

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes

Armstrong Faculty Senate

10-21-2013

October 21, 2013 AASU Faculty Senate Minutes

Armstrong State University

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

Recommended Citation

Armstrong State University, "October 21, 2013 AASU Faculty Senate Minutes" (2013). *Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes*. 49.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/armstrong-fs-minutes/49>

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

Armstrong Atlantic State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of October 21, 2013
Student Union, Ballroom A, 3:00 pm

- I. Senate President Baird called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm (see Appendix A)
- II. Senate Action
 - A. Approval of [Minutes from September 23, 2013](#) Faculty Senate (FS) Meeting
 1. Discussion: Concern expressed about the limited time between posting of President Bleicken's comments on bills/resolutions and discussion in FS meetings. President Bleicken has 30 days to respond to all bills/resolutions. May need to consider amending constitution to shorten this time. The responses can be discussed in subsequent FS meetings. The bills from the September meeting will be included on the the November agenda.
 2. APPROVED without corrections
 - B. Remarks from Dr. Georj Lewis, Vice President for Student Affairs (SA)
 1. Key short term goals are to improve stability and communication with academic departments and faculty in general.
 - i. Searches are ongoing to fill several vacant staff positions in SA.
 - ii. Effectiveness of student retention activities will be assessed.
 - iii. Will communicate directly with colleges/departments on how SA can partner with them to help students
 - a. For example, SA has identified opportunities to partner with Health Sciences in College of Health Professions on public health initiatives, civic engagement in College of Liberal Arts, and improving travel funds for students to attend College of Science and Technology conferences.
 2. Discussion: Concern expressed about high staff turnover and loss of institutional history. Efforts should be made to hire internally when possible.
 - C. Old Business
 1. Outcome of Bills
 - i. [FSB-2013-09-23-03](#): New Administrative Positions Freeze Bill
 - a. Discussion
 - i. Prior to the meeting, President Bleicken expressed to President Baird, a desire to have conversations about these issues vs. a cycle of bills and vetoes.
 - ii. Bill was thought to be too broad.
 - ii. [FSB-2013-09-23-04](#): Faculty Salary Analysis Bill
 - D. New Business
 1. Committee Reports
 - i. [University Curriculum Committee Meeting Minutes](#)
 - a. Discussion:
 - i. II.B.10. Creation of Bachelors of Science in Biochemistry-Concern about the new degree creating a need for additional biochemist faculty. However, there are sufficient faculty in the department to meet the needs of the new degree.
 - ii. III.A. Change to undergraduate catalog regarding degree

tracks. Confusion about labeling students with an undergraduate degree as “traditional”. However, the distinction relates to the face-to-face (traditional) vs. online track.

- b. All curricular items were APPROVED without modification
 - ii. [Graduate Affairs Committee Meeting Minutes](#)
- 2. FSR-2013-10-21-01: Commendation for Dr. Mark Finlay (Appendix B)
 - i. Discussion: The Finlay family expressed gratitude for the resolution. The signed resolution will be presented to the family at the beginning of the next FS meeting.
 - ii. Resolution APPROVED
- 3. FSR-2013-10-21-02: Commendation for ITS-Network Upgrades (Appendix C)
 - i. Resolution APPROVED
- 4. FSB-2013-10-21-03: Domestic Partners Benefits Bill (Appendix D)
 - i. Discussion
 - a. Several discussions held with Human Resources and Advancement regarding the need to fund benefits via private and/or foundation money. Purpose of bill is to reinforce importance of diversity and inclusion and serves as a first step towards that outcome.
 - b. If approved by President Bleicken, it will be submitted to the Vice Chancellor of Administration.
 - ii. Bill APPROVED
- 5. FSB-2013-10-21-04: Selected Standing Committee Elimination (Appendix E)
 - i. Discussion
 - a. Committee on Committee must approve bylaws changes, then approved by FS, then voted on by all faculty.
 - b. Friendly amendment to include Research and Scholarship to elimination list. However, more discussion need before moving forward on this. Amendment withdrawn and will be revisited at next FS meeting.
 - c. Lingering concerns about the disposition of the committees once eliminated from the FS. However, since committees will not be dissolved until fall 2014, FS can still prepare bills with instructions on the makeup and structure of the eliminated committees.
 - d. The large number of FS standing committees continues to pose major challenges to populate, with some committees still not fully populated.
 - e. Bill APPROVED
- 6. FSB: Re-election of Senators (Appendix F)
 - i. Bill withdrawn since it was not reviewed by Constitution and Bylaws committee prior to the FS meeting.
- 7. Formation of a Senate Rules Committee (Appendix G)
 - i. Discussion: Rules committee would combine Committee on Committee and the Constitution and Bylaws committees due to their overlapping duties. Further discussion needed for name of new committee.
- 8. Faculty-Driven Planning Initiative Update
 - i. Faculty typically stay longer than administrators at Armstrong. Incumbent

