

Georgia Southern University
Faculty Senate Meeting

October 6, 2022 | 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Meeting rescheduled from Sept. 29

Zoom Link for Non-Voting Attendees:

<https://georgiasouthern.zoom.us/j/92447726513>

Zoom Link for Panelists will be sent out by Wednesday, Oct. 5

Pre-Meeting Notes:

- 1) Read all reports, motions, and discussions included in this agenda *before* the meeting.
- 2) Be able to access copies during the meeting. Copies will not be shown online during meetings.
- 3) To allow everyone a chance to participate and to keep the meeting on schedule, please try to be succinct in your comments.
- 4) Faculty Senate meetings this year will be virtual. The meeting starts promptly at 4 p.m., which means everyone should be online by that time. The meeting space will be open with IT staff available 30 minutes prior to the starting time to help with any technical issues you may have prior to the meeting.
- 5) This meeting will be run as a virtual Video Webinar through Zoom with all Senators and select administrators as Panelists.
- 6) Senators and invited guests are asked to join with video with full name and college affiliation. Video should be on when speaking.
- 7) As a Senator, if you cannot attend, it is your responsibility to confirm a substitution with the Alternates from your college. The name and email address of the alternate should be sent to Bill Dawers (wdawers@georgiasouthern.edu) and David Walker (davidwalker@georgiasouthern.edu) as far in advance as possible to ensure that the alternate receives the appropriate link.
- 8) Alternates may vote only if they are representing a Senator.
- 9) Please raise your hand via the button at the bottom of the Zoom webpage to be recognized to speak.
- 10) All Faculty Senate meetings are recorded.
- 11) All submissions to the Chat box will become part of the official minutes of the meeting.
- 12) Edited Minutes will be distributed.

Agenda

4:00 p.m.	CALL TO ORDER
4:03 p.m.	APPROVAL OF AGENDA
4:04 p.m.	APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER MINUTES (p. 4)
4:05 p.m.	LIBRARIAN'S REPORT (p. 15)
4:07 p.m.	SENATE PRESIDENT'S UPDATE <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Updates on communication and transparency<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Tweaks being made to the pre-meeting notesb. If Panelists send chat comments to "everyone," all attendees should now be able to see those commentsc. SEC supports posting videos of Faculty Senate meetings but logistics have not been worked outd. Faculty Senate website still needs substantial updating and reorganizinge. More user-friendly interface will eventually be implemented for submission of Discussion Items and Requests for Informationf. SEC needs a webpage for ongoing initiatives2. Faculty Senate administrative hire update3. Armstrong Task Force update<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. General timetableb. Reminder about availability of data sourcesc. Thoughts on the importance of faculty familiarizing themselves with the campus and program enrollment trends 2015-2021 (note: the sheet is only for primary majors, data on second majors are on the way)4. Update on committee membership needs<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Many open seats remain - please review membership lists and consider volunteering, recruiting, etc.b. Looking for better ways to share information between committees and the full Faculty Senate

4:22 p.m.	<p>FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (SEC) REPORT</p> <p>New Business</p> <p>i. Discussion Item: Plans for survey of faculty teaching site-synchronous courses (Dawers/SEC) (p. 30)</p> <p>SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION:</p> <p>The Senate Executive Committee is planning a survey that will ask faculty about their experiences teaching site-synchronous courses. The survey will cover the following areas (and perhaps others): a) technology, b) support, c) rooms and scheduling, and d) pedagogy. In this Senate discussion, the SEC is seeking input about the survey itself and about site-synchronous instruction more generally.</p>
4:45 p.m.	<p>UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT’S REPORT (Dr. Kyle Marrero)</p>
5:00 p.m.	<p>PROVOST’S REPORT (Dr. Carl Reiber)</p>
5:15 p.m.	<p>ANNOUNCEMENTS</p>
5:30 p.m.	<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>

Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate Meeting - Minutes
August 31, 2022, 4 p.m. to 6 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 p.m.

The Senate approved the meetings from the May meeting and the Librarian's Report for this meeting.

Bill Dawers (CAH), as Faculty Senate President, began the meeting with his update to the Senate, speaking about the addition of an update from the chair/president, about concerns about service levels across the university, about the forthcoming salary study, about the timing of SRIs and plans to pilot a new SRI instrument, and about the Faculty Welfare Committee's work on the chair evaluation process.

The Senate considered a motion to adopt the updates to the post-tenure review policy document as developed by the ad-hoc Senate committee led by Dr. Marieke Van Willigen (CBSS). Questions about the instrument were asked and answered through open discussion. The Senate voted to approve the instrument by a vote of 48 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstaining.

The second discussion item was the new SRI pilot. Discussion was opened, but as no questions were asked, Bill Dawers requested that those interested in participating contact the SEC representative for their college.

The third discussion item was an update on the Armstrong Task Force. Lively discussion was held on this topic. Faculty were encouraged to visit the web page for the Armstrong Task Force to share their thoughts.

President Marrero and Provost Reiber delivered their respective updates to the Senate, fielding questions from Senators.

The meeting adjourned at 5:41 p.m.

MINUTES

Officers in Attendance: Bill Dawers (CAH, President); Ed Mondor (COSM, President-Elect); Robert Terry (CAH, Secretary); Kymberly Harris (COE, Parliamentarian).

Officers Absent: Christine Bedore (COSM, Librarian)

Senators in Attendance (by college): Annie Mendenhall (CAH); Jonathan Murphy (CAH); Lisa Costello (CAH); June Joyner (CAH); Jeffrey Riley (CAH); Chris Caplinger (CAH); Kasie Alt (CAH); Virginia Ems-Bleneau (CAH); Marieke Van Willigen (CBSS); Josh Kennedy (CBSS); Wendy Wolfe (CBSS); Jonathan Grubb (CBSS); Jayce Sudweeks (CBSS); Mike Nielson (CBSS); Tom Sweeney (CBSS); Elizabeth “Betsy” Barrow (COE); Ming Fan He (COE); Lucas Jensen (COE); Raymona Lawrence (JPHCOPH); Bill Mase (JPHCOPH); Jay Hodgson (COSM); Yi Hu (COSM); Nathaniel Shank (COSM); Worlanyo Eric Gato (COSM); Divine Wanduku (COSM); Tricia Brown (COSM); Zhan Chen (COSM); Maxim Durach (COSM); Yongki Lee (COSM); Beth Burnett (LIB); Wilhelminia Randtke (LIB); Mujibur Khan (PCEC); Hayden Wimmer (PCEC); Anoop Desai (PCEC); Salman Siddiqui (PCEC); Vladimir Gurau (PCEC); Nick Mantee (PCOB); Jun Lie (PCOB); Errol Stewart (PCOB); Sheri Carey (WCHP); Joshua Kies (WCHP); Estelle Bester (WCHP); Kari Mau (WCHP); Chris Hanna (WCHP); Leigh Rich (WCHP)

Alternates in Attendance (by college): Dean Cummings (CAH); Elise Cain (COE); Samuel Opuku (COPH); Chasen Smith (COSM); Rachel Smith (PCOB); Cuiping Schiman (PCOB); Alan Skipper (WCHP)

