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I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 12:09pm

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

After discussion regarding revision of the agenda to discuss item IIIB prior to item IIIA, a motion was made, seconded and passed to approve the revised agenda.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. (Formerly item B) Member/reviewer training and norming

Six appeals from the Spring 2018 meeting were distributed for review and discussion. These included 2 appeals the committee approved, 2 appeals the committee denied and the Dean of the student’s College approved, and 2 appeals the committee and Dean of the student’s College denied.

The committee reviewed the process of calculating quality points, GPA requirements for good academic standing, and the process of calculating the deficit in quality points in order to be in good standing. Scenarios of future academic performance that would have to be achieved in order to reach good academic standing given various ranges of quality point deficits were discussed.
Issues considered during appeal review were discussed including the quality point deficit needed to be overcome in order to re-attain good academic standing, the student’s appeal explanation, and the student’s plan for future success.

The process of example appeals that would take place under the policies enacted as of this semester was also discussed.

No action required for information only item.

B. (Formerly item A) Future meeting logistics between campuses

The A/V technology for web-connected meetings was better at the current meeting location than the previous location. However, it was not adequate for future meetings when appeals would be discussed.

Options to streamline the appeal review process were discussed. One option involved changing the appeal review process from paper-based to electronic. Appeal requests would be processed through Maxient, and the student’s transcript would be appended to their appeal request. The appeal package would be randomly assigned to 4 committee members to independently review. The members would vote via a web-based form to approve, deny, discuss or abstain (in cases of conflict of interest). Appeals with unanimous votes to approve or deny would not require further discussion, while appeals with split votes or any vote to discuss would be reviewed during a live meeting.

Maxient features and capabilities were demonstrated to the committee members.

If Maxient is determined to be a feasible platform for reviewing appeals, restrictions would be added within the system to prevent committee members from viewing other unrelated cases that are in the system. These restrictions would also prevent users who are not part of the committee from viewing appeal cases.

It is estimated to take 1 minute per appeal to upload the student information that is not auto-populated in Maxient. The administrative burden is not expected to exceed the current demands.

The committee proposed creating 2-3 “dummy” appeals after the Fall 2018 semester using data of students who are placed on Warning 1 to test the actual administrative burden, to determine the feasibility of using Maxient to review appeals, to train committee members on using Maxient and to pilot the process of electronic appeal review assignment and voting.

A motion was made, seconded and passed to move forward with the test of this approach (using Maxient and electronic voting to process appeals) at the next meeting. No actual appeals will be involved in this process as no students will have reached a point in academic standing that is eligible for appeal – only “dummy” information will be used.

C. Scheduling of next meeting
A doodle poll of members will be conducted to determine the optimal meeting date and time during the last two weeks of January.

No action required for information only item.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. In addition to testing the Maxient/electronic appeal process, the next meeting will include an update from the sub-committee on recommendations for tracking outcomes

No action required for information only item.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made, seconded and passed at 1:58pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Sullivan, PhD, Committee Chair

Minutes were approved
14 November 2018
by electronic vote of Committee Members
I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Li Li called the meeting to order on <<Wednesday>>, <<8/28/18>> at <<11>> AM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Dr. Li made a motion to approve the agenda as written. The agenda was accepted by consensus.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Minutes of the from the 3/21/18 meeting were reviewed and approved by the committee via email in March of 2018. Minutes were submitted to the Senate Librarian.

IV. CHAIR’S UPDATE
The Chair welcomed the new committee members and welcomed back the returning members. The committee members introduced themselves and the colleges they represent.

Dr. Li reminded the committee of its charge as documented in the Faculty Handbook, Article IV Section 23. The Committee has 4 primary charges:

1. recommend policy and procedures covering all aspects of the University’s support of faculty research and creative projects;
2. review and evaluate proposals for faculty research funding and allocate funds budgeted for that purpose;
3. review and evaluate nominations for awards and prizes in the area of faculty research; and
4. address other specific questions in this area that may be requested by the Senate Executive Committee.

The Chair reminded committee members that their presence and participation in the work of this committee is important to assure the committee understands the research needs and process of research across the varied disciplines of the University.

Dr. Feltman encouraged the committee to create an open dialogue within the committee to broaden our perspective of what research and scholarship looks like across the disciplines.

Dr. Eremeeva reminded the committee that some disciplines have a more service based model of scholarship. Public Health incorporates practice in the community as part of the faculty commitment.

V. NEW BUSINESS
A. <<Calendaring of Fall Meetings>> – <<The committee agreed upon 3 Fall Meeting Dates.>>
1) **October 10** - 12:15 – 1:30 PM Veazey Hall 2001C – Committee members should be prepared to discuss Research/Scholarship in the disciplines within their college.

2) **November 7** – 12:00 – 1:30 PM Veazey Hall 2001 C - Excellence Review Assignments

3) **November 28** – 12:00 – 1:30 PM Veazey Hall 3001C- Excellence Award application review 1

B. **<<Review of Committee Programs>>**

The committee chair introduced the committee to the existing programs managed by the FRC Committee. Guidelines for each program were displayed on the overhead screens. In an effort toward transparency, guidelines, applications and rubrics are posted on the ORSSP website Internal Funding page [http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/find-funding/internal_funding/](http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/find-funding/internal_funding/).

