarding faculty and staff death. Several friendly amendments were suggested during the course of discussion. Motion to approve Johnson; Second (not sure). Unanimous in favor.
   d. RFI: Equity in Parking Fees – committee discussed the details of a parking RFI that will be put forward by Johnson.
6. Faculty Welfare Concerns (Discuss Actions and Volunteers?)
   a. Personal Social Media Account Use (Hans) – discussed ensued about faculty members being asked to use the personal social media accounts for university business. Action item: seek out and read the university social media policy (Haberland).
   b. GSM language in faculty handbook (Diana) – announcement was made to committee regarding the concern over less-than-inclusive language in the faculty handbook.
   c. Holiday compensatory time and email overload (Alex) – tabled for next meeting.
d. Merit Raises/Salary Compression/Inversion – discussion ensured regarding the salary study meetings taking place on campus. Many committee members planned to attend the meeting and report back to the committee.

e. SRI’s – discussion ensured about lack of faculty input on the transition to fully online SRI’s.

f. Workload Equity – discussion ensured about workload task force created by the provost.

g. 12 Month Salary Information – tabled for next meeting.

h. Maternity Leave – tabled for next meeting.

i. Spousal Hires – tabled for next meeting.

7. Adjourn
GENERAL EDUCATION AND CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
MINUTES
General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Meeting Date – Friday, November 30, 2018

Present: Tony Barilla, Parker College of Business/Economics; Suzy Carpenter, College of Science and Mathematics/Chemistry and Biochemistry; Michelle Cawthorn, College of Science and Mathematics/Biology; Finbarr Curtis, College of Arts and Humanities/Philosophy and Religious Studies; Daniel Czech, Waters College of Health Professions/Health Sciences and Kinesiology; Ukpongson Favour, Student Government Association; Leslie Haas, Library; Susan Hendrix, Waters College of Health Professions/Nursing; Barb King, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences/Criminal Justice and Criminology; Amanda Konkle, College of Arts and Humanities/Literature; Alisa Leckie, College of Education/Middle Grades and Secondary Education; Marla Morris, College of Education/Curriculum, Foundations and Reading; Jeff Mortimore, Library; Samuel Opoku, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Health Professions/Health Policy, Management, and Behavior; Bill Wells, Parker College of Business/Finance

Guests: Delena Gatch, Institutional Effectiveness; Jaime O'Connor, Institutional Effectiveness; Brad Sturz, Institutional Effectiveness; Amy Smith, Enrollment Management; Christine Ludowise, Office of the Provost

Absent: Heidi Altman, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences/Sociology and Anthropology; Teresa Flateby, Institutional Effectiveness; Clinton Martin, College of Engineering and Computing/Civil Engineering and Construction; Pete Rogers, College of Engineering and Computing/Civil Engineering and Construction; Marshall Ransom, College of Science and Mathematics/Mathematical Science; Stacy Smallwood, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health/Health Policy, Management, and Behavior

I. CALL TO ORDER
Chair Michelle Cawthorn called the meeting to order on Friday, November 20 at 9:00 AM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
The motion to approve the agenda was seconded and passed.

III. CHAIR’S UPDATE
- Update from Office of Institutional Effectiveness on core assessment meetings, presented by Delena Gatch
  - Overview of progress toward a unified core assessment process across campuses
  - Summary of core assessment informational meetings that took place in November
    - Four meetings, two at Statesboro and two at Armstrong
    - Invited core course assessment coordinators, faculty teaching core courses, and advisors
    - 97 participants in the meetings from all core areas
    - Introduced core policy, template, and rubric; overview of SACSCOC and BOR requirements relevant to core curriculum and assessment
    - Activity to encourage collaboration within core areas for planning unified assessment processes
    - Core assessment planning days scheduled for early January, one at Statesboro and one at Armstrong

IV. NEW BUSINESS
A. CIM/GECC approval workflow issue
Chair Michelle Cawthorn explained that prior to the consolidation, GECC was included in the workflow for the approval of new core courses or any changes to core courses; we are no longer in the workflow and attempts to find out why have been unsuccessful.

Chris Ludowise offered that she and Amy Smith can work with the Registrar to put GECC back into the workflow.

Chair Michelle Cawthorne requested to be put in the workflow before the undergraduate committee upon the advice of the committee.

Barb King asked how courses that were already in process would be affected if they were not approved by the GECC in the fall semester.

Chris Ludowise recommended that anything already in process could be sent back to the committee for review.

Michelle Cawthorn said the number of courses in process is small and that the changes are minor revisions as a result of consolidation and should easily pass the committee.

Alisa Leckie asked if we would adjust the timeline for approval to ensure the GECC can review courses prior to the deadline for undergraduate committee review.