Senators not in Attendance (by college): Jennifer Kowalewski (CAH); Kathryn Haughney (COE); Karin Fisher (COE); Haresh Rochani (JPHCOPH); Amy Potter (COSM); Tuyin An (COSM); Felix Hamza-Lap (PCEC); Omid Ardakani (PCOB); William Amponsah (PCOB); Kwabena Boakye (PCOB); Paula Tilman (WCHP);

Participating Administrators: Kyle Marrero (University President); Carl Reiber (Provost); Ashlea Anderson (Interim CIO); Ashley Walker Colquitt (Dean, College of Graduate Studies); Amy Ballagh (AVP Enrollment Management); Amy Smith (AVP Enrollment Management); Ashraf Saad (Assistant Dean, Armstrong Campus, Parker College of Engineering and Computing); Bradley Sturz (Associate Director of Assessment); Breanna Calamas (Assistant Director of Advisement); Brenda Richardson (Assistant Director, First and Second Year Experience); Cassie Morgan (Registrar); Cynthia Groover (Assistant Provost); Delena A.G. Schartner (Assistant Vice President for Strategic Initiatives); Delena Bell Gatch (Assistant Vice President for Institutional Assessment and Accreditation); Diana Cone (Vice Provost); Dominique Quarles (Associate Vice President for Inclusive Excellence and Chief Diversity Officer); Dustin Anderson (Associate Provost for Student Success); Jennifer Syno (Director, Office of Advising); John Kraft (Interim Dean, College of Arts and Humanities); John Lester (Vice President, University Communications and Marketing); Kelly Crosby (Director, Risk and Compliance); Lisa Carmichael (Dean of Libraries); Matthew Pulliam (Director, IT Business Operations); Norton Pease (Associate Dean of Academic and Student Affairs, College of Arts and Humanities); Ron Stalnaker (Vice President, Business and Finance); Shay Little (Vice President, Student Affairs); Stuart Tedders (Dean, Jiann-Ping

Hsu College of Public Health); Whitney Nash (Dean, Waters College of Health Professions)

Attendees: Ameer Adkins; Barbara King; Beth Meyers; Karin Fry; David Walker; Katie Mercer; Nikiya Lewis; Susan Hendrix; Esma Campbell; Greg Chamblee; Jarvis Steele; Jessica Garner; Karelle Aiken; Michael McCurdy; Melissa Joiner; Miguel García; Nancy Remler; Olga Amarie; Rob Yarbrough; Trish Holt; Ted Brimeyer; Vladimir Gurau; Wayne Smith

I. CALL TO ORDER

a. Bill Dawers called the meeting to order at 4:01pm.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

a. Marieke Van Willigen (CBSS) moved to approve the agenda. Motion was approved 65 in favor, 0 against, no abstentions.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

a. It was noted that in the May minutes, Estelle Bester needed to be moved from alternate to senator.

b. The minutes were adopted.

IV. LIBRARIAN'S REPORT

a. The Librarian's Report was approved and adopted with a vote of 42 in favor and 0 against, without any abstentions.

V. Senate PRESIDENT'S UPDATE

a. At 4:05pm, Bill Dawers began his Senate President's update. Professor Dawers noted that he doesn't anticipate these updates to turn into lengthy discussions, but some elements might require quick question and answer sections. One goal of adding an update from the president is to make meetings more interactive. Bill Dawers said that he and the Senate Executive Committee had heard faculty concerns about Senate meetings having too much top-down communication, a problem that he hopes to address in multiple ways. Bill Dawers said that Senators should feel free to submit Discussion Items and to reach out to him or SEC representatives with ideas about possible Discussion Items. He will be looking for changes and approaches to make processes easier, including exploring possibilities for new RFI and DI forms and putting the text of discussion items in their entirety in the first few pages of the agenda. Bill Dawers also noted that at this time, the Senate is working without administrative support, but that the hiring process is currently underway for an administrative assistant to work primarily with the Senate but also with the Provost's office. He hopes that by October, this person will be in place, but he wanted to apologize for the chaos and confusion so far,

since he is the only one updating the website and handling other clerical duties.

- b. Bill Dawers then transitioned to speak to the concerns about the lack of membership on Senate committees. For the record, he provided this text from a Discussion Item submitted in March 2022 by Cary Christian, Senate President of 2021-2022:

It is becoming ever more difficult to properly staff committees at the University level. The problem appears to be primarily due to declining importance placed on service in the faculty review process. It has come to our attention that Deans and Chairs are recommending faculty engage in fewer service commitments and shift their focus more towards teaching and research particularly in light of the new changes to the faculty review processes. In the past it was common to discourage engagement in heavy service activities by pre-tenured faculty members but given the changes to the post-tenure review process, faculty at all levels are either self-redirecting their service efforts or are being advised they should do so by their chairs.

With Senate elections in full swing, we are finding that many committee positions within colleges have no nominations. Additionally, there are no nominations for President-Elect, Librarian, or Secretary. The Senate currently has 301 faculty positions including Senators, Alternates, and elected standing committee positions. Of these, each year 137 positions roll over and must be filled with new faculty members. (See the attached schedules for details). This does not include any department, college, or other university-wide service commitments. We are calling for discussion to explore ideas for addressing this issue going forward.

Bill Dawers then suggested that the problems are especially acute with the SEC-appointed members on committees and encouraged Senators to look into available SEC-appointed positions within their colleges. He said that the SEC was looking into ways to address the problems, including potentially changing bylaws so that all faculty members, not just senators and alternates, could be represented.

- c. Bill Dawers then transitioned to the salary study, mentioning concerns that have been raised about the types of schools used in the study and the impact of the most recent cost of living adjustment on the salaries as reflected in the study. He said that the Senate will need to discuss priorities for future adjustments.
- d. Bill Dawers then shifted to discussing SRIs (Student Rating of Instructor). He said that he was working with the Provost's office to return the timing of SRIs to the final two weeks of classes rather than the final two weeks of

the term. He said that an upcoming discussion item would deal with the Qualtrics SRI pilot planned for the end of the fall semester.

- e. As the final portion of his update, Bill Dawers said that the Faculty Welfare Committee is considering the May discussion of the proposed new Chair evaluation process before bringing it back to the Faculty Senate.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

- a. The first item was the Motion Request regarding the recommendations from the ad hoc committee on updating the annual evaluation/major review policies and procedures.

Mujibur Khan (PCEC) asked about the use of the term “excellence” within the evaluation form. Marieke Van Willigen (CBSS) responded by saying that part of the frustration of the process is that the Board of Regents’ policies now include evaluative terms like “excellence” within the criteria themselves and that the BOR requires the use of a standard Likert scale for evaluation across all institutions. She indicated that the language in the Faculty Handbook revisions is limited by the language choices made by the BOR.

Mujibur Khan (PCEC) then asked about the ways that tenure was defined in the document, and Marieke Van Willigen (CBSS) once again responded that the BOR’s language is required. Provost Reiber then explained that the BOR’s policy was designed for the “huge audience” of all members of the USG, including primarily teaching universities that view scholarship in different ways than an R2 institution like ours.

