

Georgia Southern University

Georgia Southern Commons

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

12-2-2019

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*. 59.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/59>

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

Georgia Southern University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes
December 2, 2019

Executive Summary: For the meeting of the Faculty Senate on December 2, 2019, several Old Business items were brought forward. New business included a motion on the Affirmation of Georgia Southern's Commitment to Inclusive Excellence, a Discussion Item on First Year Experience, and a number of new RFI's. A full account of the meeting is available below.

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. The Senate accepted the minutes of the October 27, 2019 Senate meeting. The Librarian's Report was approved, as were reports from the General Education Core Curriculum Committee, the Undergraduate Committee, and the Graduate Committee.

The Senate addressed several items of Old Business, beginning with a vote on the SECs decision not to bring to the floor a motion to reject the common form and guidelines for faculty evaluation, which were developed by an ad hoc committee. Richard Flynn (CAH), who brought forward the motion, made several clarifying points. The Senate then voted 41 to 23 to uphold the SECs decision, which means the issues concerning the form will reside in the Faculty Welfare Committee. Several questions were asked about RFIs on student names on class rolls. There was no other discussion of Old Business.

The Senate then moved to New Business. Senators approved the following motion, Affirmation of Georgia Southern's Commitment to Inclusive Excellence, in a vote that passed with 54 in favor to 3 opposed. Dustin Anderson (CAH) brought forward a Discussion Item on Clarity in Senate Representation. Amanda Konkle (CAH) brought forward a Discussion Item on FYE and SYE. Nancy Remler asked for clarification on an RFI about starting points for faculty salaries. A number of other RFIs, available on SharePoint and on the agenda, were not discussed.

President Marerro gave a brief report that focused primarily on the budget process. He was followed by Rob Whitaker (VP of Business and Finance) who briefly reviewed a slide presentation on the budget process. This presentation is available on the Performance Excellence tab of the MYGSU portal. After several announcements, the Senate adjourned at 6:03.

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) James Todesca (CAH) Carol Jamison (CAH) Chris Cartright (CAH) Tony Morris (CAH) Jack Simmons (CAH) Amanda Konkle (CAH) Lisa Abbott (CAH) Richard Flynn (CAH) Solomon K. Smith (CAH) Grant Gearhart (CAH) Richard Flynn (CAH) Heidi Altman (CBSS)
Christopher Brown (CBSS) Kevin Jennings (CBSS) Nick Holtzman (CBSS) P. Cary Christian (CBSS)

Addie Martindale (CBSS) Nancy McCarley (CBSS) Barbara King (CBSS) Fayth Parks (COE) Patricia Holt (COE) Daniel Chapman (COE) Lucas Jensen (COE) Nancy Remler (COE) Ionut Emil Iacob (COSM) Justin Montemarano (COSM) Shijun Zheng (COSM) Yi Lin (COSM) Hans-Joerg Schanz (COSM) Jeffery Secrest (COSM) Traci Ness (COSM) Donna Mullenax (COSM) Jennifer Zettler (COSM) (JPHCPH) Andrew Hansen (JPHCPH) Helen Bland (JPHCPH) Liberty Barbara Ross (Liberty) (LIB) Jessica Garner (LIB) Lori Gwinett (LIB) (PCB) Jake Simons (PCB) Chuck Harter (PCB) Stephanie Sipe (PCB) Bill Wells (PCB) Maliece Whatley (PCB) Cheryl Aasheim (PCEC) Rami Haddad (PCEC) Chris Kadlec (PCEC) Jim Harris (PCEC) Wayne Johnson (PCEC) Li Li (WCHP) Marian Tabi (WCHP) TimMarie Williams (WCHP) Katrina Embrey (WCHP) Jan Bradshaw (WCHP) Gina Crabb (WCHP) Susan Hendrix (WCHP) Melissa Gayan (CAH)

Alternates Present: Lisa Dusenberry Alternate (CAH) Ann Fuller Alternate (LIB) LeeAnn Kung Alternate (PCOB) Megan Byrd Alternate (WCHP)