on faculty to be more proactive in long term planning for Armstrong. The initiative provides the FS with an opportunity to provide administration with planning ideas on a 3 -5 year timeframe.

ii. A faculty forum will be held to discuss ideas and plan next steps.

9. Senate Information

i. Faculty Approval of Graduates at Commencement (Appendix H)

a. Question about the ordering of the colleges at the December ceremony. It was unclear if the order has always been the same or was supposed to be alternated.

b. Several questions about the ordering of the names of students during ceremony. The ceremony is no longer rehearsed and may be the cause of the students' names not being called by department.

c. FS will ask the Graduation Committee Chair to speak at the next FS meeting.

ii. USGFC Meeting Minutes (Appendix I)

iii. Send Committee Meetings and Minutes to faculty.senate@armstrong.edu

10. Meeting Adjourned at 4:27pm.

Yours faithfully,

Wayne Johnson
Faculty Senate Secretary

Faculty Senators and Alternates Attendance (8/19/13)

Department	College	# of seats	Senator(s) and Term Year as of 2013/2014		Alternate(s)	
Adolescent and Adult Education	COE	2	Regina Rahimi (3)		Rona Tyger	
	COE		Ed Strausser (3)	x	Lynn Long	
Art, Music, Theatre	CLA	3	Angela Horne (3)	x	Karl Michel	
	CLA		Deborah Jamieson (1)	x	Emily Grundstad-Hall	
	CLA		Elizabeth Desnoyers-Colas (1)	x	Megan Baptiste-Field	
Biology	CST	3	Traci Ness (2)	x	Sara Gremillion	
	CST		Brett Larson (1)	x	Jennifer Brofft-Bailey	
	CST		Kathryn Craven (1)	x	Aaron Schrey	
Chemistry, Physics	CST	3	Brent Feske (2)		Brandon Quillian	x
	CST		William Baird (3)	x	Jeff Secrest	
	CST		Catherine MacGowan (3)	x	Will Lynch	
Childhood & Exceptional Student Education	COE	2	Barbara Hubbard (2)	x	Patricia Norris-Parsons	
	COE		Anne Katz (1)	x	Glenda Ogletree	
Criminal Justice, Social, & Pol Science	CLA	2	Katherine Bennett (2)	x	Daniel Skidmore-Hess	
	CLA		Michael Donohue (3)	x	Dennis Murphy	
Communication Science & Disorders	CHP	1	Maya Clark (3)	x	April Garrity	
Computer Science & Info. Technology	CST	1	Ashraf Saad (2)	x	Frank Katz	
Economics	CLA	1	Nick Mangee (1)	x	Yassi Saadatmand	
Engineering	CST	1	Wayne Johnson (3)	x	Priya Goesser	
Health Sciences	CHP	2	Leigh Rich (2)		Joey Crosby	
	CHP		Janet Buelow (1)	x	Rod McAdams	
History	CLA	2	Chris Hendricks (2)	x	Michael Benjamin	
	CLA		Jason Tatlock (3)		Allison Belzer	x
Library	CLA	1	Melissa Jackson (2)	x	Ann Fuller	
Languages, Literature, Philosophy	CLA	4	Bill Deaver (1)	x	Nancy Remler	
	CLA		Dorothee Mertz-Weigel (3)	x	Chris Baker	
	CLA		Beth Howells (3)	x	Tony Morris	
	CLA		Erik Nordenhaug (2)	x	Richard Bryan	
Mathematics	CST	3	Michael Tiemeyer (2)	x	Greg Knofczynski	
	CST		Paul Hadavas (1)	x	Tim Ellis	
	CST		Joshua Lambert. (1)	x	Jared Schlieper	
Medical Laboratory Science	CHP	1	Denene Lofland (1)	x	Chad Guilliams	
Nursing	CHP	4	Deb Hagerty (2)		Carole Massey	
	CHP		Jane Blackwell (2)	x	Luz Quirimit	
	CHP		Jeff Harris (1)	x	Jill Beckworth	
	CHP		Amber Derksen (1)		Cherie McCann	
Physical Therapy	CHP	1	David Bringman (2)		Nancy Wofford	
Psychology	CST	1	Wendy Wolfe (3)	x	Mirari Elcoro	
Radiologic Sciences	CHP	1	Shaunell McGee (1)	x	Rochelle Lee	
Respiratory Therapy	CHP	1	Christine Moore (3)	x	Rhonda Bevis	

