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ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
August 11, 2020
Via Zoom: 2:00 pm - 3:50 pm

Attending: Lisa Abbott (CAH), Elizabeth Barrow (COE), Sara Bath (REG), Scott Beck (COE), David Calamas (CEC), Zhan Chen (COSM), Kay Coates (LIB), Nikki DiGregorio (CBSS), Lisa Dusenberry (CAH), Felix Hamza-Lup (AEPCEC), Allison Lyon (ASC), Shelli Casler-Failing (COE attending for Fayth Parks), Malerie Payne (ASC), Jessica Schwind (JPHCOPH), Solomon Smith (CAH), Kelly Sullivan (JPHCOPH), Jennifer Zettler (COSM), Stephanie Sipe (COB), Ann Fuller (LIB), Addie Martindale (CBSS)

Non-Voting Members: Christine Ludowise (PROVOST)

Absent: Nikki Cannon-Rech (LIB), Jose da Cruz (CBSS), Rose Mary Gee (WCHP), Emily Kane (COSM), Brian Koehler (PROVOST), Christine Moore (WCHP), Heather Shelly (FIN AID), Jake Simons (COB)

Guests present: Allison Lyon (ASC), Malerie Payne (ASC), Sara Bath (REG)

I. CALL TO ORDER 2:01pm

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved unanimously.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Confirm access to shared folder

B. Sign in on Excel sign-in document

C. Process overview/new member training
   a. Overview of academic standing policies
      https://em.georgiasouthern.edu/registrar/students/academicstanding/
   b. Overview of appeal procedures
   c. Overview of appeal review considerations
   d. EAB access training

   The Academic Success Center provided an overview of how to access EAB and key data that would assist evaluation of appeals.

D. Chair nominations and election
   Scott Beck was elected as Chair for 2020-2021 (unanimous)

E. Review of Appeals
   a. Breakout groups in Zoom to review appeals
Result of reviews presented in table at end of document.

F. Next Meeting 5 January 2021 at 1pm via Zoom

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50pm.

Appeals for August 11, 2020
TALLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Automatic (10 pts down or less or 2.0 or better for past two terms) (30 E1, 0 E2)</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>Approved by Dean (14 E1, 0 E2)</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved by Committee (11 E1, 0 E2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Denied by Dean (35 E1, 0 E2)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denied by Committee (49 E1, 0 E2)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Approved by Vice Provost (0 E1, 0 E2)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Total Approved Appeals (30 Auto, 11 Committee, 14 Dean)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Grand Total E1 &amp; E2 Appeals (90 E1, 0 E2)</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E1 - Auto - this number represents the number of students who have submitted the appeal form

**Total Approved Appeals = total approved appeals for E1 and E2 students + E2 student appeals approved by Provost (if applicable.)
I. Call to Order

Called to order at 9:03 on August 6, 2020

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of Agenda

Agenda approved by unanimous vote

IV. Chair’s Update

A. Introduction of members: All members introduced themselves. There was a question by Michelle Haberland regarding 2 representatives from COE. It was determined there were not two elected members. Alex Reyes is the SEC appointment.

B. Acknowledgment of Dr. Haberland’s service as past Senate Librarian

C. Discussion of spring committee minutes:

There was a brief review of election scheduling and the April 1 deadline for elections. Apportionment was reviewed, noting this would take place in January and is determined by number of full time faculty for each college that academic year. There is a minimum of 2 per college. In addition, a college cannot lose more than 1 seat in an academic year. The data from last year was reviewed and it was noted that election worksheets would be used again this spring to facilitate the identification of positions that need to be filled.

D. Review of Election Committee Bylaws (Andrew Allen requested a Review)

SECTION 19. The responsibilities of the ELECTIONS COMMITTEE shall be as follows:
E. Committee composition and responsibilities
SECTION 20. Voting membership of the Elections Committee shall be composed of one senator appointed by the Senate Executive Committee and faculty members elected by and representing each college and the libraries, one per unit. Non-voting membership shall be composed of the secretary of the Senate, who shall vote in the case of a tie among the voting members of the committee. The committee shall be chaired by the Senate librarian.

Membership on standing committees shall normally be for a two-year term with the terms of office staggered to ensure no more than 50 percent turnover in any given year. No faculty member may serve more than two consecutive terms on a standing committee.

a. Membership issues due to Covid: There was discussion of membership changes due to covid: early retirements, schedule changes, and resignation. These changes left both college elected and senate appointment positions that need to be filled. The elections committee chair (Barbara King) mentioned she would be contacting members individually regarding openings left on the senate and/or university committees. These would need to be filled early in the fall semester. The senate bylaws were reviewed relating to the filling of senate and committee vacancies: According to Article IV, section 6 of the bylaws: Members taking academic or medical leave must step down from standing committees, while away, to ensure consistent representation of their college. The elected Senate Executive Committee member for that college will, in consultation with the standing committee chair, appoint a replacement from the senators of the college in question.

Members were urged to verify with the original senators and/or committee members that are on the list to make certain they understand the process. If the situation is a matter of leave or course conflict, the situation is temporary and should be dealt with according to the bylaws (unless they choose to resign). For the Senate and some committees, alternates are already selected to assume such vacancies. As this would be a recurring absence, the same alternate should be used in each situation.

A discussion ensued regarding replacements and the potential for revisiting bylaws in order to clarify the process. Amanda Konkle, Christina Gipson, Kip Sorgen, and Michelle Haberland all commented on the issue.

(Kay entered meeting and introduced herself)

F. Spring Election Process was briefly discussed regarding Senate officers and college level elections

a. Senate officers

b. College elections need to be completed by April 1
c. Special considerations Issues including election timing, especially in regards to nominations alternates were discussed.