Senators Not in Attendance: Kristi Smith (LIB) Finbarr Curtis (CAH) Jorge Suazo (CAH) Jeffery Riley (CAH) Pidi Zhang (CBSS) (COE) Delores Liston (COE) Nedra Cossa (COE) Linda Ann McCall (COE) Abid Shaikh (COSM) Cathy MacGowan (COSM) Marshall Ransom (COSM) Sungkon Chang (COSM) Dziyana Nazaruk Senator (JPHCPH) Mark Hanna (PCB) Lowell Mooney (PCB) Bill Yang (PCB) David Calamas (PCEC) Anoop Desai (PCEC) Hayden Wimmer (PCEC) Christy Moore (WCHP) Chris Hanna (WCHP)

Administrators: Kyle Marrero (President) Carl Reiber (Provost and VP for Academic Affairs) Diana Cone (Vice Provost) Christine Ludowise (Associate Provost) Donna Brooks (Associate Provost) Rob Whitaker (VP for Finance and Operations) Scot Lingrell (VP for Enrollment Management) Amy Ballagh (Associate VP for Enrollment Management) Ron Stalnaker (Chief Information Officer) Curtis Ricker (Dean, College of Arts and Humanities) Ryan Schroeder (Dean, College of Behavioral & Social Sciences) Ashey Walker (Dean of the Graduate College) Stuart Tedders (Dean, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health) Lisandra Carmichael (Dean of the (LIB)) Allen Amason (Dean, Parker College of Business) Mohammad Davoud (Dean, AEP College of Engineering and Computing)

Guests: Teresa Winterhalter (Associate Dean, CAH) Terri Flateby (OIE) Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs) John Kraft (CBSS) Alexis Stinson (Enrollment Services) Kelly Crosby Candace Griffin (Provost's Office) Beth Durodoye, Delena Bell Hatch, Amber Culpepper, Olga Amarie. Barry Balack

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

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA: Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) made a motion to approve the agenda for the December 2nd meeting. The motion was seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES | October 23, 2019 Carol Jamison (CAH), Senate Secretary, made a motion to approve the minutes from the October 23rd meeting. Michelle Haberland (CAH) seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

IV. LIBRARIAN'S REPORT | Dec. 2, 2019 Michelle Haberland (CAH), Senate Librarian, made a motion for approval of the Librarian's Report from October 11, 2019. Bill Wells (PCB) seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

A. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee – Finbarr Curtis (CAH)
Bill Wells (PCB) presented on behalf of Finbarr Curtis. At their last meeting, the committee discussed the review process for assessment of core courses. Michele Haberland (CAH) asked if the committee considered the revision of the core at the system level. Bill Wells (PCB) said that this discussion is just beginning and will be looked at in future meetings. Delivery of the report acts as a motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

B. Undergraduate Committee –Lina Soares (COE)
The committee met November 12, 2019 and elected two co-chairs. Soares (COE) and Chopak-Foss (JPHCOPH). They approved all new programs, course revisions, and rolled back three that needed more work. Under Other Items of Business, they decided to meet with members of the Graduate Committee to discuss CIM changes. The committee also formed a subcommittee to ensure uniform language in the GSU handbook in terms of concentration and minors. Delivery of the report acts as a motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

C. Graduate Committee – Chris Kadlec (PCEC)
This committee reported that a subcommittee had been formed to look for missing SLOs within CIM. Delivery of the report acts as a motion. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

V. SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Vote on SEC Decision not to Bring to Senate Floor-

Motion: To Reject the Common Form and Guidelines for Faculty Evaluation Developed by the Ad Hoc Committee (Flynn, CAH)

SEC RESPONSE:

The SEC took up this Motion at our meeting on October 11, 2019. At this meeting, we decided not to move forward with this Motion at the Faculty Senate Meeting; this was passed by general consensus. The SEC again asked each representative from each respective college their impression of the form. Among the 9 colleges, 7 college reported having no issue/concern for the form. The University Libraries indicated that the form won't exactly fit to their faculty, put that would be true for any form brought forth. They will make adaptations as necessary. The only college reporting issue with the form was the College of Arts and Humanities. The Faculty Senate bylaws specifically state that we may not take up issues concerning just one college. Out of respect for our Fellow Senator, the SEC decided to send the form back to the Ad-Hoc Committee recommending that they take off the examples and rating scale;

and from there it will go to the Faculty Welfare. The FWC will review the form and come up with recommendations on this form.