Faculty Senate Resolution

Commendation for Dr. Mark R. Finlay

Be it resolved that:

The Faculty Senate of Armstrong Atlantic State University expresses its deep sadness at the untimely passing of Dr. Mark R. Finlay, Assistant Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Professor of History, as well as its profound gratitude for his twenty years of tireless service as a teacher, mentor, colleague, scholar, and administrator.

Faculty Senate Resolution

ITS Commendation for Network Upgrades

Whereas the recent upgrade of Armstrong Atlantic State University's information technology network was executed professionally, with minimal interruptions in service, and has received positive national attention (Computerworld, September 23, 2013, Forecast 2014: Boost your mobile bandwidth¹);

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Armstrong Atlantic State University hereby thanks, commends, and congratulates CIO Robert Howard and the entire ITS staff, with special attention to the efforts of Fernando Foster, Scott Gilreath, Ed Furia, and Torrence Worthy.

¹http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9242541/Forecast_2014_Boost_your_mobile_bandwidth

Submitted October 15, 2013 by Faculty Welfare Committee

Domestic Partners Benefits Bill (Version IV)

Whereas Armstrong Atlantic State University embraces the values of inclusion and diversity: "we value and respect an environment of mutual trust and collegiality that builds an inclusive as well as a diverse community"¹, and

Whereas the administration of Armstrong recently highlighted the importance of the value of diversity during the Convocation of Fall 2013, and

Whereas the University System of Georgia Faculty Council resolved on February 25th, 2012 that, "In the interest of equity and in order to attract and retain all of the best qualified faculty and staff, the USGFC recommends that university system benefits be extended to domestic partners,"² and

Whereas as of January 1, 2014 all colleges and universities of the University System of Georgia will extend voluntary benefits such as vision, dental, and optional additional life insurance to domestic partners of employees who are benefits eligible³ and recently (February 15, 2013) the University of Georgia Council approved the Proposal for Implementation of Full Domestic Partner Benefits ^{4,5}, and

Whereas full medical benefits are still not extended to domestic partners of employees of colleges and universities of the University System of Georgia because current State of Georgia law and policy prevent the use of state funds for persons not recognized as dependents,

The Faculty Senate requests that Armstrong Atlantic State University petitions to the University System of Georgia to allow institutional policy to include that corresponding employee portions be paid with foundation funds.

