

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

4-3-2019

Faculty Senate Minutes

Georgia Southern University

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



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

Recommended Citation

"Faculty Senate Minutes" (2019). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 51.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/51>

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

Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate
April 3, 2019
Executive Summary

For the meeting of the Faculty Senate on April 3, 2019, the following actions were taken and discussions held. A full account of the meeting is available below.

The Senate accepted the minutes of the March 3, 2019 Senate meeting, and the Librarians report including the minutes and actions from the General Education and Core Curriculum, Undergraduate*, and Graduate Committees (with those chairs or proxies reporting).

The Senate discussed and acted on 3 motions: the proposed Faculty Workload Policy, an Update to section 317 in the Faculty Handbook (course evaluation language), and an Update to Senate Bylaws, article 3. After considerable discussion, the Senate did not approve the proposed Faculty Workload Policy. This proposal will be returned to the Ad Hoc and Faculty Welfare committees for revision and brought back to the Senate at the May meeting. If it does not pass, the university will revert to the current GSU workload policy. The other two motions passed.

The Senate welcomed President Marrero who introduced himself to the Senate. He presented his vision for GSU's future emphasizing shared governance, collaboration, and transparency. Other noteworthy items were President Marrero's discussion of budget shortfalls which are being addressed primarily through the redistribution of money from vacant lines. He also pointed to strategies to increase enrollment, such as improved marketing and recruitment initiatives.

The Senate received updates and report from Provost Reiber who also discussed the effects of budget redirection. He expressed hope that we will "grow our way out of" budget shortfalls. He noted that enrollment is slightly up for fall, and he stated that we are expecting a record-breaking freshman class.

The discussion item on faculty's practical role in student success was tabled until the May meeting. The scheduled presentation on Campus Data Security (DUO) by Mr. Stalnaker will be presented to faculty electronically or at the May meeting.

The Senate adjourned at 6:04 pm.

Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate Meeting

April 3rd, 2019

4:00-6:00pm

Voting Members Present: M. Rocio Alba-Flores (CEC), Anoop Desai (CEC), Hayden Wimmer (CEC), Jim Harris (CEC), Wayne Johnson (CEC), Dustin Anderson (CAH), Robert Costomiris (CAH), Michelle Haberland (CAH), Drew Keane (CAH), Jennifer Kowalewski (CAH), Jorge Suazo (CAH), Richard Flynn (CAH), Carol Jamison (CAH), Chris Cartright (CAH), Tony Morris (CAH), Jack Simmons (CAH), Amanda Konkle (CAH), Heidi Altman (CBSS), Ted Brimeyer (CBSS), Christopher Brown (CBSS), Robert Pirro (CBSS), Meghan Dove (CBSS), Kevin Jennings (CBSS), Dennis Murphy (CBSS), Robert Jackson (Parker), Hsiang-Jui Kung (Parker), Lowell Mooney (Parker), Bill Wells (Parker), Maliece Whatley (Parker), Mete Akcaoglu (COE), Alisa Leckie (COE), Meca Williams-Johnson (COE), Patricia Holt (COE), Daniel Chapman (COE), Lucas Jensen (COE), Ed Mondor (COSM), Marshall Ransom (COSM), Jeffery Secrest (COSM), Sungkon Chang (COSM), Donna Mullenax (COSM), Traci Ness (COSM), Jennifer Zettler (COSM), Lori Gwinett (LIB), Kristi Smith (LIB), Aimee Reist (LIB), Andrew Hansen (JPHCOPH), Helen Bland (JPHCOPH), Marian Tabi (WCHP), Christy Moore (WCHP), Katrina Embrey (WCHP), Jan Bradshaw (WCHP), Gina Crabb (WCHP)

Alternates Present: Greg Ryan for Li Li (WCHP), Thresa Yancy for Janice Steirn (CBSS), Maria Adamos for Jared Sexton (CAH), Catherine Macgowan for Hans-Joerg Schanz (COSM), Starr Holland for Barbara Ross (Liberty)