V. Inclusive Excellence Initiative

The committee briefly discussed the motion passed on December 2, 2019 regarding the Senate’s commitment to working towards the realization of Inclusive Excellence and towards the obtainment of the institutional value of Openness and Inclusion. The committee is charged with identifying ways in which each it will develop, enhance, or encourage these values, acting on those opportunities accordingly, and reporting on them regularly. There were some questions regarding further meetings in this regard. Christina Gipson asked if we were given any guidance regarding the types of policies/ initiatives that are expected. It was decided a google doc would be created where committee members could brainstorm on ideas. It was decided some ad-hoc meeting or meetings would likely occur to finalize ideas presented by committee members.

VI. Committee Member Questions and Comments

Kip Sorgen had a question regarding the next meeting date. It was noted the next scheduled meeting is in February, but there may be an ad hoc meeting this fall to further discuss the Inclusion Excellence Initiative.

VII. Motion to Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 10:10 am

Respectfully submitted by Barbara King, Committee Chair

Minutes were approved 8/31/2020 by electronic vote of Committee Members
FACULTY SERVICE COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
August 31, 2020
Via Zoom: no time provided

Attending: Kwabena Boakye (PCOB), Sheri Carey (WCHP), Gwendolyn “Denise” Carroll (COSM), Dawn “Nikki” Cannon-Rech (LIB), Kristina Harbaugh (JPHCOPH), Nicholas “Nick” Holtzman (CBSS), Jessica Mutchler (WCHP), Krista Petrosino (CAH)

Absent: Catherine Howerton (COE), Marcel Ilie (PCEC)

Guests present: Candace Griffith (Provost), Tabitha West (Provost)

Normal duties for the chair are to:
1. call meeting to order,
2. send committee notes to the faculty senate
3. edit letters to individuals that have submitted proposals.
4. Two duties that are new this year:
   a. Finalize rubric for judging faculty service proposals (Feb 12, when packets are posted on Google Drive for committee’s viewing)
   b. Craft a diversity and inclusion statement for the committee (due Oct. 30); the committee decided that these three members of the diversity subcommittee will be Dawn “Nikki” Cannon-Rech and Kwabena Boakye and the chair of our committee.

Time Line for this Year:
- August 31 - Call for proposals (Fall semester)
- Oct 2 - Deadline for submissions
- Oct 9 - Proposals uploaded to Google Drive
- Oct 30 - Allocation Meeting (9am-11am)
- Nov 6 - Call for Focus on Excellence nominations
- Dec 1-4 - Call for proposals (Spring semester)
- Jan 15 - Focus on Excellence Packets due
- Feb 12 - Proposals and Packets posted on Google Drive
- Feb 19 - Allocation Meeting (9am-11am)
- Mar 2 - Deadline for Service Award Winners to Provost

Election Results
- Jessica Mutchler - Voted in as new chair for Fall 2020 through Spring 2021
- Notetakers: *Nicholas Holtzman - Notetaker for Fall 2020 semester; Krista Petrosino - Notetaker for SP’21

Budget
- Tabitha will send out the timeline and exact budget.
- This year we have $31,370 to allocate.
- This year the call includes language about travel restrictions and limitation of registration payment.
• All monies have to be spent by June 4th.

*Gwendolyn “Denise” Carroll and Nicholas “Nick” Holtzman served as note-takers for this meeting; Nick will take notes the remainder of Fall semester.
Attending: Karelle Aiken (COSM), John Barkoulas (COBA), Candice Bodkin (CBSS), Lei Chen (COEC), Cary Christian (CBSS), Laura Griffiths (COSM), Ellen Hamilton (WCHP), Mark Hannah (COBA), Susan Hendrix (WCHP), Rebecca Hunnicutt (LIB), Jeff Jones (JPHCOPH), Leticia McGrath (CAH), Samuel Oppoku (JPHCOPH), Ria Ramoutar (COSM), Nikki Rech (LIB), Dawn Tysinger (COE), Laura Valeri (CAH)

Non-Voting Members: Diana Cone (Provost Office)

Absent:

I. Call to Order
   A. Leticia McGrath called the meeting to order at 1:01

II. Approval of Minutes from Last Meeting
   A. Minutes were unanimously approved

III. Approval of Agenda
   A. Agenda was unanimously approved

IV. Welcome/Membership
   A. All members introduced themselves. New Members announced.
   B. Laura Griffiths (COSM) - appointed by SEC - concerns about eligibility (staff member, not faculty)
   C. Karelle Aiken (COSM) - appointed by SEC.
   D. Ria Ramoutar (COSM) - not elected, but was asked to serve (will follow up)
   E. Empty positions to be appointed by the SEC: 1 faculty member from Paulson COEP

V. Faculty Welfare Current Business
   A. Elections
      1. Leticia McGrath was unanimously elected for chair.
      2. Rebecca Hunnicutt and Susan Hendrix agreed to serve as co-secretaries.
         Meetings may be recorded in Zoom from here on to aid in compiling minutes.

   B. Inclusive Excellence Plan:
      1. A subcommittee was formed to come up with ideas for the FWC contribution to the Inclusive Excellence plan and will begin meeting soon so as to discuss it for Sept. meeting and revised in October
      2. Subcommittee: Candice Bodkin, Nikki Rechi, Ellen Hamilton, Lei Chen (Ellen was asked to be the convener)

   C. COVID-19 Policy on Faculty Evaluation
1. The committee approved of the idea behind the COVID-19 Policy on Faculty Evaluation that came from WCHP.

2. Question: Could faculty choose whether they can include SRI or not since for some the move to online was not as disruptive?
   a) Discussion: There was general support for having faculty have some leeway or address in the narrative the situation with the SRI.
   b) Diana Cone reminded us that the Provost made statements during the Spring 2020 semester that faculty who want to ask for extensions to the tenure or post tenure review there is a form for that extension.

3. Question: There has always been a deadline to the extension form. Will that be different now and longer extensions granted?
   a) Diana Cone: We don’t yet know what Fall 2020 or Spring 2021 are going to look like, but if the pandemic has caused you to lose the scholarship opportunity, it is possible to ask the Provost to extend the 12 months policy extension.