Discussion: Richard Flynn (CAH) noted as a point of order that the SEC Response contained some misrepresentation. He then made the following points:

1. The rationale on page 94 of the Senate agenda is a post-hoc rationale that says SEC representatives were not concerned with the forms. He argued that this form affects several colleges.
2. Procedures reside in the Faculty Handbook 305.6
3. The committee that created the forms was not a Senate committee.
4. The point is that the form should not exist at all as each college has forms in place.
5. Departments should be directed to incorporate percentages for workload. They should not apply to 2019 evaluations as percentages were not yet in place.
6. Each college has a form, so we have no need for this form. Departments have detailed criteria for promotion and tenure.

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) commented that the form should come up for a vote. “Yes” votes are in favor of upholding the SEC decision for this issue to reside in Faculty Welfare and to be revisited in Spring. “No” means the issue will be discussed immediately.

Senators then voted. The motion passed, 41 yes and 23 no. The vote to uphold the SECs decision carried.

B. RFI on Implementation of the Inclusive Excellence Study’s Recommendations for Fostering Community on Armstrong Campus (Bill Dawers, CAH)

Discussion: There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question and Rationale. The senate is waiting on responses.

C. RFI on Student Names on Class Rolls (Lisa Abbot, CAH)

Question: Is there a way we can have student's names on class rolls reflect their chosen name rather than given name?

Rationale: This question is primarily directed to protect students who are trans-gendered and going through the transitioning process. Due to their age many have not yet filed to legally change their given names. Therefore on the first day of class they face being "outed" when their name is called to confirm attendance. While "John Smith" may be presenting as Joanna Smith, this moment of identification in class reveals that she is trans-gendered. This can put these students at risk for bullying. Faculty have no way of knowing that a student goes by another name unless that student tells them. This puts the onus completely on the shoulders of the student, who may not be comfortable speaking to the faculty member before hand. If we could have the option for students to have their preferred name on the rolls it would solve this concern for faculty and students alike. I have included some two articles that discuss the issue of Trans-gendered students on college campuses.

Response: Lingrell, VP of Enrollment Management, has given the following response:

IT Services has evaluated various options as well as investigated solutions provided at other institutions. We are proposing the following as a solution to meet the request:

1. A student would have the ability to indicate a preferred name via the MyGs portal "personal settings" area.
2. The "Instructor Resources" tile located in the MyGs portal would contain a link indicating "View Class Roster." This class roster would display the student's name and preferred name in parenthesis.
3. In addition, the preferred name will be updated in Folio's - Class List / Grade Book and Folio Email Address Book. You can reference an example here which shows the original name then changed to preferred name.
4. Important Note: The solution outlined would only apply to students and not faculty/staff. The reason being that the source of record for Faculty/Staff is OneUSG with no ability to change this without going through a legal name change.

The team is prepared to have this available by Monday, March 2nd.

Discussion: Michelle Haberland (CAH) asked if this policy would apply only to class rosters, or also on diplomas? Scott Lingrell (VP of Enrollment Management) said that the RFI referred to class rosters only, but they could examine this possibility in the future. There could be an opportunity to put preferred names on diplomas. They will look into it.

D. RFI on Bookstore (Williams, CBSS)

Discussion: There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

E. RFI on University Closure Policy (Braselton, COSM)

Discussion: There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Motion on Affirmation of Georgia Southern's Commitment to Inclusive Excellence (Bland, JPHCOPH)

“As we face special challenges at the institution, the Faculty Senate is committed to working towards the realization of Inclusive Excellence and towards the obtainment of the institutional value of Openness and Inclusion. Accordingly, we will identify ways in which each Senate standing committee will

develop, enhance, or encourage these values, acting on those opportunities accordingly, and reporting on them regularly."

Rationale: Georgia Southern University Strategic Plan has its center Pillar as inclusive Excellence. While the Strategic Plan was being written by the Georgia Southern community, the institution simultaneously initiated a study of Inclusive Excellence by Dr. Damon Williams. The report on the findings of the study was shared with the campus in "Three Campuses, OneHeartbeat." It proposed the university as a whole follow 7 specific recommendations. This statement affirms that we as faculty leaders will take an active and demonstrable role in building a healthy and vibrant culture of inclusion.