Voting Members Not Present: Peter Rogers (CEC), James Todesca (CAH), Chuck Harter (Parker), Stephanie Sipe (Parker), Bill Yang (Parker), Eric Landers (COE), LindaAnn McCall (COE), Dragos Amarie (COSM), Chasen Smith (COSM), Shijun Zheng (COSM), Yi Lin (COSM), Hans-Joerg Schanz (COSM), Dzyiana Nazaruk (JPHCOPH), TimMarie Williams (WCHP), Jan Bradshaw (WCHP), Gina Crabb (WCHP)

Administrators: Kyle Marrerro (President), Carl Reiber (Provost), Scot Lingrell (VP for Enrollment Management), Amy Ballagh (Associate VP for Enrollment Management), Mahammad Davoud (Dean, AEP College of Engineering and Computing), Greg Evans (Dean, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health), Curtin Ricker (Dean, CAH), Bede Mitchell (Dean of the Library), Donna Brooks (Associate Provost), Diana Cone (Vice Provost), Christine Ludowise (Associate Provost), Ron Stalnaker (CIO)

Guests: Carol Cox, John Lester, Daniel Pioske, Hapsa Wayne, Annie Mendenhall, Lisa Dusenberry, Beth Durodoye, Candace Griffith, Julia Feischer, Kelly Crosby, Cindy Grover, Rand Ressler, Delana Gatch, Ashley Walker, Brandon Harris, Holly Camacho, Leticia McGrath, John Dicesare, Norton Pease, Amy Smith, Brenda Blackwell, Catherine Gilbert, Tim Moody

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dustin Anderson (Senate President, CAH) called the meeting to order at 4:06.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Tony Morris (CAH) made a motion to approve the agenda for the meeting. A second was made by Trish Holt (COE). The motion to approve the agenda passed.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: March 7, 2019 –

Carol Jamison (CAH), Senate Secretary, made a motion to approve the minutes. Wayne Johnson (CEC) asked whether a tabled motion would be discussed today. The SEC did not approve the motion. Dustin Anderson agreed that we might discuss this motion at end of meeting. A second was then made by Trish Holt (COE). The motion to approve the minutes passed.

IV. LIBRARIAN'S REPORT: April 3, 2019 –

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE), Senate Librarian, made a motion to approve the Librarian's Report. Jack Simmons (CAH) seconded. The motion passed.

- a. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee – Bill Wells (Parker) for Michelle Cawthorne (COSM), Chair

Report: This committee met twice this past month and for work on Core norming. They practiced grading with a rubric. Under new business, the following core courses were proposed, most with small changes: CRJ 2010, Chem 1151 and Biol 1355. Physics 1222L was approved with recommendation that the code should be changed to a K. Three anthropology courses were proposed for inclusion in the core but were returned for clarification.

Motion and Vote: The motion was made by delivery of report. The motion to approve passed.

- b. Undergraduate Committee – Chris Cartright (CAH), Chair

Report: Chris Cartright (CAH) reported that the undergraduate committee was unable to determine why some people cannot access CIM but those without access should contact the registrar. At the committee's two March meetings, the committee approved 135 items. They approved a motion to allow the registrar to approve PLO and SLO revisions as this would allow the committee to address missing learning outcomes more expediently. A subcommittee will work over the summer to streamline CIM forms. The April meeting has over 200 items and will look at program reviews. Dustin Anderson (CAH) requested that curriculum items should be submitted

regularly rather than in bulk to help this committee avoid overly long meetings.

Motion and Vote: The motion was made by delivery of the report. The motion to approve the report passed.

c. Graduate Committee – Brandon Harris (WCHP), Chair

Report: Brandon Harris (WCHP) noted that the work of the graduate committee is akin to that of the undergraduate committee with hefty curriculum items. This committee just finished graduate level CPRs. Most items have had to do with consolidation and accreditation. In February, the first two accelerated master's degrees were approved. A subcommittee will address issues relating to graduate programs on the two campuses.

