

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

10-23-2019

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*. 55.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/55>

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
Minutes

October 23, 2019

Executive Summary: For the meeting of the Faculty Senate on October 23, 2019, no action items were brought forward, but several discussions were held. A full account of the meeting is available below.

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. The Senate accepted the minutes of the September 17, 2019 Senate meeting. The Librarian's Report was approved. Finbarr Curtis (CAH) referred Senators to the Librarian's report in order to save discussion time. Christopher Cartright (CAH) reported from the Undergraduate Committee, noting deadlines for submission of items and noting a memo to stakeholders that will be distributed by the SEC and serves to clarify the committee's duties. Dr. Ashley Walker (Graduate Studies) reported from the Graduate Committee, noting dates for submission of items and then yielding her time for subsequent Senate discussion.

The Senate then had one Action Item discussing the promotion of NTT faculty. After some discussion, the Senate concluded that departments and colleges must move quickly to establish guidelines.

The Senate then had an open presentation of free speech. Finbarr Curtis (CAH) and Maura Copeland (Executive Council) each made presentations. After some discussion, the Senate approved a resolution presented by Stephane Sipe (PCB) requesting that the administration to further investigate the book burning incident following the presentation of author Jennine Capó Cruet. The Senate voted in favor of this resolution.

MINUTES

Officers: Helen Bland (President)Trish Holt (President-Elect) Carol Jamison (Secretary)
Michelle Haberland (Librarian) Dustin Anderson (Past-President and Parliamentarian)

Senators Present: Leticia McGrath (CAH) Robert Costomiris (CAH) Michelle Haberland(CAH) Jennifer Kowalewski (CAH) Jorge Suazo (CAH) Carol Jamison (CAH) Chris Cartright (CAH) Jack Simmons (CAH) Amanda Konkle (CAH) Lisa Abbott (CAH) Finbarr Curtis (CAH) Grant Gearhart (CAH) Kevin Jennings (CBSS) Nick Holtzman (CBSS) P. Cary Christian (CBSS) Addie Martindale (CBSS) Nancy McCarley (CBSS) Pidi Zhang (CBSS) Barbara King (CBSS) Delores Liston (COE) Nedra Cossa (COE) Fayth Parks (COE) Patricia Holt (COE) Linda Ann McCall (COE) Daniel Chapman (COE) Abid Shaikh (COSM) Ionut Emil Iacob (COSM) Justin Montemarano (COSM) Shijun Zheng (COSM) Hans-Joerg Schanz (COSM) Marshall Ransom (COSM) Jeffery Secrest (COSM) Sungkon Chang (COSM) Traci Ness (COSM) Donna Mullenax (COSM) Jennifer Zettler (COSM) (JPHCPH) Andrew Hansen (JPHCPH) Dziyana Nazaruk Senator (JPHCPH) Helen Bland (JPHCPH) Kristi Smith (LIB) Lori Gwinett (LIB) Mark Hanna (PCB) Chuck Harter (PCB) Stephanie Sipe (PCB) Bill Wells (PCB) Bill Yang (PCB) Maliece Whatley (PCB) David Calamas (PCEC) Cheryl Aasheim (PCEC) Rami Haddad (PCEC) Chris Kadlec (PCEC) Hayden Wimmer (PCEC) Jim Harris (PCEC) Wayne Johnson (PCEC) Li Li (WCHP) Marian Tabi (WCHP) Christy Moore (WCHP) TimMarie Williams (WCHP) Katrina Embrey (WCHP) Jan Bradshaw (WCHP) Gina Crabb (WCHP) Chris Hanna (WCHP) Susan Hendrex (WCHP)

Alternates in Attendance: Jeffrey Riley Alternate (CAH) Lisa Dusenberry Alternate (CAH)) Thresa Yancey (CBSS) Shelli Casler-Failing 1st Alternate (COE) Amanda Glaze 5th alternate (COE) Bill Mase Alternate (JPHCPH) Susan Hendrix (COHP)

