

Georgia Southern University

Georgia Southern Commons

Faculty Senate Librarian's Reports

Faculty Senate

4-3-2019

Librarian's Report 4-3-2019

Georgia Southern University

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



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

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "Librarian's Report 4-3-2019" (2019). *Faculty Senate Librarian's Reports*. 46. <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-lib-reports/46>

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

Librarian's Report

4/3/2019

	Page
Elections Committee Minutes (March 13, 2019)	2
Faculty Research Committee Minutes (January 31, 2019)	3
Faculty Research Committee Minutes (March 7, 2019)	5
Faculty Research Committee Minutes (March 14, 2019)	7
Faculty Welfare Committee Minutes (February 13, 2019)	9
General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Minutes (March 1, 2019)	12
Libraries Committee Minutes (February 27, 2019)	16

UNIVERSITY ELECTIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES
MEETING DATE March 13, 2019 12:00 noon – 1:00 pm

Members present:

Marcel Maghiar ALLEN E. PAULSON COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING & COMPUTING
Kathleen Baldwin COLLEGE OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES (CAH)
Laurie Gould COLLEGE OF BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES (CBSS)
Steve Moss COLLEGE OF BUSINESS (COB)
Aslihan Unal COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (COE)
Lauren McMillan LANE LIBRARY (LLIB)
Marina Eremeeva JIANN-PING HSU COLLEGE OF PUBLIC HEALTH (JPHCOPH)
Meca Williams-Johnson COLLEGE OF EDUCATION (COE)

Members absent:

Christina Gipson DON AND CINDY WATERS COLLEGE OF HEALTH PROFESSION
Jorge Suazo COLLEGE OF ARTS AND HUMANITIES (CAH)
Cliff Padgett COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS (COSM)

CALL TO ORDER

UPDATES

On January 29th we sent out information for extending the leadership elections to increase the pool of candidates. Nominations were open until March 11th. All nominees were confirmed and the ballots were sent from the president's office. Elections will run until April 1st and announcement of winners on April 3rd.

NEW BUSINESS

Every spring semester we vote for senate representatives from each college for the next academic term. College deans and election representatives will receive the allotted number of senators to elect new representatives for vacant seats. The University Elections Committee is aware there are several colleges still revising bylaws that may include policies on election within their colleges. To adhere to university statutes on electing senate members, we need to move forward and elect faculty *three weeks prior to the end of semester*. Therefore, the elections committee recommends that each college conduct their elections for senate representatives for allotted seats.

Each college elections representative will work with Ginger in the president's office to create ballots of the confirmed nominees. Nominations and confirming nominees will be managed at the college level with the election committee representative. Ginger will assist with creating the ballots of all the confirmed nominees. Ballots will be sent to the prospective college for voting. Each college is asked to complete their elections process before April 19th.

The committee also ensured that faculty members could only vote once in each election.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Encourage all senators to vote for senate leadership before April 1st. Encourage all faculty to vote for new senators before the deadline within your prospective colleges.

ADJOURNMENT

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE MINUTES

Faculty Research Committee Meeting Date – <<1-31-2019>>

Name	Delegate	Term expiration	Attendance
Li Li – Elected Chair	Don and Cindy Waters College of Health Professions	2019	Present
Lei Chen	Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering and Computing	2020	Present
Brian Feltman	College of Arts and Humanities	2019	Present
Chad Posick	College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (CBSS)	2020	Present
Amanda Glaze	Senate Delegate	2019	Absent
Xingfang Wang	College of Business (COB)	2019	Present
Lucas Jensen	College of Education (COE)	2020	Present
Jamie Roberts	College of Science and Mathematics (COSM)	2020	Present
Vivian Bynoe	Library	2020	Present
Marina Eremeeva	Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health (JPHCOPH)	2020	Present
Lance McBrayer	Provost Delegate	Ex Off.	Present
Ele Haynes	Provost - Rep	Ex Off.	Present

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Li Li called the meeting to order on <<Thursday>>, <<1/31/19>> at <<2>> PM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the from the 12/12/18 meeting were reviewed and approved by the committee via email in December of 2018. Minutes were submitted to the Senate Librarian on 12/14/18.

IV. CHAIR'S UPDATE

The decision about where the announcement of the Excellence Award winners from the Faculty Research Committee, Faculty Development Committee and Faculty Service Committee will be made within the new commencement structure is still pending in the Provosts Office.

