

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

5-21-2019

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*. 53.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/53>

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 Meeting

May 21, 2019

Executive Summary: For the meeting of the Faculty Senate on May 21, 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 April 3, 2019 Senate meeting, and the Librarian's 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 4 motions: emendation of sections 321.04 (Retirement) & 321.05 (Emeritus/a Policy) of the Faculty Handbook in order to be in accordance with BOR policies; revision of section 314 (Non-Tenure Track Faculty Fifth Year Review) in the Faculty Handbook; revision of the Faculty Workload Policy, which had been returned to the Faculty Welfare Committee at the previous meeting; and a motion to put into writing the temporary nature of workload increases. All of these motions passed. The Workload Policy passed with some minor wording changes to the document.

President Marrero presented to the Senate an update on the budget situation, explaining the deficit had been reduced from \$15 million to \$13.1. He gave a detailed account of how the university was meeting the deficit while also addressing faculty and student needs. A detailed account of the budget is available on the GSU Performance Excellence website. He then talked about the strategic plan and commencement. Finally, he introduced this vision statement and asked for feedback: "People, purpose, action; growing ourselves to grow others."

The Senate received brief updates from Provost Reiber. He stated that the university has met the needs and requests of colleges. Of the 124 limited faculty last year, those employed more than four years will be converted to either lecturer or non-tenure track professor.

Mr. Stalnaker presented to the faculty a presentation on Campus Data Security (DUO).

The SEC brought forward several discussion items, all available on SharePoint for review. The RFI on notification of deaths by the university was discussed at some length. President Marrero stated that he would consider the discussion and come back with a humane policy.

As an item of Old Business, Reed Smith (CAH) reported on the newly-formed Student Success Committee, which seeks to address how student success aligns with pedagogy.

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) gave a brief report on the Strategic Planning Committee. She also thanked Dustin Anderson for his service to the Senate as President. The Senate adjourned at 6:08 pm.

MINUTES

Voting Members Present:

Peter Rogers (CEC), Hayden Wimmer (CEC), Jim Harris (CEC), Wayne Johnson (CEC), Dustin Anderson (CAH), Jared Sexton (CAH), Michelle Haberland (CAH), Drew Keane (CAH), Richard Flynn (CAH), James Todesca (CAH), Carol Jamison (CAH), Chris Cartright (CAH), Tony Morris (CAH), Jack Simmons (CAH), Amanda Konkle (CAH), Heidi Altman (CBSS), Robert Pirro (CBSS), Janice Steirn (CBSS), Meghan Dove (CBSS), Kevin Jennings (CBSS), Dennis Murphy (CBSS), Robert Jackson (PARKER), Chuck Harter (PARKER), Lowell Mooney (PARKER), Maliece Whatley (PARKER), Mete Akcaoglu (COE), Meca Williams-Johnson (COE), Patricia Holt (COE), LindaAnn McCall (COE), Daniel Chapman (COE), Lucas Jensen (COE), Shijun Zheng (COSM), Hans-Joerg Schanz (COSM), Marshall Ransom (COSM), Sungkon Chang (COSM), Traci Ness (COSM), Donna Mullenax (COSM), Jennifer Zettler (COSM), Lori Gwinett (LIB), Kristi Smith (LIB), Andrew Hansen (JPHCOPH), Dziyana Nazaruk (JPHCOPH), Helen Bland (JPHCOPH), Li Li (WATERS), Christy Moore (WATERS), TimMarie Williams (WATERS), Katrina Embrey (WATERS), Jan Bradshaw (WATERS)

Alternates Present:

Starr Holland (Liberty), Timothy Cairney (PARKER), Axel Grossman (PARKER), Catherine MacGowan (COSM), Leslie Haas (LIB), Kelly Sullivan (JPHCOPH)

Voting Members Not Present:

M. Rocio Alba-Flores (CEC), Anoop Desai (CEC), Robert Costomiris (CAH), Jennifer Kowalewski (CAH), Jorge Suazo (CAH), Ted Brimeyer (CBSS), Christopher Brown (CBSS), Hsiang-Jui Kung (PARKER), Stephanie Sipe (PARKER), Bill Wells (PARKER), Bill Yang (PARKER), Eric Landers (COE), Alisa Leckie (COE), Dragos Amarie (COSM), Ed Mondor (COSM), Chasen Smith (COSM), Yi Lin (COSM), Jeffery Secrest (COSM), Aimee Reist (LIB), Marian Tabi (WATERS), Gina Crabb (WATERS), Barbara Ross (LIBTY)

Administrators:

Kyle Marrero (President), Carl Reiber (Provost and VPAA), Diana Cone (Vice Provost), Rob Whitaker (VP for Finance and Operations), Scot Lingrell (VP for Enrollment Management), Amy Ballagh (Associate VP for Enrollment Services), Mohammad Davoud (Dean, AEP CEC), John Kraft (Interim Dean, CBSS), Curtis Ricker (Dean, CAH), Greg Evans (JPHCOPH), John Lester (Marketing and Strategic Communications)

Guests:

Teresa Durham (CTE), Ameer Adkins (COE), Ron Stalnaker (CIO), Ashley Walker (COGS), Kelly Crosby (A,R&C), Jarvis Steele, Candace Griffith (AVPAA), Delana Bell Gatch (OIE), Terri Flateby (OIE), Donna Brooks (AVPAA), Amy Smith (EM), Reed Smith (CAH), Chris Caplinger (FYE), Michael Forest

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dustin Andersen (CAH, Senate President) called the meeting to order at 4:00 pm. Anderson thanked Senators for their service this year. He also acknowledged Ginger Malphrus for her twenty-six years of service and assistance to the Senate.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Richard Flynn (CAH) made a motion to approve the agenda for the meeting. A second was made by Chuck Carter (PARKER). The motion to approve the agenda passed.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: April 3, 2019

Carol Jamison (CAH), Senate Secretary, made a motion to approve the minutes from the April 3 meeting. A second was made by Helen Bland (JPHCOPH). The motion to approve the minutes passed.

IV. LIBRARIAN'S REPORT: May 21, 2019

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

a. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee – Michelle Cawthorne (COSM),
Chair

Delana Gatch spoke on Cawthorne's behalf and said that this committee had no items to report.

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

Report: The committee met on April 9th and approved all agenda items for the year, over 200 items at this past meeting. The Military Credit policy and Credit by Exam policy were approved and also Comprehensive Program Reviews completed this semester. They also discussed the committee calendar for next academic year and how to create a more efficient process for the high volume of tasks.

Motion and Vote: Motion was made by delivery of report. Richard Flynn (CAH) seconded. The motion passed.

c. Graduate Committee – Brandonn Harris (WATERS), Chair

Report: Brandonn Harris (WATERS) reported that this committee reviewed a substantial number of items and completed them all. He expressed his appreciation for the committee in completing all agenda items. He also thanked Dustin Anderson (CAH) and the Senate members for their assistance in helping the committee move items to completion. He referred Senators to the March and April committee report for details about this committee's items.

Motion and Vote: The motion was made by delivery of report. Andrew Hanson (JPHCOPH) seconded. Dustin Anderson acknowledged the hard work of these committees and asked Senators to applaud the work of these committees. The motion passed.

V. ACTION ITEMS

a. **Motion – Update to sections 321.04 (Retirement) & & 321.05 (Emeritus/a Policy) in the Faculty Handbook** – Jonathan Hilpert (COE), Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair (pages 3-6) was not present. Dustin Anderson (CAH) acknowledged Hilpert's excellent work leading the FWC on the large amount of material they covered this year, and delivered the report on his behalf.

Report: Changes were made in the sections noted above so that the GSU Faculty Handbook would be in alignment with BOR.

