

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

4-4-2018

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*. 43.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/43>

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
April 4, 2018
4:00 – 6:00 p.m.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Cheryl Aasheim; Samuel Adeyeye; Evans Afriyie-Gyawu; Samuel Opoku for Moya Alfonso; Dragos Amarie; Dustin Anderson; Kelly Berry; Helen Bland; Cary Christian for Ted Brimeyer; Christopher Brown; Robert Costomiris; Finbarr Curtis; Marc Cyr; Lisa Denmark; Meghan Dove; Mark Edwards; Michelle Haberland; Alice Hall; Chuck Harter; Ming Fang He; Jonathan Hilbert; Barbara King; Jennifer Kowalewski; Hsiang-Jui Kung; Alisa Leckie; Lili Li; Ron MacKinnon; Natalie James for Leticia McGrath; Marshall Ransom; Peter Rogers; Ed Rushton; Hans-Joerg Schanz; Jake Simons; Stephanie Sipe; Chasen Smith; Fred Smith; Janice Steirn; Linda Thompson; Mark Welford; Meca Williams-Johnson; Hayden Wimmer

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Mete Akcaoglu; Rocio Alba-Flores; Heidi Altman; Adam Bossler; Gavin Colquitt; Anoop Desai; Bob Jackson; Drew Keane; Mujibur Khan; Eric Landers; Li Li; Yi Lin; Li Ma; Santanu Majumdar; Ed Mondor; Constantin Ogloblin; Robert Pirro; Jorge Suazo; Marian Tabi; Shijun Zheng

Senate Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy
SGA: Grantson Martin

Administrators: Jaimie Hebert; Amy Ballagh; Diana Cone; Chris Curtis; Amy Heaston; Georj Lewis; Mohammad Davoud; Curtis Ricker

Visitors: Candace Griffith; Chris Caplinger; Anitra Busley; Jonquette Sanders; Shiam Sivell; Gelene Soleyn; Tamica Reed; Kiamber Haynes; Danielle Renew

-
1. [Approval of the Agenda for the April 4, 2018 meeting. Marc Cyr for Rob Pirro:](#)

Senate Secretary Marc Cyr (CAH) said that Rob Pirro was unable to attend due to illness and so had asked Cyr to conduct the meeting.

The agenda was moved, seconded, and Approved.

2. [Approval of the March 6, 2018 minutes: Marc Cyr \(CAH\), Senate Secretary.](#)

Moved, seconded, and Approved.

3. Librarian's Report for April 4, 2018: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian.

Approval of the Librarian's Report was moved and seconded. Cyr reminded senators that this vote would be to approve the report for accuracy only; upcoming votes to approve the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees' minutes, for example, would in fact approve any recommendations of those individual committees. The Librarian's Report was Approved.

a. Undergraduate Committee: Alisa Leckie (COE), Chair

They had conducted some curriculum business, mostly minor and clerical, for clarity's sake. The first concerned accreditation that needed to happen when programs were merged between campuses: Armstrong noticed that their accrediting body would not be able to approve those programs, so they just made some class adjustments to keep accreditation in line. And then in their radiological science and respiratory therapy programs, they added some clarity on program pages for students to be able to follow those programs. Leckie anticipated more such minor curriculum changes because they had done a lot of work in a really short period of time, and couldn't foresee everything that would be needed.

They also took a stab at updating their Bylaws, cherry-picking the best language from Armstrong and Statesboro, to reflect the newly consolidated Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. One piece that was approved is the addition of an ex-officio member on the committee from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Their big question regards committee membership to ensure appropriate participation across campuses. Currently, they had two representatives from each college, one elected by the college and one appointed by the SEC, and they had intended to follow Faculty Senate apportionment, making sure to have a certain number of Armstrong faculty. However, the representative from the College of Public Health indicated that they have very few faculty members on the Armstrong campus and they are completely overwhelmed with committees. They wanted Senate guidance regarding the issue of committee membership.