V. NEW BUSINESS

a. Funding Applications

- i. The Chair of the committee reviewed the funding guidelines for the competition with the committee
- ii. The Chair reviewed the evaluation criteria and evaluation sections to assure all committee members had a consistent understanding of application.
- iii. The committee reviewed the history of funding and return on investment report.
- iv. The committee review tools were described within the committee online workspace.

- A. We received 48 applications for funding in the combined Seed and Scholarly Pursuit categories.
- B. Applications are assigned on a random basis to reduce reviewer discipline bias since more applications are received from some disciplines than others. The guidelines instruct the applicant to describe their project for a general audience reviewer.
- C. Each application will receive 3 initial reviews. The purpose of the initial review is to determine funding ranking without regard to committee budget limitation.
- D. Each applicant has a folder containing application and budget materials. Each reviewer has a review sheet containing the applications assigned for initial review. Review comments will be necessary for the award phase of review.
- E. Applications received without signature or not on application forms including budget format will not be reviewed. The committee feels that attention to guideline instructions is a large part of preparation for application to external funding sources and should be mirrored in the internal competition.

v. Deadlines

- a. March 4, 2019 – Initial reviews entered into reviewer spreadsheets. (This deadline will be revisited for revision via email. To better use our time, will the committee agree to have initial reviews completed by February 11 to be discussed at the February 14 meeting.)
- b. May 1, 2019 – Award letters prepared for recipients – Depending upon budget approval.
- c. July 1, 2019 – No pre-award spending in FY19

VI. OLD BUSINESS

- A. The excellence award rubric subcommittee met via email and made some initial recommendations. The email conversation will be forwarded to the entire committee by Dr. Roberts for comment and discussion at our next meeting.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. <<Next meeting date will be March 7, 2019 in Veazey 2001C>>

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on <<1/31/19>> at <<3:31>>PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Ele Haynes, Recording **Coordinator**

*Note to Recording **Coordinator**:*

Attachment: None

Minutes were approved <3/7/19> by
<Committee Vote> of Committee Members

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE MINUTES

Faculty Research Committee Meeting Date – <<3/7/19>>

Name	Delegate	Term expiration	Attendance
Li Li – Elected Chair	Don and Cindy Waters College of Health Professions	2019	Present
Lei Chen	Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering and Computing	2020	Present
Brian Feltman	College of Arts and Humanities	2019	Present
Chad Posick	College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (CBSS)	2020	Present
Amanda Glaze	Senate Delegate	2019	Present
Xingfang Wang	College of Business (COB)	2019	Present
Lucas Jensen	College of Education (COE)	2020	Present
Jamie Roberts	College of Science and Mathematics (COSM)	2020	Present
Vivian Bynoe	Library	2020	Absent
Marina Eremeeva	Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health (JPHCOPH)	2020	Present
Lance McBrayer	Provost Delegate	Ex Off.	Present
Ele Haynes	Provost - Rep	Ex Off.	Present

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Li Li called the meeting to order on <<Thursday>>, <<3/7/19>> at <<2>> PM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Chad Posick 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

Minutes of the from the 1/31/19 meeting were reviewed and approved by the committee by unanimous vote. Minutes were submitted to the Senate Librarian on 3/8/19.

IV. CHAIR'S UPDATE

The Faculty Research Committee in conjunction with the Georgia Southern University Research and Service Foundation/ORSSP will sponsor Dr. Bob Lucas leading a workshop entitled “Breaking through the Barriers to Writing Proposals” during the week of April 14th. There will be 2 sessions of 25 participants for a total of 50 spaces. We will hold the workshop of Participants will be identified by the colleges through their Research Associate Dean.

V. NEW BUSINESS

a. Funding Applications

- i. The committee reviewed the applications and entered their evaluations into their individual reviewer sheets prior to the meeting. The individual scores were combined into the master spread sheet.
- ii. The committee review tools were described within the committee online workspace.
 - A. We received 48 applications for funding in the combined Seed and Scholarly Pursuit categories. Teams of 3 committee members reviewed each application and entered rubric numbers into the member review application.