Michelle Cawthorn agreed to try to schedule GECC meetings in spring at least two weeks prior to undergraduate committee to ensure courses were reviewed and approved in a timely manner.

B. Diversity and inclusion core course requirement

Michelle Cawthorn wanted to provide some clarification on an article that was published in The George-Anne regarding a required diversity and inclusion core course; the report stated that there would be a new requirement as part of the core curriculum for a diversity and inclusion course; the language used in the report may have been misleading, since the focus of the requirement is on incorporating more intentional content on these topics in the first year experience course and the core capstone course.

Chris Ludowise stated that the Provost had clarified the intention at the Faculty Senate meeting and that his remarks could be found in the minutes from that meeting; the intention was not to create a new requirement but to refine and reinforce the instruction already provided in the first year experience and core capstone courses.

One of the Armstrong questioned the disadvantages of adding a diversity course, as this is an important subject.

Michelle Cawthorn explained that a proposal like that should be initiated by faculty or departments and go through the usual approval process which can be complicated since core courses have to be approved by the university and the system. We are already above the number of hours preferred by the system, so it would be difficult to introduce a new requirement at this point.

Finbarr Curtis asked for clarification of the Provost’s request, and Chris Ludowise explained that although there is an optional unit in the first year experience that addresses diversity, the Provost would like that to be a requirement for all FYE courses.

C. Updates to assessment template

Delena Gatch explained that during the core assessment informational meetings, it became evident that there was not adequate guidance for the two courses that fall under additional requirements outside of the core areas: FYE 1220 and KINS 2535. To address the unique situation of those courses, an item was added under Section A of the template and a note was added to Section B, providing guidance for how these additional requirements courses should address those aspects of the template.

The committee agreed with these changes.

D. Peer review of core assessment plans in spring 2019

Michelle Cawthorn stated that in preparation for the review of core assessment plans (template sections A through Di) due on February 1, the GECC members will participate in a series of norming sessions.

Jaime O’Connor had reviewed faculty teaching schedules and proposed dates and times; will follow up to determine how many committee members can attend on those dates and times.

Delena Gatch provided an overview of the content of each session and how they prepare reviewers for the assessment and reconciliation process.
Michelle Cawthorn explained the process of peer review following the norming sessions and estimated that each committee member will be tasked with reviewing approximately 10 reports; these reports are not required to include any data although some may opt to do so.

Samuel Opoku questioned the need for reconciliation of scores and asked if we could not rely on means; Michelle Cawthorn explained that providing mixed feedback to departments is not beneficial and that the written feedback from both reviewers needs to be aligned with scores.

Delena Gatch reviews all reports following the review to refine comments from reviewers and facilitates the resolution of any scores that cannot be reconciled following the usual process.

Suzy Hendrix asked about the timeline for completing the review and Michelle Cawthorn said it is typically about a month.

E. Scheduling for spring
Michelle Cawthorn will use the days and times Jaime O’Connor provided as a starting point for scheduling GECC meetings for spring; will send a Doodle poll to members to determine the best time, keeping in mind the goal of scheduling two weeks prior to undergraduate committee meetings.

V. OLD BUSINESS
A. Pre-consolidation Georgia Southern University – Statesboro Campus General Education Outcomes
Michelle Cawthorn provided a recap of the development and assessment of general education outcomes at Georgia Southern; mentioned that there is wide-spread debate about whether or not general education is differentiated from core curriculum outcomes; while Georgia Southern attempted to assess these outcomes across all levels from freshman to senior, some were more successfully measured than others; due to the recent emphasis on core area assessment, the general education outcomes were not addressed during consolidation and now needed to be discussed by the committee.

Bill Wells asked if Georgia Southern has an official position on whether core and gen ed are the same or different and asked who makes that decision.

Chris Ludowise asked if it was within the committee’s purview to make that decision because the breadth of the outcomes seems to imply that they extend beyond academics and encompass learning that takes place outside of the classroom.

Leslie Haas pointed out that the outcomes as written place a strong emphasis on STEM and could be more inclusive of arts and humanities.

Delena Gatch stated that it is within the committee’s purview to make this decision and that if the new president wants specific general education outcomes, the President would charge the committee with that task.

Michelle Cawthorn pointed out that with the new Campus Labs software, core outcomes and program outcomes can be easily linked; Delena Gatch clarified that the general education outcomes would be institution-level outcomes and that programs would be able to identify where they align to those outcomes.

Alisa Leckie stated that the general education outcomes seems to have a lot of overlap with the core outcomes, so unless some changes were made we would be assessing the same things twice.

Michelle Cawthorn outlined four possible courses of action: use only core area outcomes with no separate general education outcomes, remove the outcomes from general education that overlap with core area outcomes, keep all outcomes for core areas and for general education, or create new general education outcomes.