**Committee Programs:**

**A. Award for Excellence in Research**

i. **Guidelines**
   1. Application - [http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/internal-funding-forms/](http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/internal-funding-forms/)
   2. Rubric - [http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/excellence-research/](http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/excellence-research/)
   3. Assignments

ii. **Deadlines**
   1. September 21, 2018— Nominations submitted electronically
   2. November 2, 2018 – Application deadline
   3. March 1, 2019 – Nominations due to Provost

**B. Faculty Research Seed Internal Funding Award**

i. **Guidelines**
   1. Application-[http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/internal-funding-forms/](http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/internal-funding-forms/)
   2. Guidelines for submission
   3. Return on Investment

ii. **Deadlines**
   1. January 28, 2018 – Applications submitted to ORSSP
   2. May 1, 2019 – Award letters prepared for recipients
   3. July 1, 2019 – No pre-award spending in FY19

**C. Faculty Research Scholarly Pursuit Internal Funding Award**

i. **Guidelines**
   1. Application - [http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/internal-funding-forms/](http://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/internal-funding-forms/)
   2. Guidelines for submission
   3. Return on Investment

ii. **Deadlines**
   1. January 28, 2018 – Applications submitted to ORSSP
   2. May 1, 2019 – Award letters prepared for recipients
   3. July 1, 2019 – No pre-award spending in FY19

**D. Publication Fund – Rolling Deadlines**

i. Funding opened July 1, 2018

ii. **Guidelines** and **Application**

iii. The publication fund is administered by the Research Administration staff and awarded on a first in basis for peer reviewed submissions.

**E. Grant Writing Workshop**

i. Grant Writing Workshop
   1. The committee will partner with ORSSP and the Provost’s Office to fund a workshop in the Spring.

ii. **Research Month – Research Symposium**
   1. To be Determined
F. **Limited Submission Funding**
   i. Ad Hoc – Committee members may be asked to serve on review committees for discipline specific limited submission grant applications as requested by ORSSP.

VI. **OLD BUSINESS**
   A. **<<None>>**

VII. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**
   A. **<<None>>**

VIII. **ADJOURNMENT**

   There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on <<8/28/18>> at <<12:22>>PM.

Respectfully submitted,
E. Haynes, Recording Coordinator

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

---

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

**Attachment:** 2018 Rubric for Excellence Award Review (Available on the Internal Funding website along with the application)
**Instructions:** For each element, assign a numerical score reflecting the level of achievement as determined by the given criteria. When more than one level is deemed applicable, assign the **lower** numerical score. (A separate rubric will be used for each round.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Minimal (1-3)</th>
<th>Acceptable (4-6)</th>
<th>Excellent (7-9)</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustained Excellence</strong></td>
<td>The body of research and/or creative scholarly activity is minimal and/or shows evidence of inconsistency within the last five years.</td>
<td>Candidate has established a substantial and consistent body of research and/or creative scholarly activity in the discipline over the last five years.</td>
<td>Candidate has established a prolific and sustained body of research and/or creative scholarly activity in the discipline over the last five years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality and Innovation</strong></td>
<td>The originality and/or quality of the candidate’s contributions are unclear and/or unsupported by peers.</td>
<td>Candidate documents original contributions and provides evidence of quality (acceptance rates, impact ratings, competitive awards, distribution statistics, etc.) as determined by the specific discipline and supported by peers.</td>
<td>Candidate documents original and innovative contributions and provides evidence of highest quality (acceptance rates, impact ratings, competitive awards, distribution statistics, etc.) as determined by the specific discipline and well supported by peers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Margin of Excellence: Discipline</strong></td>
<td>Candidate fails to demonstrate how contributions have enhanced the discipline, or statements regarding impact of work are unsupported by peers.</td>
<td>Candidate provides evidence of quality contributions that enhance the discipline as demonstrated by the recognition of peers.</td>
<td>Candidate provides strong evidence of contributions that enhance the discipline as demonstrated by the recognition of peers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin of Excellence: University</td>
<td>The potential value of the candidate’s contributions to the university is minimal and/or unsupported by peers.</td>
<td>The candidate’s contributions offer potential value to the university, as demonstrated by the recognition of peers.</td>
<td>The candidate’s contributions clearly bring prestige to the university because of their quality and academic and/or artistic distinction, as demonstrated by the recognition of peers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International/National Community Value</td>
<td>Candidate fails to demonstrate impact or recognition at the national and/or international level.</td>
<td>Candidate provides evidence of national and/or international impact or recognition, as demonstrated by the support of peers.</td>
<td>Candidate provides strong evidence of contributions that impact the discipline at a national and/or international level, as demonstrated by the recognition of peers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and/or Creative Leadership</td>
<td>Involvement in promoting, supporting, and/or empowering peers and/or students in carrying out research and/or scholarly creative activity is insignificant or undocumented.</td>
<td>Candidate documents involvement in promoting, supporting, and/or empowering peers and/or students in carrying out research and/or scholarly creative activity.</td>
<td>Candidate provides clear and convincing evidence of significant involvement in promoting, supporting, and/or empowering peers and/or students in carrying out research and/or scholarly creative activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and Partnerships</td>
<td>Candidate offers little evidence of research support in the form of partnerships or funding.</td>
<td>Candidate provides evidence of research support in the form of partnerships and/or internal or external funding.</td>
<td>Candidate provides evidence of significant and sustained research support in the form of partnerships and/or external funding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works in Progress</td>
<td>The scope and potential impact of research and/or scholarly activity currently in progress is unclear and/or undocumented.</td>
<td>Research and/or scholarly activity currently in progress demonstrates a commitment to quality and is likely to have value for the discipline or institution.</td>
<td>Research and/or scholarly activity currently in progress demonstrates an ongoing commitment to quality and innovation and is highly likely to impact the discipline and bring recognition to the institution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Support</td>
<td>Peer recommendations are subjective or unsupported and/or limited to internal peers.</td>
<td>At least three recommendation letters demonstrate well-reasoned, objective support from internal and external peers.</td>
<td>More than three recommendation letters demonstrate well-reasoned, objective support from both internal and external peers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship of Research Efforts to Teaching Workload Responsibilities</td>
<td>Peer recommendations do not demonstrate how the candidate’s research activities excel in relation to his/her teaching workload responsibilities.</td>
<td>Peer recommendations provide general evidence of how the candidate’s research activities excel in relation to his/her teaching workload responsibilities.</td>
<td>Peer recommendations provide well-reasoned, objective support for how the candidate’s research activities excel in relation to his/her teaching workload responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation and Bibliographic Format</td>
<td>The application materials are not well organized, do not include all necessary evidence, and/or the bibliographic format does not allow for understanding of the candidate’s contributions.</td>
<td>The application materials are organized and include all necessary evidence. The bibliographic format allows for understanding of the candidate’s contributions.</td>
<td>The application materials are carefully and logically organized and formatted and include all necessary evidence. The bibliographic format enhances the committee’s full understanding of the candidate’s contributions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reviewer Comments:

**Recommendation:**  
☐ Do not proceed to next review  
☐ Proceed to next review
Meeting Minutes (9/17/18)

2018-2019 FWC

In attendance Clinton Martin <cdmartin@georgiasouthern.edu>, Wendy Wolfe <wlwolfe@georgiasouthern.edu>, Timothy Cairney <tcairney@georgiasouthern.edu>, Jonathan Hilpert <jhilpert@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>,

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda (unanimous in favor)
3. Faculty Handbook Section 304 and 305
   a. Discussion ensued regarding corrections from the FWC subcommittee. Committee discussed proper grammar for section. No corrections made to sections.
   b. Vote to Approve: Unanimous in favor. See recording for motions and seconds. Handbook sections will be moved on to faculty senate for vote of approval.
4. Faculty Handbook Section 318 319 321.02 321.05
   a. Discussion ensued regarding corrections from the FWC subcommittee. Committee discussed the definition of full time summer employment, summer abroad teaching, BOR summer pay rates, and grammatical edits to the sections. Minor corrections to section listed in summary.
   b. Vote to Approve. Unanimous in favor. See recording for motions and seconds. Handbook sections will be moved on to faculty senate for vote of approval.
5. Faculty Handbook Sections 322 (01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 08)
   a. Discussion ensued regarding corrections from the FWC subcommittee. Committee discussed midterm grading policy and the BOR policy on faculty consulting. Minor corrections listed in summary.
   b. Vote to Approve. Unanimous in favor. See recording for motions and seconds. Handbook sections will be moved on to faculty senate for vote of approval.
6. Discussion of Faculty Welfare Concerns and Committee Priorities
   a. Merit Raises
   b. Salary Compression/Inversion
   c. HR partner benefits and resources
   d. SRI’s
   e. Workload Equity
   f. 12 Month Salary Information
   g. Personal Social Media Account Use
   h. GSM language in faculty handbook
   i. Action Items: Contact HR about website update to partner benefits and resources; Locate meeting minutes about SRI’s (FWC and senate)
7. Adjourn
GENERAL EDUCATION AND CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
MINUTES
General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Meeting Date – Friday, October 26, 2018

IN PERSON MEETING CANCELLED DUE TO EXCESSIVE TIME CONFLICTS

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. CHAIR’S UPDATE

IV. NEW BUSINESS

V. OLD BUSINESS
   A. At the previous meeting, the proposed rubric for reviewing Core Course assessment reports was reviewed. There were several suggestions from the committee for changes and clarification. The rubric was revised by Delena Gatch, Jaime O’Connor, and Michelle Cawthorn. In lieu of an in person meeting (see above) the committee voted on whether or not to accept the changes and approve the new rubric electronically. There was unanimous approval of the revised rubric (17 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain).

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

VII. ADJOURNMENT
### B. COURSE ALIGNMENT WITH CORE CURRICULUM

Narrative describing the alignment between the core course and area student learning outcome.

- **1 - BEGINNING**
  - No narrative is given aligning the course and Area Student Learning Outcome, or the narrative is too broad or vague to show clear alignment with the Area Student Learning Outcome.
  - Narrative does not specify which campuses and/or delivery modes offer the course.

- **2 - DEVELOPING**
  - Narrative includes a general description of the knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions to be gained from the course, but the description is not closely aligned to the Area Student Learning Outcome.
  - Narrative misidentifies which campuses and/or delivery modes offer the course.

- **3 - ACCEPTABLE**
  - Narrative includes a description of the alignment of course content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions to the Area Student Learning Outcome.
  - Narrative specifies which campuses and/or delivery modes offer the course.

- **4 - EXEMPLARY**
  - Narrative includes a precise description of the specific course content, knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions that directly align with the Area Student Learning Outcome.
  - Narrative specifies which campuses and/or delivery modes offer the course along with additional details regarding the number of sections, faculty, and students at each location.

### C. TEACHING STRATEGIES

Narrative describing teaching and learning activities incorporated into the course to address the area student learning outcome.

- **1 - BEGINNING**
  - No teaching and learning activities are described, or information provided does not connect to Area Student Learning Outcome.

- **2 - DEVELOPING**
  - Teaching and learning activities provide minimal opportunities for students to obtain the knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions contained in the Area Student Learning Outcome.

- **3 - ACCEPTABLE**
  - Teaching and learning activities provide diverse opportunities for students to obtain the content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions contained in the Area Student Learning Outcome.

- **4 - EXEMPLARY**
  - Teaching and learning activities build upon each other to help students achieve content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions contained in the Area Student Learning Outcome.

### D. ASSESSMENT METHODS I: MEASUREMENT TOOLS AND ASSIGNMENTS

Description of the measurement tool(s) & the associated assignment(s), how they align with the area student learning outcome, & their validity. (NOTE: Measurement tools and assignments should be equivalent across all applicable campuses and/or delivery modes.)