Motion: Richard Flynn (CAH) made a motion to approve. Wayne Johnson (CEC) seconded.

Discussion: There was no discussion.

Vote: The motion to approve passed.

b. **Motion – Revision of section (Non-Tenure Track Faculty Fifth Year Review) 314 in the Faculty Handbook** – Jonathan Hilpert (COE), Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair was not present. Dustin Anderson (CAH) delivered the report on his behalf.

Report: This policy was approved unanimously by the committee and vetted by faculty,

including non-tenure track faculty. This revision is required to enable the advancement of non-tenure track faculty.

Motion: Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) made a motion to approve this item. Richard Flynn (CAH) seconded.

Discussion: There was no discussion.

Vote: The motion to approve passed.

c. **Motion – Faculty Workload Policy** – Jonathan Hilpert (COE), Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair & Dustin Anderson (CAH), Faculty Workload *AdHoc* Committee

Motion: “The proposed faculty workload policy will position faculty to secure and maintain workloads that are ideal for their success and productivity. It was approved by the faculty welfare committee by a vote of 16 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstain. The proposed text, a revised version of the policy developed by the ad hoc committee, rectifies problems with the current policy which may lead to increased workloads for faculty without clear recourse. The proposed policy contains important protections for tenure track and non-tenure track faculty that will allow them to pursue their career objectives in differentiated ways.” This motion seeks to rectify problems with current policy. Richard Flynn (CAH) made a move to approve. Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) seconded.

Discussion: Discussion began with Jim Harris (COE) noting that the current policy specifies a twelve-hour load, and a department chair can change loads with approval of the dean. He questioned why we are changing the current policy when the current one seems to offer some flexibility. Michelle Haberland (CAH) explained that this new workload policy does allow for variation and is focused on negotiations between faculty member and department chair, which the committee though would ensure most flexibility. Dustin Anderson (CAH) added that department chairs come and go, so faculty need recourse. Christy Moore (WATERS) stated that her college asked specifically for this policy change because negotiations between department head and dean have left faculty with little recourse. She stated that the current policy does not allow sufficient negotiation.

Richard Flynn (CAH) Jack Simmons (CAH) commented that this policy looks like an improvement from the previous version. Simmons (CAH) stated that he appreciates the work of the committee. His concern was with paragraph seven and workload percentages.

He asked that the percentages be omitted. He also was concerned with this sentence which he believed might enable administration to change course loads: “These should generally be made on an annual basis to support an individual faculty member’s career objectives as well as departmental needs and/or resources.” Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) suggested that we end the sentence with the word ‘objectives’ and omit the rest. Jack Simmons (CAH) stated that he approved of this amendment. Dustin Anderson (CAH) noted that ultimately the authority lands with dean and department head, but this policy provides clear explanation for faculty workload and contingency based on need.

Chris Cartright (CAH) acknowledged that the revised proposal seeks to empower faculty when negotiating for workload, but he expressed concern with the statement that “dean will either accept or modify” workloads. While this is, in fact, our procedure, he wondered if this statement was necessary. Might this statement undercut the sentiment of the policy to increase the power of faculty? Is this sentence necessary given that the policy seeks to give strength to faculty negotiation? Dustin Anderson (CAH) explained that this statement simply acknowledges the process and lays clear the chain of responsibility. The committee wanted the language as clear cut as possible. Wayne Johnson (CEC) said that discussion of this statement did come up in Faculty Welfare discussions. Rob Pirro (CBSS) suggested beginning the preceding sentence with the phrase “dept chairs *and college deans* must clearly articulate the outcomes expected for ...” The subsequent sentence would be struck because it is implied: “The dean will either accept or modify.” This amendment would address the concerns. Helen Bland (JPHCOPH), speaking on behalf of Welfare Committee, expressed her belief that striking this clause would not change the policy. She agreed with that the phrase is redundant in regards to the sentiment of the policy.