Jeff Mortimore raised the concern that our committee could be setting university-wide outcomes without input from other divisions that contribute to the general education of students.

MOTION: Bill Wells made a motion that the committee vote to make a determination on whether to continue to have separate general education outcomes and core area outcomes.

Michelle Cawthorn asked for further discussion on this issue.
Amy Smith stated that the general education outcomes are different from core curriculum because they describe things that all graduates should be learning from their experience in and out of the classroom; Jeff Mortimore concurred and restated his concern that this is not just a faculty matter.

Michelle Cawthorn clarified that other stakeholders were involved in the initial development of the general education outcomes.

Suzy Hendrix preferred the idea of a smaller set of general education outcomes, distinct from the core outcomes, as a means of identifying the values of the new university.

Finbarr Curtis agreed that the goals were important, but questioned the necessity of measuring them; pointed out that the university mission statement should function as the values statement.

Jeff Mortimore agreed that the core curriculum should be assessed but that the mission statement should be evaluated at a higher level.

Chris Ludowise explained that all units at the institution are assessed and that program outcomes align with the mission of the department which should align with the mission of the university.

Leslie Haas questioned how departments would determine which criteria fit or did not fit.

Tony Barilla stated that general education is not the same thing as core curriculum; core curriculum cannot encompass general education; lean assessment goals are the best way to start; core area outcomes define something we know is important and can be assessed to establish a starting place.

Finbarr Curtis asked what value would be added by adopting these additional outcomes that already seem to be assumed as important and embedded in the university mission; advocated from keeping core area assessment distinct, not to detract from broader mission.

Jeff Mortimore concurred that we could glean from the general education outcomes what we want but leave any changes to the mission at the university-level.

MOTION: Finbarr Curtis made a motion that for the purpose of assessment, general education is equivalent to the core curriculum outcomes. Motion was seconded and approved.

Bill Wells asked what would happen to the general education outcomes document; Chris Ludowise stated it would archived as a historical document.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on November 30 at 10:01 AM.

Respectfully submitted,
Jaime O'Connor, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved <<Date>> by electronic vote of Committee Members
Present: Dr. Marcel Ilie, CEC; Dr. Jennifer Kowalewski, CAH; Dr. Richard Flynn, CAH; Dr. Stephanie Sipe, COB; Dr. Constantin Ogloblin, COB; Dr. Meca Williams-Johnson, COE; Dr. Alma Stevenson, COE; Dr. Michele McGibony, COSM; 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. Thomas Koballa, Dean, COE [Academic Affairs]

Guests: Ms. Candace Griffith, VPAA; Mrs. Cindy Groover, Institutional Effectiveness; Dr. Ashley Walker, COGS; Mrs. Audie Graham, COGS; Mrs. Wendy Sikora, COGS; Mrs. McKenzie Peterman, COGS; Ms. Doris Mack, Registrar’s Office; Dr. Tracy Linderholm, COE; Dr. Stephen Rossi, WCHP; Dr. David Williams, CEC; Dr. Rand Ressler, COB; Dr. Jolyon Hughes, CAH; Dr. Brenda Blackwell, CBSS; Dr. Beth Howells, CAH; Dr. Maureen Stobb, CBSS; Mr. Norton Pease, CAH, Dr. Janie Wilson, CBSS; Dr. Karen Spears, WCHP

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Brandonn Harris called the meeting to order on Thursday, November 8, 2018 at 9:00 AM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Stephanie Sipe made a motion to approve the agenda as written. A second was made by Dr. Constantin Ogloblin and the motion to approve the agenda was passed.

III. CHAIR’S UPDATE

A. Comprehensive Program Review Update

Dr. Harris stated the Graduate Committee will be completing five program reviews in Spring 2019. The team members for each program are listed below.

College of Arts and Humanities:
MA: Professional Communication & Leadership
Team Members - Dr. Ted Brimeyer, Dr. Shijun Zheng, Dr. Rocio Albra-Flores

Professional Communication and Leadership Certificate
Team Members - Dr. Chad Posick, Dr. Michelle McGibony, Lori Gwinett

MA: Spanish
Team Members - Dr. Gina Crabb, Dr. Andrew Hansen, Dr. Marcel Ilie

MA: English
Team Members - Nikki Cannon-Rech, Dr. Stephanie Sipe, Dr. Constantin Ogloblin

College of Behavioral & Social Sciences:
MA: Social Science
Team Members - Dr. Jennifer Kowalewski, Dr. Julie Reagan, Dr. Alma Stevenson