¹Armstrong Atlantic State University Catalog 2013-2014. Retrieved from:
http://www.armstrong.edu/images/academic_affairs/current_undergraduate_catalog.pdf

²University System of Georgia Faculty Council Meeting, February 25, 2012. Retrieved from:
http://www.usg.edu/faculty_council/documents/resolutions/USGFC_Resolutions_-_Feb_25.pdf

³University of Georgia, Proposal for Implementation of Full Domestic Partner Benefits August 2012, Retrieved from: <https://apps.reg.uga.edu/UniversityCouncil/publicCommitteeMeeting/showAgenda/105>

⁴UGA Council Approves domestic partner benefits for employees, The Red and Black. Retrieved from:
http://m.redandblack.com/news/uga-council-approves-domestic-partner-benefits-for-employees/article_726d9efa-08e5-11e2-b0b5-001a4bcf6878.html?mode=jqm

⁵UGA committee approves domestic partner benefits. The GA Voice. Retrieved from:
<http://www.thegavoice.com/news/georgia-news/5200-uga-committee-approves-domestic-partner-benefits-next-vote-set-for-sept-27>

Proposed Changes (version 2)

Suggested changes to Faculty Senate committees based on feedback from current Committee Chairs and Members:

Committees of the Senate

- 1. Steering**
- 2. Rules and Administration**
 - Scope would cover aspects of Elections, Constitution and Bylaws, and Committee on Committees?
- 3. Academic Standards**
 - This committee would remain in place, with the addition that it also would assume duties currently related to Student Success (with regard to academics).
- 4. Education Technology**
 - Members of the current ETC feel this should remain a standing committee.
 - (Perhaps ETC might wish to speak further about this at the upcoming meeting?)
- 5. Planning, Budget and Facilities**
 - The current PB&F Committee has requested that much of the committee's scope and its name remain the same, particularly in light of the Education Technology Committee's suggestion that it continue as a standing committee.
- 6. Faculty Welfare*****
 - It has been suggested that this committee's scope remain as-is.
 - However, with the idea that tasks related to Faculty Research and Scholarship would be taken over by Faculty Development (which would be moved outside of the Senate; see below), it is recommended that at least two members from Faculty Welfare serve as members of and/or Senate liaisons to the Faculty Development Committee.

Committees that Recommend to the Senate (if these are Committees of the Senate, move these there)

- 1. University Curriculum** (No changes)
- 2. Graduate Affairs** (No changes)

Committees to Be Moved Outside of the Senate

- **Faculty Development*****
 - This committee would take on many of the tasks that were covered as part of the faculty-side of Research and Scholarship (as the Office of Faculty Development already is involved with and/or oversees much of this).
 - Additionally, the Director of Faculty Development suggests that this office and the VPAA/Provost create, by appointment of the deans, a review board that could review Advanced Academic Leave and Internal Grant applications. Two representatives from each college could be members of this board: one who has accrued a distinguished record of scholarship and one who has a strong track record of exemplary teaching (these would probably be either full or associate-level professors, who would serve for two or three consecutive years).
- **International Education**
- **Honors**
- **Writing**
- **Library**
- **Interdisciplinary**
 - (There seems to be a consensus that there is no special need for a member of this committee to automatically serve as a member on the UCC.)
- **Student Research and Scholarship** (or Student Scholar Symposium)
 - The coordinators of undergraduate research from CST (Mateer) and CoLA (Belzer) have stated that they could form a non-Senate committee of faculty who are interested in running the Student Scholar Symposium. The current Research and Scholarship Committee agreed that it would make much sense for faculty committed to these issues to be involved with them, rather than have appointments of faculty who might see this as outside their purview.

Faculty Senate Bill

Selected Standing Committee Elimination

The Bylaws of the Faculty Senate of the Armstrong Atlantic State University are hereby amended to delete Sections C, I, J, K, and M of Article XI, which refer to the missions, duties, membership, meetings, and reports of the Library, Writing, International Programs and Activities, Honors Advisory, and Interdisciplinary Studies Committees, respectively. The elimination of these committees from the Senate is not a statement on their value to the University, but rather recognition of the fact that they can best complete their missions as independently constituted bodies comprising the faculty and administrators most knowledgeable about them.

Faculty Senate Bill

Re-election of Senators

The Bylaws of the Faculty Senate of Armstrong Atlantic State University are hereby amended as follows:

Article V, Section A, Paragraph 3 is deleted and replaced by the following:

3. Senator may serve two consecutive three-year terms, but a three-year wait period is required before that Senator may be elected again.