Jack Simmons (CAH) stated that his previous concern about percentages was still an issue. He was concerned that it could cause unfairness between campuses because of distribution of resources. Dustin Anderson (CAH) explained that the reference to 100% makes clear that no one will have a workload over 100 %.

Wayne Johnson (CEC) had a question on procedure: Item I mentions a ‘College Executive Committee.’ He asked what this was. Richard Flynn (CAH) explained that every college is required to have a college executive committee, but this committee is called Faculty Governance Committee. Dustin Anderson (CAH) explained that this name could be amended. Christy Moore (WATERS) thanked the ad hoc committee for their work on this policy.

Amendment to Motion: Following this discussion, these amendments were made paragraphs 6 and 7 of the proposal: the sentence beginning ‘these should be generally

made' will end with the word 'objectives.' The statement "deans will accept or modify" will be struck. The amended sections will read as follows:

"For all full-time faculty, workload percentages must add up to 100%. Specific percentages should follow departmental norms related to actual teaching load assigned, scholarly expectations, and service assignments. These should generally be made on an annual basis to support an individual faculty member's career objectives as well as departmental needs and/or resources. Workload assignments for faculty members will be negotiated with the department chair as part of annual review. No workload assignment or negotiation can yield a workload that will prevent a faculty member from achieving requirements for advancement (tenure, promotion, post-tenure, or any other) described in the faculty handbook, college guidelines, or department guidelines."

"Department Chairs *and College Deans* must clearly articulate the outcomes expected for a particular workload division of effort, and appropriately reflect that division of effort in the annual review process. ~~The dean will either accept or modify the teaching load.~~ Faculty members whose workloads are not commensurate with the expectations of their position, hiring agreement, or career objectives can utilize 1) college faculty executive committees and 2) college and university grievance processes to reach a compromise. In the event a faculty member contests a workload agreement, no changes in workload will take place until the faculty member's grievance can be heard through the college and university grievance processes. "

Motion: Richard Flynn (CAH) made a motion to accept the amendments suggested above. Trish Holt (COE) seconded the motion.

Vote: There was no further discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

d. **Motion – Temporary Nature of Workload Increases** – Marc Cyr (CAH)

This motion stated that "the Provost and/or President provide a policy in writing that states that any increases over stated norms in faculty workloads imposed by current abnormal circumstances will not be permanent, will not set a precedent for future faculty workloads, and will expire as soon as we return to what the Provost calls "normal times" or within one contract year, whichever comes first." Dustin Anderson (CAH) made the motion. Richard Fynn (CAH) seconded.

Discussion: Rob Pirro (CBSS) asked what the Provost thinks about this motion. Carl Reiber (Provost) responded that he believes the new workload policy takes care of this issue. Beyond that, if what is being asked of faculty exceeds 100% of workload, a

discussion would need to take place. Marc Cyr (CAH) congratulated the Senate for wanting guidelines in writing. He noted that he made this motion before the current workload policy was proposed, but he believes this motion needs to be put in writing to protect non-tenured and other vulnerable faculty as this gives recourse over verbal promises. If one is asked to carry a workload over 100%, there ought to be a limit.

Janice Steirn (CBSS) stated that she likes this motion but we need to be explicit about what 'normal times' means. What conditions constitute normal times? Chris Cartright (CAH) expressed support for the motion. He noted that the statements about the impact of the budget on faculty workloads had been interpreted in different ways. Complex matters need to be clarified, especially considering the amount of administrative turnover and recent fluctuations in enrollment. He encouraged the provost's and president's offices to have clear communications.