4. Question: Is it possible to include the CoVid-19 document to include in their promotion materials even if their promotion/review is in five years?
   a) Discussion: the policy does not specifically say that, but we should encourage faculty to document their difficulties due to CoVid-19-related circumstances in the narrative. The document does say specifically to work with the chair to reallocate the teaching/service/scholarship ratio for that year.

5. Question: has there been a new faculty evaluation form for CoVid-19?
   a) Diana Cone: No, there has not been a new form.

6. Discussion:
   a) There was a suggestion that we should maybe have a different annual faculty evaluation form that is specifically designed around CoVid-19. WCHP is discussing this.
   b) Everyone was impacted by CoVid-19. Some maybe less than others, but everyone was disrupted and the evaluation should reflect that.
   c) Suggestion that the policy should be not just CoVid-19 specific but to cover emergencies in general.
   d) The effects that we have seen this semester may not be visible at first but can carry on in the future. We may want to look at the long view on this.

7. Status: FWC will wait until WCHP Faculty Affairs Committee gets back to us with any comments or suggestions regarding the policy as they are currently discussing it, and then decide at the next meeting what kind of recommendation we bring to the Senate.

VI. Faculty Welfare Old Business

A. Pathway for NTT Faculty

1. Last year, the FWC had formed a subcommittee to review a pathway for promotion for the new Non Tenure Track line, but the committee has not yet finalized this task. Diane Cone clarified that the task is only referring to the
timelines required for a path to promotion and for the requirements for the degree. The colleges can determine their own benchmarks.

2. Discussion: Last year’s subcommittee had a hard time coming up with any single criteria for people who had completed a degree moving into a higher pay or a higher role, and every college had a personal approach.

3. Diane Cone: to go from lecturer to something else you have to wait for an opening for the NTT. You cannot just go from lecturer to a promotion to NTT. What is the timeline and are there any parameters campus-wide to have those credentials? What is needed is a pathway that gives NTT faculty a timeline. The individual benchmarks are up to the colleges.

4. NTT Subcommittee: Ria Ramoutar, John Barkoulas, Laura Valeri, Jeff Jones, Hendrix, Mark Hannah. The subcommittee will come up with a simple timeline to bring up for the next meeting.

B. Teacher Pension Plan - University obligations

1. The committee was informed of an article in the AJC outlining the situation. AJC: Georgia House approves bill making it clear University System doesn’t owe teacher pension plan
2. No comments. No discussion.

C. Faculty Evaluation Subcommittee

1. The Provost had requested a review of the form used for evaluating faculty and asked that it be more uniform. Leticia McGrath will follow up with SEC whether this is still something we are tasked to do.

D. House Bill 1094 Update - University Paid Parental Leave

1. Leticia McGrath gave an update: This bill originally included a new policy that would grant three weeks of paid parental leave to nearly 250,000 state employees, extending the popular benefit to K-12 teachers, University System of Georgia staffers and other new parents for the first time in the state’s history. By June, however, Republican senators stripped the parental leave language from the proposal.
   a) From March 2020: Georgia House GOP leaders back paid parental leave for state workers
   b) From June 2020: Georgia Senate advances bill to slash paychecks for legislators
2. FWC should keep this issue on a radar because it’s something that we may decide to address.

VII. Faculty Welfare Concerns

A. Surveying for Faculty Concerns at Department/School and College Level

1. Members of the FWC were instructed to poll faculty in the respective colleges about their concerns and to report them on the shared spreadsheet and alert
Leticia McGrath, Susan Hendrix, and Rebecca Hunnicut in order to follow up and add to the agenda for the next meeting (if necessary).

2. Categories to Document Faculty Concerns:
   a) COVID-19
   b) Budget/Salary/Benefits
   c) Workload/T&P
   d) Space/Facilities
   e) College/Dept. Level Concerns
   f) Other

B. COVID-19

1. Faculty/Students/Staff Mental Health Concerns for CoVid-19
   a) The FWC discussed if there are sufficient mental health services in place for faculty, students, and staff dealing with the stress of losses, sickness, death, etc.
   b) Kepro and other telehealth services with counseling sources are in place [https://www.usg.edu/well-being/site/article/usg_employee_assistance_program](https://www.usg.edu/well-being/site/article/usg_employee_assistance_program)
   c) Concerns: concerns over privacy when it comes to discussing people who are suffering, hospitalized, or bearing losses or announcing deaths.
   d) Question: Is there a way to make an announcement when someone passes?
      (1) Diana Cone: Legally the University is not allowed to discuss it and family members have to give approval. It’s out of the realm of Academic Affairs.
      (2) Comment: part of the problem is not being allowed to discuss a loss when the legal issue is in place. Would there be a way for us to make a statement known prior to our deaths that we would want the announcement to be made?
      (3) Diana Cone: will consult with Maura Copeland. Cone mentioned that we had a situation when the family reached out and drafted an announcement and the University had their hands slapped.
   e) Concern: disclosures of CoVid-19-related illnesses or deaths.
      (1) Diana Cone: A student may self disclose a CoVid-19 diagnosis or exposure to a faculty member if they wish, but faculty are not allowed to share that with others in the class. The CARES system is the official system for reporting. They will take care of the process, but we are otherwise not allowed to discuss it. Administrators cannot discuss if faculty are involved, and faculty cannot discuss students, etc. The University is being held to a very high level of confidentiality.
      (2) Question: Some students self-disclose to faculty but not to CARES. What should faculty do?
         (a) Diana Cone: If students self-disclose then faculty can report students to CARES but it’s best if we direct students to do so. Faculty can call the CARES hotline
and report that a student self-disclosed so a team member can follow up.

2. **Criteria for Contingency Plans**
   a) The State of the University Address suggested that there are no benchmarks for closing. The impression is that there is no number of people sick or dead that would cause the University to close down.

   b) Discussion: How to continue classes if we’re sick? We can call in sick, but what if you are not capable of not completing your duties? What if you are hospitalized or in other ways your illness disables you long term? At department/school levels we are told we should step in to take over another colleague’s classes, but in practicality there are problems when stepping into someone else’s specialty or discipline.

   (1) Diana Cone: There is a department/school chair workshop where this is on the agenda, a plan for how to take over a faculty’s workload. The Associate Deans are on standby to serve as facilitators to get the Zoom started if faculty can teach from home if they have to quarantine. There is a high level administrative committee discussing those things. There are so many different variables to consider. Those decisions will not be made in isolation. The Governor’s office, the CDC, DPH, etc. are all in communication. It’s hard to pinpoint today what we might do when tomorrow could be completely different: it’s a moving target.

   c) Comment: if someone is tested in Bulloch County and it’s positive, they list the parents’ address instead of the DPH. One of the problems is that if you have 10,000 students who test positive, if they are not listed in Bulloch, we would not be aware of that.

   d) Question: Is the University planning to release those numbers? We were given to understand that if a large contingency of students call in sick that we would be contacted but it’s not clear what the benchmark is. This is a concern.

   e) Comment: the consistent message is that the University is following the CDC and the DPH, and what we see is 473 for 400,000 residents, which puts the county transmission as “very high”, which by CDC standards, means moving the entire university to remote learning, but that is not happening. Many of us are struggling because we are told we are following CDC guidelines, but as we look at how each county is faring, we are far exceeding numbers for the CDC guidelines considered safe for face to face instruction.

   f) Comment: many believe that we will be open for a brief time then we will hit a “very high” number of cases and then we will move to virtual. Though we do not know the numbers, the expectation is that it will happen. Once we open, many will be looking for numbers to indicate when the critical point comes.

   g) Question: is there any way to get numbers for cases at GSU?

   (1) Diana Cone: data for the CARES is self-reported so that data is not going to be released due to possible inaccuracies. There are some self-disclosed mechanisms but they are not limited to
COVID-19 and they are not very accurate. We may get some data from campus testing, but not comprehensive data that would include faculty.

h) Comment: some numbers are in Bulloch EMS and some DPH. Resource: https://dph.georgia.gov/CoVid-19-19-daily-status-report

i) Question: who are the committees or who are in these meetings to look at the numbers?

(1) Diana Cone: President’s Cabinet’s Meeting 3x week with Brian DeLoach, there are meetings with the RAC and all the colleges, then each unit also gets an update on what is happening in their unit that week, there are also cabinet meetings that pull out all the data. Brian DeLoach is on calls with the DPH almost every day, and with departments across the state and the USG. Once he hears from all that, we go down the list and how these impact the various units across the campus and people ask us questions related to our unit. There are also weekly updates.

j) Comment: many people have concerns about numbers and related and don’t know what questions to ask and who to ask.

(1) Diana Cone: SEC is the best place to send the questions and let them take it to the President.

(2) Comment: we have been doing just that, but each SEC member is allowed to ask only one question, and there are not many members to ask questions. All questions are not being addressed.

(3) Diana Cone: I recommend that the SEC make a list of questions and to present that at the meeting and have the President and Provost determine how to answer. To send them to me or the other committees, we are not where to bring up those questions.

3. Outdoor Classes

a) Many universities are allowing classes to take place outdoors. In South Georgia we enjoy mild weather and could also do this. It has been brought to the FWC agenda. Comments?

b) Question: is there anything that can stop us?

c) Comment: some people were told that we cannot do it.

d) Comment: there are some setup items needed, like tents, etc. to whom could we address the question? What are the guidelines?

e) We could ask our chairs what options are available and find out if there are any issues preventing us from doing that.

C. Ongoing Concerns from last year

1. Parental/Maternity Leave - there is nothing statewide and as FWC we should probably do something about this.

a) Question: Other Universities do have a parental leave policy. How are they allowed but not GSU?

b) Candice Bodkin will research other Georgia University’s policies and bring to the committee
2. **Online Classes Size**
   a) Question: context. Are we talking about guidelines for potential class sizes? What is the context?
   b) Comment: we only provided the data. We did not really focus on the discussion last year. It’s a work in progress. We should refine the questions that we want answered.
   c) John Barkoulas will refine some of the questions associated with this issue and we will continue to discuss this at the next meeting.

**Adjourned: 3:01 pm**
I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Finbarr Curtis called the meeting to order on Friday, August 14 at 1:04 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Agenda passed unanimously.

III. CHAIR’S UPDATE

- Finbarr Curtis welcomed new members to the committee and encouraged them to review the modules in the GECC Folio course for useful information for committee service.

- Finbarr Curtis reported on his service with the ad hoc FYE curriculum committee. The committee met every week in the spring to make improvements to the curriculum and included advising in the redevelopment. Curriculum is still imperfect, but is substantially improved over last fall. The curriculum now is an extended orientation with a DEI component. The old model consisted of one-third orientation and two-thirds a mini course. The committee killed the mini course. The new curriculum is mostly orientation with five modules of DEI. Maurice in the multicultural center was highly involved, and this has made the DEI materials more sophisticated and better organized. Finbarr believes now the course will be able to be assessed, since there was no assessment report for the previous academic year.

- Amanda Hedrick asked for clarification on the focus of the course and about the inclusion of information literacy in the course. As a college composition professor, she looks for opportunities to reinforce material presented in FYE. Finbarr Curtis stated that information literacy is still included in the curriculum. Students do read a book and there is some required writing, but it is not a reduplication of what is in college composition. Michelle Cawthorn stated that in her honors FYE
there is only one day that is devoted to information literacy. It could be incorporated into other modules, but it is not the intention of those modules. Finbarr agreed that it is in the curriculum, but much less than it had been in the past.

- Amanda Hedrick asked if non-FYE faculty could see the modules to better understand what has changed. Michelle Cawthorn offered to share with her. Jaime O’Connor stated that all GECC members were granted access to the FYE modules in the previous academic year. Since FYE falls under core, the GECC is responsible for any changes to curriculum or assessment so there should be no problem with GECC members accessing those materials. Finbarr Curtis recommended contacting Brenda for access. Jaime will follow up with Brenda to request access for the committee.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Election of committee chair

- Three nominees were presented to the committee: Michelle Cawthorn, Finbarr Curtis, and Bill Wells. Nominees introduced themselves and spoke about their experience with core curriculum and the GECC. A vote was taken by Zoom poll. Bill Wells was elected as chair of the committee with 5 votes. (Michelle Cawthorn, 4 votes; Finbarr Curtis, 4 votes; 1 abstention)

- Finbarr Curtis agreed to preside over the remainder of the meeting at Bill’s request due to a conflict with a department meeting. Jaime O’Connor shared the Zoom recording with Bill following the meeting.

B. General Education Town Hall meetings

- Delena Gatch gave an update on progress made over the summer. IAA has been trying to put plans into place to execute the charges from the GECC. The redesign is anticipated to consume a significant portion of the committee’s focus this year. IAA was notified recently that the proposal has not been formally presented to the BOR, but will be presented early in 2021. The video and proposal that has been shared is still in draft form and has been delayed from the original timeline. The full implementation of the new core curriculum is now expected in Fall 2023. This allows sufficient time to develop proposals following the requests of the committee. IAA is working to coordinate the curriculum process with the Office of the Registrar. Students will need to register the spring 2023, courses will need to go to the system for approval before that. The push to Fall 2023 allows us to meet that timeline.

- Delena Gatch stated that the committee requested Town Halls for fall term. COVID protocols meant Town Halls needed to be held virtually instead of face-to-face. IAA designed a schedule over a two week span for faculty, staff, students, and alumni, coordinated with the class schedule and offering both morning and afternoon sessions for all groups. The schedule was distributed to all faculty and staff this week. IAA has now added a registration button. IAA has been working with IT regarding best practices for this type of Town Hall. One of the challenges is not knowing how many people may attend any particular session. The Provost will be recording a short message to be included in the Town Hall presentation. The presentation will also include slides from the BOR proposal and discussion questions for attendees to provide feedback.

- Jaime O’Connor stated that the intention of the Town Halls was to collect as much feedback as possible. Recognizing the unique challenges of the start of this semester, this will not be the only
opportunity for feedback. IAA will be circulating surveys to faculty/staff and student, and can offer focus groups if the committee requests.

• Jaime O’Connor reminded the committee that it is essential for this to be faculty-governed process because it is a curriculum change. For this reason, it is critical for the committee to be present and take leadership of the Town Hall meetings. A sign-up sheet was circulated to committee members, and Jaime worked with individuals to fill in sessions based on their teaching schedules. A few sessions remain without GECC representation. Jaime encouraged the committee members to sign up for additional sessions based on their availability with the goal of having two GECC members present at each session. Since there is now a registration for the sessions, Jaime will notify members if there are no attendees signed up for a particular session the day of or day before.

• Bill Wells asked who would be moderating the Town Hall sessions. Jaime O’Connor stated that ideally the committee chair would take an active role in the presentation for as many sessions as possible and that IAA would be coordinating that with him soon. Other GECC members may also take a role in leading sessions, or if needed Jaime or Delena Gatch can step in and present that portion. Jaime will circulate another sign-up sheet for those who would like to present. Jaime emphasized that the role of the IAA is logistical and administrative support and to promote events, but that this process is owned and led by the GECC.

• Delena Gatch stated that IAA has been working with IT for best practices for setting up the sessions but that may be adjusted based on registration numbers. IAA will be providing support with moderating chat, logistics, and keeping the meetings running. Delena reiterated that we want GECC visible and present.

• Jaime O’Connor requested feedback from the committee on the draft version of the Town Hall slides for the presentation. The committee asked Jaime to go through the slides and for the link to be re-shared. Jaime provided a quick overview of the slides for the presentation.

• Jaime O’Connor stated that we anticipate writing new SLOs based on the core element overlays of critical thinking, global competencies, and information literacy. Jaime has started some preliminary research into assessing these areas on a larger scale.

• In addition to Town Hall questions, a survey will be distributed to faculty/staff and students that will ask for more specific details in relation to the core and a comment form will be available at the end of the Town Hall for attendees to provide any suggestions or feedback that may not have fit into the time restrictions of the meeting.

• Rocio Alba-Flores asked if attendees would see the current courses to help them answer questions about current courses in the core. Jaime clarified that a link to the core courses by area would be shared via chat during the meeting for attendees to reference.

• Finbarr Curtis asked if we could provide some clarity on what a thematic journey is. Jaime O’Connor referenced the examples provided by Dr. Denley in his video presentation of the redesign proposal – design and creativity; data and technology; global perspectives theme; or a broad question that can be addressed from different perspectives. Delena Gatch added that she has discussed the thematic journey concept with Steve Engels in the honors program and he has suggested the literature around “wicked problems,” such as the energy crisis which can be viewed from a scientific perspective, an economic perspective, and other lenses. This is where Georgia
Southern has an opportunity to put a stamp on students in terms of what these journeys look like and what discussions we would like to have with students through these journeys that would go across multiple courses and multiple perspectives. Feedback from stakeholders across campus through the Town Halls could really benefit this aspect of the redesign.

• Finbarr Curtis clarified that it sounds like faculty will need to develop new classes to address thematic journeys, and Delena Gatch agreed. Finbarr suggested that faculty will need to be flexible and develop something new instead of offering the same courses; we may want to directly ask in discussion questions what kinds of new courses they would be willing to produce.

• Bill Wells stated that one of the challenges is developing themes while maintaining academic freedom. We may face some faculty resistance to changing courses. We will need support from an authority who will reinforce the necessity of faculty working together and developing new approaches to courses. Bill stated that this will not be simple. Selecting 30 hours is different from getting faculty to build the thematic journey concept into the core. Bill is not opposed to thematic journeys, but emphasized that this will require faculty to think differently and be held accountable by those outside of their department.