Provost Reiber then commented that he had his team go over the document thoroughly but that while they were okay with almost everything, they had some specific concerns, including timelines, that needed to be ironed out. The one specific point where he had a concern, but wasn’t a dealbreaker, was about the interaction between the chair and the committee about whether a faculty member will need to go on a performance improvement plan. He was concerned about protecting confidentiality in cases where the faculty member may not want to involve a committee or where Title IX or other aspects may create concerns about who has access to specific information. Provost Reiber indicated that there are about 10 different smaller timing issues that also need to be addressed.

Dr. Van Willigen (CBSS) wanted to share that while Georgia Southern used faculty governance to draft and revise this policy, other institutions in

the USG were entirely administratively driven. She expressed thanks that the Provost's office used a shared governance model.

Annie Mendenhall (CAH) raised a question about whether there would be situations where the committee would not have access to information as part of tenure and review. Provost Reiber explained that during annual review, there may be sensitive information held by the chair that cannot be shared with the committee, and that the Provost's office would like to protect the faculty member in cases where sharing the information more widely may lead to potentially poisoned relationships within a department.

Lisa Costello (CAH) stated that while she understood the need for privacy, she also wanted to recognize the work of Dr. Van Willigen's committee to keep faculty involved in all steps of the process with sensitivity to power dynamics.

Dr. Mendenhall (CAH) suggested a friendly amendment to give faculty being reviewed the option not to include a department Post-Tenure Review committee as part of the process if desired.

Bill Dawers (CAH) asked Dr. Van Willigen (CBSS) about the next steps in the process. She responded that the next step after approval by the Faculty Senate and university administration would be to send this up to the BOR, who would then evaluate it and provide feedback. She said that many other institutions are further along in this process, and we have a limited timeline. She asked Provost Reiber what he anticipated the timeline would be. He indicated that after minor things were ironed out, he and President Marrero would then submit them up to the system, and that he would anticipate around November 1st to be the timeline for when the messages would be returned. President Marrero said that the timeline for implementation is January 1st, but he believed that because of the quality of the document, there would be little difficulty in achieving the timeline.

Dr. Van Willigen (CBSS) said that colleges, schools, and departments will need to change policies to align with the new guidelines.

Dr. Khan (PCEC) asked about the appeal processes if faculty felt that the evaluation was not fair. Dr. Van Willigen (CBSS) indicated that there are, within each of the major reviews, appeals processes.

Bill Dawers (CAH) then asked for clarification about the friendly amendment that Dr. Mendenhall (CAH) had suggested. Dr. Van Willigen (CBSS) suggested that after she reviewed that section, she believed a

single sentence could be added to do that. Bill Dawers then called the question at approximately 4:37pm. The vote was 48 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstained.

- b. At 4:40pm, Bill Dawers then transitioned to the next discussion item, which was the new SRI pilot. As indicated in the Discussion Item, he requested faculty members who were willing to run the SRI pilot. He opened the floor to discussion and said that anyone who wanted to be part of this could put their name in the chat. There were no questions and no volunteers. Bill Dawers encouraged people to reach out to their SEC representatives to volunteer.
- c. At 4:45pm, Bill Dawers then transitioned to the Armstrong Task Force. The purpose was to generate discussion.

Dr. Mendenhall (CAH) said that several Armstrong faculty had reached out to her with concerns about student life on the Armstrong Campus. She wanted members of the Task Force to speak to this if possible. Also, since the last SEC meeting, she said that some have been concerned about the role of site-synchronous classes on the Armstrong Campus, especially if they might detract from student experience. She indicated that she felt it was really important that the Task Force consider the experience on campus and the upsides of having peers who attend and share that positive experience together.

Provost Reiber responded that he has no preconceived notion about the delivery of courses, but that it will be a data-informed decision. He said that a survey will be sent to students in the near future to ask about what forms of delivery they desire. He indicated that the goal of identifying four to six programs to promote was meant largely to help address a decreased campus population. Shay Little (Student Affairs) indicated that Megan Feasel is leading a specific group within the Task Force to look into student engagement on the Armstrong Campus.

Ed Mondor (COSM) asked about what will happen if the four to six programs that are identified do not grow as desired. Provost Reiber responded that our goal will be to use a fail-fast approach so that we can identify problems quickly and adjust course as needed. The goal, he indicated, is growing the Armstrong student population. Dr. Mondor (COSM) asked about a specific measure of increase as the target – 5%, 10%, 15%? Provost Reiber responded “YES! All of those!” and President Marrero said that stabilization is the main goal, but the real concern is that while the Savannah area has grown, the number of students at both

Savannah State University and Armstrong State/Armstrong Campus has declined. Speaking to Dr. Mendenhall's point, President Marrero stressed that campus life is indeed a crucial aspect and is being considered.

Bill Dawers expressed his appreciation to Scot Lingrell (Enrollment Management) and to Amy Ballagh (Enrollment Management) for their high-quality work with data to help the Task Force understand what has happened in terms of the student enrollment in various programs.

Provost Reiber also spoke to the campus life issue about the effect of class distribution, indicating that Dr. Dustin Anderson had looked into the distribution of classrooms on campus, indicating that because of the large classrooms in the Armstrong Center, part of the struggle of campus life is that students are being pulled away from the central areas of the campus, creating a perception of less campus life. Dr. Mendenhall suggested that perhaps course caps should be considered because the larger class sizes are pulling students out of campus and changing the experience of being in class.

Scot Lingrell (Enrollment Management) stated that the data is abundant and that using it in many different directions is crucial to success. He asked if the Senate had any ideas of how this information could be distributed throughout the university community so that people had more confidence in the work of the Armstrong Task Force. He stressed that the Task Force's website has a feedback button and a second button that links to data.

Bill Dawers said that while this is an Armstrong-focused task force, its work will affect all colleges and programs across the university in some way, and so that even those more focused on Statesboro should be aware of its progress.

Provost Reiber stressed that the Task Force is not operating from a "decisions have already been made" model, that they are open to new ideas and new approaches, and that that the committee is approaching things with an open mind and encourages feedback from as many stakeholders as possible.

VII. UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT'S REPORT AND BUDGET UPDATE (Dr. Kyle Marrero)

- a. First, President Marrero commented on the early start of the semester, indicating that he hoped that in the future, the dates would not be so early.

He then transitioned to speak about the Armstrong Task Force, stating once again, based on Hyundai's regional new facility, we believe that there be accelerated population growth in an already growing area. He stressed that we need to think about what Armstrong and Liberty can be, while honoring what they have been, and look forward to the needs of the future. He stressed that while there are many different career aspects, we also need to be heralding and holding up the belief that humanities degrees and training students in how to learn can prepare them for a world where people will be changing careers seven to ten times.

Addressing the timing of forming the Task Force now, President Marrero said that it wasn't done before both because of Covid-19 but also because we didn't have sufficient data. He reiterated that he wanted people to visit the website, look at the data, and be involved with open forums to speak to the future growth in the region.