They also discussed the committee's role in the comprehensive review process. Armstrong's Undergraduate Curriculum Committee did not participate in the comprehensive review at all. They solicited input from a variety of sources and decided to continue to participate in Comprehensive Program Review, primarily to be in line with the General Education and Core Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Curriculum Committee as they participate in that process, and emphasizing the fact that they review reports so that they are clear, coherent and able to be understood by the

Board of Regents, who are in essence lay people in the field and not necessarily technical experts.

Jake Simons (COB) wanted to know what bylaws Leckie was referring to.

Leckie said Armstrong used the word “bylaws” while we have an “operating code.”

Simons asked where this document was published, and Leckie noted it is on the Committee’s website.

Cyr said that the issue of the committee membership was something that the SEC would need to discuss. He noted this was the sort of thing the Library has always faced.

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) said our Senate Bylaws indicate that it should be one representative per college. Any change to that would require a Senate vote.

Cyr said that wasn’t the issue; rather, the problem was potentially having no representation from one of the campuses. He added that he hadn’t been making a suggestion, only noting that it was a problem that needed to be discussed.

The motion to approve was seconded and the report Approved.

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

Cawthorn was not present. Fred Smith (LIB) said they had met recently and mostly tweaked their operating code. There was no report to be made

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

The Graduate Committee met on March 8th primarily to go over some new policy language to introduce some clarity in the new Handbook. The items were centered on enrollment, dual degrees, internal credit hour sharing, senior privilege, the accelerated bachelor’s/master’s program, and some language clarifying our requirements for graduate assistants. The committee felt comfortable with all those changes as they were done cooperatively with representatives from the Armstrong campus.

The report was moved, seconded, and Approved.

4. Provost’s Report: Diana Cone

Provost Cone thanked faculty and especially advisors for their hard work during a very difficult registration period. With course names and numbers changing, colleges changing, it was difficult to make sure that students are on track to get their degree.

IAB Building

This is on track for on-time completion.

Faculty Resignations

There were some concerns that maybe we have had a larger number of faculty resignations this spring than we typically had in the past. On the Statesboro campus we have had a total of 30 resignations this spring, and 13 of those are retirements. Typically, in any given year, we start off the year doing between 80 to 100 searches, so we are not anywhere near over where we would be in any typical year.

Mark Welford (COSM) asked for the registration numbers for the Fall for both the Armstrong and Statesboro campuses.

Amy Ballagh (Interim Vice President for Enrollment Management) said we were at 4,138 within our second day of registration for fall.

Welford asked if that was up or down.

VP Ballagh said, “Since we really compare to previous year because we are several off-track by dates, it’s really, really difficult to tell at this point, so we are keeping a very close eye on it as we move through the next couple of weeks. But the numbers are looking relatively good.”

Michelle Haberland (CAH) asked for the Armstrong numbers, or clarification if the number cited was combined. Her understanding was that Armstrong had suffered a significant decline in enrollment, that consolidation has had a negative impact on students coming to Armstrong.

VP Ballagh said that as of the previous day 659 students had registered for Armstrong, and added, “. . . we are tracking by campus, and so it’s really difficult to judge where we are comparatively from year-to-year, but we are keeping a close eye on that as well. And it’s a smaller portion of our overall enrollment.”

Haberland didn’t understand the difficulty, given that Armstrong had data on previous enrollments.

VP Ballagh said it was “simply because of the registration dates and how rolled out to Armstrong, compared to how they rolled out from Georgia Southern, as of last year, so when we’re adding the numbers together, we’re doing them at the same time and so the numbers are comparative.”

5. President's Report: Jaimie Hebert

President Hebert said that they would continue to provide enrollment information to anyone interested, noting that this was a number one concern, not only insuring overall enrollments, but maintaining the balance of enrollments across all campuses. He said there was a myth floating around Armstrong that things were disappearing, that students weren't going to be completing degrees, and so forth, none of which was true. He said there were far more opportunities for students on that campus than before, and any student who entered a program there would have the opportunity to complete that program.