- B. The committee reviewed the combined numeric values for the award rubrics. Using the estimated budget for funding as a guide for cut off numbers, the committee used the numeric rankings and the initial reviewer's votes qualitative assessment of fundability to eliminate the bottom portion of the field. (Eliminated 3/3 no's and 2/3 no votes).
- C. They then used the same strategy to fund the top group using a cutoff rubric score of greater than 61 and 3/3 yes or 2/3 yes. Committee members interjected comments where they felt the strategy did not do justice to the proposal.
- D. The remaining 5 proposals are numerically equivalent and are the focus of the next round of review. All committee members will evaluate these for next meeting.
- E. The committee will also review the proposals that are in the not funded category to evaluate equity funding opportunities. These funds were set aside to assure opportunity to fund a broad spectrum of disciplines. Criteria for consideration are solid proposals that fell below the funding line but are in areas of scholarship not represented in the funding pool.
- F. Applications received without signature or not on application forms including budget format were not be reviewed or included in the funding pool. The committee feels that attention to guideline instructions is a large part of preparation for application to external funding sources and should be mirrored in the internal competition.

iii. Deadlines

- a. March 12, 2019 –Second round reviews entered into reviewer spreadsheets.
- b. May 1, 2019 – Award letters prepared for recipients – Depending upon budget approval.
- c. July 1, 2019 – No pre-award spending in FY19

VI. OLD BUSINESS

- A. This discussion was tabled until the February 14th meeting to allow time for greater feedback. The excellence award rubric subcommittee met via email and made some initial recommendations. The email conversation will be forwarded to the entire committee by Dr. Roberts for comment and discussion at our next meeting.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. The committee Chair will be out of the country for 3 weeks beginning March 21st.
- B. <<Next meeting date will be March 14, 2019 in Veazey 2001C>>

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on <<3/7/19>> at <<3:30>>PM.

Respectfully submitted,
 Ele Haynes, Recording **Coordinator**

Minutes were approved <<3/14/19>> by <Vote> of Committee Members

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE MINUTES

Faculty Research Committee Meeting Date – <<3/14/19>>

Name	Delegate	Term expiration	Attendance
Li Li – Elected Chair	Don and Cindy Waters College of Health Professions	2019	Absent
Lei Chen	Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering and Computing	2020	Present
Brian Feltman	College of Arts and Humanities	2019	Present
Chad Posick	College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (CBSS)	2020	Present
Amanda Glaze	Senate Delegate	2019	Present
Xingfang Wang	College of Business (COB)	2019	Present
Lucas Jensen	College of Education (COE)	2020	Present
Jamie Roberts	College of Science and Mathematics (COSM)	2020	Present
Vivian Bynoe	Library	2020	Absent
Marina Eremeeva	Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health (JPHCOPH)	2020	Present
Lance McBrayer	Provost Delegate	Ex Off.	Present
Ele Haynes	Provost - Rep	Ex Off.	Present

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Amanda Glaze called the meeting to order on <<Thursday>>, <<3/14/19>> at <<2>> PM. Dr. Glaze filled in for Dr Li.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes of the from the 3/7/19 meeting were reviewed and approved as amended by the committee by unanimous vote. Minutes were submitted to the Senate Librarian on 3/25/19.

IV. CHAIR'S UPDATE

None

V. NEW BUSINESS

a. Funding Applications

- i. The committee reviewed the numeric values for the second round of funding and discussed relative merit and awarded the remaining funds to fully fund proposals. The remaining funds were forwarded into the equity funding pool.
- ii. The committee revisited projects that had merit but were below the funding line and generated from disciplines that were not represented in the funded pool. Two additional proposals were recommended for funding.
- iii. The committee assigned an overall rank order to the proposals recommended for funding to account for uncertainty in the incomplete budget allocation process.
 - A. The committee will schedule another meeting if the funding provided is significantly less than budgeted funding.

b. Election of Chair

- i. Eligible candidates for Chair for next year are all 1st year committee members
- ii. The committee accepted nominations from the floor.
- iii. 3 committee members were nominated and accepted the nomination. Dr. Posick, Dr. Roberts and Dr. Glaze.
- iv. It is unclear if the senate appointment is a one year or two year appointment
 - A. Amanda Glaze was elected chair pending determination of committee term
 - B. Jamie Roberts was the runner up in the election.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