Motion and Vote: The motion was made by delivery of report. The motion passed.

III. ACTION ITEMS

a. **Motion – Faculty Workload Policy** – Diana Cone (VPAA), Faculty Workload *AdHoc* Committee, Chair (page 3)

Brian Koehler (COSM and co-chair of this subcommittee) and Dustin Anderson (CAH) presented the proposed workload policy. This policy is an adjustment and replacement to the current policy. Anderson briefly explained the history of the GSU policy was made in 1998, which required all full-time faculty to teach 12 credit semester hours. In 2004, the load was 12 credit hours with adjustments made by chair and dean approval. In 2017, the current policy was put into place by the Consolidation Implementation committee. The standard load under this policy is “12 hours for tenure-line faculty and 15 for non-tenure track faculty.” The new work load policy would move away from this. The intent is to be less restrictive. Most faculty currently teach a 3/3 load with significant research. This is the typical tenure-track load. The proposed policy will add for some flexibility but sets generic guidelines. Accreditation agencies or other needs may require such flexibility. This policy provides guidelines to protect faculty. The subcommittee created examples of some typical workload models. These models are samples only; they are not meant to be exact. Workload may vary for individual faculty and departments, but we need some codification of expectations for annual evaluations.

Question: Rob Pirro (CBSS) expressed concern about the vetting of this proposal. He was concerned that this policy did not go through the Faculty Welfare committee. Further, the annual workload models give illustrative examples but imply consent between faculty and chair, but elsewhere it says load may vary depending on need. Did the committee discuss this ambiguity?

Response: Dustin Anderson (CAH) responded that the evaluative process must allow faculty to advance, and cannot present untenable situations. He offered the example of faculty covering for colleagues on FMLA; if their load increases, then they must be evaluated on the actual situation based on expectations put in writing, rather than the standard expectations for that department. Department level policies must allow faculty to advance. A change in standard load must be reflected in annual evaluations. As to the concern about faculty welfare involvement, Anderson responded that there were two items that did not go through Faculty Welfare, this item and the ratings of instruction placeholder. This assigned to an ad hoc in light of the load that Faculty Welfare already had with updates and corrections to the faculty handbook, and the Transitional Tenure and Promotion policy

that was finished in March. The chair of the Faculty Welfare was able to review and provide feedback on the proposal. The assignment of the ad hoc was not to exclude the Welfare committee, but to be able to propose this policy during this year as it could have an impact teaching for the following year. Not putting it forward this year means another cycle on the standing policy.

Question: Michele Haberland (CAH) stated that she is on the faculty welfare committee. She stated that she did not see this policy nor did other members except for the committee chair. She expressed concern that this policy was not vetted by what she saw as normal channels. She was also concerned that the committee was appointed and not elected.

Response: Dustin Anderson (CAH) said that the subcommittee work was performed in light of successfully completing the university mission of having a workload in place by next academic year. Anderson asked if the concern was that the policy did not come from a faculty committee or that it did not come from the Welfare committee specifically. Haberland said both. Anderson said that the idea that faculty were on the committee was a misconception. The ad hoc was a faculty committee composed of faculty with members across colleges and rank. The policy wasn't just vetted by faculty, it was created by faculty. Haberland asked if the committee members who appointed since members of the Welfare committee were elected. Anderson responded that while the committee was appointed, some of those members had been elected as college representatives in other capacities. Anderson indicated that the members of the committee were listed at the end of the proposal.

Question: Christy Moore (WCHP) stated that she has two issues with the proposed policy: 1) it does not address non-administrative twelve-month faculty members, especially regarding summer hours, and 2) nowhere are zero credit hours such as labs accounted for.