• Delena Gatch mentioned that this is why student learning outcomes will be especially important. The institution is accustomed to looking at student learning outcomes by area, but this will be a model that uses over-arching student learning outcomes instead of area-based outcomes. Delena agrees that this will be challenging and will require collaboration across disciplines, which will prepare students for what they will be doing after they leave the institution.

• Finbarr Curtis mentioned that this will benefit those who are willing to be creative and develop new courses to be in the core. Bill Wells agreed that we will have to get out of the silo mentality. Jaime O’Connor shared that in a recent meeting with the Provost it was stated that the BOR is expecting a true redesign of the core, not just a repackaging of existing curriculum. The Provost is aware of the scope and will give support to setting a high bar for the new core.

• Cheryl Aasheim asked if there will be one thematic journey or multiple journeys, and mentioned that coordinating multiple thematic journeys will be complicated and will require the curriculum to stay consistent enough to allow students to complete thematic journeys. Jaime O’Connor replied that based on Dr. Denley’s presentation it will be up to us as an institution to determine how many thematic journeys are appropriate, but it will be more than one.

• Finbarr Curtis mentioned that in a prior conference call with Dr. Denley, he tried to get clarification on the degree of flexibility surrounding some aspects of the proposal, such as digital fluency and oral communication. Jaime O’Connor replied that we have no specific details at this time about the degree of flexibility we will have, but that based on the current BOR policies, it is likely that there will be certain classes that are consistent across all institutions in the system, down to the course number, title, and description. Delena Gatch suspects that these kinds of questions will be answered early in 2021 after the official proposal goes to the BOR.

• Barb King asked about the transferability of thematic journeys, with each institution having unique thematic journeys. Delena Gatch replied that thematic journeys are seen as overlays, so she does not anticipate an expectation of having to complete a thematic journey going from one institution to another. This is offering institutions the opportunity to put a stamp on the core beyond just the institutional options.
• Donna Brooks added that she has a different perspective on thematic journeys based on a workshop in Athens in January. It seemed that Dr. Denley’s suggested thematic journeys had more to do with overarching disciplines or areas of study, such as health professions, arts and humanities. Colleges may have different core expectations. We need to get some clarity. Delena Gatch mentioned that ideas have been changing along the way. Cheryl Aasheim suggested that we need clarification on this prior to the Town Halls to prevent creating confusion. Delena replied that unfortunately, we won’t be able to get clarification since the proposal has not yet been finalized by the BOR. Donna Brooks suggested contacting Chris Ludowise since she is in closer contact with the system office. Cheryl mentioned that what Donna described seemed to make more sense in terms of transferability between institutions. Barb mentioned that what Donna described seemed geared toward helping guide students in selecting core courses dependent on their individual areas of study. Donna said instead of “Intro to Psychology” we might have “Intro to the Behavioral Sciences” as a broader-based course so that a student could make decisions about their majors early on.

• Jaime O’Connor stated that even though we don’t have a final proposal, the Town Halls will help us to initiate conversations and gauge values of stakeholders and we can revisit any of these areas as they become more concrete through the process.

• Michael Cuellar asked to clarify thematic journeys as either broad introductory courses or series of courses addressing bigger questions threaded throughout multiple disciplines. Jaime O’Connor responded that we have heard different versions of this proposal but that we do not have a finalized proposal yet, so we will need to navigate some ambiguity in the Town Hall discussions. Until we have more specific guidance, it’s open to all possibilities.

• Finbarr Curtis offered that we need to communicate that making arguments about the core based on “protecting turf” will not be effective. Proposals need to be framed around what is beneficial for the students and the institution.

• Barb King asked about the core element overlays and which courses those are applied to, such as global competencies not shown for social sciences, which seemed to carry that focus. Jaime O’Connor replied that we do not know the logic for the placement of the overlays, and that some of them do seem like they could fit in other places. We are not sure how hard and fast these designations will be, so it is something we will need to navigate. Delena Gatch added that, depending on system guidelines, if a course could make an argument for a specific overlay aligned with curriculum, it would be allowed to be included.

• Michael Cuellar raised the point that if we commit to creating these new courses, resources will be needed to develop and provide these new courses and asked if we have support from administration. Delena Gatch said that she does not have a good answer for that question, recognizing the current situation is not normal, and that time will tell. Michael said that his department would have zero resources to offer a core curriculum course. Without additional faculty, it would not be possible for them to offer these courses. Finbarr Curtis mentioned that with massive cuts to humanities, history, and sciences, some faculty will need classes and will be willing to develop new courses following thematic journeys.

• Finbarr Curtis asked about the nine institutional options and how we would accommodate a one-credit science lab or a two-credit FYE. Delena Gatch has not heard how that will be addressed, especially coming from the sciences. We may be able to make some of those adjustments as an
institution. It seems that the 18 hours of field of study courses are similar to Area F, but we won’t know for sure how this will all work until there is a final version. Jaime O’Connor encouraged the committee to respond to the survey on the BOR Gen Ed Redesign website since some feedback collected through that survey has already instigated changes. The more these issues are raised, the better the chances of them being noticed and addressed at the system level.

C. Core Redesign Surveys

• Jaime O’Connor shared the draft version of the surveys for faculty/staff and students. Based on the previous timeline, these would have needed to go out quickly, but with the expanded timeline we may be able to delay administration of the survey based on the committee’s preferences. Cheryl Aasheim agreed that we should delay until after the Town Halls so we can make adjustments based on that initial feedback. Barb King agreed that a delay would help us accommodate any changes due to the unpredictability of the semester. Jaime will share the Google doc versions of the survey for the committee to review and add any comments until we are ready to distribute.