Senators Not in Attendance: Jeffrey Riley (CAH) James Todesca (CAH) Tony Morris (CAH) Solomon K. Smith (CAH) Richard Flynn (CAH) Heidi Altman (CBSS) Christopher Brown (CBSS) Lucas Jensen (COE) Cathy MacGowan (COSM) Yi Lin (COSM) Barbara Ross (Liberty) (LIB) Jessica Garner (LIB) Jake Simons (PCB) Lowell Mooney (PCB) Anoop Desai (PCEC)

Administrators: Kyle Marrero (President) Carl Reiber (Provost and VP for Academic Affairs) Donna Brooks (Associate Provost) Rob Whitaker (VP for Finance and Operations) Amy Ballagh (Associate VP for Enrollment Management) John Lester (VP for Marketing & Strategic Communication) Curtis Ricker (Dean, College of Arts and Humanities) Ryan Schroeder (Dean, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences) Ashley Walker (Dean of the Graduate College) Stuart Tedders (Dean, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health) Lisandra Carmichael (Dean of the (LIB) Mohammad Davoud (Dean, AEP College of Engineering and Computing)

Guests: Delana Bell-Hatch, Candace Griffith, Kelly Jo Crosby, Alma Stroaker, Amy Smith, Barry Bellack, Beth Durodoye, A. Saad, Teresa Winterhalter, John Kraft

I. CALL TO ORDER: Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) called the meeting to order at 4:00.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) made a motion to approve the agenda for the September 17th meeting. Bill Wells (PCB) seconded the motion. Following this, senators engaged in some discussion about the order of the agenda and procedure of senate meetings. Lisa Abbott (CAH) requested an amendment requesting that the order of the agenda be changed. She asked that the Senate consider placing old business first. Lisa Abbott (CAH) also made an amendment to add new business in the form of motions from the floor. She made this second amendment on behalf of Richard Flynn (CAH) and herself regarding a matter the implementation of faculty evaluation forms at the Provost's level. Dustin Anderson (CAH) stated that according to the bylaws, new business must be sent two days in advance to the senate according to senate bylaws. The spirit of the bylaws is to allow all people input on Senate matters, when we take motions from the floor, it only allows people that are present to be privy to the information and participate, thus not allowing for representation or input from the faculty. Robert Costomiris (CAH) noted that the current agenda has no place for new business. He proposed that we add it to this agenda. Helen Bland replied that according to our bylaws we can't bring up motions from the floor, due to the explanation given above. She proposed delaying this discussion in light of the recent more pressing senate issues which require attention and open discussion. She welcomed an ad hoc committee to make motions to change the format of the senate.

Lisa Abbott (CAH) then clarified that her motion is asking to reverse the order of old and new business. Item 9B and 9A switch places on the agenda. Bill Wells (PCB) seconded the motion to change the order of the agenda. This motion passed. Again, Robert Costomiris (CAH) questioned the meaning of 'new business,' which should allow someone to bring up something new from the floor. Traditionally, this was the case. After this discussion, approval of the agenda passed.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: Carol Jamison (CAH), Senate Secretary, made a motion for approval of the minutes from the September 17, 2019 meeting. Stephanie Sipe (PCB) seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

IV. LIBRARIAN'S REPORT Michelle Haberland (CAH), Senate Librarian, made a motion for approval of the Librarian's Report from October 11, 2019. Lori Gwinett (LIB) seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

a. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee – Finbarr Curtis (CAH) reported that his committee's reports can be found in the most recent Librarian's report, but he preferred to save his time for Senate discussion on more pressing issues. Approval of the report passed.

b. Undergraduate Committee – Chris Cartwright (CAH) reminded faculty and administrators that the undergraduate curriculum deadline is February 4 for items that need system approval. He pointed out that the committee is looking at software to help make CIM revisions more efficient. The committee just approved a memo to stakeholders to clarify a lot of the questions that have come up in the past about the roles of this committee. The SEC has been asked to circulate this memo. He also announced that he has resigned as chair and Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss and Dr. Lina Bell-Soares will take over as co-chairs. Approval of the report passed.

c. Graduate Committee – Dr. Ashley Walker (Graduate Studies) presented this committee’s report on behalf of Jennifer Kowalewski (CAH), who was not present. Dr. Walker highlighted the priority deadline of February 13th for curricular matters. The committee elected a chair and is moving forward. Approval of the report passed.