Response: Catherine Gilbert (WCHP), responded that the committee had two principles to stay within: 1) the university system doesn't recognize summer teaching, and 2) the goal to create a flexible workload policy that allowed for variation. The proposed policy allows for departments to make these workload decisions. Faculty and chairs determine the specifics. Dustin Anderson (CAH) added that this proposed policy requires that departments having clear guidelines. Christy Moore (WCHP) followed by asking what would happen if a department head won't work with a faculty member. She remarked that in such situations, people end up overworked and ready to quit. Anderson responded that the Faculty Grievance committee and other avenues would protect against such situations.

Question: Marshal Ransom (COSM) commented that a number of things related to workload are negotiated between faculty member and chair. He pointed out these statements in the proposed policy: "may vary for individual faculty as agreed by faculty member and chair and approved by dean," "chair in consultation with faculty member will recommend workload" and later "the dean will accept or modify the load." It does not say that the Provost will make this decision.

Response: Dustin Anderson (CAH) confirmed that workload decisions go up to management at the dean level and are then collected by the Provost's office. Carl Reiber (Provost) confirmed that the diversity of activities is not something the Provost should micromanage. Chairs along with faculty and deans make these decisions. The Provost only intervenes if there is an issue.

Question: Jack Simmons (CAH) is concerned by this phrase: “decision made annually during merit review process” implying faculty can change workload. He expressed concern that this might make long-term research projects and promotion difficult. Annual workload models ask us to give percentages. How could this work out? How do we measure workload? The proposed policy recommends that we look at prior history of faculty. How will this work when workloads were historically different? Once on a workload, how could one alter it?

Response: Dustin Anderson (CAH) responded that the proposal states each department must put in writing specifics and timelines. Departments must establish timeline for moving from one load to another. He stated that the committee could clarify conversion of time and effort and how that might be tracked. He agrees that if a faculty member has been on a set load and wants to change, that conversation should come into play in annual review. The spirit of this policy is intended to protect faculty and to document why loads are as they are for faculty.

Question: Heidi Altman (COBS) asked about the proposed 5/5 teaching load. In the faculty handbook, those promoted through lecturer levels must demonstrate teaching and service or professional growth and development. How can a lecturer find time for this on a 5/5 load?

Response: Brian Koehler (COSM) explained that the committee working on the policy found a lot of variation in what lecturers are doing. The committee tried to show a range in the load of lecturers and all tenure-line faculty in order to support the path to promotion. Dustin Anderson (CAH) reiterated that the effort is to protect faculty. If a lecturer is moved to 5/5, that lecturer would be evaluated with this load in mind.

Question: Heidi Altman (COBS) then pointed out that faculty development is necessary for promotion. Do we separate lecturer from contingent faculty? Those on a 5/5 load cannot go up for promotion according to this policy.

Response: Dustin Anderson (CAH) responded that such issues should be fleshed out at the departmental level.

Question: Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) noted that in her college, some of the items listed here didn't seem realistic. She suggested that the policy should include some of the “invisible” service that takes up a lot of time. She suggested that we set realistic expectations and that 65% teaching, 10 % scholarship, and 25 % service might be more realistic considering the direction of the university. Do we really think we will have three times as many hours for scholarship as service? And also, will we soon spend half as many hours on research as teaching? Realistically, this hasn't happened.

Response: Dustin Anderson (CAH) explained that the proposed policy contains illustrative examples only and not binding numbers. Percentages can vary at the department or individual level. This policy will push those departments without clear guidelines to develop them, and it will also protect faculty by articulating those expectations.

Note: This motion was then moved to a vote. This motion did not pass. It will go back to the committee for revisions and then will be passed on to Faculty Welfare to review. Faculty Welfare will present the revised policy in May, and it will go back up for a vote. Meanwhile, the standing GSU workload policy stays in place.

b. Motion – Update to section 317 (course evaluation language) in the Faculty Handbook –
Jonathan Hilpert (COE), Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair (page 8 of Agenda)

Jonathan Hilpert (COE) explained that changes in SRIs were put forth by a task force and presented to the Senate. The Senate asked for removal of the phrase “summer excluded.” The task force did so and now return to the Senate to seek approval. Wayne Johnson (CEC) seconded the motion.