Dustin Anderson (CAH) noted that this motion speaks to the issue of trust, especially in recent times after consolidation. We want a way to feel good about decisions and continuity, and we want to have a clear understanding of expectations. Marc Cyr (CAH) concurred, quoting former President Ronald Reagan "Trust, but verify." Heidi Alman (CBSS) asked about tenure / promotion guidelines which state that faculty cannot be assigned a workload that will impede advancement towards tenure and / or promotion. How does this affect lecturers with a 5/5 load as this load impedes their progress towards promotion? She said that if something were to be put in writing, it would feel better. Dustin Anderson (CAH) agreed and pointed out that the new workload policy states that expectations must be outlined. Michele Haberland (CAH) noted that our new workload policy will not be effective immediately, and our current one is in violation because lecturers are on 5/5 load. This 5/5 load should be documented as a case of extraordinary circumstances, she maintained. Jack Simmons (CAH) noted that every year is a "crisis year." He likes the last clause in the motion which stipulates that "unusual circumstances" leading to increased workload will not exceed beyond one contract year. Dustin Anderson (CAH) noted that the provost wasn't hesitant to put this motion in writing. He suggested that perhaps in the coming year, we could add this motion as an amendment to faculty the workload policy.

Vote: There was no further discussion. The motion passed.

VI. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – Kyle Marrero

President Marrero noted that he has now been at GSU 51 days, and much has happened. He continues to listen and learn and gain an understanding of all of the GSU campuses. He has identified 14 faculty and staff that form a learning group to talk with him in detail

about the culture, decision making process, and challenges of our university. Wayne Johnson is one of those in this group. He has interviewed each of them and met with them as a group. Trust, communication, and transparency were recurring words in these interviews. He will focus on these three issues. Trust is earned, and he hopes to earn our trust. He thanked the learning group for their assistance.

Next, President Marrero addressed the budget. He stated that we had a \$15 million deficit on April 3rd as reported to the Senate. Through credit hour generation and subsidizing from the BOR, that number ended up being \$13.1 million. The numbers were originally 198 vacant positions that needed to be cut. 69 of these were faculty, and the remainder were staff. We sought to ensure program delivery, student support, and student progression, as well as operational sustainability. This number changed to 43 faculty because of these guiding principles; 25 positions were moved forward. We also identified 152 staff positions for a total of 195 positions. By cutting these vacant lines alongside with operational reductions and the 2.5% tuition increase, we were able to fulfill the \$132,000,000.00 budget deficit and provide \$13.2 million in opportunity investment. We looked at student success and invested \$2.6 million in enrollment services to try to provide a one-stop shop for students as they register and seek financial aid. The other part of that amount was in Counselor services and investment in the Wexford Campus. The university invested the e-tuition differential; the money that was generated was put back into programs. He stated that we looked at faculty and staff with the faculty equity study. We needed \$3.8 million to get staff to the appropriate entry point salary. \$2.7 million went to professorial ranks. \$6.5 million became our investment towards equity adjustments. Promotion and tenure required \$513,000 recurring. In all, this meant \$8 million recurring in equity and merit salary adjustments as of July 1. This will be our investment. With \$3 million from the state, the total will be \$11 million.

We had no remaining reserves at the institution. We have a pending reduction, so money has been held for that. The good news is enrollment: our goal for fall is to be flat or have slight growth (.7 percent of 1 percent). We are optimistic because our applications and acceptances are up. Undergraduate applications and graduate applications are up. We will at the least stabilize for next fall. It is critical as we move forward to reach out to students and to what we can do to make them choose GSU.

Next, Dr. Marrero spoke about the strategic plan. He stated that he is very happy with the work done by Helen Bland (JPHCOPH), and Julie Gerbsch. He will host a town hall in August and again in January or February so we can grade the administration in regards to the strategic plan. The comprehensive administrative review (CAR) is part of this plan, especially in efforts to focus on efficiency. Our CAR report has been approved by the system. President Marrero will circulate the CAR and will show where and how money

was allocated. \$19.7 million in savings were found in the CAR. This is the same number found through budget redirection but reported through a different lens.

Looking forward, he wants to highlight optimizing facilities, military and veteran affairs, marketing and communications and centralizing IT and advising. These are areas of CAR.