V. ACTION ITEMS

1. Discussion Item - NTT Assistant Professors | Donna Mullenax

Subject of Discussion: This request for discussion follows from the RFIs answered in the September meeting. I would like to open the floor to discuss the non-tenure track assistant professor line, its possible meaning for the university, the impact it has on the lecturer line, and more.

Rationales: 1) The initial part of the conversation I would like to have is “how will this position be evaluated?” After researching the 2019-2020 GSU Faculty Handbook per the provost’s response that the guidelines would be in the faculty handbook, I was unable to find the guidelines for promotion for this position. Promotion guidelines exist for tenure track lines as well as lecture and senior lecturer lines. This poses a significant problem as there are NTT assistant professors that have submitted dossiers for promotion and there are no guidelines in the departments, college, or faculty handbook to follow. There are five year review guidelines in the faculty handbook that were adopted in the Spring 2019 semester. 2) The second part of the conversation I would like to have is the impact this position may have on the university as department chairs are challenged to offer more classes with fewer faculty. Since this position does not count toward the 20% according to the BOR, the NTT faculty can teach more classes for the same salary. Will this lead to a reduction of research faculty (grant writing faculty and undergraduate research mentors)? Will the NTT assistant professors have to go up for promotion? Another issue that has arisen is the moral of the lecturers and senior lecturers who did not receive a salary study bump, while the NTT faculty appear to be doing the same job at assistant professor salaries.

Discussion and Questions: The Senate first addressed the question of evaluating NTT (non tenure-track) faculty. Carl Reiber (Provost) noted that there are no guidelines and the Faculty

Senate Welfare committee is now creating guidelines. Helen Bland (JPHCPH) chairs the Faculty Welfare Committee. She stated that the committee began discussion of this issue and assigned a sub-committee to start this process but it cannot be done overnight. She is concerned that time is critical in this issue. Mark Hanna (JPHCPH) stated that in absence of anything different, an NTT would need to follow the same guidelines as others at the same rank. The standards are determined by colleges, but in the absence of other guidance, an application for promotion of NTT faculty will follow a similar procedure to a tenure-track faculty.

Donna Mullenax (COSM) then moved to her second issue: the fear that NTT assistant professors may be hired in lieu of tenure-track faculty who do research. How will this impact grant funding and undergraduate research? Carl Reiber (Provost) corrected that 20% of student credit hours is the USG cap. He noted that we must be cognizant of our hires in light of our R2 status. This must be discussed, particularly at the department level. Jessica Garner (LIB) stated that she was on the Faculty Welfare Committee last year and worked on the five-year review for NTT faculty. Dustin Anderson (CAH) noted that the Faculty Welfare Committee worked on five-year review but not promotion. Jack Simmons (CAH) asked if department should develop this criteria. Donna Mullenax agrees, but most departments have not had sufficient meetings this year, and time is critical. Robert Costomiris (CAH) asked for clarification as to why the NTT line exists since we have lecturers. Chris Cartright (CAH) asked whether we apply standards of lecturer or standards of professor to NTT faculty. Dustin Anderson (CAH) stated that the university does not have a distinction for these positions. Equity in pay and promotion is being assigned disproportionately. We should do no harm to those who were caught in the crossfires of this legacy. Those who are non tenure-track have terminal degrees. Helen Bland (JPHCPH) reiterated that one must have a terminal degree to advance to NTT associate professor, according to BOR policy. Chris Cartright (CAH) asked that departments receive some guidance from the administrations about distinctions between those roles. He asked if it is fair to say that NTT faculty must have a terminal degree where lecturers do not. Carl Reiber (Provost) noted that you can be a NTT Assistant without a terminal degree, but you must have a terminal degree to be promoted to associate. While he acknowledges that the distinctions are messy and unclear, we have people in their career who thought they had a trajectory. We need to make sure they can move forward, and departments can best do this.