Dr. Marrero then transitioned to some of the challenges, speaking to the enrollment decline that has occurred. Over the summer, the university prepared for it, but after the drop for non-payment, we are currently trending down about 5.7% down in comparison to last year. Reinstatements will be crucial to the final census, and he encouraged all faculty to send students to financial aid to try to get problems resolved. He indicated that there are programs that can help students stay enrolled, including through the Georgia Southern Foundation. He stressed that B term will be important, and he thanked any faculty who had added courses.

In terms of finances, we are looking at about a 5% or another \$3.9 million drop in earned revenue. Auxiliary items (parking, student fees, etc) all have less revenue, which is another drop of about \$1.5 million as well. President Marrero said that reductions are being found in operational costs and in terms of automation, but we are also looking at vacancy pools, though he stressed that the university remains committed to delivering curriculum. However, he did say that programs that are showing less growth may not see their vacancies filled or may see their vacancies moved to growing programs.

President Marrero said that he is committed to administrators meeting with the Planning, Budget, and Facilities Committee on a monthly basis to improve transparency and help faculty better understand the budgeting processes.

President Marrero then spoke to facilities improvement, noting that the Memorial College Center on Armstrong Campus is currently being updated, and then stressed the update of the Student Success Center that has been recently completed. He talked about the updates to the Science Center on the Armstrong Campus in the upcoming months. He then said that the Williams Center on the Statesboro Campus is being updated and that new parking is being added after the demolition of an aging housing complex on the Statesboro campus. The new parking will be done by the end of spring, but it has been delayed by supply chain issues. The same has affected the soon-to-be-built new Convocation Center, which had a delayed start due to supply chain issues.

President Marrero concluded by commenting on the increased student life on all campuses and how thankful he was that this aspect was resurgent. He thanked the enrollment management and marketing teams, saying that they had done everything right, and that the drop in enrollment is due to a confluence of other forces beyond the university's control.

VIII. PROVOST'S REPORT (Dr. Carl Reiber)

- a. Provost Reiber opened by concurring with President Marrero that it was very pleasant to see increased campus life. He thanked Dr. Van Willigen's committee for their efforts on the PTR review that was voted on earlier in this meeting.

Provost Reiber then switched to discuss Covid-19, reminding faculty that the notification system still updates the class roster and that students need to be given support to be able to succeed in their classes.

Provost Reiber stated that the USG and BOR are stressing career development and career placement, and that while the Parker College of Business has tracked employment as part of its accreditation, CBSS is now beginning this process as well, and Glenn Gibney will be working with all colleges within Georgia Southern to enable colleges to achieve better career placement. He said that a positive meeting with Hyundai had occurred, and he was very hopeful that it will lead to internships and other positive connections in the future.

He stressed that the BOR was looking at low yield programs that need to be evaluated and considered, looking for duplications and other concerns that need to be addressed to potentially cut programs that are not producing sufficient graduate levels. He concluded by stressing the

importance of constantly considering enrollment and its budget consequences.

Josh Kennedy (CBSS) asked when the revised final exam schedule will be released. Provost Reiber said that it has become more complex, and that he had received an updated version from the Registrar, but that it was still being evaluated. Ed Mondor (COSM) said the Registrar had told him that it would be Tuesday by the latest, but Provost Reiber said that the date may be delayed if Academic Affairs catches any conflicts that are still not resolved.

IX. ANNOUNCEMENT AND UPDATES

- a. Bill Dawers said that he had been made aware that the chat comments cannot be seen by non-panelist attendees; however, chat comments are (as noted above) part of the record of this meeting. He will work with IT to determine if there is a way that all chat can be viewed by both panelists and attendees.

X. ADJOURNMENT

- a. Bill Dawers adjourned the meeting at 5:41pm.

**Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate
Librarian's Report
September 26, 2022**

<u>Standing Committees</u>	Page
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE	2
FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE	5
GRADUATE COMMITTEE	10
SENATE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE	14

Submitted respectfully by Christine Bedore, Faculty Senate Librarian, in preparation for the September 29, 2022 meeting of the Georgia Southern Faculty Senate.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES

August 16, 2022
11:00am to 1:00pm
Zoom

Present:

Faculty: Nikki DiGregorio (CBSS); Lauren McMillan (University Libraries); Jian Zhang (JPHCOPH); Hongjun Su (CEC); Rob Terry (CAH, for Joanna Schreiber during the fall semester); Mariana Saenz-Ayala (PCOB); Asli Unal(COE); Sabrina Hessinger(CSM); and Joelle Romanchick-Cerpovicz (WCHP)

Faculty Center Staff: Michael McCurdy and Teresa Durham

Guests: None.

Absent: None

A. CALL TO ORDER

1. Dr. Terry (interim chair) called the meeting to order at 11:03 am.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

1. Dr. DiGregorio made a motion to approve the agenda as written.
2. Dr. Hessinger made a second and the motion to approve the agenda was passed.

III. CHAIR'S UPDATE

1. Dr. Terry called for nomination or self-nomination for Committee Officers
2. Dr. Zhang nominated Dr. DiGregorio for the committee chair. Dr DiGregorio declined the nomination due to time/other conflicts.
3. Dr. Terry nominated Dr. Hessinger as the chair and Dr. Zhang as the secretary.
4. Dr. Hessinger explained that she was recently appointed as the chair, and it might take her time to learn the nature and scope of FDC. Dr. Zhang shared his concern due to other commitments. Both however accepted the nominations.
5. Dr. Terry proposed the motion to vote.
6. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.
7. Dr. Hessinger took over the chairship immediately and thanked the committee for the vote of confidence.
8. MS. Durham would put together a Google Drive folder for this year's FDC, including documents that contain previous information to give you and the committee some idea of what to expect for timeline and content, as well as templates for meeting notes, etc.

Discussion of new business for the fall

1. Mr. McCurdy updated Regents Awards and proposed FDC committee release calls for nominees as soon as possible. The awards include
 - a. Regents' Momentum Year Award for Excellence in Advising and Student Success
 The committee suggested either the Student Success Committee and/or the office of the Associate Provost for Student Success be responsible for this award.

- b. Regents' Momentum Year Award for Excellence in Teaching and Curricular Innovation -
The committee agreed that our University Academic Excellence winner, Heidi Eisenrich, would be an appropriate nominee for this award.
- c. Regents' Teaching Excellence Awards for Department or Program
The FDC did not have a recommendation for an appropriate entity to vet this type of nominee.
- d. Regents' Teaching Excellence Awards for Online Teaching
The FDC is willing to create a procedure for this award and would be willing to review proposals and choose the nominee. They suggest that we create the process this year and nominate our first person in fall 2022.
- e. Felton Jenkins, Jr. Hall of Fame Faculty Awards
The nominee for this award is typically the highest scorer from the University Teaching and Academic Excellence Awards that this committee reviews. The highest scorer this year is Heidi Eisenreich but the committee proposed that she be the nominee for the Regents' Momentum Year Award for Excellence in Teaching and Curricular Innovation. This would then allow us to nominate the University Teaching Award winner, Sue Ellen Dechenne-Peters, for this Felton Jenkins Award. The FDC subcommittee will review our application guidelines to ensure that the University Teaching Award application aligns with the requirements for this award.
- f. Regents' Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Awards
No action is expected from FEC committee, The CTE/Faculty Center, in conjunction with the SoTL Leadership Team, hosts a call for a SoTL Scholar that is chosen each spring. The winner of the GS SoTL Scholar has historically become the nominee for this Regents' Award.