Dr. Marrero remarked that commencement was a great experience for him. In college ceremonies, he saw a good chance for students and faculty to engage. GSU hosted 9 ceremonies in 36 hours. Scot Lingrell (VP for Enrollment Management) sent out surveys for feedback. A faculty focus group will also provide input as well as a student group. A new plan should be proposed by July 1 that takes these studies into account. He stated that the Armstrong and Statesboro foundations have been combined as of July 1. This means that fundraising will be unified.

Finally, Dr. Marrero noted that the strategic plan, its mission and values, will be a road map to measure success and also how we treat each other. He purposefully left out the vision statement. He will provide a link for our commentary: president.georgiasouthern.edu/strategicplan/planning.

Investing in faculty is essential and impacts students' effectiveness; thus, our plan is "People, purpose, action; growing ourselves to grow others."

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

Carl Reiber (Provost) reported good budget news: for the next academic year, we have met the needs and requests of colleges. Of the 124 limited faculty last year, those employed more than four years will be converted to either lecturer or non-tenure track professor. Twelve of these faculty members have terminal degrees. The remainder will be lecturers. We will bring back positions for those with fewer years depending on their years of service. We need to be in compliance with BOR rules. We are extending the policy for retaining non-tenure track faculty for another year. Thereafter, limited-term contracts will be for one year and will be renewable for two. We will have 90 limited term faculty next year that will be returning. These limited-term faculty will allow the university to cover the teaching needs of departments. If enrollments grow, we can invest that money in more instructors. The budget is sound for next year barring any unforeseen occurrences. This has been accomplished primarily through attrition and vacant lines, many of which have long been vacant.

VIII. Presentation on Campus Data Security (DOU) – Ron Stalnakar (CIO)

Ron Stalnakar (CIO) gave a presentation on two-factor authentication, which is designed for protection of data. Two-factor authentication requires the following: 1. Password and 2. Some technology you have on you (such as a phone). Faculty do not need it to get into our work station or faculty instructor stations in classrooms. This technology was implemented in 2015 in IT services. In 2017, all of IT began using it. In 2018, it was implemented by the offices of the president, vice president, HR, financial aid and other groups with highly sensitive info. In 2019, it was implemented by all faculty and staff.

Implementation has been tweaked, such as the ‘remember me’ option which has increased from 4 hours to 30 days. There are now 4,026 GSU users of this technology. Of these, 2003 self-enrolled. There are approximately 13,200 authentications every 15 minutes. We are at 91% adoption rate. This technology is our only defense against phishing emails. A data breach can cost \$3.86 million average; or about \$148 per breach. Two-factor authentication is required by the BOR by end of June. Duo was chosen as an industry standard and because it has lots of options and is user friendly.

Questions and Responses: Wayne Johnson (CEC) asked if GSU faculty and staff will have access to fobs that will generate duo cords. Stalnakar replied that this is currently under progress. Chris Cartright (CAH) asked why we don’t have this technology on the work stations in classroom. Stalnakar explained that this would potentially disrupt instruction. Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) stated that she was one of the 19 help tickets. Her old phone won’t download the app. Stalnakar explained that IT can list older phones as a ‘dumb’ phone and enable authentication without the telephone app. Jim Harris (COE) asked why we couldn’t use an external personal email as a second authentication. Stalnakar responded that they didn’t consider this but could entertain the idea. Richard Flynn (CAH) noted that the ‘30 day’ box doesn’t work from home. He has to do the two-factor each time. Stalnakar told him that IT can help with this issue. Mete Akcaoglu (COE) asked why we have to change our password every 30 days. Stalnakar responded that this is the current USG policy, but it may change with the added extra security of DUO.