Traci Ness (COSM) wondered about senior lecturers with PhDs. Where do they fit into this scenario? Carl Reiber (Provost) acknowledged that this is a problem. Lisa Abbott (CAH) stated that this is precisely why we need to make motions from the floor. She stated that we need an ad hoc committee to define these positions. She asked the administrators to do this. Dustin Anderson (CAH) responded that ad hoc committees formed last year were sent back to Senate Committees. Thus, most of these issues are sent to Senate Welfare. Helen Bland referred senators to sections 8.3.4.2 and 8.3.3 in USG handbook. Carl Reiber (Provost) noted that GSU descriptions do not align with USG guidelines. Nancy Remler (CAH) asked if the Senate

Welfare Committee was charged with writing descriptions. Helen Bland responded that this is true. Jim Harris (PCEC) noted that section 8.3.8 of the USG handbook has good definitions. Donna Mullenax (COSM) noted that 8.3.8 discusses lecturers but not NTT faculty. This discussion then ended.

VI. OPEN FORUM – Free Speech Presentation

A. Presenters:

Finbarr Curtis (CAH), who has written a book on the subject of free speech, brought up some problems with free speech and how FYE is handling these issues in coursework. The FYE has a section on free speech. It deals with free speech issues, including how the First Amendment applies to universities. He expressed his belief that the best remedy for bad speech is to expose it publicly. Some public institutions have responded by expelling students for speech acts and taking actions to ensure a non-hostile environment for students. After the recent GSU incident at the reading of author Crucet, some students felt threatened, according to Dr. Curtis. The GSU talk resonated with many students who then felt the book burning was directed towards them. Students who were hurt by the book burning are now question whether they belong, and he believes that the university needs to make a strong response.

Maura Copeland (Executive Council) is the GSU lawyer. She stated that she essentially agrees with Finbarr Curtis about the potentially harmful effects of some speech acts. There is a legal question and an educational question about this incident. She then showed senators a video about the legal issues surrounding free speech. This video was viewed by FYE students. Maura Copeland then expressed that some forms of speech are not tolerated, such as threats and harassment. Finbarr Curtis's talk indicated that slurs were made during the speaker's talk. Maura Copeland had not heard this information before and said that no reports of slurs were reported to her or the university.

Stephanie Sipe (PCB) read a statement that calls on the faculty to join her in asking the administrators to take a detailed look at the incident. She disagrees that an investigation would go against first amendment rights of students. She read a statement expressing her reasons for this view. She asked the faculty to ask the administration for a full and transparent investigation of the book burning because we don't have enough facts about the incidence.

Bill Wells (PCB) asked clarification between a motion and a resolution. Helen Bland replied that this was not a motion, but a resolution. Resolutions are recorded in the Faculty Senate minutes and are not considered actionable items. Stephanie Sipe (PCB) stated that the intent is for the

administration to further investigate the incident.

Jack Simmons (CAH) Asked to see a written version of the resolution for it was a lot of information. Stephani Sipe (PCB) clarified the resolution is for a full investigation and legal analysis to see if protection is granted by 1st amendment rights.

Senators then discussed this resolution. Michele Haberland (CAH) asked about the incident in regards to the student code of conduct. She asked if incident merits an investigation separate from a discussion of the first amendment. Maura Copeland (Executive Counsel) explained that we don't tolerate violations of our student code of conduct. She says that she has looked at this closely. The fire was at a housing complex where students can use grills without permission. The threats and harassing behavior require evidence. In this case, the university cannot go on a hunt for evidence. This would be intrusive. No one has come forward to say that racial slurs were made during the lecture or that threats on social media were made.