Dr. Harris has been working with Ms. Candace Griffith to get everything set up for the review process. He stated some of the committee members had questions regarding the timeline. Dr. Harris asked Ms. Griffith to provide additional information related to the timeline and review process. Ms. Griffith said once she confirms rooms for the training sessions she will send an email to the Chairs of the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees with the details. They will be hosting four sessions beginning in late January and early February that will review the rubric and Campus Labs. People will only be required to attend one of those sessions. Two sessions will be offered on the Armstrong campus and two on the Statesboro campus. After that the committee members will be assigned a test program review to read and then there will be two norming sessions. Ms. Griffith explained that the member will read one review, reconvene in mid-February. She said Dr. Delena Gatch will be leading
the sessions. After the first norming session they will read a second program review and reconvene again in a norming session, if it is needed. This will allow the committee members the month of March to read the program reviews and score them in time before the April committee meeting. Ms. Griffith said more information will be provided at a later date.

Dr. Harris stated new/revised program and course submissions in CIM must include the specific course learning outcomes (SLOs). He said this is something that was recently brought to his attention, and that some of the curriculum submissions in today’s agenda do not include the SLOs. Based on his discussion with Ms. Griffith prior to the meeting the committee has two options:

1) Approve the items, pending the inclusion of the SLOs. The SLOs would have to be updated in CIM by the end of January 2019, so that Faculty Senate can review the November Graduate Committee minutes in their February meeting.

2) Table items and push the submissions back in CIM so that information can be added and resubmitted to the committee at a later date.

Ms. Griffith provided a brief explanation as to why this is required information. She said it would be best practice to include the SLOs on the program and course submissions. It is not expected for the Graduate Committee to review the quality of the SLOs. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will work with the programs to ensure everything is correct. During the SACSCOC review they found that the SLOs were not included in CIM and since CIM is the university’s official repository for curriculum it is necessary for programs/departments to update this information so that it is available for the SACSCOC report.

Dr. Tracy Linderholm asked if the revisions could be submitted gradually, when other revisions are needed. Ms. Griffith said yes.

Dr. Richard Flynn and Dr. Beth Howells did not agree with why the SLOs had to be included in the course revisions. Ms. Griffith recommended that Dr. Howells have a conversation with Dr. Delena Gatch, in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, regarding what specifically she is looking for in the form of course objectives/outcomes verses program outcomes.

There was further discussion regarding the importance of including this information in CIM. The committee agreed to move forward with reviewing the curriculum items on the agenda. Dr. Harris reminded everyone that moving forward this will be expected in all submissions. The timeline for curriculum revisions will be left to the discretion of the departments.

Dr. Harris suggested that colleges submit their curriculum revisions early so that the committee is not reviewing a large amount of curriculum during the April meeting when they are reviewing the Comprehensive Program Reviews.

IV. DIRECTOR’S UPDATE

Dr. Ashley Walker shared the following updates:

- The Accelerated Bachelors to Masters proposals will require approval from both the Undergraduate Committee and the Graduate Committee. When entering this information into CIM departments will need to submit two separate proposals, one for UGC and the other for GC. It is recommended to edit your current program pages in the CIM system.

- Reminded programs with full-time enrollment exceptions that they were only grandfathered in for this year. If programs want to continue to have this exception in the 2019-2020 academic year they will need to submit proposals through CIM as a program revisions. This will ensure the items are routed for EMC approval through the workflow. There is a question on the CIM form that asks if the program revision will impact enrollment. Please select yes to this question so that the request will be sent to EMC.

- The COGS Newsletter, The Grad Post, was sent out Tuesday to graduate students, Graduate Program Directors, Department Chairs, and Administrators. Please feel free to forward the message to your colleagues.

- During the September grant cycle the Armstrong GSO council awarded 7 travel grants ($5,189.40). The Statesboro GSO council awarded 7 research ($6,168.44) and 12 travel grants ($8,166.10). The next grant deadline to submit travel and research proposals to the GSO is November 15. COGS will be sending emails reminders to students. Please encourage your students to apply.
The Fall GSO events went well. The councils hosted the following events:

- Statesboro council hosted the annual GSO Tailgate during the October 6 homecoming game. There were 134 graduate students and faculty in attendance.
- GSO Armstrong council hosted a Trick or Trivia event on October 30 and there were 30 in attendance.
- GSO Armstrong council hosted a Grant Writing Workshop on November 6 and 10 graduate students attended.
- The GSO Statesboro council will be hosting their annual GSO Fall Social at Nonna Picci on Wednesday, November 28, from 7-10 PM. COGS will be sending emails reminders to students. Please encourage your students to attend.