2. Mr. McCurdy updated the budget for this year's faculty development funds. A total of \$52,849.94 will be available. He proposed FDC committee release calls for proposals as soon as possible. Dr. Terry reminded me that the rubrics are available for proposal evaluation.

3. Question raised by Mao Lin

Mao Lin asked how to handle the time gaps between funding approval and actual travel time (forwarded by Dr. Terry). Ms. Durham walked through the timeline for FDC faculty development funds and explained that the inconveniences were associated with the fiscal cycles of the University System of Georgia, at large, and the Georgia State Budget process. It is practically feasible to make prepay using personal money for the flight tickets, registrations, and others, and get reimbursed before the closure of the funds.

4. Handling scheduling conflicts:

Dr. Saenz raised the concern that some members may have to teach Tuesday 11 am-1:45 pm classes. Dr. Terry recalled that it was rare that FDC monthly meetings went beyond 12:30 pm. The committee encouraged the members who cannot make the monthly meetings due to time conflicts to have their coworkers to join the meetings whenever possible as alternatives to ensure a quorum is present for voting purposes.

A. OTHER

- 1. No other business.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. No other announcements.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

1. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on August 16, 2022, at 12:05 pm. A motion to adjourn was made by Dr. Terry and Dr. DiGregorio seconded the motion. All voted in favor to adjourn.

Minutes were approved by an electronic vote of Committee Members on 08-30-2022

Vote Record Note: Motion to approve by _____
Seconded by Nikki _____
All voting in favor: unanimous

Respectfully submitted,
Date: 08/31/2022

Sabrina Hessinger, PhD, FDC Committee Chair
Jian Zhang, MD, Scribed (with help from Ms. Durham)

**Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
Meeting Agenda
09/02/2022 2021-2022 FWC 1:00-3:00 pm**

FWC Members Present:

Leti McGrath	Candice Bodkin	Dawn Tysinger
Amanda Konkle	Mark Hanna	Lili Li
Amy Potter	Pam Mahan	Rongrong Zhang
Tamerah Hunt	Lei Chen	
Betsy Barrow	Sam Opoku	
Ria Ramoutar	Marieke Van Willigen	

I. Call to Order 1:01 p.m.

Amanda--Business to add—no

II. Approval of Agenda Motion Dawn, Seconded, Betsy.

III. Faculty Welfare New Business

- A. BOR Post-Tenure Review policy and BOR Student Success policy draft Marieke update—
Committee met as a whole a couple weeks ago, broke into two different groups: 1) Student Success Changes 2) Post Tenure Review Changes.
Faculty should have received a request to fill out the survey.
83% of faculty do not want student success to be a separate annual report section and do not want a separate annual evaluation ranking.
Guidelines under what you need to qualify for promotion you have to be noteworthy (language not used anywhere else) in 2 of 5 sections.
Under tenure have to be noteworthy in 3 of 5 categories. My concern, how do you document you are noteworthy if those are not separate categories on evaluations?
That was the overwhelming feedback.
How do you report on those 3 sections without talking about student success activities you do if they are all pulled out in separate category? It's awkward to report.
Post-tenure review feedback much less definitive. Comments on the inconsistency in the language in the draft guidelines. Every university has to use 5-point system on evaluations. They had suggested unsatisfactory. Everybody will use the same language and the same 5 rankings. In the document, however, those words are not used consistently.
We are building in faculty governance in each of the stages so it's not left solely to administrators. We are working on faculty oversight being built in.

PTR committee will take faculty handbook language and make edits as suggestions. Faculty Senate can then debate about whether this is the language that can be used.
Timing. They think the process will work much more quickly than possible.
Realistically you would find out you would need to do a corrective in the spring. This would start in the fall of the next year. When you walk through the timeline, this is a 4-year cycle. Write in protections in that people are not getting the feedback from each level of the post-tenure review. We're going to suggest you should be getting that feedback as you go and you should be able to respond.

Questions:

Tamerah—One thing coming up with our department, concern over minimum/maximum language.

Mark—Two timeline related questions: 1) Seems like your committee is working really fast, is this an imposed deadline?

Marieke—University is required to have approved our plan by early October. Colleges are already asking for the guidelines. We decided once we had our head in it and kept going we wouldn't lose momentum.

Mark-- 2) Would there be any consideration for when the policy has teeth for people at some level of performance? What's the transition to this look like?

Marieke—language in draft guidelines in frequently asked questions. There's language that suggests a grandfather in for those on the tenure track.

Another piece of feedback that came out from committee/survey is this only applies to people with tenure. Does not apply to lecturers.

Post-tenure review also applies to faculty administrators. Faculty administrators will go through post-tenure review. Provost office will be handling this. Faculty administrators could not only lose their administrative position but also their job.

Leti—How many are on this committee?

Marieke—21. Have tenured folks, lecturers and professional folks on this committee. Student success affects everyone.

IV. Faculty Welfare Unfinished Business

A. Lecturer Salary Inequity Concerns (Subcommittee Report: Ria Ramoutar, convener) Ria has no updates.

B. Annual Faculty Evaluation Form Revision (Subcommittee Report: Mark Hanna, convener)

Mark—we had a great discussion in Senate with regard to what we proposed as a form. There didn't seem to be much opposition to the form. Two areas that came back as things that might need to be done: 1) Integrate Student Success 2) Clarify the weights that are being applied.

Suggestion is that we put forward a motion or proposal that includes the form like we developed but adds a couple sentences describing how weights are defined and adapted throughout the year. With regard to student success, it seems we need to wait until there is more clarity on what Student Success is and how it needs to be evaluated. Leave form as is and add the words Student Success.

Marieke—I am nervous about the idea that we don't have a specific place where we are saying this is what I've done and this is how I've applied it. The chair needs to make sure that in your annual evaluation, they are somehow writing an evaluation as to what you've done in student success and professional development.

I would advocate having something that prompts faculty to identify student success/professional development in each section.

Somewhere on the annual evaluation your chair has to make a statement as to where you stand on those two items.

Add in a place where the chair evaluated you on student success and professional development.

Mark—I would personally prefer for administration to be responsible for that part of the form.

Tamerah—Suggestion for subsections: 1a) Student evaluations 1b) Student success evaluations.

Mark—There is so much diversity across campus. Needed something that was flexible. Our thought was to have something broadly useful and flexible.

Professional development is new but was thrust upon us by BOR.

Propose: Let me add a sentence about weights and a section on student success in the former areas.

Marieke—I wouldn't send it to Senate until we have the final recommendation from my committee.

Mark—Maybe we create a form with a placeholder?

Marieke—Have a draft.

Mark—My reservation is that this is last year's assignment. Concern this will pass to next year's FWC.

Leti—Our charges for 2021 were provided the beginning of the academic year. That hasn't been the case this year. We've received no charges. We've assumed the charges that were not complete we are to continue. We haven't had any confirmation that this is something we are still supposed to be working on.