- A. The excellence award rubric subcommittee conclusions were presented by Dr. Roberts for comment and discussion by the committee.
- B. Discussion:
 - 1) A rubric is helpful to reviewers for making sure that all the components upon which applicants were told they'd be evaluated actually do get evaluated. Thus, even if the 1-9 scale is arbitrary, it's probably more useful to the reviewer than a simple overall ranking system. Our heartburn seemed to pop up when asked to generate un-weighted averages across metrics and rank candidates as such, in part because we graded differently (different means and variances) and in part because we wanted to weight different metrics differently.
 - 2) Suggested compromise: We continue to use this or a slightly modified rubric as a reviewing tool, in order to ensure we are covering all the bases, but allow each reviewer the flexibility to use rubric results in whatever way makes the most sense to them to develop the straight-up rankings that will be averaged across reviewers and used to select winners. In essence, we skip the first averaging step we did last fall. Of course, this still leaves room for discussion and defense of outlier rankings, but at least everyone will (a) be on the same scale at that point, and (b) feel less constrained by the rubric math.
 - 3) Teaching load – The committee has struggled with the inclusion of teaching load. The instructions for letters includes instructions: At least one letter must be authored by a faculty member from the applicants department or college and must provide a description of the applicant's research activity in relation to his/her teaching workload responsibilities as defined by the faculty handbook.
 - 4) Conclusion: The rubric is adequate when viewed as a tool. It should only be used as a focusing tool and not as equally weighted values suitable for averaging.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS .

- A. << None >>

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on <<3/7/19>> at <<3:42>>PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Ele Haynes, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved <<3/25/19>> by
<Email Vote> of Committee Members

Meeting Minutes (2/13/19)

2018-2019 FWC

Attendance: Clinton Martin <cdmartin@georgiasouthern.edu>,

Jonathan Hilpert <jhilpert@georgiasouthern.edu>,

Alexander Collier <acollier@georgiasouthern.edu>,

Jessica Garner <jgarner@georgiasouthern.edu>,

Samuel Opoku <sopoku@georgiasouthern.edu>,

Michelle Haberland <mah@georgiasouthern.edu>,

Jamie Scalera <jscalera@georgiasouthern.edu>,

Allissa Lee <alee@georgiasouthern.edu>,

Hans-Joerg Schanz <hschanz@georgiasouthern.edu>,

Helen Bland <hwbland@georgiasouthern.edu>,

Janet Bradshaw <jbradshaw@georgiasouthern.edu>,

Jim LoBue <jlobue@georgiasouthern.edu>

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the Minutes Motion: Schanz Second: Bland unanimous in favor
3. Approval of Agenda Motion: Bland Second Lee unanimous in favor
4. Faculty Welfare Actions (from 1/5/19)
 - a. Handbook changes to 315 Principal Lecturer – Chair announced revision passed the senate and will be included in the faculty handbook
 - b. Handbook changes to 321.03 Educational Leave -- Chair announced revision passed the senate and will be included in the faculty handbook
 - c. Campus Announcements – Committee discussed senate feedback. Items of discussion include family consent, legal ramifications, role of staff counsel, role of HR. Chair agreed to meet separately with Representative Johnson and Smith to discuss next steps after the motion was tabled by senate. Meeting is set for 2/19.
 - d. Senate Discussion of Tenure and Promotion Policy – Committee discussed recommendations for revision to the policy based on the senate discussion. Recommendations included integrating the six major lines and related personnel actions and removing the sunset clause.
5. Faculty Welfare Actions Going Forward
 - a. Strategy for Tenure and Promotion Policy -- Chair agreed to make changes to the evaluation expectations and sunset clause sections of the document and send to committee for electronic vote the week of 2/18

- b. Section 317 revised to reflect the current SRI procedures (See Below) – Committee discussed changes to the section. The revised section was passed motion Scalera; second Lobue; unanimous in favor. The committee also discussed the possibility of a related senate resolution including 1) more time to complete the SRI 2) time in class to complete the SRI 3) longer window to complete the SRI 4) ability of students to stop and start the SRI 4) the SRI for team teaching 5) SRI for summer courses 6) faculty training/instruction in the delivery of the SRI.
 - c. FYI: BOR is proposing changes to the BOR Policy Manual around outside consulting
- 6. Faculty Welfare Concerns (Discuss Actions and Volunteers?)
 - a. Personal Social Media Account Use (tabled)
 - b. GSM language in faculty handbook (tabled)
 - c. Merit Raises/Salary Compression/Inversion (tabled)
 - d. Workload Equity (tabled)
 - e. 12 Month Salary Information (tabled)
 - f. Maternity Leave (tabled)
 - g. Spousal Hires (tabled)
- 7. New Business
- 8. Adjourn

Current:

317 Student Ratings of Instruction

Georgia Southern requires and conducts written or online student ratings of instruction each academic term (excluding summer) to provide information to faculty for their use in the improvement of teaching. Results are also used in faculty evaluation as mandated by Regents policy as a portion of an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Department chairs return a summary of numerical results and students' written comments to faculty each academic term; original responses are the property of the University. Courses shall be evaluated by students in the same manner as the course is conducted.