• Jaime O’Connor mentioned that we are hoping to form a student working group to offer feedback throughout the process, and asked for suggestions for what we could offer as incentives for students to participate. There is no budget for incentives, so creative options are appreciated. Barb King suggested early registration. Donna Brooks suggested to reach out to SGA for input. Jaime mentioned that although we have SGA representatives on the committee, but their participation has not been consistent and we would very much like their participation through this process.

D. GECC Folio Course

• Jaime O’Connor reminded the committee that there are resources in the Folio course that would be especially beneficial for those new to the committee since we have limited time for orientation in the meetings. The course will also be used for initial stages of norming prior to peer-review of assessment documents. This will streamline the peer-review process through asynchronous training and resources. This framework was built by Brad Sturz over the summer and will improve our consistency in scoring. Jaime will let everyone know when that module will be available.

• A Core Assessment Overview Course was also created in Folio this summer and will be made available to all core course coordinators. It is a self-paced course guiding the process of developing core course documents. It combines materials from the Core Course Assessment Document Handbook with worksheets and checklists from the Assessment Document Writers Groups that took place over the summer, and includes many annotated examples from assessment documents submitted last year.

V. Old Business

A. Core Courses not reporting 2018-2019

• Jaime O’Connor presented an update on core courses that did not submit assessment documents in the 2018-2019 assessment cycle.
• CORE 2000 Core Capstone Course – some issues with the schedule and implementation of the course; lacking central leadership to coordinate assessment efforts; these issues are not yet resolved

• SABR 2960 Study Abroad – no designated faculty coordinator; Kristin Karam, Interim Director of Office of Global Engagement, attended Summer Assessment Document Writers Group and is now prepared to lead that process; with the pandemic, we may not see a report on this course for this academic year

• HONS 1133 Inquiry in the Natural Sciences – HONS courses were not offered in this academic year, but we did receive plans for all of the other courses; plans in flux due to the proposed formation of an Honors College

• HUMN 2321, 2322, 2433, 2434 – these courses have not been offered recently; the committee has discussed plans to maintain one course and retire others; course ownership has been unclear; may be addressed through the redesign

• IDS 2000 Diaspora Studies – no centralized leadership for interdisciplinary courses; recent leadership changes offer new avenues to request assessment documentation

B. Remote instruction assessment resources

• Jaime O’Connor reminded the committee that IAA has provided a list of curated resources to support assessment during remote or hybrid instruction. These resources are included on the IAA website under “Assessment in a Time of COVID-19.”

C. IAA consultations with core courses

• Jaime O’Connor provided an update on core courses that were identified for additional support following the last assessment cycle.

• IAA met with 35 core course coordinators to review feedback from the committee and make recommendations for next steps prior to the pivot to emergency remote instruction.

• Meetings were in the process of being set for 12 additional courses. Communication with those courses has been ongoing due to the COVID disruption.

• IAA will be contacting these courses directly prior to the submission deadline to offer additional assistance as they finalize their assessment documents for 2019-2020.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. IAA will be sending out an Assessment Update Newsletter on Friday, August 21 with additional details about new resources and upcoming events.

B. IAA has scheduled a Data Day with open appointments for assessment coordinators to share the
data they have collected and get suggestions for data analysis and visualization. Half-hour appointment slots are available on Friday, September 11.

C. IAA has planned Assessment Document Charrettes as an opportunity for authors to get initial feedback on their assessment documentation. This is a structured, interactive activity that yields feedback quickly and from multiple perspectives. Charrettes will be offered Thursday, September 17th in the afternoon and Friday, September 18th in the morning.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 2:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Jaime O’Connor, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved 8/24/2020 by electronic vote of Committee Members
LIBRARY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
August 10, 2020
Via Zoom: 9:05 am - 10:10 am

Attending: Lisandra R. Carmichael (Dean of the GS University Libraries), Stephanie Jones (COE), Jessica Rigg (LIB), Hyunju Shin (PCOB), Ruth Whitworth (JPHCOPH), Barbara Hendry (CBSS), Maliece Whatley (PCOB), Shainaz Landge (COSM)

Absent: John O’Malley (PCEC), Christian Hanna (WCHP), Julia Griffin (CAH)

I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Lisandra R. Carmichael called the meeting to order on Monday, August 10 at 9:05 AM.

II. NEW BUSINESS
A. Introductions
Dean Carmichael welcomed everyone to the first Georgia Southern University Libraries Faculty Senate Committee meeting for the fall semester of 2020. Everyone then introduced themselves.

B. Chair Appointment
Dean Carmichael called for volunteers to be chair. Ruth Whitworth volunteered. Dean Carmichael made a motion to have Ruth Whitworth elected as chair. All voted in favor. Motion passed.

C. Plan for Openness and Inclusion.
The Faculty Senate has charged all of the committees to draft a measurable plan to develop, enhance, or encourage the values of openness and inclusion. The deadline to submit the plan to the Faculty Senate office is October 30th. After some discussion on the subject it was agreed that Dean Carmichael and Ruth Whitworth would draft an email to the Faculty Senate asking for clarification on the charge.

D. Changes at the GS University Libraries for the Fall Semester.
1. Reduced Library Hours due to implementation of health and safety protocols as a result of COVID-19:
   
   At Henderson:
   Sunday: Noon – Midnight Monday - Thursday: 7:30 am - Midnight Friday: 7:30 am to 5:00 pm
   Saturday: Closed

   At Lane: Monday - Thursday 8am - 8pm Friday
   8am - 5pm Saturdays closed Sundays 2pm - 8pm

2. Laptops & Technology
During the emergency closure of the university due to the pandemic, the colleges, ITS, and the Libraries together collected 172 laptops that were then checked out to students at the Libraries or mailed to students’ homes so they could continue their studies online during the spring and summer semesters. As the students prepare for the return to campus, the Libraries have been getting back those laptops back and returning them to ITS for processing before going back to the colleges. During the fall semester students will be allowed to check out laptops for 7 days at a time instead of the pre-pandemic checkout time of 3 days. Laptops will not be mailed to students; they must physically check them out of the libraries as was the policy before the pandemic. They will also be able to check out web cameras and headphones to participate in virtual classes.