Summary of the ELECTIONS COMMITTEE proposed changes to the bylaws and the constitution.

The ELECTIONS COMMITTEE which is currently responsible for maintaining membership on the committees in accordance with the bylaws has had difficulty in the past finding volunteering candidates for all the member positions because of the complexity of the current senate committee structure and the non-uniform terms of memberships for various types of committees. The Elections Committee proposes the following changes to help simplify the senate committee structure and terms of office.

I. Proposal to change most terms of office and committee terms to a uniform three years:

A. The Committees of the Senate – we propose changing the member terms to three years without regard to the length of time remaining in the Senator's elected term.

Rationale: This will provide greater continuity and experienced committee members who are able to perform the duties of the committee more efficiently in addition to making more uniform and simple the complex senate terms structures. No longer would the exact ratio of one third be required for annual elections to committees in an effort to keep all positions filled since it is already part of the election cycle that no committee ever has all its members being elected new for the first time to form that committee. Maintaining the one third ratio so specifically is not required to affirm the intent of the rule which is to always make sure some experience committee members are always present from year to year in the election cycles. The current election cycle and terms of office make the specification of having a third new members elected each year somewhat redundant.

B. The Standing Committees - Most already have a three year term with the exception of the university curriculum committee. We propose that the UCC members also have a three year term in the interest of uniformity, continuity, and efficiency. We also propose removing the stricter requirement necessitating half of the membership of all standing committees be elected annually.

Rationale: It would be easier if sometimes slightly more than half could be newly elected and sometimes slightly less than half be newly elected. The intent of the rule is still satisfied by keeping a number of experienced committee members always present from year to year while making room for new members to come into service. The current election cycle and terms of office make the specification of having half new members elected each year somewhat redundant.

II. Proposal to combine three senate committees into one new committee called SENATE RULES COMMITTEE.

A. To help simplify senate committee structure and ease demand on the elections committee to continually find volunteer candidates, the Elections Committee proposes the creation of the SENATE RULES COMMITTEE (and the simultaneous dissolution of Constitution and Bylaws Committee, Committee on Committees, and the Elections Committee). This proposed SENATE RULES COMMITTEE will take on the functions of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, the Committee on Committees, and the Elections Committee. The committee description and membership is as follows:

Senate Rules Committee

Charge: The committee will regularly review the Constitution and Bylaws and the charges of each committee of the Senate to keep them up-to-date and effective as well as developing and maintaining the nominations and election processes.

Duties: The Committee assures that the membership and work of each committee is consistent with the bylaws. The Committee can propose changes to committee and senate bylaws and inform the Senate of any change(s) in committee structure. This committee has the responsibility to propose revise, or eliminate Senate committees and standing committees of the Senate. The Senate must approve any changes in committees' bylaws. This committee is responsible for maintaining the membership of each committee and the senate via the election processes. These election duties include:

1. solicit nominations and accept nominations
2. determine willingness to serve
3. prepare slates of nominees
4. conduct university wide elections for the Standing Committees of the Senate
5. conduct elections for the Senate Committees
6. manage the election process
7. announce the results of elections
8. have the authority to call special elections.

Membership: The Senate Rules Committee shall consist of six Senators elected by the Senate. No member of the Senate Rules Committee can be nominated for Senate office.

Rationale: All three of the existing committees are RELATED and responsible for reviewing and enforcing the RULES of the senate itself so it makes sense that the functions of these three committees occur in a coordinated and unified way which would occur more easily if all of these duties were performed by ONE single committee instead of three separate committees. We propose six members are needed given the combined duties. None of these Senate Rules members can be nominated for senate offices as is currently the case with The Elections Committee.

Faculty Approval of Graduates

During this December's ceremony the dean of each college will ask the faculty of their college to stand after each group of students stand by degree. Once the faculty stands, the dean will address Dr. Bleicken and say "President Bleicken, these candidates have satisfied all requirements prescribed by the University and have been approved by the faculty of the college". Then, the students and the faculty will be asked to be seated.