IX. SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Dustin Anderson (CAH) noted that responses to these items are available on SharePoint. Other information will be available on SharePoint through June.

a. RFI – Credit Hour Production (page 20)

This item will be updated over the summer.

b. RFI – Withdrawal from Courses after WWAP date (page 21)

The submitter asked the Senate to hold off discussion until our next meeting.

c. RFI – Recourse for Missing Policies (page 22)

The response was that in the event of missing policies, colleges and departments will default to university policies. Thus far, only one college has not submitted revised policies. Carl Reiber (Provost) added that if a department or college is lacking policies, we have to go to the next level up in order to be in compliance, especially with personnel matters. There were no questions.

d. RFI – External Review of Lecturers (page 23)

Diana Cone (Vice Provost) responded to this RFI noting that external reviews are not required, but they offered as an option by two colleges.

e. RFI – Notification of a Death in the University Community (page 24)

This RFI asked why the 2007 policy is not current protocol. John Lester (Marketing & Strategic Communication) responded to the RFI and has posted his response on SharePoint. Several meetings were held on this topic, and their findings will be published on the faculty welfare page of GSU's website.

Wayne Johnson (CEC) noted the distinction between protocol and practice; we have not been following the practice. The rationale seems to be that we don't acknowledge deaths because it is difficult to do. He argued that this is not a sufficient reason and should still be done. We need to recognize those that have given to this institution. We are given information about such events as buying football tickets. It is devastating to the morale that faculty can pass away and administration does not acknowledge this. With the recent deaths of Dr. William Deaver (CAH) and Dr. Robert Strozier (emeritus, Armstrong campus), information was not circulated and many missed the opportunity to grieve. He is disappointed in the university's response. Kristi Smith (LIB) asked about the rationale that individuals can send death notices to various groups but not post them on the university listerv. Students were not informed in a timely or appropriate manner. They found out on their way to class when they saw a make-shift memorial. She doesn't understand why such notices can't be announced at the university level. What is the difference in these communication types? John Lester (Marketing & Strategic Communication) replied that one is institutional and the other is personal, and not everyone would want a public announcement. Wayne Johnson (CEC) argued that although this could give the appearance of difference in how announcements are made, but our policy is that family must consent. We understand if an employee's family does

not consent, so this is not a legitimate concern. Chris Cartright (CAH) suggested that the university could include in death announcements that they are made in consultation with family. This isn't a logical reason to ignore loss of colleague over the appearance of unfairness. Ann Fuller (Library) notes that a large part of our success is working closely together. We need to know about that death of our colleagues. This is an important part of our job and also makes us human. Janice Steirn (CBSS) noted that newspapers publish death notices and obituaries. Do we need consent to report news? If not, it looks very bad if a death of a colleague shows up in local news before our community knows about it.

President Marrerro agrees with the human aspect of informing the community about deaths. We need to think through how to do this and be consistent. We will come back with a humane option. Knowing the current policy, he picked up the phone and called the families.

X. OLD BUSINESS

a. Discussion Item – Faculty's Practical Role in Student Success (pages 26-31)

Reed Smith (CAH) chairs this new committee. The Provost's office has taken a great interest in student success this year. No firm recommendation has been made because the committee is waiting on the new strategic plan, but as an institution we need to work together to achieve student success. Dustin Anderson (CAH) commented that FYE, advising, and others from across campuses participated in committee discussions. This is a large discussion as we need to determine where student success aligns with our pedagogy.

XI. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES: Vice-Presidents & Committee Chairs

a. Update on University Budget – Rob Whitaker (VPBF)

Mr. Whitaker noted that this information was covered by President Marrero in his report.

b. Update on Strategic Plan – Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) (pages 32-36)

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) thanked all who participated in strategic planning. The planning committee spoke to over 1400 individuals and conducted numerous surveys. All of the information is available in the packet.

Announcement:

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) also thanked Dustin for his service. He set a precedent for the consolidated university. His belief that we are better together helped us to move forward. Dustin Anderson (CAH) then thanked all of the senators for the successes we have had this year.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Chris Cartright (CAH) made a motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 6:08pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Carol Jamison (CAH, Senate Secretary)