Partially online courses whose content is offered 50% or more online are evaluated through CoursEval. As with any evaluation, faculty shall have the right to respond to student ratings regarding factors that might have influenced student ratings of instruction scores.

Approved by Faculty Senate, March 6, 2018, and President, March 8, 2018.

Proposed:

317 Student Ratings of Instruction

Georgia Southern requires and conducts ~~written or~~ online student ratings of instruction each academic term (excluding summer) to provide information to faculty for their use in the improvement of teaching. Results are also used in faculty evaluation as mandated by Regents policy as a portion of an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. ~~Department chairs return a summary of numerical results and students' written comments to faculty each academic term; original responses are the property of the University. Courses shall be evaluated by students in the same manner as the course is conducted.~~ All courses are evaluated through CoursEval; responses are the property of the University. As with any evaluation, faculty shall have the right to respond to student ratings regarding factors that might have influenced student ratings of instruction scores.

~~Partially online courses whose content is offered 50% or more online are evaluated through CoursEval. As with any evaluation, faculty shall have the right to respond to student ratings regarding factors that might have influenced student ratings of instruction scores.~~

~~Georgia Southern requires and conducts online student ratings of instruction each academic term (excluding summer) to provide information to faculty for their use in the improvement of teaching. Results are also used in faculty evaluation as mandated by Regents policy as a portion of an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. All courses are evaluated through CoursEval; responses are the property of the University. As with any evaluation, faculty shall have the right to respond to student ratings regarding factors that might have influenced student ratings of instruction scores.~~

Approved by Faculty Senate, March 6, 2018, and President, March 8, 2018.

GENERAL EDUCATION AND CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Meeting Date – Friday, March 1, 2019

- Present: Heidi Altman, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences/Sociology and Anthropology; 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; Teresa Flateby, Institutional Effectiveness; 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; Clinton Martin, College of Engineering and Computing/Civil Engineering and Construction; Jeff Mortimore, Library; Peter Rogers, College of Engineering and Computing/Civil Engineering and Construction; Bill Wells, Parker College of Business/Finance
- Guests: Delena Gatch, Institutional Effectiveness; Jaime O'Connor, Institutional Effectiveness; John Peden, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences/Human Ecology; Tom Sweeney, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences/Human Ecology
- Absent: Leslie Haas, Library; Susan Hendrix, College of Health Professions/Nursing; Marla Morris, College of Education/Curriculum Foundations and Reading; Samuel Opoku, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health/Health Policy and Community Health; Marshall Ransom, College of Science and Mathematics/Mathematical Science; Stacy Smallwood, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health/Health Policy and Community Health; Student Government Association

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Michelle Cawthorn called the meeting to order on Friday, March 1 at 1:08 due to technical difficulties.

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 Norming Sessions, presented by Delena Gatch
 - Three norming sessions were held on Tuesday, January 22; Tuesday, January 28; and Tuesday, February 5 from 9:30-10:30 a.m.
 - The first norming session focused on Campus Labs training and making slight adjustments to the report rubric
 - Four reports were reviewed, covering five courses
 - ENGL 2100 Literature and Humanities
 - PSYC 2300 Global Perspectives in Developmental Psychology
 - ART 1000 Art in Life/ARTH 2531 Art History I
 - PHSC 1211 + 1211L Physical Environment and Lab
 - Committee members who participated in the norming: Samuel Opoku, Susan Hendrix, Bill Wells, Jeff Mortimore, Leslie Haas, Heidi Altman, Stacy Smallwood, Barbara King, Finbarr Curtis, Pete Rogers, Michelle Cawthorn, Daniel Czech, Alisa Leckie, Susie Carpenter, Marla Morris
 - Office of Institutional Effectiveness attendees: Teresa Flateby, Delena Gatch, Jaime O'Connor, Brad Sturz
- Update from Office of Institutional Effectiveness on Core Course Plan review
 - Out of 101 anticipated assessment plans
 - 79 complete and submitted
 - 7 are in progress
 - 6 have not submitted
 - 9 have chosen not to submit
 - Committee review update

- 56 courses have been reconciled
- 17 courses have been reviews by both reviewers
- 11 courses have been reviewed by only one reviewer
- 8 courses have not been reviewed
 - 6 of these have not been submitted
 - 2 are still in progress
- GECC members not participating
 - Marshall Ransom declined to participate
 - Stacy Smallwood, Marla Morris – personal/family emergencies prevented from completing on time
- Special thanks to those who volunteered to review additional reports
 - Finbarr Curtis, Jeffrey Mortimore, Amanda Konkle, Leslie Haas, Michelle Cawthorn, Alisa Leckie