Also, the time of the second ceremony has changed.

1st ceremony:

Processional begins 9:45am

Ceremony begins 10:00am

2nd ceremony:

Processional begins 1:15pm

Ceremony begins 1:30pm

USGFC Meeting Minutes – September 14th, 2013

- I. Meeting was called to order by Doug Moodie at 10:02 am.
- II. Introductions – all present introduced themselves and indicated which institution they represent. Douglas Moodie (Kennesaw State University) introduced Humayun Zafar (Kennesaw State University) as the makeshift meeting minutes recorder. Timothy Brown (Georgia Perimeter College) talked about use of an electronic forum for maintain institutional memory.
- III. Dr. Richard Carvajal, President of Bainbridge State College thanked the USGFC for their work, who in turn was thanked by the USGFC for being allowed to use the facilities without being charged.
- IV. Douglas Moodie talked about the use of USGFC for a lot more than what has been the case in the past. Douglas Moodie mentioned how Dr. Davis told him that the USGFC needs to push down information to faculty, since at times President's have not done so. New elected positions would need to be created. We would need to have an official vote once new positions are set, and by-laws would need to be modified. A recommendation about creation of sub-committees to address this issue was made.
- V. Skype call with Dr. Houston Davis – Executive Vice Chancellor for the USG at 10:20 am
A. Dr. Davis presented the topic areas that were a part of the agenda:

1. Online Teaching Issues – Dr. Davis stressed on the importance of quality control for MOOCs. He stated that focus should not necessarily be on what MOOCs are but what they need to be. There are numerous issues: ID management (not just knowing who a participant is, but where he/she is), and difficulty in assessing learning objectives. Dr. Davis stated that he shares the same concerns that faculty does. He mentioned D2L's latest announcement about MOOC like tools in an appropriate setting. D2L's current contract with the USG does not allow for enrolment of out of state students in a MOOC. Dr. Davis stated that D2L is going to be approached about this issue. William Griffiths IV (Southern Polytechnic State University) asked why we could not use credit by exams (e.g. challenge exams). Dr. Davis replied that a group will be formed to look at various MOOC models. There is not just an academic component but also a fiscal one. Therefore, the group will include an even split of administrators and academics. Dr. Davis also talked about formation of a consortium that will look into addressing all of these issues. The consortium will include mostly academics. A MOOC forum will also be set up, and it will include 2-3 representatives from each institution.

Dr. Davis then addressed the conversation at Kennesaw State University about certifying instructors without having to go through QM course certification. Dr. Davis stated that this issue is better left for the institutions to resolve. He would like to focus on broader conversations about online learning, hybrid courses etc.

2. Consolidated Institutions – Dr. Davis stated that he cannot say that future consolidations will or will not happen. A lot of lessons have been learned from the previous consolidation. Looking at the books, administrative savings have occurred. This has resulted in some FTE issues being resolved. He mentioned that it is not about saving money for saving

money sake. Funds that were saved were left for institutions and were not given back to the State. Other lessons learned include: importance of addressing system and department level differences between two institutions before and after consolidation. Good housekeeping for SACS was the right thing to do. Future consolidations will include transitional executives. Future consolidations will also address potential P&T issues. Dr. Davis stated that people should not feel that the rules were changed on them. Mark Spraker (University of North Georgia), Jean Pawl (Georgia Regents University), and Kirby Swenson (Middle Georgia State College) expressed concerns that people at their respective institutions were not grandfathered in. Dr. Davis asked them (and everyone) to send him specific information (at Houston.davis@usg.edu) and he will look into it.

He was also asked about Domestic Partner benefits (not part of the agenda). Dr. Davis said that we follow State law. Active conversations are going on about this issue. The Board is trying to work within the space that is available to see what options are available.