Provost Search Successfully Completed

Dr. Carl Reiber had accepted our offer for the Provost's position. He was already engaged with people on our campus and with the system.

Motions

Of the motions that came forward at the last meeting, he had Approved all but one. He did not Approve the motion regarding students exercising their right to protest because he felt it was unnecessary for two reasons: One, we have a process in place which allows us, on a case-by-case basis, to examine a student's disciplinary record and make a subjective decision here on our campus. He believed this was more equitable than having a blanket statement that may lead to difficulties in interpretation down the road. Two, we are prohibited from denying access to the University when a person is exercising constitutional rights. He was grateful to the Senate for bringing this up, however, because it caused the University to consider what this process is all about, that it is about protecting the security and safety of our campus, and that we should never utilize that process to invoke our political views.

Mark Welford (COSM) understood that our future Provost would maintain two labs, one on the Savannah campus and one in Statesboro, and he was concerned that those labs might distract him from his work as Provost.

President Hebert said he and Dr. Reiber had discussed that quite a bit. Dr. Reiber had assured him that, currently, at UNLV he didn't have very much time to spend in his lab, but the graduate students in that lab maintain the funded research that is going on. He will be bringing with him a technician/graduate student who will work in the lab.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Marc Cyr (CAH), Senate Secretary

Cyr said he would read the report as written by Moderator Pirro and likely direct any questions to other members of the SEC because he had not been able to attend the agenda setting meeting.

Strategic Plan Draft Update

The eight committee members, composed of four faculty members, two staff members, and two Student Government members, drawn from various campuses of our consolidated university, had finished an initial draft of Strategic Values and Priorities and submitted it to the administration. Once the committee got the draft back from the administration, they would hold forums on all campuses in order to get feedback from students, staff, and faculty. After that, they would revise the statement and submit a final draft to the President sometime in May.

Senate Office Elections

The ballot would come out early the following week. It looked like all offices would be contested.

RFI on Shooting Sports Education Center

While we were promised by members of the former administration that the Sports Shooting Center would pay for itself, that is not the case now, and is not likely to be the case anytime soon. Significant amounts of student fees are being diverted into supporting the center, so it was worth asking whether this is the best use of funds and whether adjustments should and can be made to better reflect student recreational needs. The Senate Executive Committee suggested that the new Senate Standing Committee on Planning and Budget might be the proper venue for considering this issue. That committee was in the process of being formed.

Discussion Item on Transitional P & T Standards

This was on the agenda because a Senate Executive Committee member felt that the issue has kept coming up in Senate meetings, and that it would be a good idea to have a less ad hoc discussion. The agenda contained language passed by the Armstrong Senate plus a couple of qualifications that were suggested to cover contingency business. So far the only university-wide statement we had on this issue was the Provost's message for next academic year, that people should go up for P & T based on the standards under which they were hired.

Robert Costomiris (CAH) commented on the response to his RFI re: the Shooting Sports Education Center. He thanked Mr. Sherry for providing the information, and asked that the numbers be included in the minutes:

“66% of the Shooting Education Center’s budget comes from RAC fees. That’s 7% total RAC fees. 502 students used the SSEC per year. . . . if you take the \$370,000 coming from RAC fees, divide it by the number of students, that’s \$737 per student to use the [Shooting] Sports Education Center. Okay, if you take that number of \$370,000 and divide it by student individual visits, of 9,306 [that is] \$40 per visit for each student to visit the Sports Shooting Center. Now those numbers are meaningless unless you see them in the light of what the general public pays, so there are 1,351 members from the general public, non-student members, who pay or contribute to the cost, the budget of the Shooting Center, \$193,000. If you divide \$193,000 by 1,351, you only come up with a cost of the general user of \$142 per year. [*Secretary’s Note:* [link to fees](#)] So it’s significantly less than what students themselves are contributing per student per year. Now, it’s not clear to me. . . . These are very gross calculations. There are other things that I can’t figure out based on the numbers that are given to me because the budget provided by Mr. Sherry does not provide exact numbers of what membership fees are, what user fees are, he doesn’t break that down. So it may not look this bad, but . . . it’s still odd, and oddly imbalanced. It seems to me that students, I think, the student RAC fees seem to be underwriting the public operation of this facility. And I guess what I would do is ask the students themselves, whether the Student Government Association wants to look into this and see if there’s anything, what they think about the way this is dividing up.”