Discussion: Patricia Holt (COE) asked for a motion for the Senate to adopt a statement for inclusive excellence. The Senate is committed to uphold the institutional values of inclusion. Each Senate standing committee will develop, enhance, and encourage our values. Lucas Jenson (COE) seconded the motion. Patricia Holt stated that it is our responsibility to show that we are all dedicated to commitment to inclusive excellence and to ensure our commitment to openness and inclusion. The motion passed 54 to 3.

B. DI on Clarity in Role of Representation (Dustin Anderson, CAH)

What does it mean to be a "representative" of the college while serving as a faculty senator? Post-consolidation, we still seem to have very different understandings of the represented constituency, and how senators represent their colleges.

Rationale: Each individual member comes to some understanding of what their representation will be, but as a body it seems to vary between something akin to a Trustee (acting autonomously; voting the way they individually imagine would represent their own group) or a Delegate (seeking the authority to vote from their group), or sometimes as a kind of hybrid between the two. Given the senate's recent action on an item taken from the floor this distinct merits clarifying. The articles of the bylaws indicate that there are any items to be discussed or acted on should be shared at least two days ahead of time in writing, which implies that any item that will be discussed is something that all faculty should have the ability to read, consider, and engage with ahead of the meeting to express any concern, support, additional information, etc ... with their senate representatives. Taking items from the floor prevents this interaction. Do we trust senators to know the material and implications of items that they have spent more time reviewing than the general populace, or should there be a clear line of communication about values or goals from the general populace up to the Senators?

Discussion: Dustin Anderson (CAH) explained that there is some confusion about role and responsibilities of senators. There are some differences across campuses. Senators should discuss what their roles entail to avoid inconsistency. Are votes representational or based on individual understanding? We need to be transparent and clear. Also, there is some confusion about departmental versus college representation. Michele Haberland (CAH) noted that the Bill of Rights has representatives vote according to the majority of their constituents, but this did not make it into the Constitution. We are empowered by the model of the US Senate to vote our conscious and also in the interest of our constituents. Jack Simmons (CAH) asked if the fundamental question is if we represent our colleges or departments? Senators are elected to represent their colleges, Dustin Anderson (CAH) responded. However, there is some imbalance among colleges in how departments are represented. Barbara Ross (COSM) noted that she is a representative for the Liberty Campus and not her college.

Dustin Anderson (CAH) replied that apportionment led to Liberty Campus as having a representative for the campus rather than a particular college.

C. DI on First-Year Experience and Second-Year Experience (Konkle, CAH)

The First-Year Experience and Second-Year Experience programs are frequently heralded as central to student retention and inclusive excellence, yet faculty are hard-pressed to justify being part of these programs due to the fact that participation is no longer compensated. It is essential for the Senate to discuss the future of these programs and especially to address how the evidence collected by a task force of faculty in Spring 2019 will be used to ensure that we not only have these programs, but also that these programs positively impact student-faculty relationships and student retention.

Rationale: On several occasions, the Provost has mentioned wanting feedback on the current iteration of First-Year Experience. Second-Year Experience has also undergone some of the same revisions that changes First-Year Experience, with similar results--both programs now involve fewer faculty. Many faculty expressed concerns over how FYE is currently being taught, as well as how faculty are compensated for participating in these discussions. A number of faculty have also asserted that the lack of compensation is a significant factor in their decision not to participate in the course. The incident related to Crucet's visit makes clear that faculty concerns were warranted. Nevertheless, it appears that the university intends to continue in the current approach to FYE next semester even though it contends these courses are central to the Inclusive Excellence pillar of the University's values and mission as well as student retention. The faculty fellow for this, Trisha Brown, has spoken with some departments and distributed surveys, but the surveys don't address what we see as the essential problem: lack of funding and no compensation or incentive that fits meaningfully into a tenure and promotion plan for qualified faculty to participate in the courses. The survey does not provide a genuine opportunity to reflect on what is best for our students and the future of these programs. The Senate encourages conducting the programs effectively and reminds administrators of the importance of encouraging students to form relationships with faculty and staff that contribute to the retention piece of this puzzle. These tenets are undermined by the current 'course-in-a-can' model being taught largely by staff (as recorded in the GECC minutes from October 25, Chris Ludowise recently reported that this course is taught by approximately 15% faculty, 85% staff, but it is unclear how many of these are full-time faculty rather than administrative faculty). From those minutes: "Previously, the course was taught by 60% faculty and 40% staff, which then shifted to 85% faculty and 15% staff, but the latest design flipped that proportion so that the course is taught predominantly by staff."

Discussion: Amanda Konkle (CAH) prefaced the discussion by saying that she hopes we can address it in the positive spirit of problem solving. She would like the Senate to discuss these courses in order to consider what is best for the multiple stakeholders involved, including faculty, staff, students, and the reputation of the university. Her intention is not to create an 'us / them' tension between faculty and staff, but to take expertise of both staff and faculty to make the most of the class. FYE-affiliated faculty recommended some changes based on best practices of peer and aspirational institutions but these recommendations were not implemented in the new version of FYE. Trisha Brown, the faculty fellow in the provost's office working on this initiative suggested that we will not roll back to the old model either in the format of the course or in terms of compensation. She seeks workable solutions as to how this program might move forward in the future.

Jack Simmons (CAH) questioned whether, with core curriculum revision coming, it makes sense to commit 10% of our core education hours to these two courses. Michele Haberland (CAH) responded that we should shift the percentage back to the faculty and have them teach it in load. Chris Cartright (CAH) emphasized the significance of the course. He was on the task force that worked on revisions and was disappointed to see the work sidelined and the program streamlined. The programs are very effective at helping students find direction and succeed, he argued. Because it is so important and because it takes up 10% of our load, we need to invest our resources to be sure students have the correct expertise. Modules and asynchronous activities might help us engage more thoughtfully with these issues. He sees the book burning as a result of the defunding of these programs. Melissa Gayan (CAH) noted that if it comes back to faculty teaching loads, we could incorporate learning communities, attaching FYE to other classes. Lisa Abbott (CAH) asked why the program that did exist was streamlined as it was successful. Jack Simmons (CAH) expressed his concern that we may have to choose between FYE and other important core courses. Lisa Abbott (CAH) asked again why the program was redesigned. Chris Ludowise (Provost's Office) responded that we had gone through a cyclical process of redesign. She claimed that FYE was new to the Armstrong campus. It was redesigned to add in inclusion and diversity. Robert Costomiris (CAH) assumed that FYE is to help students succeed. It is a one-size fits all course and possibly shouldn't be. Chris Ludowise noted that this had been part of the conversation but it is an ongoing conversation. Carol Jamison (CAH) asked as a point of clarification if Chris Ludowise had stated that FYE was new to the Armstrong campus. In fact, she pointed out, the program had been at Armstrong for over seven years. Lisa Abbott (CAH) asked about training for faculty and staff. Michele Haberland (CAH) asked about the role of budget in redesign of FYE course. Chris Ludowise noted that these issues were discussed before the current budget crisis. Changes were made to ensure staff equity.

Carl Reiber (Provost) noted that Chris Ludowise headed up the redesign. The central pool of money used for faculty stipends was available. That pool of money would have to be cut, or the administration would have to identify colleagues to find other jobs. We chose to protect the integrity of faculty, he explained. Stephanie Sipe (COB) noted that revisions to programs should improve the program. Had there been more transparency about the circumstances related to budget, maybe more faculty would have been willing to take this on as part of an overload. Many of us on the faculty side felt that this was done as an ambush at the last minute, she stated. Revisions need to improve the curriculum and not paste together a half version of the course that we can afford. Chris Ludowise responded that evaluations of the FYE class and in discussions with students revealed that learning outcomes were not being met. The redirection was intended to address this. In the future, she will try to make sure faculty are aware of FYE decisions.