- **1 - BEGINNING**
  - No information is provided about how the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) relate to the Area Student Learning Outcome.
  - Area Student Learning Outcome is assessed with only indirect measure(s) (i.e., surveys).

- **2 - DEVELOPING**
  - Area Student Learning Outcome is assessed with direct measure(s) (i.e., objective tests, rubrics).
  - General description is provided of the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s).

- **3 - ACCEPTABLE**
  - Detailed description of measurement tool(s) and their alignment with the Area Student Learning Outcome is provided. This includes:
    - for an objective test measurement tool, test blueprint maps individual questions to expected levels of mastery from Bloom’s Taxonomy
    - for an analytic rubric measurement tool, each trait is described by multiple levels of possible performance
  - Detailed description of the assignment(s) and alignment with the area student learning outcome provided. This includes:
    - for an objective test assignment, representative test items are described to indicate relevance to the Area Student Learning Outcome and the expected level of mastery;
    - for a performance-based assignment evaluated with an analytic rubric, the assignment prompt is described to indicate relevance to the Area Student Learning Outcome and the expected level of mastery.
  - Measurement tool(s) will provide a direct/observable result(s) and are appropriate to the area student learning outcome and the level of mastery expected.
  - Assignment(s) are appropriate to the Area Student Learning Outcome and the level of mastery expected.

- **4 - EXEMPLARY**
  - The Area Student Learning Outcome is measured with direct measures may be supplemented with indirect measures.
  - A description of the development process for the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) is included to illustrated appropriateness and accuracy (validity and reliability) of the tools.
### E. RESULTS

Clear & concise illustration of data collected (presentation of data). Includes a narrative or table/figure with sample size, count, averages, percentages, & ranges as appropriate to the assessment tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - BEGINNING</th>
<th>2 - DEVELOPING</th>
<th>3 - ACCEPTABLE</th>
<th>4 - EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No results are presented, or it is unclear how the results relate to the Area Student Learning Outcome.</td>
<td>Presentation of results is insufficiently detailed; only overall student scores or averages are presented.</td>
<td>Tables and graphs effectively communicate results, including sample size, count, averages, percentages, and ranges, as appropriate to the measurement tool.</td>
<td>Results are easily understood, as well as their implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Process will provide limited information for guiding instruction and curriculum.</td>
<td>Missing results from some applicable campuses and/or delivery modes.</td>
<td>For objective tests, results are presented according to items or groups of items, as demonstrated in the test blueprint.</td>
<td>Strengths and weaknesses in student learning are easily identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Process will provide limited information for guiding instruction and curriculum.</td>
<td>- Tables and graphs effectively communicate results, including sample size, count, averages, percentages, and ranges, as appropriate to the measurement tool.</td>
<td>For rubrics, results are presented according to rubric trait and level, including counts and percentages.</td>
<td>For an objective test, results are presented according to the test blueprint and include item analysis information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Tables and graphs effectively communicate results, including sample size, count, averages, percentages, and ranges, as appropriate to the measurement tool.</td>
<td>Results included from all applicable campuses and/or delivery modes, but are not equivalent in rigor or level of detail.</td>
<td>Results included from all applicable campuses and/or delivery modes.</td>
<td>For rubrics, inter-rater reliability is ensured through reconciliation of scores across multiple raters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F. DISCUSSION