3. Testing in the Libraries

Students are welcome to reserve a study room up to one week in advance for studying or test taking purposes. They can also checkout a laptop with webcam and microphone to take a test in a quiet corner of the library. Presently the GS University libraries do not have the staff available to proctor exams.

4. Community Patrons

Due to COVID-19, the GS University Libraries will only be open to students, faculty and staff of Georgia Southern University and East Georgia University during the fall semester. This is a temporary measure. The Libraries are committed to serving the community and will resume community patronage as soon as it is possible to do so. During this time the community is welcome to use the GS University Libraries online resources, and to work with a librarian through our online chat service.

E. Faculty Senate Library Committee Meeting Schedule

Some of the members have a conflict in their teaching schedule with the present time in which these meetings are scheduled and for that reason they were not able to be present at this meeting. After a review of schedules of members present, the best times for these meetings are the second Tuesday of the month, from 3:30 to 5:30PM. Lizette will send out an email to determine if the members not present are able to attend future meetings at the new time.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. None.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned on Monday, August 10 at 10:10 AM

Respectfully submitted, Lizette Cruz, Recording Coordinator
I. CALL TO ORDER

   Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss called the meeting to order on Tuesday, August 25, 2020 at 3:32 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

   Dr. Cheryl Aasheim made a motion to approve the agenda. A second motion was made. The motion to approve the agenda was passed.

III. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

IV. COMMITTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

   Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss stated that this committee reviews curriculum changes that include consolidation clean up, new course proposals, changes to existing programs as well as inactivation of courses and programs. Dr. Chopak-Foss encouraged the committee to read each proposal and come prepared to the committee to vote.

V. SELECTION OF UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE CHAIR

   Dr. Chopak-Foss asked the committee to nominate a new committee chair for the 2020-2021 academic year. After no response from any committee members, alternate member, Dr. Richard McGrath stated that this is shameful. Dr. McGrath expressed that this is the most important committee in the university and there is no excuse for no one offering
nominations. Dr. David Calamas then nominated himself as chair of this committee. Dr. Chopak-Foss asked Dr. Calamas if this was his first year on the committee and if he wanted to do this. Dr. Cheryl Aasheim stated she is willing to assist Dr. Calamas, but cannot be the chair this year. Dr. Chopak-Foss then asked the committee for any other nominations. Mrs. Jamie Cromley nominated Dr. Chopak-Foss to be the committee chair. Dr. Calamas then stated that he is happy to shadow this year as it is his first year on the committee. Dr. Chopak-Foss asked again for any other nominations. No other nominations were offered. Dr. Chopak-Foss asked if we needed a vote. Dr. Calamas moved to close nominations. Dr. Chopak-Foss will serve as the chair this year and Dr. Calamas will shadow.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Curriculum Inventory Management (CIM) Form Overview

Presented by the Office of the Registrar

Mrs. Kathryn Stewart presented the updated Curriculum Inventory Management (CIM) course and program forms to the committee. Many new features are now available, including required explanation fields that must be completed in order to submit the form into workflow. The Office of the Registrar will offer more in depth CIM training and one-on-one CIM training sessions in the future. Dr. Russell Thackston commented about the “Will this course be listed on a program page” field on the course form. Dr. Thackston clarified that if the course is listed on a program page this is where it would need to be included. Dr. Donna Brooks mentioned that if the change does impact other programs, there should be a way to alert those other programs so they can make changes to their programs as well. Mrs. Stewart stated the users should receive an FYI email notifying them when their department is included as impacted on the form. Ms. Doris Mack clarified that this field was not a required field, and if the user did not select the impacted department, that department would not be notified. Dr. Aasheim asked what someone should do if they do not know all of the programs impacted by a change. Mrs. Stewart stated that the user should reference the ecosystem on the course/program forms.

Mrs. Stewart mentioned that there are templates available to copy when creating new program forms. The templates provide an outline in the program requirements/catalog page section to provide consistency among the program forms. Mrs. Stewart stated that the deans and associate deans are responsible for reviewing the forms in detail before approving. Dr. Aasheim inquired about the program assessment methods field on the program form. She asked if there was any way to import this information to avoid having multiple copies of the same information. Ms. Mack stated that once the information is entered, it will remain until another user removes it from the form. Ms. Candace Griffith stated that as far as the program reviews are concerned, they are not housed in a database to pull into this form, so this is not a possibility. Dr. Brooks stated that as a committee they would instruct others to find this information. Dr. Delena Gatch stated that this information is not stored in a database, but every month she goes through these areas of the form to make sure they are consistent with what she has in her office. Dr. Aasheim suggested adding a help bubble instructing the user to see their SACS person.
III. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Wayne Smith stated the Office of the Registrar will offer CIM training sessions and inform the committee of training dates. In regards to who needs to be trained, Dr. Chopak-Foss stated it varies by college who is inputting the forms and other fields come from the faculty. She would like to have a bigger training session.

Dr. Chopak-Foss asked if there is any other business that needs to come to the floor. Dr. Chopak-Foss stated the official first meeting will be September 15th via Zoom unless we have clearance to meet face to face. She mentioned to be on the lookout for curriculum items coming in for that meeting. Dr. Chopak-Foss notified the committee they can filter their emails from CIM. Mr. Smith stated during the next meeting we will vote on the Spring Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting dates. Dr. Chopak-Foss stated depending on the volume of curriculum, we may need to meet twice in April. Dr. Gatch added that the General Education and Core Curriculum Committee (GECC) is undertaking a redesign of the Core Curriculum. As this proceeds forward, this will generate a lot of curriculum items. GECC has requested to coordinate Spring meeting dates with Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Spring meeting dates to avoid extensive curriculum delays.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Chopak-Foss asked for a motion to adjourn. Dr. Aasheim made a motion to adjourn the meeting. A second was made by Ms. Laura Valeri and the meeting was adjourned at 4:09 p.m.