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Review/approval of new or revised Core Course Proposals

- Chair Michelle Cawthorn reported that the committee has been reinstated in the course approval workflow, but we are not in the right place in the review process; we have been asked to review now some courses that went through the approval process in fall semester, when we were not in the workflow
- Bill Wells asked if some of these courses were already in the catalog, and objected to using committee time to review courses that were already approved and in the catalog
- Delena Gatch explained that even if the courses were in the catalog as part of the core, the revisions to these courses should still be reviewed and approved by the committee; Finbarr Curtis concurred, pointing out that revisions could change the course in such a way to make it inappropriate for the core
- Bill Wells asked where the committee should be in the approval process
- Chair Michelle Cawthorn stated that it should be after the dean of the college, prior to the undergraduate committee
- Alisa Leckie clarified that each course proposal first goes to the registrar to check codes, then to GECC, then to undergraduate committee; the course only proceeds for consideration for the core if it is approved by the GECC
- **CRJU 2010 Universal Justice**
 - Michelle Cawthorn stated that only the course description was being changed to this course that is already part of the core
 - Barb King explained that the revision to the course description was submitted last year, but it somehow did not make it through the process and was never updated in the catalog; the new description is clearer and more accurately reflects what is actually taught in the course

MOTION: Finbarr Curtis made a motion that the committee vote to approve the course changes to move forward to the undergraduate committee. Bill Wells seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.

- **PHYS 1111K Introductory Physics I, PHYS 1112K Introductory Physics II, PHYS 2211K Principles of Physics I, PHYS 2212 Principles of Physics II**
 - Delena Gatch explained that these are intro courses in the program and there were some scheduling complications between the Statesboro and Armstrong campuses. The requested changes would help to resolve those issues, ensure consistent coding in Banner, and allow for anticipated changes due to budget cuts and the impact on faculty course loads.
 - Bill Wells asked for clarification on the course numbering – no letter following the number indicates just lecture, “L” after the number indicates just lab, “K” after the number indicates lecture and lab combined
 - Finbarr Curtis asked if all four credits in the combined format count towards the core; Delena Gatch responded affirmatively

MOTION: Jeffrey Mortimore made a motion that the committee vote to approve the change to all courses to move forward to undergraduate committee. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

- **CHEM 1151 Survey of Chemistry I**
 - Delena Gatch stated that this course was already approved by the undergraduate committee with the understanding that it would be sent back to GECC for review and approval; the proposal asks to remove a Math prerequisite which was mistakenly added during consolidation

MOTION: Bill Wells made a motion that the committee vote to approve the change to the course. Suzy Carpenter seconded and the motion was unanimously approved.

- **BIOL 1335 Plants and Civilization**
 - Michelle Cawthorn stated that this course was already in the core, but it had no learning outcomes; prior to consolidation all courses were expected to add course outcomes, but due to the high volume of changes during consolidation, some courses were approved without them and are now going back and adding them

MOTION: Bill Wells made a motion that the committee vote to approve the change to the course to move forward to undergraduate committee. Finbarr Curtis seconded the motion and the motion was unanimously approved.

- **PHSC 1221L Physical Science Laboratory**
 - Michelle Cawthorn explained that the purpose of the proposed change was to make the lab for the course available online in an asynchronous format
 - Tony Barilla asked for clarification on whether this would be considered a hybrid format
 - Suzy Carpenter explained that it has historically been offered face-to-face, but they now want to make only the lecture portion face-to-face and the lab available online
 - Bill Wells suggested that since the course is already in the catalog, this would be an administrative clean up
 - Delena Gatch suggested it should be coded as a K course and not an L course so that it would fit expectations of a hybrid course
 - Clint Martin suggested that the committee approve the course, but with strong recommendations to clarify the proposal

MOTION: Bill Wells made a motion that the committee vote to approve the course with strong recommendations to change the course code to “K” and to clarify the proposal. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

- **RECR 1530 Recreation and Leisure in Society**
 - Michelle Cawthorn introduced this new course being proposed as an addition to core area E; two guests from the program were in attendance to answer questions: John Peden and Tom Sweeney
 - Michelle Cawthorn pointed out that there was part of a rubric under the learning outcomes section of the form that needed to be moved to the correct section
 - John Peden explained that the rubric and learning outcomes were part of their annual report and also linked to their accreditation requirements
 - Heidi Altman questioned whether analysis skills were emphasized enough in the learning outcomes to justify a connection to core area E; also thought the learning outcomes presented did not show a strong link to “shaping human behavior” which is part of the emphasis of core area E; Jeffery Mortimore agreed that analysis needed to be evident in the language used in the proposal
 - Tony Barilla said he could see how they were trying to make the course general, but that it seemed too specific to the major to be considered a general education course, which is the purpose of the core; Bill Wells agreed, and pointed out that the course is a pre-requisite for upper-level courses in the program so making it a core course seemed to have the purpose of attracting students into the program
 - Finbarr Curtis stated that he saw no problem with using a course like this to introduce students to the major since many other programs do the same thing
 - Clint Martin asked if this type of content had ever been taught as an FYE course; professors from the department said that there was a recreation special interest group as part of FYE, but it is no longer a consistent part of FYE

- Professors Peden and Sweeney made the argument that over half of the students who take the course are from outside the major, and the concepts presented are broad enough to be applicable to everyone
- Finbarr Curtis asked about the level of social-science content that would be required to meet area E requirements, and if students are reading texts by classical social scientists; Professors Peden and Sweeney replied that they are drawing from a range of fields that inform disciplinary scholarship, including sociology, psychology, and anthropology making it relatable to students and broadening the perspectives of majors
- Delena Gatch emphasized that for this course to pass BOR guidelines, the proposal will have to show a strong alignment with social science; Barbara King agreed adding that there is a difference between drawing from social sciences and contributing to the scholarship of social sciences and challenged the department to ask what the course brings to social sciences instead of what it draws from social sciences
- Bill Wells states that learning goals 2 and 4 in the proposal seemed more in line with the social science aspects of the course while other learning goals were more program specific and task-oriented. Since the BOR is reluctant to add more courses to the core, the justification will have to be very strong and should emphasize the learning goals that are most aligned with area E.

MOTION: Tony Barilla made a motion for the proposal to be returned to the department for clarification and stronger alignment to core area E, based on the recommendations of the committee. Motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

- **ANTH 2131 World Archaeology, ANTH 2231 Biological Anthropology, ANTH 2331 Cultural Anthropology**
 - Heidi Altman explained that these courses were all previously at the 3000-level; recently the program was restructured and these were shifted to the 2000-level to allow more opportunities for students to take upper-level courses
 - ANTH 2231 Biological Anthropology was considered a non-lab science prior to consolidation, and the proposal is to add this course to core area D2 as a non-lab science
 - Delena Gatch pointed out that the course would need to fit the definition of a natural science according to the BOR requirements, and the justification would need to include rationale for anthropology as a natural science
 - Bill Wells pointed out that the listed course equivalencies made it appear that the three courses were interchangeable; Heidi Altman stated that that is incorrect and it must be an error in the form due to the renumber of the courses that would need to be corrected
 - ANTH 2131 World Archeology is proposed as an addition to core area B due to the global focus of the course
 - Finbarr Curtis questioned why the courses were proposed for area B instead of area E. Heidi Altman explained that ANTH 1102 Introduction to Anthropology was already in area E and the department wanted to offer students more options in area B. Adding more anthropology courses to the core also benefits students who were not introduced to the discipline in high school
 - Delena Gatch reminded the committee that the operational working group that worked on designing the core curriculum during consolidation made an effort to prevent any program from being spread over too many areas, which could result in a student taking all core courses from one discipline instead of gaining broad exposure to many disciplines. She encouraged the committee to take that into consideration and develop a policy that could be applied equally to future course proposals.
 - Barb King asked if there could be a policy in place for limiting students to no more than two courses from any area as part of their core curriculum; Michelle Cawthorn replied that the system does not allow those kinds of constraints
 - Clint Martin pointed out that their accrediting body wanted students to take classes with a strong relationship to their discipline
 - Heidi Altman stated that anthropology is divided into four very distinct field, which makes it difficult to categorize courses that fit only two areas of the core
 - Clint Martin asked what would happen if a student took these courses as part of the core and then decided to major in anthropology; Heidi Altman replied that has not been a problem yet, and that there are other upper-level courses that could be substituted