Explains the meaningfulness of the data presented above (interpretation of results) with a clear, complete, & succinct analysis focusing on the interpretation of & reflection on the assessment data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - BEGINNING</th>
<th>2 - DEVELOPING</th>
<th>3 - ACCEPTABLE</th>
<th>4 - EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No interpretation is attempted, or the interpretation does not relate to the Area Student Learning Outcome and/or the results.</td>
<td>Interpretation is attempted, relates to the Area Student Learning Outcome and/or results, but the interpretation is either:</td>
<td>Interpretation is aligned with the Area Student Learning Outcome and the results.</td>
<td>Interpretation directly addresses the Area Student Learning Outcome and results leading to an action plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Insufficient to support curricular decisions.</td>
<td>- Insufficient to support curricular decisions.</td>
<td>Interpretation is explained in terms of the desired levels of student performance, and is based on student achievement of those levels.</td>
<td>Interpretation addresses past trends in student performance, as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Offering excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretations leading to improvements in student learning.</td>
<td>- Offering excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretations leading to improvements in student learning.</td>
<td>Interpretation is justified through current disciplinary standards, previous results and/or benchmarks.</td>
<td>Interpretation identifies possible areas of improvement, thus initiating future actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Not aligned with previous action plans.</td>
<td>- Not aligned with previous action plans.</td>
<td>Interpretation includes how course content, experiences, and/or the assessment process might have affected results.</td>
<td>Interpretation of data includes an analysis of equivalencies across all applicable campuses and/or delivery modes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neglects to include data provided by all applicable campuses and/or delivery modes.</td>
<td>- Neglects to include data provided by all applicable campuses and/or delivery modes.</td>
<td>Interpretation indicates the appropriate collaboration and consensus of multiple internal stakeholders (e.g., section instructors, committees, staff, and/or students).</td>
<td>- Interpretation is detailed enough to justify decisions concerning changes in instruction and/or curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Interpretation provided for data from all applicable campuses and/or delivery modes.</td>
<td>- Interpretation provided for data from all applicable campuses and/or delivery modes.</td>
<td>Interpretation is detailed enough to justify decisions concerning changes in instruction and/or curriculum.</td>
<td>Interpretation provided for data from all applicable campuses and/or delivery modes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Gi. ACTION PLANS I: IMPACT OF PAST IMPROVEMENTS AND CHANGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - BEGINNING</th>
<th>2 - DEVELOPING</th>
<th>3 - ACCEPTABLE</th>
<th>4 - EXEMPLARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed action plan from the previous cycle is included, who implemented it, when it was implemented, &amp; outcome of the implementation.</td>
<td>A copy of the proposed action plan from the previous cycle is included.</td>
<td>All proposed actions from the prior year’s action plan were specifically addressed, including who implemented them, when they were implemented, and the outcome of the implementation.</td>
<td>Additional documentation is provided, showing the implementation of proposed actions (e.g., course syllabi, meeting minutes, curriculum change forms, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● No actions taken during the current cycle, or the actions taken during the current cycle seem unrelated to prior year’s action plan.</td>
<td>● All proposed actions from the prior year’s action plan are addressed, but details about implementation are insufficient. ○ If actions proposed during the previous cycle were not implemented, no reasonable justification is given. ● Missing prior action plans from some applicable campuses and/or delivery modes.</td>
<td>● If actions proposed during the previous cycle were not implemented, reasonable justification is given. ● If actions taken during the current cycle were not proposed during the previous cycle, they are reasonably justified through external evidence. ● The report reflects with sufficient depth on the implementation of proposed actions and the data returned from them during the assessment cycle. ● Prior action plans and implementation details provided for all applicable campuses and/or delivery modes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gii. ACTION PLANS II: USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR FUTURE PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies planned for course improvement; actions designed to improve instruction &amp; curriculum; rationale for action is based on data &amp; analysis of results.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● No actions proposed for the next cycle. ● Proposed actions are not based on the data captured through the assessment process. ● Proposed actions are unrelated to the improvement of the educational program, and therefore student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● The connection between proposed actions, results/discussion, and/or Area Student Learning Outcome is not clear. ● Proposed actions are too broad or vague to guide the improvement of the curriculum and student learning. ● Proposed actions do not demonstrate evidence of input from more than one person. ● Proposed actions pertain only to assessment plan changes (process/measure only). ● Proposed actions do not address variations in results presented by all applicable campuses and/or delivery modes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Proposed actions are directly connected to the Area Student Learning Outcome. ● Proposed actions are data-driven, directly relate to the results/discussion. ● Proposed actions focus on the improvement of student learning. If modifications are made to the assessment process, they are data-driven. ● Proposed actions contain a process for evaluating their effectiveness. ● Proposed actions demonstrate evidence of input from multiple internal stakeholders. ● Carryover actions from the previous cycle are noted. ● Proposed actions address variations in results presented by all applicable campuses and/or delivery modes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Proposed actions are specifically detailed, including who will be responsible for implementation and approximate dates of implementation. ● Proposed actions are targeted to any unique needs or opportunities based on results presented by specific campuses and/or delivery modes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Present: Stephanie Jones; College of Education; Kristi Smith, Lane Library; Christian Hanna, Waters College of Health Professionals; Donna Mullenax, College of Science & Mathematics; Natalie James, College of Arts & Humanities; Meghan Dove, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences; W. Bede Mitchell, Dean of the GS Libraries; Quentin Fang, College of Science & Mathematics.

Guests: Douglas Frazier, Director of Lane Library & Associate Dean of the GS Libraries; Ann Fuller, Head of Circulation & ILL, Lane Library; Aimee Reist, Learning Commons Librarian & Coordinator, Lane Library; Jessica Garner, Head of Access Services, Henderson Library; Vivian Bynoe, Reference and Instruction Librarian, Lane Library; Lauren McMillan, Reference and Instruction Librarian, Lane Library.

Absent: John R. O’Malley, College of Engineering & Computing; Ruth Whitworth, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health; Allissa Lee, College of Business; Clement Lau; Director of Henderson Library & Associate Dean of the GS Libraries.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Stephanie Jones called the meeting to order on Monday, October 8th at 2:00PM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Stephanie Jones made a motion to approve the Sept. 17th meeting minutes as written. All were in favor and the motion to approve the minutes passed. Dr. Stephanie Jones made a motion to approve the agenda. Dr. Christian Hanna asked if attendance was being taken at the meetings. Dr. Stephanie Jones confirmed that attendance was being taken. All were in favor and the motion to approve the agenda passed.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. GS Libraries Budget Update

Dr. Mitchell wanted to inform the Faculty Senate Libraries Committee of certain issues that have sprung up which affects the Libraries’ budget.

1. All staff vacancies that occur must now be requested for fulfillment with an accompanying justification that needs to go forward to the President’s cabinet. Presently the library has forwarded 4 vacancies for approval. Also, one vacant faculty position that was requested to be filled has been postponed until next year.

2. The hours for the Learning Commons at Armstrong Campus for fall semester were set based on the expectation that a new full time position was going to be created, funded and approved. Dr. Mitchell reallocated funds from elsewhere in the Libraries’ budget to create the new position, which was reviewed and classified by the Office of Human Resources. We then requested approval from the President’s Cabinet to fill the position. While waiting for that approval, there was a resignation from a part-time position in the Learning Commons. Being short both positions threatened our ability to maintain the current Learning Commons schedule, but thankfully some gracious staff have agreed to temporarily change their work schedules in order to avoid a schedule reduction. Provost Reiber has assured Dr. Mitchell that the full time position for the Learning Commons had been approved, however the President’s Cabinet has now instituted a new 60 to 90 freeze on all staff hiring. Provost Reiber says that he needs to go back to the President’s Cabinet and remind them that this position had already been approved and should not be further delayed. Dr. Mitchell expressed his appreciation to those staff and faculty willing to change their schedule.