- The last fall Graduate Writer’s Boot Camp is scheduled November 10, from 9:30 AM – 4:15 PM. Lunch and swag items will be provided by COGS and the Graduate Student Organization. Students must register in order to attend.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. College of Arts and Humanities
   Dr. Beth Howells presented the agenda items for the College of Arts and Humanities.
   Department of Literature
   Course Revisions:
   - ENGL 5090G - Special Topics in English
     JUSTIFICATION:
     Can be online or F2F.
   - ENGL 5526G - 20th and 21st Century British Literature
     JUSTIFICATION:
     Can be online or F2F.

   MOTION: Dr. Flynn made a motion to approve the agenda items submitted by the College of Arts and Humanities. A second was made by Dr. Meca Williams-Johnson, and the motion to approve the Course Revisions without conditions was passed.

B. Waters College of Health Professions
   Dr. Karen Spears and Dr. Stephen Rossi presented the agenda items for the Waters College of Health Professions.
   Department of Health Sciences and Kinesiology
   New Course:
   - NTFS 7790 - Practicum in Nutrition and Dietetics
     JUSTIFICATION:
     Provide credit hours for required practicum.

   MOTION: Dr. Williams-Johnson made a motion to approve the New Course submission by the Waters College of Health Professions. A second was made by Dr. Flynn, and the motion to approve the agenda item was passed.

   Course Revisions:
   - HADM 6350 - Legal Environment of Health Care
     JUSTIFICATION:
     The existing course combined legal and ethical content and was created a few years ago due to a need to add a program capstone course to the MHA curriculum and abide within existing program credit hour constraints. Given concurrent curricular changes being made and the need to expand legal and ethical content that cannot be covered adequately in the existing combined course, we propose to modify the content of the existing course to focus predominantly on legal environment and expand ethics content as part of revised 2nd year professional seminar course.
   - HADM 7500 - Strategic Management and Marketing Healthcare Organizations
     JUSTIFICATION:
     Currently, the MHA program teaches a stand-alone marketing course (HADM 6550). In order to accommodate the additional credit hours of content in the Ethics and Leadership course and stay
within the 53 hour limit, it is necessary to streamline the existing curriculum. The MHA faculty that teach
the existing strategy and marketing courses have discussed the overall feasibility of adding the didactic
marketing content to the strategy course and approve of this change, given the previous addition of the
MHA capstone course for purposes of strategy and marketing content application.

**HADM 7600 - Ethics and Leadership in Health Administration**

*JUSTIFICATION:*
Concurrent with the changes to the existing legal environment course (HADM 6350), we propose to
modify and expand (from 1 to 3 credit hours) the existing 2nd year professional seminar course to
focus primarily on content related to applied and professional ethics in healthcare settings and
leadership development skills for early careerist MHA students. Through examinations of philosophical
texts, case studies, discussions, and presentations, students will examine, consider, and propose
resolutions to both routine and unique biomedical and managerial ethical dilemmas. The course will
focus on bridging theory with applied ethics and “real-world” decision-making (“identifying and doing the
right thing” in a variety of health-related situations) and explore effective and moral leadership.

**Revised Program(s):**
**MHA-HLTH - Health Administration M.H.A.**

*JUSTIFICATION:*
Curriculum changes to meet current CAHME curriculum accreditation standards.

Dr. Julie Reagan stated she teaches the Legal Health Environment course for the former MHA program
on the Statesboro campus. She asked Dr. Rossi if they have the course outcomes. Dr. Harris stated
the outcomes are included in CIM. Dr. Reagan said in the spring she will be teaching the first year
class on the Statesboro campus. She said Dr. Joey Crosby wanted to ensure that the courses on each
campus be consistent. Dr. Reagan and Dr. Rossi will work together to confirm the course outcomes
are the same.

**MOTION:** Dr. Williams-Johnson made a motion to approve the Course Revisions and the MHA Program
Revision by the Waters College of Health Professions. A second was made by Dr. Flynn, and the
motion to approve the agenda items was passed.

**CERG-GERO - Gerontology Graduate Certificate**

*JUSTIFICATION:*
The revised statement clarifies that the nine credit hours of approved electives must be at the 5000
level or higher.

**MOTION:** Dr. Flynn made a motion to approve the Certificate Program Revision submitted by the
Waters College of Health Professions. A second was made by Dr. Andrew Hansen, and the motion to
approve the agenda item was passed.

**C. Discussion of Prior Learning Assessment Policy Revision** – Dr. Linderholm provided a brief
explanation of what the PLA policy is and stated when it was first approved the maximum credit hours
was aligned with the transfer policy. Dr. Linderholm explained that the transfer policy has changed
from 6 to 9, and asked the committee to consider revising the policy to align with the current transfer
policy. The suggested revisions are listed below.