Given all this uncertainty, I don't know if perhaps we should consider asking the Provost directly if this is something he continues to have us do. Do we have a direct charge to hold off? Mark—Provost did make some progress on the use of the form.

Betsy—I suggest Mark make changes and put forth to Senate.

Tamerah—Suggest to hold off.

Mark—We will keep it on our FWC agenda next month.

C. [Chair Evaluation](#) (Subcommittee Report: Dawn Tysinger, convener) Provost—periodic review, 5-year review.

When we met with the Provost he gave us his thoughts on chair evaluation.

As a committee, we identified some priorities that needed to be in the Chair evaluation. The first came from the Provost. Expressed a desire to move away from a chair for life (term limits). A second priority came from the committee ensuring that faculty had a process for providing confidential input. Our third priority was looking at a process in order to continue in the position, need to be approved by the majority of the faculty. If the Dean went against the recommendation, Dean had to explain their rationale for why that choice was made.

We looked at peer and aspirant universities.

We used the current review as a jumping off point and altered it based on our priorities.

We recommend a ten-year limit to the time a chair can serve. Have to have the balance for the chair to make changes but not stagnate.

Leti—concern over paper/pencil feedback.

Amanda—Having faculty do this is tricky. Could we could get assistance from the Dean's office? Have someone administer who is not involved in the department? We have two campuses.

Dawn--A lot of concern was raised about taking votes.

Betsy—there is a way to make sure the email is not being recorded.

Mark—might make sense to say voting will be conducted by anonymous ballot. Suggestions—Provost office might administer this.

Tamerah—Had questions about Interim time period.

Dawn—I would assume the interim period did not count toward those 5 years. Betsy—Question about new chairs being limited to 10 years.

Dawn—If a person is in chair role and steps down, Provost said not to be concerned with that piece.

Marieke—When you take a position your contract says what your base salary would be if you step back to faculty. Might want to include a caveat where there may be unusual circumstances. If the university is in a situation where you can't do an outside hire, you could get stuck. The preference is to have this term limit but to include the caveat.

Dawn—The issue of rotating chair you could have some unwilling participants. Mark—Recommended wording of department chairs will “normally serve.”

Dawn—We will look at softening language or adding a caveat or exit clause.

Leti—This is very important. There is very little there in the handbook.

D. COVID-19 FWC Subcommittee (Subcommittee Report: Betsy Barrow, convener)

1. [Mask mandate](#)

Pam—I initially thought I was putting forth a motion but it was actually a discussion item.

There’s a lot of discussion. Some faculty expressed concerned about antagonizing the BOR.

Leti—Some asked why are we doing this if we know it won’t be something we have control over.

Some colleagues realized it was symbolic and wasn’t worth the effort.

Good back and forth on this at Senate.

I did remind our colleagues many other faculty senates have done this.

Amanda—Discussion on calling it a mask mandate or a statement on beliefs. Betsy—Reached out to subcommittee this month. We decided as a subcommittee to wait. Mark—Senate chose to not treat it as a motion. A reasonable course of action is to say we did what we needed to do.

Betsy—I’m on the fence. I wear my mask everywhere. I recently had a student who requested an online placement because she has underlying health concerns. School where she was placed does not have a mask policy.

Leti-- A fellow senator sent me this wording as a suggestion: "The ubiquitous use of face masks would protect our community against high rates of infection, leading to more engaged and effective face-to-face instruction and allowing an uninterrupted educational experience to once again become the norm for our students."

Committee voted 8-5 in favor of sending back to the committee for consideration.

2. [Faculty evaluation policy](#)

Amanda--SRIs are required by the committee.

Faculty are having issues with Covid-19 affecting their reviews.

Senate said to take it back to the committee.

Marieke--The only thing that needs to be changed is that we can’t not include SRI’s in evaluations. Having a statement saying you can have a separate document would be helpful.

Betsy—Need to edit the document concerning SRIs.

Tamerah—Need to have these percentages, have this written down in a document is very important.

Betsy—Include clarification that Provost has sent out memos.

Mark—Include the memos in the document.

Leti—Suggested Subcommittee make the suggested changes and then send to the entire committee. Encourage feedback. If none is received Amanda and Leti will then send on to SEC.

E. Course Caps and Position Allocation (Amy Potter, convener) Amy—Submitted RFI on January 21, 2022

V. Faculty Welfare Concerns

A. Spreadsheet to Report Faculty Welfare Concerns: Please reach out to your colleagues in each of your colleges to request that they submit concerns that we should address in future meetings. Report them in the spreadsheet linked here, and include any supplementary information as needed.

- B. Ongoing Faculty Welfare Concerns
1. Parental Leave (Candice Bodkin)
 2. [Faculty Pay - 10 Months vs 12 Months](#)

VI. Adjourn

2:59 p.m. Tamerah motioned, Betsy seconded
Respectfully submitted by Amy Potter

GRADUATE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Graduate Committee Meeting Date – September 8, 2022

Present: Dr. Gus Molina, CEC; Dr. Jeff Riley, CAH; Dr. Eric Silva, CBSS; Dr. Jonathan Grubb, CBSS; Dr. Errol Stewart, Parker COB; Dr. Ming Fang He, COE; Dr. Michele McGibony, COSM; Dr. Bill Mase, JPHCOPH; Dr. Linda Kimsey, JPHCOPH; Dr. Gregg Rich, WCHP; Ms. Ruth Baker, Univ. Libraries; Dr. Leslie Roberts, [Alternate] COE

Guests: Dr. Cindy Groover, VPAA; Dr. Delena Gatch, IAA; Ms. Barbara King, IAA; Dr. Ashley Walker, COGS; Dr. Checo Colón-Gaud, COGS; Mrs. Audie Graham, COGS; Mrs. Wendy Sikora, COGS; Mrs. Sara Emily Ridgway-Jones, COGS; Mrs. Megan Murray, COGS; Mrs. Caroline James, COGS; Ms. Kelli Aikens, COGS; Mrs. Cassie Morgan, Registrar's Office; Mr. Wayne Smith, Registrar's Office; Ms. Doris Mack, Registrar's Office; Ms. Tiffany Hedrick, Registrar's Office; Ms. Kirsten Hicks, Registrar's Office; Ms. Seana Clay, Registrar's Office; Ms. Jessica Lindbom, GSO Representative; Dr. Stephen Rossi, WCHP; Dr. Brian Koehler, COMS; Dr. David Williams, CEC; Dr. Brenda Blackwell, CBSS; Dr. Nandi Marshall, JPHCOPH; Dr. Rand Ressler, Parker COB; Dr. Jolyon Hughes, CAH; Dr. Daniel Skidmore-Hess, CBSS; Dr. Shelli Casler-Failing, COE; Dr. Trent Davis, CBSS; Dr. Ryan Schroeder, CBSS; Dr. Mohammad Davoud, CEC; Dr. Lowell Mooney, Parker COB, Dr. Will Lynch, COSM

Absent: Dr. Xiaoming Yang, CEC

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Shelli Casler-Failing called the meeting to order on Thursday, September 8, 2022 at 9:00 AM. She shared the following reminders:

- Mute microphones when others are speaking.
- Alternates are only required to attend meetings if they are filling in for someone. In this case, notify Audie Graham (agraham@georgiasouthern.edu) so that she is aware of the substitution. Alternates are still welcome to attend meetings, but if they are attending as a guest they are not allowed to vote.
- Instructed committee to use hand reactions when the committee is all in favor.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Michele McGibony made a motion to approve the agenda as written. A second was made by Dr. Ming Fang He and the motion to approve the agenda was passed.