Wayne Johnson (PCEC) asked Chris Ludowise if we have statistics to show impact of FYE on retention. Melissa Gayan (CAH) asked about tracking students in the future. Barbara King (CBSS) asked about data to compare Learning Communities with other FYE courses. Chris Ludowise responded that the LC were small numbers but could be tracked. Leticia McGrath (CAH) noted that the number of students in FYE classes had increased dramatically, making it difficult to discuss controversial issues. It was originally designed to be a seminar. The removal of themes from the course takes away the significance of the course as a seminar. We are trying to engage students on difficult topics and need to include faculty, she maintained. Chris Ludowise replied that we experimented with class size this year but hope to work with all of us to develop curriculum and make class size smaller. She would welcome team teaching.

Amanda Konkle (CAH) concluded this discussion by thanking everyone for their thoughtful comments. It is an ongoing conversation, she noted. She hopes Chris Ludowise will ensure that this conversation moves forward, especially as to whether it is the best place to teach diversity.

Before moving on, Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) asked for any points of clarification on the remaining RFIs. See individual RFIs below.

D. RFI ON Senate Motions for the Floor (Abbot, CAH)

When did it become Senate protocol to not allow motions from the floor? In looking at senate minutes it appears that last year was the first year in which senators were not allowed to make motions from the floor. How was this decision established as protocol?

Discussion: There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

E. FI on Inaccessibility of Official Student Group Status on Armstrong Campus (Rago, CAH)

Discussion: There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

F. RFI on University Statements & Policies on White Supremacy, Hate Speech, and Terrorism (Cartwright, CAH)

Question: How does the university administration define 'white supremacy'? Either as Armstrong State or Georgia Southern, what public communications and/or policy guidelines has the university published regarding white supremacy? How does the administration define 'hate speech' and/or 'unprotected speech'? Either as Armstrong State or Georgia Southern, what public communications and/or policy documents has the university published regarding hate speech? What are the relevant university policies and/or federal regulations for identifying and responding to terrorism or extremist threats? How should faculty and students respond to speech which makes them feel discriminated against, harassed, or threatened, even when that speech is protected?

Rationale: GSU's Inclusive Excellence initiatives were instigated by multiple instances of anti-black language, one of which included a call to violence. FBI director Christopher Wray testified before Congress in July that most domestic terrorism cases this year involve white supremacist motives. FBI data indicates that hate crimes related to race/ethnicity have risen since 2012, and the Department of Homeland Security issued a strategy document in September which lists white supremacist violent extremists as a particular threat. Research from the National Institute of Justice indicates that radicalization to ideologically motivated violence occurs along an escalating trajectory of behavior. As a formerly segregated, historically white institution in the Southeast, GSU must respond to the published scholarship demonstrating that historically white institutions' failure to address white supremacy results in the exclusion and attrition of students and faculty of color. As a public institution, GSU has a responsibility to proactively address the potential threats of ideologically motivated violence. Understanding our institution's previous statements and policies on white supremacy, hate speech, and

terrorism will help the GSU community promote inclusion in an evidence-based, historically situated manner.

Response: from Maura Copeland, Chief Legal Affairs Officer

The President's Diversity Advisory Council ("PDAC"), under the leadership of Chair Dr. Maxine Bryant (Interim Chief Diversity Officer), has developed and issued Georgia Southern University's Inclusive Excellence Statement:

"Inclusive Excellence is a strategic pillar and a core value at Georgia Southern University. We recognize that our success as an institution of higher learning depends on our ability to embrace, value, and appreciate the diversity of students, staff, faculty, administrators, and alumni across our campuses. Inclusive excellence is continuous and comprehensive; intentional and dynamic; transformational and innovative and is embedded in all aspects of our culture and actions. Inclusive excellence speaks to sustaining a campus climate that honors, respects, and is inclusive of all elements of diversity that makes each of us unique: culture, race, ethnicity, color, national origin, sex, age, (dis)ability, creed, religious or spiritual beliefs, sexual orientation, socio-economic status, class, gender identify, gender expression, veteran status, political philosophy, etc. We uphold that all of our individual differences enrich our university."