Discussion: Trish Holt (COE) asked what was meant by the statement “all responses are property of the university” Carl Reiber (Provost) explained that this statement serves protect students under federal statute. Richard Flynn (CAH) questioned if the statement “summer excluded” was the only objection. Hilpert responded that the Welfare committee decided to exclude this phrase under the direction from the previous discussion at Senate. The main change was to transition SRIs from pencil and paper to electronic format.

Vote: The motion passed.

b. Motion – Update Senate Bylaws – Dustin Anderson (CAH), Senate Executive Committee, Chair (page 10) article 3 section 5; reviews and updates.

Dustin Anderson (CAH) explained that one standing committee had changes approved in September that aren’t yet reflected in the updated bylaws. Trish Holt (COE) seconded the motion.

Discussion: Maliece Whatley (Parker) asked about section 19 item G which concerns elections. She noted a discrepancy in that this section states that elections must be completed by April 1, but university guidelines state that they must be complete no later than three weeks prior to the end of semester.

Response: Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) explained that the April 1 deadline was to give us more time to adhere to the statutes, which have overall authority.

Vote: The motion passed.

VI. PRESIDENT’S REPORT – Kyle Marrero

Kyle Marrero, GSU’s new president, addressed the Senate. By way of introduction, he stated he likes to see shared governance at work, and the collaborative effort to create the best environment for faculty and students. He and his family will bi-locate to be in both communities. He wants to let us know that he has studied us and knows what we have been through and where we are headed. He acknowledged the legacy of the formerly separate institutions but emphasized that we must move forward to form a new university with a shared vision. His background is in arts and humanities. He was formerly an opera singer and has been a U.S. artistic ambassador. These experiences have shaped who and what he is. Our goal is to forge the new GSU. He will do his best to listen and hear our needs. He values transparency and openness.

President Marrero then addressed the budget. He explained that on May 3, 2019, we must submit our budget, and it must be balanced by July. He then recapped Rob Whitaker’s previously-presented budget report. GSU has undergone a period of decreased enrollment, and decreased enrollment means decreased revenue. We will find out on April 17th when we get our budget whether we have been supplemented by the state. We have to assume that we will be allocated a budget based on our formula. Marrero added that we are reducing online tuition to zero for GSU, and this will add up to fifteen million dollars that is coming to us. The current budget shortfall is being addressed through the elimination of 191 vacant positions; 68 of

these positions are faculty lines. The 2% merit increase will come forward but it is only funded at 75%. The university is responsible for the remaining 25%. The faculty equity study is critical to retain and recruit the best faculty. This will be a priority. Remaining dollars will go toward student success initiatives and developing a new student marketing plan. He is developing a strategic enrollment plan to target various populations of students who would fit the various campuses and programs. Additionally, \$5 million is being applied to the renovation of the Pirate Athletic Center into additional advising space. The new strategic plan should be in place by July 1. The strategic plan imperatives will define us for the next five or six years. Marrero plans to have town halls so we can hold him accountable. These initiatives and inclusive excellence led by Damon Williams are critical as we move forward. We need to define who we are as a unified eagle nation.

Dr. Marrero concluded by giving the Senate his vision of what a president should do. Marrero explained that he sees the job of the president as setting the tone and the tempo for the university. He wants faculty to have courage to speak out, have a voice, be engaged, and to treat each other well and respectfully. This is the tone. The tempo must serve the region and respond to the needs of the region. We will be an institution that is defined regionally.

Question: Rob Pirro (CBBS) remarked that he was glad to hear the president use the word ‘citizen’ to describe our students. We are not vocational, but we are invested in developing citizens with civic values. This is central to our mission.