**Prior Learning Assessment Policy**

Georgia Southern University graduate programs may offer students an opportunity to
obtain select graduate credit by Prior Learning Assessment (PLA). For programs opting-in, PLA is the means by which university credit can be awarded for learning gains resulting from experiences outside of the traditional university milieu. A maximum of 6 9
credit hours may be earned via PLA, with the total number of PLA credit hours earned and credit hours transferred from another institution not to exceed 6 9 credit hours.

A student’s eligibility for PLA will be determined by the department chair in collaboration with the subject area program faculty and approved by the College of
Graduate Studies. The department will determine the number of semester hours of graduate credit for which a student may request eligibility. A student may be deemed eligible for PLA before or within the first semester of admission to one of the University’s graduate programs. Note: Eligibility for PLA does not guarantee program admission. Program admission and eligibility for PLA are separate and distinct decisions.

Graduate credit earned by PLA will be considered resident credit. A grade of “B” or better on any and all assessments is required to receive graduate credit. Graduate credit earned by PLA will be noted as “K” on a student’s Georgia Southern University transcript. Program faculty will determine the appropriateness of accepting PLA for their individual degree programs. Program faculty may also specify courses to be excluded or included for possible PLA credit.

**Prior Learning Assessment Procedures**

The procedure for seeking PLA credit is as follows:

1. Student petitions the department chair of the subject area before or within the first semester of program admission for an opportunity to demonstrate competence in the learning outcomes associated with a particular course or set of courses listed in the University’s Graduate Catalog. To petition the department chair to engage the PLA process, students must complete and submit the following form: https://cogs.georgiasouthern.edu/wp-content/uploads/PLA-COGS-form.pdf

2. The department chair or his/her designee will provide guidance to the student regarding how competence must be demonstrated, the acceptable timeframe for demonstrating competence, and the process of review (previously determined by department chairs in conjunction with program faculty members).

3. The student submits evidence of competence in the form and within the timeframe acceptable to the faculty of the program from which credit is sought. The evidence appropriate for each course under consideration for PLA will be determined by program faculty. Options include but are not limited to portfolios, exams, digital badges, or other means consistent with the learning outcomes of the course or courses at the program discretion.

4. The program faculty members will determine acceptable dates of evidence submission for each course or set of courses for which credit is sought via PLA.

5. The student will receive notification of performance results within a timeframe established by the program.

6. Students may appeal PLA decisions by following the procedures established by the university grade appeal process.

**MOTION:** Dr. Hansen made a motion to approve the revisions to the Prior Learning Assessment Policy. A second was made by Dr. Jennifer Kowalewski, and the motion to approve the revised policy was passed.

Dr. Tracy Linderholm stated it is a good recruitment strategy for programs to include if they accept PLA credit on their program page.

**VI. OLD BUSINESS**

**A. Enrollment Management Council Members List** – During the September meeting the committee request a revised list of the Enrollment Management Council. The revised list is below.
B. Discussion of issues related to ongoing assessment of alumni – No update was provided.

C. Prior Learning Assessment Update – The link below was provided by Dr. Linderholm to be shared with the committee. The webpage shows where the program faculty have clearly laid out their PLA process. Seeing this might help committee members understand the concept a little better.
https://coe.georgiasouthern.edu/tcld/prior-learning-assessments-procedures-and-timelines/

D. Registrar's Update – Ms. Doris Mack stated there were no updates from the Registrar's Office, but she would be happy to answer any questions.

Dr. David Williams asked for clarification on how to complete the program hours on their Accelerated Bachelors to Masters proposals. Ms. Mack said to keep the hours the same as what is listed for the program, and to include the ABM hours at the bottom.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS – Dr. Harris stated that post-consolidation the College of Graduate Studies has been reviewing the graduate policies. He stated Dr. Walker has discussed this with him and they will be sending
an email out to the committee to perhaps form a sub-committee to review some of the policies to see if any revisions need to be made.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on November 8, 2018 at 10:09 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Audie Graham, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved December 5, 2018 by electronic vote of Committee Members
I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Ed Mondor called the meeting to order on Wednesday, September 12, 2018 at 12:10 PM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
A motion was made to approve the agenda as written. A second was made, and the motion to approve the agenda was passed.

III. CHAIR’S UPDATE
None.

IV. NEW BUSINESS
A. Election of Chair for Committee
   a. Patricia Holt and Catherine Macgowan graciously agreed to Co-Chair the Planning, Budget, and Facilities Committee for 2018-2019.