Discussion: Robert Costomiris (CAH) asked about the response from Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs). Her response indicated that based on consultation with legal office, the issue was reviewed and students did not violate the code of conduct. How much of an investigation occurred? How was the determination made? Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs) replied that the response was to the Resolution and not the RFI. The investigation looked at all information coming in and sought to verify truth. Robert Costomiris then asked if any students were interviewed. Maura Copeland responded no. Chris Cartright (CAH) clarified that he wanted to ask these questions because the incidents on this campus could culminate in violence. We need a robust response to behaviors and expressions that are historically linked to acts of violence. Is it correct to assume that the university has no statement on hate speech or terrorism? Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs) noted that those are not the legal terms: unprotected and protected speech are the terms that must be used. There is a crime of terroristic threats. There is no policy unless there is a crime. Chris Cartright (CAH) responded that he was not aware that hate speech doesn't have much of a legal force in the United States. It is important that we build on these questions beyond legal and punitive description. We should consider the cultural and social dimensions of what effects these behaviors could have and how we respond to speech that is protected yet harmful. Michele Haberland (CAH) asked Maura Copeland if the administration is aware of recent incidents of white supremacy on the GSU campuses. Is the university monitoring campus climate and social media for evidence of organized white supremacy on campus? Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs) stated that she is aware of one incident. If organizations and individuals don't cross the detailed in her response to this RFI, there is no action the university can take.

G. RFI on Filming on Campus by Non-USG Affiliated Entities (Johnson, PCEC)

Discussion: There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

H. RFI on FYE Faculty Compensation and the use of Academic Advisors and Peer Mentors to teach FYE in Fall 2019 (Johnson, PCEC)

Discussion: There was no direct discussion of this item, although it was addressed indirectly through the previous Discussion Item on FYE. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

I. RFI on Transparency in the Selection of Provost Fellows (Holt, COE)

Discussion: There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

J. RFI on Definitions of Starting Points on Salary Positions (Remler, COE)

Question: Will the Faculty Welfare Committee's subcommittee assigned to write the policy for faculty promotions also define the minimum requirements for employing (as opposed to promoting) faculty in tenure-track and non-tenure track positions?

Rationale: As a result of consolidation, the university finds itself with multiple tracks of faculty positions which render inconsistencies in the minimum qualifications required to acquire full-time roles. The three different tracks at Georgia Southern are as follows: Tenure-track full-time lines ranging from assistant professor, associate professor and professor. Non-tenure track full-time lines ranging from instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, professor. Non-tenure track lecturer lines, ranging from lecturer, senior lecturer and principal lecturer. Consequently, many faculty members hold similar credentials but different positions. The conversion of limited-term faculty to permanent lecturer positions adds a layer to such inconsistencies, which can eventually lead to more inconsistency and therefore inequity as faculty apply for promotions. Consider the clauses in existing policy manuals: Although section 311 of Georgia Southern's faculty handbook outlines qualifications for promotion, the handbook does not articulate minimum qualifications for initial employment as an instructor or assistant professor. Neither do USG policies articulate a specific description of the starting point for any of the above faculty lines. USG Policy Manual Section 8.3.1.2 (Minimum Qualifications for Employment) outline credentials "at all academic ranks" as follows: Consisten[cy] with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC)'s requirements for institutional accreditation Evidence of ability as a teacher Evidence of activity as a scholar and ability in all other duties assigned Successful experience (which will necessarily be waived for those just entering the academic profession who meet all other requirements) Desirable personal qualities judged on the basis of the personal interview, complete biographical data and recommendations The above listed criteria are understandably general , with the most salient qualification being the first--alignment with SACSCOC requirements. The SACSCOC Faculty Credentials Guidelines clarify standard 6.2a of the SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation as follows: "When an institution defines faculty qualifications using faculty credentials, institutions should use the following as credential guidelines: a) Faculty teaching general education courses at the undergraduate level: doctorate or master's degree in the teaching discipline or master's degree with a concentration in the teaching discipline (a minimum of 18 graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline)." However, these guidelines do not differentiate between an instructor, a lecturer or an assistant professor. The absence of specific criteria in our governing bodies' policy manuals exacerbates the absence of clarity in our own faculty handbook. In order for the university to move forward with a consistent , fair procedure for faculty professional advancement , it stands to reason that

the institution begin with a clear, concrete set of criteria for each starting point--instructor, associate professor and lecturer--followed by a clarification of the already-existing policies and procedures for advancement.