Jake Simons (COBA) thought that the SEC suggestion that the new budget committee look into this matter was appropriate because that type of analysis can be very revealing, but also needs to be looked at in the totality of the RAC facilities.

Cyr agreed with Simons and with Costomiris’s suggestion that the SGA think about those numbers.

Michelle Haberland (CAH) asked Cyr if he had a suggestion re: how faculty might look into the SSEC’s and University’s relationship with Daniel Defense Industries. Cyr thought that issue would be part of the parcel of issues looked at by the new budget committee, or she could contact the chair when the committee is staffed.

7. Discussion Item on Transitional P & T Standards

Cyr noted the language included in the agenda re: this item (*see below*). He thought the language was good because it was relatively streamlined. He noted that Jonathan Hilpert was on the OWG and the Welfare Committee, which have been looking at these matters, and turned initial remarks over to him.

- a. “Faculty members hired into the tenure track shall be responsible within their probationary period for meeting the College and departmental/school promotion and tenure criteria in effect at the time their employment begins. For all subsequent promotions, faculty members shall be responsible for meeting the College and departmental/school promotion criteria in effect at the time of their most recent promotion or post-tenure review. However, any candidate for tenure or promotion may elect to use the current criteria if they choose.” [*from the Armstrong Faculty Senate*]
- b. Remaining under the promotion and tenure criteria in effect at the time employment begins or in effect at the time of the most recent promotion or post-tenure review assumes there has been no change in the mix of teaching, research, and service duties for which one was hired or under which one worked at the last promotion or post-tenure review.
- c. Any elected changes to promotion or tenure or post-tenure criteria and mix of teaching, research, and service duties should be worked out with the department/school head in writing.

Jonathan Hilpert (COE) noted that at the last Senate meeting he had made some comments about the fact that those committees had developed several different working models, and he and Jim Lobue had passed along language from the OWG to the Senate Executive Committee. Some language that came from the Armstrong Faculty Senate was in this day’s agenda, as well as a couple of other things. He thought it was “important that as a group, we have a very rich discussion about what this transitional language is and what it means for people.” He also had a couple of suggestions for additions, but wanted to make those “within the context of a broader conversation about this language and its merits. “

When no one spoke up, Cyr noted that one thing Hilpert and he had talked about before the meeting was Hilpert’s suggestion that the references to current policies and practices made it important that those policies and procedures not “get lost”; we need to have some kind of directive that they remain recorded and filed now, before all systems get integrated and the previous systems jettisoned, so that there can be no mistakes or misunderstandings re: what policies individual faculty members are operating under.

Hilpert thought the proffered language did a good job of making sure that people will be evaluated under the policies that they were hired under until they reach the next level of advancement, and of how if workload changes, the nature of the individual’s guidelines should probably also change. But he thought some things were missing: First, that policy storage issue. The OWG suggested they be in electronic repositories that can be accessed by the individuals involved and, importantly, by all personnel reviewers. He further noted that procedures for external review were not addressed here, and some campuses have procedures for letter writing, and others don’t. Procedures for internal review differ from campus to campus as well, and this was not addressed. Neither was

there anything about lecturers. There was also nothing about the mechanism by which such language would become policy, whether this would require a change to the Faculty Handbook or come about via some other route in Academic Affairs.

Jake Simons (COB) noted our current guidance for policy and procedures required the colleges to have implementing procedures. He concurred with the archiving proposal, and thought those archives would then contain the information needed about the other items Hilpert had mentioned.

Cyr agreed, and thought this general transitional statement did not need to include details of the new policies that were being worked out.