3. In light of the 60 to 90 day hiring freeze on staff vacancies, there will need to be a careful consideration of any future Libraries vacancies are “mission critical”, and therefore are worth requesting an exemption from the freeze. We cannot seek an exemption for every vacancy but there are some positions that are must be filled to maintain essential library functions.
Dr. Mitchell stated that it is the Libraries' commitment to maintain service levels to students as high as possible, but he wanted to make sure that the Faculty Senate Libraries Committee as an advisory group to the GS libraries was aware that these are not typical times. Ordinarily vacancies such as those in the Learning Commons in past have been filled very quickly and there was no need to even consider changing the schedule. Dr. Mitchell asked if anyone had any questions or comments.

Kristi Smith asked if the 60 to 90 day freeze is after the position is approved. Dr. Mitchell stated that was not stipulated in what Provost Reiber shared with the Deans, but the 60 day staff hiring freeze that was in place on the Statesboro campus prior to consolidation started the clock from the date a position was vacated. Thus you could conduct the recruitment so that the new person could begin work 61 days after the predecessor had left.

Donna Mullenax asked whether the SACSCOC accrediting agency had any requirements of equal library service hours for multi-campus institutions. Dr. Mitchell stated that there is no such specific SACSCOC requirement, but nevertheless the new GS Libraries strategic goals that were first drafted this past summer includes the extension of library and/or Learning Commons hours on the Armstrong campus. The purpose of creating the new full time position was to meet that commitment. When that position and the recently vacated part-time Learning Commons position are filled, the Learning Commons will be able to extend its service hours.

A question was asked as to what was the vacant faculty position that was placed on hold. Dr. Mitchell stated that it was a reference, instruction, and liaison position in Henderson Library's Research Services Department. Dr. Christian Hanna asked, considering what is happening, if the target amount usually expected in year-end funding has been lowered and if the money saved from the salaries of the unfilled position will be used instead. Dr. Mitchell stated his understanding is the money that the provost is having to find to cover various shortfalls will probably mean that Academic Affairs will not be able to return to the libraries budget any kind of salary savings. Dr. Mitchell believes it is likely that there will be very little year-end funding at the end of this fiscal year. Dr. Hanna then asked how he anticipates this affecting the libraries budget. Dr. Mitchell stated that at the present time the licenses and contracts for the most part are paid through the end of this fiscal year. If they do not receive any year-end funding at the end of spring semester, then for the next fiscal year in December there will need to be a reduction in subscriptions and resources because those subscriptions run on a calendar year.

GS Libraries personnel will share with the Faculty Senate Libraries Committee some options for determining how best to address a materials budget shortfall, giving priority to retaining resources that provide the greatest support to GS academic programs. A key part of such plans is ensuring quick and efficient access to information resources that the GS Libraries will be unable to continue licensing, probably through various interlibrary loan processes. This is the challenge for the next 12 to 18 months. Dr. Hanna asked if the staff will also be asked about where they think savings could be gleaned from. Dr. Mitchell stated that both faculty and staff will be asked to participate. He emphasized that while the immediacy of access will have to be compromised for some things total access will not be compromised. It just means that some things will only be accessible through resource sharing with other libraries, or when necessary for a per-transaction purchase from various resource vendors.

B. GS Libraries Marketing Plan update
After the conversation with Megan Bouchillon Dr. Mitchell forwarded to her a number of topics for the potential "Did you know?" campaign. She asked for some follow up statistics and she is working on some examples at the moment.

C. Update of Dean of the GS Libraries Recruitment
There is no update in regards for recruitment for the next dean of the GS Libraries. The ad for the recruitment of a new president of the university was just recently released. Optimistically we might know who the next president is going to be by January, even if that person does not assume the responsibilities until later.

D. Affordable Learning Georgia
Affordable Learning Georgia is an initiative of the University System of GA to help provide tools and resources to faculty seeking more affordable alternatives to traditional textbooks, which in some areas can cost hundreds of dollars. Affordable learning Georgia has done a lot of work in lining up contracts and providing other types of access to various open educational resources, one of which is a service from a company named Intellus. This company is hoping to make the process of developing a syllabus around open education resources much faster, easier and efficient for faculty. The idea behind it is that it provides faculty with an interface and a means of searching all the different types of open education resources by key word and discipline, helping to you to select those resources which would be most applicable to a particular class that you are teaching. Since this is something that would be of general interest to faculty and since libraries across Georgia have been asked to help promote open educational resources, Dr. Mitchell has arranged with a representative of Intellus to meet with those who are interested, on Monday, Oct 22nd at 2PM. The representative will do a demonstration of the product: what it does and how it can serve the needs of faculty. This will be the principal agenda topic on the 22nd. At that time it can be decided if another meeting during fall semester will be needed.

E. Resources and Services for Online Students
In response to a request from Dr. Stephanie Jones, there was discussion of the resources and services that the Libraries provide for online students. On the GS Libraries homepage on the upper right hand corner there is a tab for the full suite of online library services available whether students are taking their classes only online, or may just want to do their library research from the comfort of their homes or favorite coffee shop. In addition to the online access to electronic resources there is full service chat reference, email reference, and telephone reference. Distance education students who are 50 or more miles from campus can request for books to be shipped to their home for free. They receive a mailer with sufficient postage to mail the books back to the lending library. They have the same access to reference assistance, interlibrary loan, and GIL Express as any student taking a traditional class on campus. GIL Express will deliver to any USG campus, so you can have a book sent to a campus nearer to where you live than your institution’s library may be. The quality of these services is especially important for faculty and students on the Liberty campus, where there is no physical library.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS
A. The next Faculty Senate Library Committee Meeting was set for Monday, October 22th, 2018 at 2:00PM.

V. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on Monday, October 8th, 2018 at 2:37PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lizette Cruz, Recording Coordinator
1. The office of athletic compliance self-reported two secondary (level 3) to the NCAA, the first on 9/13/2018 (which has been closed) and the second on 11/1/2018 (which is in process).