B. Election of Secretary
   a. None elected.

C. Discussion Topics:
   a. Shooting Center restricting international students (and faculty)
      i. Maura Copeland was present to discuss why some international students and faculty cannot use the gun range at the Shooting Sports Education Center (SSEC).
      ii. Maura stated that it was a federal law that barred some international students and faculty from using the facility. It was dependent on the type of visa the person had (not on their country of origin), whether they were legally allowed to “possess” a firearm. Georgia Southern must comply with all federal laws. In addition, some international students do not have a SSN, and a SSN is required for a background check to use the facility.
      iii. A discussion then ensued as to whether students barred from using this portion of the facility should receive a reduction in fees, as the SSEC is partially funded through the
RAC fee. Rob Whitaker stated that it would be difficult to discern exactly what portion of the RAC fee should be refunded, as it is not a set amount of the fee that goes to the SSEC each year. Furthermore, it would set a bad precedent for students to be refunded fees just because they didn’t want to use a certain facility on campus.

iv. It was argued that this was a completely different situation, and in fact would not be setting a precedent for those students choosing not to use a certain service, as the international students weren’t choosing not to use the SSEC, they were legally barred from using the SSEC.

v. A motion was made to not provide a reduction in fees to international students that were barred from using the SSEC facility. The motion was seconded, and the motion was approved.

b. Progress and cost of campus signage (re-signage)
   i. Rob Whitaker discussed the cost of signage (and re-signage) that is occurring on the Armstrong and Liberty campuses.
   ii. Funding for signage can be put into 6 main categories: Large signs – Armstrong ($40K), Directional signs – Armstrong ($140K), Interior wall – Liberty ($6.5K), Interior building – Armstrong ($100K), Department of Transportation Signs – All over Savannah ($10K), and Billboards – Highway ($9K).
   iii. A question was raised if the signage/re-signage costs also included banners, badges, letterhead, police cars, etc. Rob Whitaker said that he could provide more details at the next meeting if people had questions about particular expenses.

c. Timeline for faculty salary alignment
   i. Rob Whitaker stated that the faculty salary alignment survey is scheduled to be completed by December 2018 or January 2019. The total cost of the survey is $76K. The timeline is unknown, however, for actual salary adjustments.
   ii. When the survey has been completed, the first thing that will be addressed is: What are the critical issues?
   iii. Rob Whitaker was not sure when or how the results would be communicated to faculty.

d. Possible GS purchase of Savannah Mall (Savannah, GA)
   i. Rumors have been circulating that Georgia Southern is interested in purchasing the Savannah Mall (Savannah, GA).
   ii. Rob Whitaker stated that he has not had any conversations about purchasing the mall, and to the best of his knowledge no one else associated with Georgia Southern University has had any conversations about it.
   iii. There have been conversations about buying the Kroger grocery store adjacent to Armstrong campus. Kroger, however, will only lease the building, they will not sell it.
   iv. With regards to land purchases, the development of South Campus (Statesboro, GA) is progressing. Roads and lighting have been put in, with funding from the state. GS has also purchased two additional pieces of land for South Campus. Some concerns have been raised about creating safe passage from the current campus to South Campus. To extend Akins Boulevard from one side of campus to the other is not easy to do. Thoughts about increasing safety, such as installing a tunnel to cross Akins Boulevard is currently being considered.

e. Student worker payroll issues
   i. Many student payroll issues exist. For example: Why are there different student salaries between campuses? Why are student workers working for weeks with no salary?
   ii. It was suggested that the paperwork is too complex and should be streamlined.
   iii. Rob Whitaker stated that he was aware of several pay discrepancy issues for student workers. Electronic hiring is progressing, which will hopefully help with the hiring process.
   iv. It was suggested that Human Resources (HR) should come to a future meeting to explain “chart streams” and “mapping”.

f. Hiring of consultants
   i. A question was posed about the fees we pay each year to outside consultants.
ii. Maura Copeland stated that if a consultancy costs over $25K, it must be bid out.

iii. Rob Whitaker said that he would be happy to provide details on any consultancy fee, if he had more details about which one was being requested.

iv. The list is very long, and it would be hard to discern exactly what each consultant was hired to do, as the statement would list a person or company’s name and what they were paid.

v. Rob Whitaker said that he would be happy to provide a list, however, of any year requested.

vi. Patricia Holt requested all for this academic year over $25K.

g. Financial aid overpayment impacts

i. Rob Whitaker stated that Georgia Southern, from 2011-2015, had given financial aid to students that were not eligible to receive aid. The federal government was requesting repayment of those funds.

ii. Georgia Southern University sent a reimbursement of approximately $9.4 million, over two fiscal years (one check in June 2018, one check in July 2018).

iii. This money came from fiscal reserves (i.e., end of year money), so it did not directly impact any department or college budget.

iv. The university is currently in the process of figuring out new course numbers, new programs, etc. and how it affects financial aid.

v. On another note, also regarding financial aid, there has been concern about students that start courses later in the term being dropped at the beginning of the term. These students having their registration cancelled and losing financial aid. Amy Ballagh said that she would definitely look into this matter, to see how she could assist these students.