- Bill Wells asked if these courses were currently in area F and if they would be taken out of F and put into different areas; students cannot receive credit for the same course in both the Core Curriculum and area F.
- Heidi Altman stated that the department wants students to take these courses for the joy of anthropology and offering these courses in the core would help to reach more non-majors
- Michelle Cawthorn asked if other schools in the system include these in their core; Heidi Altman said yes
- Delena Gatch offered that overall there are 20 courses in area B; 12 are offered at Statesboro, 11 at Armstrong, and 5-7 at Liberty; offerings are not uniform across campuses
- Finbarr Curtis asked if the inconsistent offerings is creating any obstacles to graduation; Delena Gatch responded that it is too early to tell
- Heidi Altman said all three of these courses would be offered at all three campuses
- Barb King asked if the courses were not included in the fall catalog but were accepted as part of the core later, could students who had already taken the courses retroactively count them as core credits; Delena Gatch responded affirmatively

MOTION: Bill Wells made a motion for the committee to send the courses back to the department for clarification and re-review at the April GECC meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Remaining agenda items will be rescheduled for future meetings. The meeting was adjourned on March 1, 2019 at 2:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jaime O'Connor, Recording Coordinator

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

FACULTY SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE MINUTES

Faculty Senate Library Committee Meeting Date – February 27th, 2019

- Present: Stephanie Jones; College of Education; Kristi Smith, Lane Library; Christian Hanna, Waters College of Health Professionals; Natalie Ingalsbe, College of Arts & Humanities; W. Bede Mitchell, Dean of the GS Libraries; Allissa Lee, College of Business; Douglas Frazier, Director of Lane Library & Associate Dean of the GS Libraries; Donna Mullenax, College of Science & Mathematics; Meghan Dove, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences; Ruth Whitworth, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health;
- Presenters: Autumn Johnson Special Collections Research Services, Henderson library; Ruth Baker, Scholarly Communications, Henderson Library
- Guests: Debra Skinner; Head of Collection & Resources Services, Henderson Library; Leslie Hass; Head of Research Services, Henderson Library; Jessica Garner Head of Access Services, Henderson Library; Rebecca Hunnicutt Catalog Metadata Librarian, Henderson Library; Michael Benjamin, College of Arts & Humanities; Lizette Cruz; Sr. Administrative Assistant to the Dean of the GS libraries.
- Absent: John R. O'Malley, College of Engineering & Computing; Clement Lau; Director of Henderson Library & Associate Dean of the GS Libraries.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. W. Bede Mitchell called the meeting to order on Monday, February 27th at 3:40PM.

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. *GS Libraries Budget Update*

Dr. Mitchell has not yet received any information on the 10% budget redirection and therefore had no real update. If he receives any information that would indicate any significant cut to the Libraries budget or any change whatsoever he will convene a meeting as soon as possible.

B. *Faculty Scholarship/ Publications Program Proposal*

Autumn Johnson and Ruth Baker presented a proposal for an annual Faculty Scholarship and Publications program to highlight faculty research to the campus community. Everyone was provided with a handout outlining the proposal. The program will highlight the library's role in aiding faculty research, encourage research awareness among the undergraduate and graduate populations, and increase the profile of Special Collections as a caretaker of institutional history. The program would consist of an event to take in place around November of 2019. They presented the ways that the libraries presently promote faculty scholarship. They proposed several programs to feature the work of faculty and promote them especially to the undergraduate population. Dr. Mitchell asked for input on thoughts about the idea. It was suggested to have a reception and Autumn agreed that they have considered doing so. The faculty invited to speak at the event would be chosen by approaching dept. heads for their recommendations and through library liaisons. It was suggested that maybe choosing one faculty member per college would be another way of picking faculty to highlight.

The event could be duplicated at both the Statesboro and Armstrong campus simultaneously, or could be a larger event held at one campus. Another idea was to do it in the fall at one campus and in the spring at the other campus. There was discussion back and forth about which way would be best. It would be an open event to everyone, community and students. Dr. Mitchell suggested that everyone should take the proposal and work on the ideas presented today. The revised version can then be shared and once everyone is comfortable with general concept, Dr. Mitchell can take the proposal to Dr. Reiber. After the provost approves the proposal, the details and specifics can be worked out. Everyone agreed.

C. *Other Business*

Leslie Haas asked the committee to think about what services and changes they felt are needed from the Libraries in light of the consolidation as it pertained to outreach to faculty on the Georgia Southern campuses and to get that information back to her. The Libraries are working on a plan but would like the input of faculty, along with the surveys, focus groups and interviews they are planning.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. There were no other announcements.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on Wednesday, February 27th, 2019 at 3:51PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lizette Cruz, Recording Coordinator