Response: President Marrero concurred that employers want well-rounded citizens. His musical training helped him to become a president. We have a higher calling.

Question: Jack Simmons (CAH) stated that the merger has turned both universities inside out. Are we asking for additional funding? He asked the president to share his strategy in moving us past post-consolidation budget issues.

Response: President Marrero stated that we need resources to define our strategy. We are in “budget reduction deficit land” and need assistance.

Question: Michelle Haberland (CAH) thanked President Marrero for his comments about transparency. One of the things we have discussed is the fact that the enrollment decline was predictable following consolidation. Everyone knew enrollment would take a hit, and now we bear the consequences. This is patently unfair. She hopes the USG knows that consolidation leads to enrollment decline. It begs logic that we should get a budget hit after consolidation.

Response: President Marrero noted that enrollment projections look good, and we should be able to stabilize the decline. Marketing will ensure that we don’t find ourselves in this position again.

VII. PROVOST’S REPORT – Carl Reiber (VPAA)

Carl Reiber (VPAA) responded to the RFI on the regional academic plan. The regional plan was submitted as part of consolidation and is designed to develop GSU’s presence in Savannah on the Armstrong campus. (See agenda, page 24, for a full list of these initiatives).

Dr. Reiber addressed the budget cut, which he said has been reduced from 10% to 7.5% in order to be viable without cutting occupied lines. He said that we are seeing a slight increase in fall enrollment. He stated that we will need to look at how we distribute courses. He also said that we are looking at a record enrollment for the incoming freshman class this year. Next, he said, we need to focus on adding transfer students. We need faculty to teach within the current budget constraints. He has gone through the recommendations for managing budget constraints made by deans and department chairs, and most have

been approved. He claimed that the provost's office took the largest percentage hit of the budget reduction. Institutional Effectiveness, for example, took a bigger hit than academic departments. As far as academic budget adjustments, we eliminated vacant lines and now have to ensure that classes are staffed. He asked that we be patient and tolerant as we move through this budget crisis. We will grow our way out of it. We are making progress with our momentum year approach to enhance student success. He noted that there were excellent ideas and innovations coming from the faculty. We will work to incorporate learning resources such as synchronous learning. He thanked Dustin and the College of Computing and Engineering for testing this technology and noted that we will be expanding it since it seems to be going well. Its success has exposed issues with our other video-conferencing technology.

Question: Christy Moore (WCHP) asked about vacant lines that have been eliminated. Do they include retirees? If enrollment is so important, why did we close the Masters of Adult Education?

Response: Dr. Reiber responded that closure was a college decision; this program wasn't productive and was low enrollment. The university system looks at low yield and low enrollment programs. We need to look at programs that are declining, and we have to scrutinize them and make decisions. Sometimes, it's better to merge a program if it is low yield or ask how we can evolve it. We have filled our budget hole for this year and are looking at how to balance the budget next year. Deans will decide if lines are cut or redirected.

At this point, it was 5:58. Dustin Anderson (CAH) said we could not complete the agenda even with additional time. He proposed that Ron Stalnaker (CIO) who was on the agenda to make a presentation might make the information available electronically and then join us for questions. Discussion items will have to be rolled over to the May meeting.

Motion to extend: No motion was made to extend time. The meeting adjourned at 5:57. We will convene next in May. Senators are asked to refer to the Senate website to align dates as there will be several action items at the May meeting. The workload document will reappear in May. If it does not pass, we will remain at 5/5 and 4/4 load. The discussion item on faculty's practical role in student success are tabled until the May meeting. Before the meeting adjourned, Senate members, at the suggestion of Helen Bland (JPHCOPH), thanked ITS for making Senate meetings possible. Those present then applauded ITS for their service and also applauded our new president.

Adjournment: Wayne Johnson (CEC) made a motion to adjourn. The motion was accepted. The meeting adjourned at 6:04.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Jamison (CAH, Senate Librarian)