(Secretary's Note: Policies and documents that the Senate passed are stored in [Digital Commons](#))

Hilpert said that meant that, in the case of external review, for example, some faculty members would be required to engage in external review, and some not.

Alice Hall (CBSS) said she has encouraged faculty in her unit who are not tenured to make sure they saved copies of the current guidelines on their desktop so they would have them as their protection, and her college currently requires applicants to include the standards that they're going under in their portfolios.

Janice Steirn (CBSS) was concerned that we have changed policies too frequently, that it's hard for her or anyone to figure out what policies apply. She also thought there would be problems with people who have just been tenured and promoted, and so in a few years they go for full, but they and someone on another campus doing the same will be judged by radically different policies.

Cyr said he was surprised, in the language here, not to see the term "personnel action," that you work under your current standards until the first personnel action you undergo, whether it's promotion and tenure or post-tenure review, or lecturer level, and then after that you're on the new ones.

Simons clarified that his earlier remarks were expressing a concern that we shouldn't feel that in crafting university-level policies we need to deal with issues that are currently at the discretion of the individual colleges.

Provost Cone said that Moderator Pirro had asked her to send out a statement for Fall 2018 and that subsequent segments may be coming out. She said what she had announced previously in Senate touched on what Cyr had just said, that faculty should be allowed to follow the pre-consolidation guidelines for their department or college until they go for their next review, so if they go Fall 18, Fall 19, or Fall 20, "whether it's post-tenure, pre-tenure, whatever, they would follow the guidelines that were in place this current year in their department or college." She thought the policy repository was a good idea. For example, "If they go for post-tenure, maybe they just finished post-tenure last year, so they have five years, and then they'll follow up with guidelines that were pre-consolidation until their next review, was really what the intent was." She thought

that “where we’ve got a little bit of confusion was that there was some discussion that faculty may be given some different workload options, moving forward, so that if they have been strictly on a 4-4 teaching load and not . . . much expectation for scholarly works, then now if they are given a 3-3 teaching load, should they be held more accountable. That may be the case, and I think that’s what the language here on this page is trying to get at, but I would like to remind you that it does take a little bit of time to gear up research, so even if they are given a 3-3 and they go in one or two more years for tenure, they probably haven’t had time to really garner many publication. So they still may need to follow under the pre-consolidation guidelines. But I think that’s what the committee was trying to get at here where they said they would work with their department chair.”

Hilpert said the language did discuss shifting workloads, but said nothing about working with a department chair or a faculty executive committee within a particular college, to reconstitute what the expectations or guidelines might be. Some of the language that came out of the OWG did have some recommendations for that process. He also noted concerns about storing past copies of the Faculty Handbook. [*Here is a link to previous Faculty Handbooks:* [older Faculty Handbooks](#)]

Robert Costomiris (CAH) thought that keeping hard copies of policies would be a good idea, as a redundancy. Faculty members could include copies of the policies under which they are going up in their materials so reviewers have them right at hand. He further noted that electronic copies might not be open to being clearly dated.

Fred Smith (LIB) asked where the P & T language in the agenda came from. Cyr said he thought Smith would know since he had been at the SEC meeting. Helen Bland (COPH), also an SEC member, said she didn’t know the source(s) either.

Hilpert thought this lack of clarity came back to the question of how these items would become actual policy: “It’s not real clear if it’s supposed to go to the Senate first and then the CIC, or the CIC and then the Senate. We’ve had a lot of conversations within our OWG about that process. I think we’re all very much in agreement that the Senate should be the ones who are reviewing and approving these documents because this is policy for us, by us, right? But also at the same time, I don’t know where this language came from and I don’t know how it got on this agenda, so . . . some of it’s better than what we put forward, but like I said, it seems to be missing a lot of the things that we’ve already brought through, and we don’t have a mechanism to approve it, even if we did get to a place where we liked it.”