3. System versus Institution Goals – Dr. Davis said that this issue came about when State Colleges started shedding Associate degrees, and moving toward Bachelor degrees. Some have even started offering Masters degrees. He stated that institutional aspirations are not going to be discouraged, but there is a firm commitment to access (such as costs to students). The Board is going to put procedures in the handbook to provide institutions wanting to move up a tier a series of steps to follow. Moving up a tier involves a complex assortment of not just degrees and/or programs but also facilities, funding etc. Brian Schwartz (Columbus State University) asked if new funding formulas would be implemented. Dr. Davis said that that will happen, and the new formulas will not be based purely on enrolment. They will focus on programs, retention and graduation rates, and fund raising (if applicable). State Colleges need to be awarded for successful transfers, which is currently not the case. Basically the different tiers will have varying reward structures.

4. Salary compression – Dr. Davis stated that a 1% increase across all USG institutions would cost \$140 million. Healthcare costs are projected to be 120% of where they were a few years ago. This will rise dramatically. Institutions have addressed some equity issues. USG is being proactive about rising healthcare costs by looking at various providers. Dr. Davis also mentioned that there may be a need to think creatively about workload issues. 5/5 and even 7/7 are becoming the norm and need to be looked at.

5. State Funding - Dr. Davis stated that it would be a good thing if the USGFC presented an annual report. This would result in a constant channel of communication. Dr. Davis also stated that he was surprised that after joining the USG that seven years ago the state/tuition funding rates were 75%/25%. Right now it is about 50%/50%. We are not going back to 75%/25%. 60%/40% maybe possible but that is not a guarantee. They also need to look at the percentage that contributes toward administrative costs.

6. Status of Past USGFC resolutions – Dr. Davis said that he will look into this.

7. Financial Help for USGFC from USG – Dr. Davis stated that future meetings will be supported by the USG (\$500 for each meeting in Fall and Spring to cover lunch costs). VPAAAs will be contacted to ensure that there is support for mileage and accommodations.

8. Quality assurance of teaching – A question was raised about the best way to evaluate learning. Dr. Davis proposed that there should be a summit around the topic. He referred to a link with the Complete College Georgia (CCG) initiative, which may lend itself to conversations about evaluation of teaching. The Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) needs to provide leadership on this issue.

B. Dr. Davis then opened up the floor for questions from the group

Question 1 – Is ADP going away?

Answer – Other tools are being looked at. This does not mean that ADP is going away.

Question 2 – Are there any updates on the gun debate?

Answer – Existing State law has the support of the Board. The Board would like to focus on appropriations that contribute toward salary raises instead of focusing on this issue unnecessarily. However, they are willing to do so if needed.

Question 3 – Will the upcoming D2L upgrade include the analytics package?

Answer – They are currently negotiating price. Some institutions are willing to pay themselves. A comment about poor system level support was raised. Dr. Davis said that anyone with specific issues about this should contact him directly via email.

Question 4 – Are programs with single digit enrolments in danger of being shut down?

Answer – They are taking a good hard look across all institutions that have programs with low enrolments. However, a single digit enrolment itself does not mean an immediate shutting down of the program. That is where the conversation starts. There is also a focus on ensuring that low producing programs at an institution do not result in other programs being approved at that institution.

VI. Meeting minutes from April 20th, 2013 meeting were presented for approval – meeting minutes were unanimously approved (moved by Humayun Zafar and seconded by Jean Pawl)

VII. Break-out groups for lunch discussion – There were four break-out groups for lunch:

Group 1 – discussion of expansion of USGFC – executive committee/officers, by-laws/tiers, and annual report.

Group 2 – discussion about declining summer enrollments.

Group 3 – discussion about evaluation of teaching.

Group-4 – discussion about consolidations

VIII. Resolution

a. Resolution related to summer enrolment:

1. The USGFC asks the system office to encourage individual campuses to research the issue of declining summer enrolment and propose solutions with the goal of increasing

RPGs, overall summer revenue, and facility utilization by improving access to part-time summer enrolments. We feel strongly that this aligns with CCG. Proposed solutions might include experimenting with fee structures, financial aid and academic advising, and strategic course scheduling.

IX. Meeting adjourned at 2:45 pm.