2. Below is the link to access NCAA Graduation Success Rate (GSR) and Federal Graduation Rate for Georgia Southern University:
   http://www.ncaa.org/about/resources/research/graduation-success-rate

3. Below is the link to access NCAA Academic Progress Rate (APR) for Georgia Southern University:
   https://web3.ncaa.org/aprsearch/aprsearch

4. Below is a link to the “Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics,” the goal of which is “to ensure that intercollegiate athletics programs operate within the educational mission of their colleges and universities.”
   http://www.knightcommission.org/

5. Below is a link to “The Drake Group,” whose mission “is to defend academic integrity in higher education from the corrosive aspects of commercialized college sports.”
   http://thedrakegroup.org/

6. As of July 1, 2018, Georgia Southern is no longer of probation with the NCAA.
Dr. Reed Smith called the meeting to order on Friday, November 9, 2018 at 3:14 PM.

Christy Rikard, Director of Admissions, gave a quick recap and then resumed the presentation on “Undergraduate Admissions Requirements.”

Discussion that arose during the presentation:

- Scholarship Awards and the Financial Aid Process
  - There are need-based and merit-based aid.
  - Georgia Southern is not competitive with other universities in the number and size of awards offered.
    - There are fewer than 20 full-time renewable scholarships.
    - Awards are front-loaded. The impact this has on retention of students is unknown.
    - Department funds come from various sources.
  - Hope scholarships are automatically applied to student accounts.

- Recruiting the Family
  - Parents are emailed on most contacts with prospects
  - Parents are emailed once a student is on campus.
• Some Preview and SOAR sessions are offered in Spanish.

• High School Counselor Efforts
  o There is an effort to build relationships with high school counselors.
    ▪ They are sent materials and swag bags.
    ▪ Lunches are hosted in hometowns.
    ▪ Breakfasts are hosted on campus.
    ▪ Some individual lunch and coffee meetings are held when needed.

• Collaboration with Academic Affairs
  o There is promotion of new and growing programs.
  o They have training with each program every summer.
  o Admissions has spoken with each Dean this fall to discuss changes.
    ▪ Some faculty are giving guest lectures at high schools.
    ▪ Favour suggested having celebrity alumni involvement.

• Campus Specific Recruitment
  o Statesboro campus should maintain current.
  o Armstrong campus has room for growth.

• There are recruitment efforts for specific populations.
  o Savannah State will offer a degree in Homeland Security at the Liberty Campus.
  o International students are helped with visas.
    ▪ Countries for recruitment are selected based on their potential student population.
      • Kwabena suggested including countries in Africa for recruitment efforts and suggested using an existing study abroad program in that region.
      • Dragos suggested including countries in Eastern Europe for recruitment efforts and suggested using an existing study abroad program in that region.
  o Denied students are given information on how to address the shortfalls in their applications.

• Application Processing and Decisions
  o The application process is completely online using gafutures.org.
    ▪ The decision window is 2 weeks.
    ▪ Processing is divided by territories.
    ▪ There are application fee waivers, No fee November.
    ▪ There is a process for appealing admission decisions.

• Preventing Melt
  o Active and continued recruitment is used through orientation.

• Additional Recruitment efforts include:
  o Mini-mesters and start now events are used.
  o Eagle Incentive Program
  o Southern Leaders Conference and Interview Day

• Using data to make decisions
  o Data from Institutional Research is used to help in decision making.

• Christy ended her presentation and opened the floor to questions.

• Diana asked how the Student Success Committee can help the Admissions Office.
  o Christy replied: by asking questions, offering ideas, being involved, and giving Southern hospitality to campus visitors.
There will be no December meeting.

The meeting schedule for the spring semester will be determined based on spring schedules.

The meeting was adjourned on November 9, 2018 at 4:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Rasnick, Recording Secretary
I. CALL TO ORDER

Voting Members Present: Dr. Maria Adams, Ms. Ruth Baker, Dr. Yasar Bodur, Mr. Christopher Cartright, Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss, Dr. Anoop Desai, Dr. Laurie Gould, Mr. Felix Hamza-Lup, Dr. Chuck Harter, Dr. Barbara Hendry, Dr. Lucan Jensen, Dr. Jun Liu, Mr. Jeffrey Mortimore, Dr. Donna Mullenax, Dr. Amy Potter, Dr. Lina Soares, Dr. Marian Tabi,

Non-Voting Members Present: Ms. Linda Covino, Ms. Candace Griffith, Ms. Doris Mack, Mr. Wayne Smith, Ms. Barbara Weiss

Visitors: Dr. Delena Bell Gatch, Dr. Alisa Lecki

Absent: Dr. Raymona Lawrence, Dr. Margaret Mossholder, Dr. Dziyana Nazaruk

Dr. Alisa Lecki called the meeting to order at 3:44 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A Soares/Bodor motion to approve the agenda was passed unanimously.

III. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Dr. Alisa Lecki welcomed the committee members and visitors

IV. ELECTION OF UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE CHAIR

Dr. Alisa Lecki asked for a volunteer to chair the committee for the 2018-2019 academic year. With no response, Dr. Lecki suggested taking a look at those absent and put out a call to see if anyone would be willing to serve as chair. She stated that she would be happy to come and get the next meeting started.
V. OTHER BUSINESS

➢ Comprehensive Program Reviews

Ms. Candace Griffith from the Provost’s Office spoke about the comprehensive program review. Ms. Griffith stated that for those who were not aware, the undergraduate committee reviews the comprehensive program reviews at the university level and that she would receive the reviews from the department chairs and deans, February 1, 2019. Ms. Griffith announced that there is a web software, Campus Labs, which will be used when uploading the program reviews. She stated that the UG Committee will have access to those specific program reviews and that the committee will conduct their reviews in February and March using a rubric that will be provided. Then at the April meeting, the committee will discuss the results of the review.