Robert Costomiris (CAH) asked President Marrero to tell us his experience in learning about this incident and how he came to be in touch with the system and the necessary legal experts. What was the timeline? President Marrero then gave senators a timeline of how he learned about and responded to this incident. He began by expressing that book burning is the antithesis of what we stand for. Immediately upon learning about the incident, the university wanted to make a holding statement. He then connected with the USG attorney and gave a draft of our statement. It was approved by 5pm Thursday afternoon. By the next morning, he wrote his own response which was sent for review and returned that afternoon. He was able to submit that statement by Friday afternoon.

Daniel Chapman (College of Education) asked how we can affirm our values if this book burning incident is antithetical to them? How can we bring the community together? Dr. Marrero noted that the Strategic Plan has shaped a clear vision and was created along with faculty and staff. He noted the university's search for a chief diversity officer. He noted that we are working with SGA. He developed an advisory council on student diversity. They have planned town hall discussions and panels. Dr. Maxine Bryant is working on a diversity statement and diversity crisis response. Each college has been tasked with an inclusive excellence plan. He asks that faculty continue to move forward with discussions. He continued work with Damon Williams on diversity. The university has set a timeline on the seven recommendations made by Damon Williams.

Maura Copeland (Executive Council) wanted to clarify that the goal is to heal and help the university move forward. She does not believe we can mine social media for more information.

At this point, it was 6:00. Lisa Abbot (CAH) made a motion to extend the meeting fifteen minutes. Robert Costomiris (CAH) seconded.

Discussion then continued. Jack Simmons (CAH) noted two issues: one is behavior of students and the other is fire safety. An investigation of Cruet's talk would have a chilling effect.

Carol Jamison (CAH) asked about FYE and compensation for faculty teaching it. Carl Reiber (Provost) noted that this was a transitional year for FYE. He explained that the class focuses on student success. Students wanted a focus on diversity, and this discussion continues beyond the FYE courses. For example, Core 2000 deals with global and multi-cultural issues. Lots of discussions are underway about how we can integrate diversity and inclusion throughout our core.

Chris Cartright (CAH) noted that we want students to have civil conversations. Is it the perspective of the administration that white privilege is real? President Marrero stated that yes, it exists, and we have to help our students understand this concept. How it's delivered is up to our academic professionals. Carl Reiber (Provost) noted that the administration needs input to make this course better. He reiterated that this was a transitional year.

Mark Hanna (PCB) asked for clarification of the resolution. The point of contention seems to be with the scope of the investigation, he stated. Stephanie Sipe (PCB) called for an investigation which would include social media. Helen Bland asked for clarification on the resolution, if it included everything in her read statement or only asking for an investigation of the incident. Stephanie Sipe (PCB) stated that she is just calling for an investigation. Robert Costomiris (CAH) suggested putting the resolution off so that we could review all the information. Bill Wells (PCB) stated that if a plan for voting for the resolution was pre-arranged that the Faculty Senate needed the information, discussion ensued. Bill Wells rescinded his objection to the vote. Andrew Hansen (JPHCOPH) stated if Bill Wells (PCB) had not rescinded his objection, he was in favor of seeing the information. During this discussion, Lisa Abbott (CAH) called the question so we could vote on the resolution. Robert Costomiris (CAH) seconded. Stephanie Sipe (PCB) made a comment for the record that she did not engage in sneaky behavior. She shared with senators, administrators, and GSU attorney Maura Copeland. She and Maura Copeland had a difference in opinion. Her procedures in writing this resolution were transparent.

The final vote was 42 affirmed; 13 denied, and 3 abstained.

Adjournment: Robert Costomiris (CAH) moved that we adjourn the meeting. It was seconded. The meeting ended at 6:26pm.

**Respectfully submitted,
Carol P. Jamison (CAH)
Senate Secretary**