Response: Provost Carl Reiber appointed the Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) to create guidelines for Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty evaluations. A subcommittee (NTT Subcommittee) within the FWC has been formed to address this task. At present, the NTT Subcommittee is not reviewing the policy for promotions for faculty in tenure-track positions. The policies for tenure-track promotion are in place at all levels and the FWC has not been asked to address them. The NTT subcommittee has been tasked with creating a pathway for promotion for NTT faculty where these pathways do not exist and to make clearer the distinction between the various non-tenure track positions used throughout the university. The NTT Subcommittee has begun their review.

Discussion: Nancy Remler (COE) asked for clarification of this RFI. Her understanding is that a subcommittee from Faculty Welfare is looking at pathways for promotion of NTT. This subcommittee will define starting the point for NTT. Is this the case? Cary Christian (CBSS) asked what she means by 'starting point,' as that comes from departments. The goal is to come up with a university-wide standard. Nancy Remler replied that there is no defined minimum criteria for accepting employment in various lines. Cary Christian replied that these positions are not well defined by the BOR. The subcommittee will try to clarify these definitions. Carl Reiber (Provost) thanked the Faculty Welfare Committee for taking this on. He asks that the committee be considerate of the needs of various departments. We need some latitude to suit the needs of various colleges and departments, he explained.

K. RFI on Transparent Budget Process (Bland, JPHCOPH)

Discussion: There was no discussion of this item. See Sharepoint for Question, Rationale, and Response.

VI. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – Dr. Kyle Marrero

Dr. Marrero gave an enrollment update for Fall 2019 in comparison to 2018: enrollment is 1.3% down in headcount but credit hours are down only 1%. Spring shows good retention of students. We are down in the number of undergraduate students by 490; the GSU freshman class of 2018 had record numbers, but is now down 6.8%. Kennesaw and GSU both had significant growth that captured much of the freshman market and partly accounts for our lower numbers. We need to find new avenues for recruitment. We had growth in the following areas: fully online students is up 12.1% growth, graduate student enrollment is up 1.8%, and dual enrollment is up 23.67%. The number of transfer students is also rising.

Dr. Marrero then spoke to the importance of Inclusive Excellence in creating an environment that reflects our value. We are a large institution and have those around us who don't align with our values. This statement about values only makes sense if we declare our values, he explained. Thus, we must move them forward. The President Student Advisory Committee is an important initiative in working towards establishing values. Courageous Conversations will begin on both campuses. The first topic is privilege and respect. These initiatives advance our values. Our diversity chief officer search is

underway. Faculty Staff development days will be held soon (January 10 for faculty) and the topic is inclusive excellence. The Leadership Development Institute will be in February. Employee Excellence awards will be in April. Dr. Marrero reminded Senators that an email has been distributed about budget process as part of transparency. He then briefly reviewed the budget process.

VII. FY 2020-2021 BUDGET PRESENTATION – Rob Whitaker, VP for
Business & Finance

Rob Whitaker noted that this presentation is available on the MYGS portal in the Performance Excellence window. There, one can find the following: 1. Budget narrative; 2. Budget data sheets, and 3. New funding requests for FY2021.

Questions: Michele Haberland (CAH) asked about Student Affairs on page 2 of the budget report; the first line on this page says “counseling eliminate operating funds for savings of 95K. Are we eliminating counseling? Dr. Marrero replied that we provided new funding for Student Affairs to add counselors. Dr. Marrero also stated that we won’t have a finalized budget until April, 2020. Each year, an increase in health benefits is requested. For GSU employers, the increased projection is 1.6 million recurring. We will assume it is not funded by USG. Any projected reductions will have to be incorporated.

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) concluded the meeting with the following announcements:

1. Nominations for University Awards of Excellence open tomorrow. See the Agenda for information package.
- B. We are working on replacing Ginger and will do better at maintaining the Senate Website.
- C. The next Senate meeting is February 5 and will be here at Armstrong, on one campus only.
- D. Check the website for RFI deadlines.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 6:03.

**Respectfully Submitted,
Carol Jamison (CAH and Senate Secretary)**