Ms. Griffith went on to state that in the past it has generally been two to three committee members who reviewed one proposal and alternates could be used. She stated that there are approximately 19 programs. So that each member should only have to review one maybe two proposals.

She stated that she would like the new chair to provide the names of the two or three undergraduate program reviewers for each program review by September 28, 2018. After which, training will be offered for those programs reviewers on the undergraduate committee using the Campus Lab software. She also stated that training from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness will be provided in early February for members to use the rubric and evaluate the comprehensive program reviews.

➢ Registrar’s Update

Ms. Doris Mack from the Registrar’s Office updated the committee on the status of the CIM trainings. She stated that because of the inclement weather, the training scheduled for later in the week had been canceled and that they were reviewing several dates in which Courseleaf could reschedule to visit the campus. She went on to say that the Registrar’s Office would be sending out an email within the next few days to let everyone know when the trainings would be offered.

Ms. Mack spoke briefly about the catalog. She stated that they were almost ready to publish the final catalog. She explained that what is being seen currently on the website is live and as corrections are made the results can be seen instantly. She went on to explain that if things on the website are not correct and need to be updated or corrected, to please contact the Registrar’s Office. She noted that only items that have been approved through the curriculum process will be updated.

A question was asked if there would be a link in the email to register because it was felt that the rooms would not hold a lot of people. Ms. Mack stated that if the Courseleaf representative comes to campus, then registration would be available. She reiterated that the link would not be in the email that will be sent out later this week but closer to the date of the trainings.
Dr. Lecki asked if people who have had CIM training in the past can start submitting curriculum for review or are we waiting until CIM training has happened?

Ms. Mack stated that she felt this was something that needed further discussion by the Registrar’s Office because of the reimplementation of CIM.

Another question was posed to Ms. Mack. For clarification, is this something that every member of the committee has to have training on and if yes will there be training in person on this campus?

Ms. Mack stated that she felt that anyone who will be submitting curriculum would benefit from attending the training and that there would be training sessions offered on both campuses.

Mr. Wayne Smith, reiterated Ms. Mack’s sentiment that any discoveries that went through the curriculum committee meeting, graduate or undergraduate, that was approved and for some reason were not updated correctly that the Registrar’s Office would make the update. He also said that if something was forgotten or left out those items would need to be submitted to the curriculum committee for approval to be effective for Fall 2019 not Fall 2018.

He also commended Doris, Justin, Jade, Tori and a few other people from the Registrar’s Office on doing a tremendous job.

Dr. Alise Lecki encouraged everyone to please consider chairing the committee

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee, an Soares/Tabi motion to adjourn the meeting at 3:57 p.m. was passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted

Doris J. Mack
Recording Secretary
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
MINUTES
OCTOBER 9, 2018, 3:30PM

CARROLL 1047, STATESBORO CAMPUS
SCIENCE CENTER, CHEMISTRY CONFERENCE ROOM, SAVANNAH CAMPUS

Submitted by Barbara Hendry, CBSS Representative

Voting Members Present: Chris Cartright; Dr. Maria Adamos; Dr. Donna Mullenax; Dr. Amy Potter; Caroline Hopkinson; Dr. Barbara Hendry; Dr. Chuck Harter; Dr. Jun Liu; Jeffrey Mortimore; Dr. Jessica Schwind; Dr. Lina Soares; Dr. Lucas Jensen

Non-Voting Members Present: Candace Griffith; Dr. Delena Bell Gatch; Doris Mack;

Visitors: Dr. Stephen Rossi; Dr. Brian Koehler

Absent: Dr. Anoop Desai; Dr. Felix Hazma-Lup; Dr. Marian Tabi; Dr. Peggy Mossholder; Dr. Laurie Gould; Dr. Yasar Bodur; Dr. Dziyana Nazaruk; Dr. Raymona Lawrence; Ruth Baker; Wayne Smith; Martin Grantson.

This record of attendance is based on the sign-in sheets and was added to the minutes by Chris Cartright following discussion at the November 6 meeting.

- The meeting was called to order by Christopher Cartright, the Chair of the UGCC.
- The meeting agenda was approved.
- As the Sept. 11, 2018 minutes were not prepared yet and no curriculum items were submitted, the committee did not vote to approve those minutes at the October meeting.
- Christopher asked if anyone would be willing to serve as the UGCC secretary. We agreed to rotate this duty for now. Barbara Hendry volunteered to take minutes for the present meeting.
- Comprehensive Program Reviews (CPRs) were discussed:
  - Candace Griffith (Asst. Provost) explained the Comprehensive Program Review process and the UGCC’s role in reviewing these reports. Reviewer training will be provided in January, 2019.
  - Nineteen undergraduate program CPRs will be submitted in January, 2019. There should be at least two UGCC reviewers per report. Christopher called out the programs and committee members and alternates present at the meeting each volunteered to review one, although there were not enough members/alternates present to cover all of the programs. Christopher will contact members and alternates who were not at the meeting to assign them the remaining CPRs.
- Other Business
  - It was asked whether there will be any curriculum items on the agenda for the November UGCC meeting.
Doris Mack (Asst. Director, Registrar’s Office) said that the proposed curriculum changes should make it through the work flow for the November UGCC meeting.

It was asked whether there will be more curriculum items than usual at the next meeting. The answer was no.

We discussed what we need to send to the Faculty Senate for the librarian’s report. As no curriculum items have been considered at either the Sept. or Oct. UGCC meetings, we planned to submit the agenda and minutes for both the Sept. and Oct. meetings once they are approved at the Nov. meeting.

- The meeting was adjourned.