V. OLD BUSINESS

None.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on Wednesday, September 12, 2018 at 1:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Ed Mondor, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved <<Date>> by electronic vote of Committee Members
STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE MINUTES
Student Success Committee Meeting Date – January 22, 2019

Present: Dr. Dragos Amarie, Physics; Dr. Kwabena Boakye, Management.; Lauren McMillan, Armstrong Library; Dr. Fayth Parks, Education; Dr. Lace Svec, Biology, Dr. Reed Smith, Communication Arts; Dr. Jennifer Zorotovich, Family Development; Greg Anderson, Sec. Yr. Exp.; Holley Camacho, Research; Dr. Tilicia Mayo-Gamble, Health Policy; Christy Rikard, Dir., Admissions; Cathy Roberts-Cooper, Academic Success; Kimberly Simpson, CAH Advisor; Amy Smith, Enrollment Management; Ashley Walker, Graduate Students; Dr. Mark Whitesel, Interim Dean of Students

Absent: Dr. Elizabeth Rasnick, IT; Dr. Diana Sturges, KINS; Dr. Dustin Anderson, Senate, Dr. Chris Caplinger, FYE; Dr. Christine Ludowise, Associate Provost; Favour Ukpongson, SGA Rep.

I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Reed Smith called the meeting to order on Tuesday, January 22, 2019 at 4:04 PM.

II. NEW BUSINESS
A. Subcommittees Created
   • Subcommittee for Retention (proposal 4): Ashley Walker, Dr. Lace Svec, and Kimberly Simpson. These members will work to start developing retention plans and a document that would require discussion with the Provost Office. Ashley Walker would like to expand proposal 4 to include graduate students as there is a problem with the retention rate of graduate students.
   • Subcommittee for Incoming Scholarships (proposal 1): Dr. Mark Whitesel, Dr. Jennifer Zorotovich, and Christy Rikard. These members will work to make contacts and do research with University Advancement to aid in scholarships for students to help with retention rates.

B. Academic Success Center - Cathy Roberts-Cooper
   • Cathy explained the Learning Goals and Services for the Academic Success Center. She also presented on the location and staffing across the three campuses and services provided on each campus. Cathy presented on the changes to the programs offered by the Academic Success Center, including the Academic Intervention Program for any undergraduate with an institutional GPA less than 2.0, the Learning Support for math and English placement, and the Outreach program. The Outreach program includes Tutoring, Mentoring, Workshops, Presentations, and Consultations.

III. OLD BUSINESS
A. Recommendations for Committee to address – Four recommendations from Fall 2018: 1) scholarships for incoming freshmen, which needs involvement of University Advancement; 2) bottlenecking courses; 3) full implementation of Momentum Year and Growth Mindset in FYE and Academic Success Center, which Dr. Caplinger has implemented in FYE; 4) putting a retention plan into writing for Georgia Southern University, which includes defining faculty role in student success.
   • It was suggested to reword proposal 1 to include students other than incoming freshmen, helping to stress continuity for students. Faculty Senate Moderator Dustin Anderson recommended a subcommittee to work on this proposal.
   • Dr. Anderson said proposal 3 may be submitted to the Senate as a motion.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS
A. Reminder to Subcommittees – Reminder to the two subcommittees to work together before the next meeting to present findings and/or preliminary proposals on February 19, 2019.
Student Success Committee
Proposed Recommendation 1

Georgia Southern University should investigate strategies for increasing the number of scholarships available for both incoming and ongoing students in order to make the university more competitive in the recruitment and retention of high-quality students. Most likely, finding methods to increase Foundation funding needs to become a university priority.
Recommendation # 2

Georgia Southern University should investigate methods to reduce the number of so-called Bottleneck Courses. That is, courses that meet maximum capacity on a continuing basis; thereby, preventing students from securing enrollment in courses that allow them to meet prerequisites for subsequent courses. Included among possible solutions are the hiring of adjunct faculty so additional sections can be offered and more effectively managing Wait List strategies, and implement periodic adviser-faculty interactions, so both parties in the process better understand each other’s challenges.
Georgia Southern University should fully implement all the elements of the Momentum Year and Growth Mindset strategies in the FYE and the Student Success Center, as well as whenever feasible across the university curriculum, so students are better prepared, both academically and emotionally, to meet the demands of a rigorous university education.

(May be submitted to Senate as a motion)
Georgia Southern University should devise and implement a university wide Retention Plan that outlines strategies that will aid both undergraduate and students in successfully completing their degree in a successful and timely manner.
V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on Tuesday, January 22, 2019 at 5:05 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Katharine Ours, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved <<Date>> by electronic vote of Committee Members