Cyr supposed Moderator Pirro would clarify the source of the language. He then noted that he and Moderator Pirro had discussed a different Welfare Committee item that would likely be on the May agenda and that had come to Pirro as a “proposal.” Cyr had told Moderator Pirro that this was the sort of thing that “would need to come forward as a motion, not a ‘proposal,’ not a ‘let’s talk about it’ item, but a motion if you want it to go into the Handbook, if the Faculty Welfare Committee wants it to go in the Handbook: This is what you’ve worked out, this is what you think ought to go forward. Then it needs

to come to the senate as a motion, or we can't act on it. We can talk about it, but we can't act on it. It's got to be on the agenda ahead of time, so people can look at it."

Hilpert agreed.

8. Unfinished Business

None

9. New Business

Ming Fang He (COE) asked whether, since the merger, there had been discussion about the advancement of graduate study at Georgia Southern. Faculty she had talked to were "very discouraged" because we did not have a graduate school anymore.

Provost Cone was not sure where this confusion came from. She said we do still have a "College of Graduate Studies" and had hired a "director" for that, Ashley Walker, who directs that "center." We "have a full-staffed office now for Graduate Studies." The emerging Academic Strategic Plan will include Graduate Studies. Academic Affairs and the Deans have been working on their academic plan for expansion of programs, which includes a lot of requests coming forward to expand the Graduate programs. We currently provided more graduate assistantships to our colleges than ever before.

Cyr asked for clarification: Provost Cone had "called it both a 'college' and a 'center.' Is it an actual college with a dean, or is it a center with a director?"

Provost Cone said, "We have a College of Graduate Studies with a director."

Ming Fang He thought that issue might be the cause of the confusion. We used to have a Dean, now we had a Director, and she understood that a lot of daily functioning was handled in the Provost's office. She thought we used to have a much more encouraging environment for faculty doing "cutting edge research," including a ceremony celebrating the publication of books. She thought there was confusion on the part of faculty about where to go for support and guidance, and was concerned that we had a lack of vision in this area.

Dustin Anderson (CAH) said, "There was a division in between Research and Economic Development and the Graduate College, and speaking both as the Chair of the Graduate Curriculum Committee and as a Program Director, I've seen no drop off in productivity from the College of Graduate Studies. In fact, since Dr. Walker started that position, I feel like we've actually made some headway past where we were with the most previous Associate Dean that was in the position, so I don't know that the title for that has had any functional difference with what's gone on in that capacity. . . . I've had nothing but a more positive interaction with the College of Graduate Studies since Dr. Walker's interim position and hire, and I don't know that having a dean title there has made a phenomenal difference."

Michelle Haberland (CAH) had a question on another subject, this pertaining to the March 19 Faculty Senate meeting on the Armstrong campus. It was her understanding that at that meeting it was discussed or announced that the History Department would be moved from the Statesboro campus. She said this was an issue that involved many departments, the question of faculty input on such decisions. She also asked that Armstrong minutes be available to Statesboro faculty as well because the people at Armstrong seemed constantly to have information before those in Statesboro did.

Provost Cone noted that last summer the location of all departments was determined during the OWG work and posted on the [consolidation webpage](#). The History Department was designated as having its home department office on the Savannah campus at that time, so that should not be new information. She noted that every college was having at least one department on the Armstrong campus as a home base.

Haberland asked if that meant the faculty input would have been the people on the OWG who agreed to this.

Provost Cone said, “The OWG on the degrees and programs was a combination of the deans, and so they would have solicited input from their colleges to bring forward to the OWG.”

Haberland said, “Okay, I’m going to play hardball here. So then faculty weren’t represented then, directly. They were administrators who made that decision then. Is that correct?”

President Hebert said this had been part of “the full academic structure package that was rolled out” in late August. At the March Armstrong senate meeting he had been asked if the decision to home-base History in Savannah had been changed. He had answered that no changes had been made, that the History department would be located in Savannah, as published.

10. [Announcements: Vice Presidents](#)

None.

11. [Announcements from the Floor](#)

None.

12. [Adjournment](#)

Moved, seconded, and Approved.

Submitted by Marc Cyr, Senate Secretary