III. ELECTION OF GRADUATE COMMITTEE CHAIR

Dr. Casler-Failing asked for nominations for the election of the 2022-2023 Graduate Committee Chair. Dr. He nominated Dr. McGibony to serve as Chair, and she accepted the nomination. With no objections, the committee approved to elect Dr. McGibony to serve as Chair for the 2022-2023 Graduate Committee meetings.

IV. DEAN'S UPDATE

Dr. Ashley Walker shared the following updates:

- The Graduate Student Organization has put out their first call for travel and research grants. The fall deadlines are September 15 and November 15, and the spring deadlines are February 15 and April 3. COGS will be sending email reminders to students. Please encourage your students to apply. In the past we have had two councils, one on the Statesboro campus and the other on the Armstrong campus. Due to budget changes we have combined the two councils, but we will still a faculty advisor on each campus. Dr. Thresa Yancey will continue serving as the faculty advisor on the Statesboro campus and Dr. Aaron Schrey is the faculty advisor on the Armstrong campus.
- COGS will continue to host social hour webinars for graduate students. The first fall event was scheduled on August 24th and it was well attended. The next will be held on September 21st, and the title for the webinar is 'Library Resources for Graduate Students'. COGS will send emails to graduate students with additional information as the date approaches.
- COGS will be attending a couple of graduate fairs this fall. If programs would like additional information on the fairs please contact Megan Murray at 478-2302 or meganmurray@georgiasouthern.edu.

Dr. Walker explained that the revised agenda was sent out to include the curriculum items submitted by the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences.

V. APPROVAL OF 2022-2023 GRADUATE COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE

Dr. Bill Mase made a motion to approve the 2022-2023 Graduate Committee meeting schedule. A second was made by Dr. He and the motion to approve the schedule was passed.

The approved meeting schedule is below.

**Schedule of Meetings
Graduate Committee (GC)
2022-2023 Academic Year**

Meeting Date	Meeting Time	Meeting Locations		Agenda Items Due to Office of the Registrar	Agenda Items Due to GC Recording Secretary	Agenda Items Posted on Web and Sent to GC Members
		Statesboro Campus	Armstrong Campus			
September 8, 2022	9:00 a.m.	Virtual via Zoom		August 18, 2022	August 25, 2022	September 1, 2022
October 13, 2022	9:00 a.m.	Virtual via Zoom		September 22, 2022	September 29, 2022	October 6, 2022
November 10, 2022	9:00 a.m.	Virtual via Zoom		October 20, 2022	October 27, 2022	November 3, 2022
December 8, 2022 *January 19, 2023 **February 9, 2023 March 9, 2023	9:00 a.m. 9:00 a.m. 9:00 a.m. 9:00 a.m.	Virtual via Zoom Virtual via Zoom Virtual via Zoom Virtual via Zoom		November 17, 2022 December 12, 2022 January 19, 2023 February 16, 2023	November 23, 2022 January 5, 2023 January 26, 2023 February 23, 2023	December 1, 2022 January 12, 2023 February 2, 2023 March 2, 2023
April 13, 2023	9:00 a.m.	Virtual via Zoom		March 23, 2023	March 30, 2023	April 6, 2023

***THIS IS THE FINAL MEETING TO HAVE PROGRAM CURRICULUM APPROVALS IN BANNER FOR EARLY REGISTRATION ON MARCH 6, 2023.**

****THIS IS THE FINAL MEETING TO HAVE COURSE CURRICULUM APPROVALS IN BANNER FOR EARLY REGISTRATION ON MARCH 6, 2023 AND CURRICULUM APPROVALS FOR THE 2023-2024 GSU CATALOG. Note: Items requiring Board of Regents/System Office approval may still not make the catalog if submitted this late and the submission is still pending System Office/Board of Regents/DOE approval at the time the catalog is finalized.**

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. College of Behavioral and Social Sciences

Dr. Trent Davis presented the agenda items for the Department of Public and Nonprofit Studies.

Department of Public and Nonprofit Studies

New Course(s):

PBAD 7810 – MPA Professional Portfolio

JUSTIFICATION:

The MPA Professional Portfolio serves as a culminating activity for students in the MPA Program Executive Track. The Executive Track is a new track under the broader umbrella of the MPA program. The Executive Track is a cohort-based, lock-step model that admits students in the spring (Spring 2023 will be the first cohort). Courses are taught fully-online, in an abbreviated 8-week format. While students will collect academic and professional artifacts for use in their portfolio throughout their course of study, they will be responsible for preparing and presenting their portfolio during their final semester.

PBAD 7820 – Immersion I

JUSTIFICATION:

Immersion I is a short-term, intensive experience for students in the MPA Program Executive Track. Immersion I occurs during the students second semester in the program, or approximately at the halfway point. The Executive Track is a new track under the broader umbrella of the MPA program. The Executive Track is cohort-based, lock-step program that admits students in the spring (Spring 2023 will be the first cohort). Courses are taught fully-online, in an abbreviated 8-week format. Immersion I will expose students to a range of topics (through readings, workshops and activities, and guest speakers) that supplement and support classroom learning, while providing opportunities to gain a deeper understanding of the discipline.

PBAD 7821 – Immersion II

JUSTIFICATION:

Immersion II is a short-term, intensive experience for students in the MPA Program Executive Track. Immersion II occurs during the students fourth (and final) semester in the program. The Executive Track is a new track under the broader umbrella of the MPA program. The Executive Track is cohort based, lock-step program that admits students in the spring (Spring 2023 will be the first cohort). Courses are taught fully-online, in an abbreviated 8-week format. Immersion II will expose students to a range of topics (through readings, workshops and activities, and guest speakers) that supplement and support classroom learning, while providing opportunities to gain a deeper understanding of the discipline.

Revised Program:

Master of Public Administration

JUSTIFICATION:

The Executive Track adds an “executive style” model to the existing MPA Program. The current program is offered in a hybrid format (i.e., Hybrid Track) that blends online and in-person instruction on the Statesboro Campus. In order to reach adult-learners from a geographically diverse region, the Executive Track is offered fully-online, in an abbreviated 8-week format. The Executive Track, as required by the program’s accrediting body, relies on the same core curriculum, mission, and student learning outcomes as the Hybrid Track.

Dr. Errol Stewart asked for clarification on the catalog year for these items. Dr. Davis confirmed that the department will be launching this program in spring 2023. Dr. Walker stated they have received approval from the President and Provost to have the spring 2023 start term.

MOTION: Dr. Linda Kimsey made a motion to approve the agenda items submitted by the Department of Public and Nonprofit Studies. A second was made by Dr. He, and the motion to approve the New Courses and Revised Program was passed.

B. Curriculog Committee Member Training – Barbara King conducted the training for the new Curriculog curriculum management system. She reviewed the [workflow](#) and discussed the [resources](#) that are available on the Office of Institutional Assessment and Accreditation website. Ms. King briefly reviewed the [Graduate Committee Curriculum Handbook](#) and [Checklist](#). She asked the committee members to let her know if there are any additional items that should be added that would be beneficial to others. Additional training materials can be found on the Office of the Registrar’s [website](#). If anyone has Curriculog questions please email CCS@georgiasouthern.edu.

Dr. Brian Koehler referenced the list of names who has access to Curriculog, and asked for clarification of the roles for department curriculum chairs and department curriculum members. Tiffany Hedrick explained that the chairs are the only ones that will be able to approve the items in the system, and the members would only receive the notifications. Ms. Hedrick asked Dr. Koehler to send the complete list of who needs access to the system to CCS@georgiasouthern.edu, and to identify what their role should be.

VII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Registrar’s Update – Mr. Wayne Smith said if anyone has questions about the new system please let the Registrar’s Office know. He thanked Doris Mack, Tiffany Hedrick, and everyone who assisted with rolling out the new system.

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS – Dr. Walker reminded everyone that the January meeting is the final deadline to have program curriculum approvals and the February meeting is the final deadline for course curriculum approvals. Mr. Smith also pointed out that another change is that a December meeting has been added to the schedule this year.

Ashley said there are several SEC appointments that have not been assigned. She asked if IAA or the Registrar’s Office will be keeping track of any new members, or if COGS should notify them of changes so they are added to the Curriculog system. Dr. Delena Gatch said IAA was told by Faculty Senate to keep monitoring the website for GECC membership changes. Mr. Smith asked Dr. Walker to notify the Registrar’s Office when new Graduate Committee members are added. Dr. Mase said Dr. Bill Dawers is working hard to get the unfilled

positions assigned within the next few weeks.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on September 8, 2022 at 10:01 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Audie Graham, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved September 21, 2022 by electronic vote of Committee Members

SENATE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes

September 1st, 2022

9:00 to 10:00am

Voting Members Present: Matthew Flynn (CBSS), Yan Wu (COSM), Jessica Garner (LIB), Yelena Tarasenko (JPHCOPH), Amy Rundio (WCHP), Andrew Allen (PCEC)

Non-Voting Members Present: Robert Terry (CAH, Outgoing Chair, Faculty Senate Secretary), Christine Bedore (COSM, Incoming Chair, Faculty Senate Librarian),

Absent: Robert Lake (COE), Tony Barilla (PCOB), Nan LoBue (CAH)

I. CALL TO ORDER

Robert Terry (CAH) called the meeting to order at 9:05 AM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Andrew Allen motioned to approve the agenda; Yelena Tarasenko seconded. No discussion was held; it was unanimously approved.

III. OUTGOING CHAIR'S UPDATE

A. Introduction of New Chair

1. Christine Bedore was introduced to the committee.
2. However, due to navigating personal issues, Robert Terry chaired the committee in his role as the Faculty Senate Secretary.

B. Reminder to follow college guidelines

1. Robert Terry reminded all members of the federal-like structure of this committee and that the primary guidelines for how elections to be run are college-specific, and to update their awareness of those policies.

C. Reminder that our primary work this fall is to fill empty seats

1. Robert Terry reminded the committee members that during the fall, the primary work we need to be doing is to run special elections and organize appointments as detailed in college-specific bylaws to fill any empty seats as possible.
2. Robert Terry stressed that the 2022-2023 membership list has been placed on the shared drive and that all members have access to it via a link he has shared via email. All members should use this link to verify the accuracy and to update replacements.
3. Robert Terry also thanked Nan LoBue for the updates she made to the election committee guide originally created by Barbara King. He stressed that these updated procedures should explain much of the work and answer many questions for new members of the committee.

D. Overview of the Spring Election process

1. Robert Terry explained the process of how the spring elections for senate officers will be run by the Faculty Senate Librarian, but that all college elections will be run according to the policies established in the college bylaws. However, he indicated that this spring, due to efforts by current Faculty Senate President Bill Dawers, there may be an effort to move the schedule forward so that as many positions

as possible can be set by the end of the spring semester, reducing the confusion caused by attempting to fill SEC-appointed seats and vacated seats at the same time.

E. Open Questions

1. Robert Terry opened the floor to questions or comments. Amy Rundio (WCHP) asked for clarification about who would be eligible for positions in a special election. Robert Terry explained that any member who currently met the definition of faculty as explained in [the most recent faculty senate handbook](#) would be eligible. Matthew Flynn (CBSS) indicated that he is waiting on updates from his dean for following policies for special elections. Jess Garner (LIB) wanted it noted that the Library is currently struggling to fill its positions due to short staff and because service at the college level is currently not being valued in the same way as service at the national level is. Robert Terry indicated that this was a concern that he and Bill Dawers shared and that has been raised at SEC multiple times and was raised in the faculty senate meeting on 8/31. He indicated that he and Bill Dawers will continue to emphasize this issue with President Marrero and Provost Reiber in order to try to encourage increased evaluation of service work done at the university, college, and department level.

IV. Adjournment

With all questions answered and no further comments, Robert Terry called for a motion to adjourn. Yan Wu (COSM) moved, and Yelena Tarasenko (JPHCOPH) seconded.

Respectfully submitted by Robert Terry, Faculty Senate Secretary

Minutes were approved on September 7, 2022 by email-based vote of Committee Members

Senate Executive Committee Request Form

SEC via campus mail: PO Box 8033-1

E-Mail: fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu

Standard View

Close

Discussion Item Request Print View

SHORT TITLE

(Please provide a short descriptive title that would be suitable for inclusion in the Senate Agenda.)

Plans for survey of faculty teaching site-synchronous courses

SUBJECT OF DISCUSSION:

(Please state the nature of your request as concisely as possible.)


The Senate Executive Committee is planning a survey that will ask faculty about their experience teaching site-synchronous courses. The survey will cover the following areas (and perhaps others): a) technology, b) support, c) rooms and scheduling, and d) pedagogy. In this Senate discussion, the SEC is seeking input about the survey itself and about site-synchronous instruction more generally.


RATIONALE(s):


(Please explain why this issue is one of general concern for the Faculty Senate or for the University and not a matter concerning only an individual college or administrative area.)

Site-synchronous courses are being taught by numerous departments across several colleges. In some cases, courses might not be available to students on some campuses at all if they were not offered in a site-synchronous mode.

If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form and send.

 Click here to attach a file

 Click here to attach a file

 Click here to attach a file

Submitted by:

wdawers

Phone:

Email:

wdawers@georgiasouthern.edu

Re-Enter Email:

wdawers@georgiasouthern.edu

ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY

This site is for use exclusively by Georgia Southern University faculty, staff, and administrators. Submissions are reviewed by the SEC for relevance to the mission and business of the Faculty Senate. This site is a tool not for debate but solely for information exchange. Redundant and contentious submissions will not be accepted.

Note to faculty users: Double-check your data before submitting, because the data cannot be edited afterward

Approval

Response:

SEC Response:

Senate Response:

President's Response: