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FACULTY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
October 20, 2020
Via Zoom 11:05am-12:25pm

Voting Members Present: Diana Botnaru (WCHP), Kristen Dickens (COE), Patsy Kraeger (CBSS), Lauren McMillan (LIB), Mariana Saenz (PCOB), Joanna Schreiber (CAH), Hongjun Su (COE), Rob Terry (CAH), Jian Zhang (JPHCOPH)

Non-Voting Members Present: Deborah Walker (CTE)

Guests: Patricia Hendrix (CTE)

Absent: Shijun Zheng (COSM)

I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Patsy Kraeger called the meeting to order at 11:05am

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Dr. Schreiber made a motion to approve the agenda as written
Dr. Botnaru made a second and the motion to approve the agenda was unanimously passed.

III. CHAIR’S UPDATE
Update - Member removal procedures
• Dr. Holt stated it was more of a recommendation, rather than something included in the faculty handbook, since people were not showing up.
• If we do not have enough members for a quorum, we will adjust the date, rather than proceed with a process to remove members.
• If you cannot locate an alternate, please contact Dr. Kraeger so we can make arrangements as needed (e.g., email polling vote).

IV. OLD BUSINESS
The following old business was discussed in sections A-D below. Deborah Walker, Center Director made a report on the University Award rubrics.

A. University Awards
1. Rubric was broken down into components; aligned with USG award criteria
2. Instead of points range, moving to single numbers for evaluation
3. Turn rubric into a Google Form prior to dissemination.
4. Goal to have finalized version at last FDC meeting of Fall semester (Nov. 17th).

Summary of discussion points raised by the committee members:
• Discussion of whether points should be weighted higher or lower for some criterion.
  Example: student evaluations could not be weighted as heavily.
• Research indicates SRIs are biased toward women, BIPOC individuals, especially in STEM fields.
• Question of examples of strong vs. “weak” rubrics, to help assist in finalized current rubric.
• Reminder that USG posts the portfolios of previous award recipients; perhaps we can share that website so others can examine what a “strong” award recipient looks like.
• Additional comments about the rubrics should be emailed to Deborah Walker and she would share them with the rubric subcommittee.

B. Redesign of RFP: Deborah Walker, Center Director made a report on Redesign of RFP made a report.

1. Previous problems with summer stipends (they came out of the next budget year).
2. Dr. Kraeger and Deborah Walker reviewed comments and took feedback into consideration when creating the Call for Proposals.
3. The purpose of the award is to recognize faculty development, not so much research.
4. $52,00 to spend between now and June 30th, 2021.

Summary of discussion points raised by the committee members:
• Points made about whether or not we can pay professional dues to organizations; questions about if that is prohibited or has been previously allowed.
  o Some conference registration fees include organization dues. Need to seek clarification on this matter and edit the Call as needed.
• Consideration of adding “Equipment” as an option for the “format for the Professional Development Request.”
• Discussion of adding language around innovative teaching strategies.
• Possibility of requiring applicants to submit a budget narrative for clear indication of how the funds will be used.
  o Suggestion to provide an upper limit for funding would be helpful for folks preparing proposals and reviewers.
    ▪ An upper limit set for this year could change for next year depending on the budget.
  o Request for members to provide feedback on if we should request a budget narrative
  o Discussion of members about transparency of funding amount and how it is provided
    o The clearer we are about the situation, the less arbitrary our decisions will be and the less concerned people will be about favoritism and inconsistencies in evaluation
    o If we share the percentage from last year of the amount awarded, we also need to indicate that this year the budget was considerably reduced.
• Center Director, Deborah Walker posed the question of if we want to make this proposal form retroactive, or limit it to the spring semester.
  o We could consider retroactively funding conference fees but not technology/equipment.
    ▪ Vote on retroactively funding conference fees but not technology/equipment for Fall 2020.
• Center Director Deborah Walker questioned when we want to send the Call, if we want to consider sending it in December or wait.
  o Discussion of Award Timeline:
    ▪ (a) Call to be sent on December 1, 2020
- (b) Close submissions on January 22, 2021
- (c) Review beginning on approximately January 28, 2021
- (d) FDC decision made on February 16, 2021
- (e) Notification of award recipients on March 1st, 2021
  - Removed if you had been funded in a prior year that you could not apply

**Vote** on retroactively funding conference fees but not technology/equipment for Fall 2020. Motion to approve by Dr. Kraeger. Second by Dr. Schreiber votes in favor, No votes against. One abstention. No discussion. Motion passed with all in favor and one abstention. A quorum was met.

C. **DEI Report** -

FacDev Committee, DEI subcommittee draft report was included in the last minutes. No Action was taken in this meeting. No report was made. The FacDev Committee is waiting for instructions from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) for the new deadline in December 2020.

**Summary of discussion points raised by the committee members:**

- Dr. Kraeger stated the DEI report will remain a standing item. We are ahead and will keep revisiting this item at future meetings to ensure it is aligned with the newly released Inclusive Excellence plan.

V. **NEW BUSINESS** - None

VI. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- Center Director, Deborah Walker shared information about upcoming Professional Development Day (PDD):
  - Want to bring in FDC for input on Professional Development Day planning.
  - Fall PDD scheduled for Week of Nov. 9th (a part of the momentum year).
  - Spring faculty development day in January (day before the start of the semester); however, given there will be a training in November, perhaps the dates are too close together.
  - Would like input on time frame and topics for the day. Also to consider if we want a Zoom meeting (like an all-day conference) or something different.

- Discussion on how and why the FDC should work strongly in tandem with the CTE for faculty development planning. Consideration of how to create and deliver high quality programming that is inclusive to faculty and meets their needs.

VII. **ADJOURNMENT**

A motion to adjourn was made by Dr. Terry. Dr. Su seconded the motion and all voted in favor to adjourn.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on 10-20-2020 at 12:25pm.
Respectfully submitted on this 27th day of October, 2020

Dr. Patsy Kraeger, Committee Chair
Dr. Kristen Dickens, Committee Scribe
Faculty Research Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
October 16, 2020  
Via Zoom: 12:00 pm - 2:00 pm

Voting Members Present: David Sikora, Chair (PCOB), John Carroll (COSM), Brett Curry (CBSS), Caroline Hopkinson (LIB), Joshua Kennedy for Brett Curry (CBSS), Jeff Klibert (CBSS), Li Li (WCPH), Marcel Marghiar (PCEC), Mary Villaponteaux (CAH)

Non-Voting Members Present: Ele Haynes (Provost)

Absent: Antonio Gutierrez de Blume (COE), Lance McBrayer (Provost)

Recused: Asli Aslan (JPHCOPH)

Guests present: None

I. CALL TO ORDER  
Meeting was called to order at 12:00 PM by Chair, Dr. David Sikora.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA  
Motion to approve brought by Li Li and seconded by Dr. Brett Curry

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 9/18/20 (reminder)  
Motion to approve brought by Dr. Jeff Klibert and seconded by Dr. Brett Curry

IV. CHAIR’S UPDATE - Dr. David Sikora

V. OLD BUSINESS  
A. Inclusive Excellence Plan- Directions from the Senate  
1. Discussion: Dr. Sikora obtained additional information from Dr. Wilson, Faculty Senate and Dr. Curtis. Two main objectives for FRC focus:  
   a) To establish a tracking baseline of measures that establish the relationship of FRC sponsored research efforts to diversity and inclusion to inform future Inclusive Excellence efforts toward establishment of effective goals and actions.  
      (1) Measures for consideration: Funding submission and award ratios  
          (a) Titles/subject matter that involves inclusive topic  
          (b) Awards that fund minority researchers  
          (c) Awards that study minority populations.  
          (d) Award distribution by discipline  
      (2) Focus will be on small, measurable steps to build a solid foundation for ongoing efforts.  
   b) Facilitate an annual Inclusive Excellence Research Symposium presence for undergraduate and graduate students to present research related to diversity, equity, and inclusion.
(1) Explore partnership with the existing Georgia Southern Research Symposium to include a diversity and inclusion track or tag.

B. Excellence Award Process and Rubric
   1. Discussion: The current rubric will be used to review for both awards in this academic year. Committee members will collect thoughts during this year’s reviews and at the end of the process the committee will re-evaluate the application package, rubric and process to better support the University Award format.
   2. FRC guideline page [https://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/find-funding/internal_funding/](https://research.georgiasouthern.edu/orssp/find-funding/internal_funding/)
   3. University Awards Page [https://www.georgiasouthern.edu/gsawards/](https://www.georgiasouthern.edu/gsawards/)

C. Excellence Award nomination window extended
   2. New dates - Nomination: 9/14 - 10/30; Application 10/31 - 11/13
   3. To date received 2 nominations for Discovery and Innovation and 7 for Research.

VI. NEW BUSINESS
    None

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS and OTHER BUSINESS

    A. Good of the order

    B. Future action items:
       1. Revamping of the Excellence Award guidelines and rubric
       2. November - assignment of Excellence Award applications.
       3. November - Listening session - Dr. Curtis

VIII. ADJOURNMENT-Committee adjourned at 1:45pm on a motion by Dr. Li Li and seconded by Dr. Brett Curry. Minutes will be reviewed and approved at the next stated meeting of the committee

*Faculty Research Committee>> meetings are not recorded.*
Faculty Service Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
October 30, 2020  
Via Zoom: 9:00 am- 11:00 am

Voting Members Present: Jessica Mutchler, chair (WCHP), Dawn “Nikki” Cannon-Rech (LIB), Sheri Carey (WCPH), Gwendolyn “Denise” Carroll (COSM), Kristina Harbaugh (JPHCOPH), Nicholas “Nick” Holtzman (CBSS)

Non-Voting Members Present: Candace Griffith (Provost Office), Tabitha West (Provost Office)

Absent: Kwabena Boakye (PCOB), Marcel Ilie (PCEC), Krista Petrosino (CAH)

I. Call to Order by Jessica Mutchler

II. Approval of Agenda  
Sheri Carey moved to approve the minutes from the previous meeting. The minutes were approved.

III. New Business  
A. Inclusive Excellence  
• There was an update on the Inclusive Excellence statement. Three people are on the subcommittee. Instead of the subcommittee creating an overarching statement, it is focused on creating strategies, as outlined in the action plan. The subcommittee is creating smart goals for each strategy assigned. We have until December to complete this. Dr. TaJuan Wilson is working with subcommittee.  
• Jessica Mutchler asked for any questions.  
• Candace asked about “smart goals”. Answer: The campus has to create a measure of success for the Inclusive Excellence plan, relevant to the action plan. Discussion of goal/objective distinction ensued. Jessica plans to discuss this with TaJuan Wilson.  
• Review of rankings then commenced.  
• Round 1: $14,022 to dispense.  
• There were six proposals to evaluate. The committee fully funded two proposals, partially funded two proposals, and sent two proposals back to the authors for clarification.  
• The Next meeting is Feb 15, from 9-11AM; excellence awards and allocation take place then.  
• The excellence award submissions must be in by November 13.  
• The committee discussed how to effectively organize the documents submitted for awards.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Notes taken and submitted by Nicholas S. Holtzman, Ph.D
Faculty Senate Welfare Committee
Meeting Minutes
October 14, 2020
Via Zoom: 1:00 pm - 3:00 pm

Voting Members Present: Leticia McGrath, chair (CAH), Karelle Aiken (COSM), John Barkoulas (PCOB), Candice Bodkin (CBSS), Dawn Cannon-Rech (LIB), P. Cary Christian (CBSS), Ellen Hamilton (WCPH), Mark Hanna (PCOB), Susan Hendrix (WCPH), Rebecca Hunnicutt (LIB), Jeff Jones (JPHCOPH), Samuel Opoku (JPHCOPH), Ria Ramoutar (COSM), Nancy Remler (COE), Dawn Tysinger (COE), Laura Valeri (CAH)

Non-Voting Members Present: Diana Cone (Provost Office)

Absent: Lei Chen (PCEC)

I. Call to Order at 1:00 pm, quorum met

II. Approval of Agenda
   Motion to approve agenda by Dawn Tysinger and Jeff Jones. All members approve.

III. Updates from the Chair/Co-Secretaries
   A. New member - Nancy Remler COE welcomed by members

IV. Faculty Welfare Unfinished Business
   A. COVID-19 Policy on Faculty Evaluation
      WCHP Final Approved COVID-19 Policy on Faculty Evaluation
      Motion for suggestion to FAC Senate? Discussion: automatic extensions to reduce stigma and make applying less of a barrier? “Automatics” may cause difficulty in monitoring. There would need to be a document trail. Date change (September) will be corrected. Extension = delay in compensation increase. Could we just change the deadline date to be pushed back a year? Could this be generic and not just for the pandemic? Strongly consider a redistribution of effort for the period of time affected by covid-19 pandemic vs extended timeline. Rewording completed with input from all members present. Motions from Ellen Hamilton and Laura Valeri to approve the amended document. All approved. See attachment to be included with these minutes.

   B. COVID-19 FWC Subcommittee
      Feedback received. Information compiled and coded into 4 categories: increased workload; quality of instruction and technology; effect on enrollment; and health and safety measures. Document submitted for approval prior to submission to the Senate. Motion to submit as a discussion item. Leti McGrath and John Barkoulas. All approve. Karelle to submit with Leti’s help.

      Faculty COVID Concerns
      The Virus Moved Female Faculty to the Brink. Will Universities Help - The New York Times
      Please read. Suggestions for solutions.
C. Inclusive Excellence Measurable Plan (Subcommittee Report) led by Ellen Hamilton. Document to review for approval. Plan from Office of Inclusion...27 page document to be launched this week to include a template and a rubric. A plan will be there for each committee with an extended deadline. Will await direction.

FACULTY WELFARE Diversion and inclusion revised

D. Pathway for NTT Faculty (Subcommittee Report) Discussion: suggestion of a change in terminology. Create pathways now and revisit the titles later? Academic Professional title--per Diana Cone, HR asking for a retirement of that title. Possibly remove that language. Really a staff oriented position not a teaching role. Clinical titles? Considered NTT really. Much discussion on this topic. Approve just the pathway? Revisit alternatives to language to be less confusing? Achievement in two areas, possibly. Editing completed during this meeting for vote today to move this topic along. Clarifications obtained from faculty handbook. Motion to approve Jeff Jones and Laura Valeri. This was actually voted on and approved in minutes 4/15/2020. Voted on wording changes as noted in the document as follows: 

For promotion, Lecturers must provide evidence of “noteworthy achievement in teaching and achievement in at least one of the following areas: (1) service; and/or (2) professional growth and development” (Faculty Handbook 315.04). Promotion of Non Tenure Track faculty would require evidence of noteworthy achievement in two areas from the following: teaching, service, professional activity, research, scholarship, creative activity, or academic achievement as appropriate to the NTT to be suitably distinguished from expectations of faculty who are on the tenure track.) all approve. Five year timeline is presented for motion and approved. Next topic of vote is adding this statement: [External peer evaluations/letters but open to department/school level as appropriate to discipline.] Karelle Aiken and Laura Valeri motion. Majority approved.

J.T. Hughes - NTT Proposal - to rename the NTT faculty members "Clinical"

E. Chair Evaluation (Subcommittee Report) no report.

F. Faculty Evaluation Form Revision
   Subcommittee needed Committee not yet seated d/t other subcommittee obligations.

G. Suggestion for Bylaws: Member Representation on FWC
   Statement regarding membership on the FWC regarding representation from both campuses d/t the very nature of this Committee. Discussion: Include Liberty campus. Tabled d/t time constraints. It’s 2:59pm

V. Faculty Welfare New Business
   A. ProctorU (Mark - email Sept 17) Proctor U cannot handle the demand. Discussion item submitted surrounding academic dishonesty and CoVid-19 concerns.

   B. Student Ratings of Instruction SRI - Dustin Anderson tabled to next meeting d/t time constraints.

VI. Faculty Welfare Concerns
   A. Spreadsheet to Report Faculty Welfare Concerns tabled to next meeting d/t time constraints.
      1. Please reach out to your colleagues in each of your colleges to request that they submit concerns that we should address in future meetings. Report them in the spreadsheet linked here, and include any supplementary information as needed.
B. COVID-19 tabled to next meeting d/t time constraints.
   1. Room caps have changed

C. Ongoing Faculty Welfare Concerns tabled to next meeting d/t time constraints.
   1. Parental Leave (Candice Bodkin)
   2. Online Class Size Information (John Barkoulas)
   3. Health Insurance Premiums
   4. 10 months vs. 12 months pay

VII. **Adjourn** at 3:02pm with unanimous vote.
GENERAL EDUCATION AND CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
October 16, 2020
Via Zoom: 1:00pm- 2:00pm

Present: Bill Wells, chair (PCOB), Cheryl Aasheim (PCEC), Rocio Alba-Flores (PCEC), Mary (Estelle) Bester (WCHP), Michelle Cawthon (COSM), Michael Cuellar (PCOB), Finbarr Curtis (CAH), Matthew Flynn (CBSS), Amanda Hedrick (CAH), Catherine Howarter (COE), Linda Kimsey (JPHCOPH), Barb King (CBSS), Natalie Logue (LIB), Taylor Norman (COE), James Thomas (JPHCOPH), Jennifer Zettler (COSM)

Non-Voting Members: Amy Ballagh (Enrollment Management), Delena Gatch (IAA)

Guests: Candace Griffith, Office of the Provost; Jaime O’Connor, Institutional Assessment and Accreditation; Amara Orji, Institutional Assessment and Accreditation; Brad Sturz, Institutional Assessment and Accreditation

Absent: Amy Ballagh (Enrollment Management), Donna Brooks (Provost), Delena Gatch (IAA), Chris Ludowise (Provost), Kari Mau (WCHP), Jeffrey Mortimore (LIB)

I. CALL TO ORDER
Chair Bill Wells called the meeting to order on Friday, October 16 at 1:02 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Finbarr Curtis motioned to approve the agenda. Cheryl Aasheim seconded. Agenda passed unanimously.

III. CHAIR’S UPDATE
- Bill Wells reported that we are still waiting for clarification on expectations for implementation of the Inclusive Excellence action plan within the committee. The template provided was more than anyone expected, and Trish Holt Faculty Senate President has directed the Senate Executive Committee to put that work on hold until we get more information and adjust the scope. Finbarr Curtis asked for clarification about whether the action plan was supposed to be focused within the committee or if it is supposed to be focused on our work with the core curriculum. Bill specified that in the previous academic year the Faculty Senate passed a motion to include inclusive excellence in all committees. Bill has asked TaJuan for clarification whether we are to be keeping inclusive excellence in mind through the core redesign or whether our committee meetings should be addressing inclusive excellence, but we have not gotten clear direction on that yet. Bill said he would forward the template to everyone. He said the template is not simple, and Barb King agreed that it is involved and comprehensive in what it is trying to accomplish.

IV. NEW BUSINESS
A. Course inactivations
- Bill Wells introduced four humanities courses that have been kept in the core listing even though they have not been offered in some time. He explained that there is hesitation for removing courses from the core because it is difficult to get courses in the core since they have to pass the university approval process and then go forward to the BOR for approval.
Finbarr Curtis reminded the committee that the committee had agreed to remove three of the four courses from the core since they had not been offered and to preserve one for potential revision with plans to be offered. At this point, with the new core pending, Finbarr stated that he is fine with inactivating these courses and focusing on the development of new courses to meet the requirements of the new core. Bill asked Candace Griffith for clarification on removing courses from the core. Candace replied that removing a course is fairly simple. Once it has university approval, she will need to send a memo to the system office notifying them to remove that course. Candace agreed that it made sense to wait on adding things to the core since we will be redoing everything in the redesign. Finbarr also stated that keeping those courses in the listing for students was misleading since the courses are not actually offered.

• Michelle Cawthorn asked if the college has a say in inactivating the courses. Jaime O’Connor responded that these proposals came from the college and had already gone through approval to come to the GECC. Jaime also explained that since the core redesign timeline has been pushed back while we are also approaching our reaffirmation for accreditation, it is essential for us to have evidence of assessment from all courses, which made it more urgent to remove courses that are not being offered from the core.

MOTION: Finbarr Curtis motioned to remove the four humanities courses (HUMN 2321, HUMN 2322, HUMN 2433, HUMN 2434) that aren’t being taught to be inactivated from the core. Cheryl Aashiem seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

B. Review/discussion of norming scores

• Jaime O’Connor shared the results of the core course assessment document that committee members had been asked to score as part of the calibration training and norming process. The committee discussed each rubric trait, paying attention to divergent scores on specific traits.

• Michelle Cawthorn noted that one reviewer has asked for differentiation between the lecture and lab portions of the course since it was a science course and reminded the committee that they had previously determined that lecture and lab did not need to be reported separately. Natalie Logue asked why it was not necessary to report on labs. Michelle Cawthorn specified that the content of the labs was the same as in the lecture and was measured by the same outcomes. Science faculty felt burdened by having to report on both components separately when it was focused on the same SLOs. Natalie asked a follow up question, noting that the assessment document had included examples from the labs and asked if that was appropriate. Jaime replied that there was no problem with the labs being included, but that there is no expectation of separate scoring or reporting for the lectures and labs. Bill Wells asked if labs were being conducted online and if they were still considered part of the course. Michelle Cawthorn explained that labs are still happening, but the circumstances under COVID-19 are very challenging and far from ideal for faculty and students.

• Jaime O’Connor reminded the committee of the difference between a direct measure and an indirect measure since there seemed to be some confusion about those definitions. Jaime also stated that if a strong alignment between course SLOs and the Core Area Outcome was established in the first section of the report, the course could report results based on course SLOs and still be in alignment with the Core Area Outcome. Finbarr Curtis agreed and said that once that alignment is established, we do not expect courses to repetitively restate the Core Area Outcome throughout the assessment document.

• Jaime O’Connor stated that the committee should score the assessment document based on the language in the rubric but that they could offer comments and suggestions that go
beyond the specifications of the rubric if they thought there were opportunities for improving the assessment process and student learning.

- Michelle Cawthorn brought up sampling strategies for large enrollment courses as a reasonable strategy. Bill Wells pointed out the issue with some faculty not participating in the assessment. Jaime O’Connor agreed that in certain cases that was a persistent issue and that those responsible for drafting the assessment document often had little control or influence in those situations.

- Linda Kimsey asked for clarification about the inclusion of the assessment plan and how that was different from the assessment document. Jaime O’Connor explained that following consolidation, we had asked core courses to present a shared assessment plan to be followed by all courses on all campuses and then to collect pilot data based on that plan. When IAA shares the review materials with committee members, they include the previously submitted documents along with prior feedback to that course so that committee members can see if previous feedback was addressed and applied in the current document. Linda asked a follow up question about the check box for the assessment plan on the Smartsheet form. Jaime stated that in a few cases, core courses may submit an assessment plan if they are behind schedule on developing their assessment process. If a committee member noticed a document that included no results or discussion, they should check the box for assessment plan to indicate that it is not a complete assessment document. Jaime also mentioned that some courses who were working on plans and assessment data would not be submitting until spring semester to allow time for IAA to work with them more directly on the development stage.

- Jaime O’Connor reminded the committee that they do need to enter comments to accompany each score. Comments in the individual review are used when reconciling scores with the second reviewer and comments made in the reconciliation review would be shared back with the person who submitted the report along with their department chair. Jaime encouraged the committee to be mindful of the tone used in comments and to include comments that would point toward specific things that can be improved. It is fine to pull language directly from the rubric to help the document author to know what to focus on and if a committee member is unsure of a specific recommendation, they can refer the author to consult with IAA for resources and support in a particular area. Jaime also encouraged committee members to point out positive aspects of the assessment document, particularly recognizing the significant challenges everyone has been working under recently.

- Jaime O’Connor mentioned that in the documents submitted so far, she has noted cases where courses had strong action plans, but because of COVID-19 those action plans have been delayed or were unable to be executed. She anticipates we may see some lower scores in this area because of COVID impacts, and she asked the committee to acknowledge these circumstances in the comments that accompany scores.

- Bill Wells pointed out that there was no evidence of support from other faculty in the proposed action plan. This lack of participation seems to be something that should be addressed by department chairs or deans. Jaime O’Connor agreed that it is sometimes difficult to tell what kind of collaboration may have taken place unless the document author is very explicit about that.

- Finbarr Curtis pointed out that for most of the beginning level rubric traits, nothing is included or proposed, so if something has been offered in that portion of the document it can almost always be scored higher than beginning.

- Jaime O’Connor asked if there were any issues or questions related to using Smartsheet. She reminded the committee that they will each receive one email for each course that includes all of the links needed to complete the review, the name and contact info for the
review partner, and the form to submit the final review. Jaime reminded the committee that the two reviewers should interact to produce the reconciliation review, either by email (if scores and comments are very similar) or over the phone or by Zoom if there seems to be divergence in scores and comments.

- Jaime O’Connor stated that committee members would be reviewing 9 or 10 documents with one or two review partners and that they would have 14 days from the initial notification to complete the full review. For courses that have been granted a submission extension, the reviewers would still have 14 days from the date that they receive the request for review from Smartsheet.

- Jaime O’Connor mentioned that reviewers could recommend IAA intervention for courses that fell at developing or below in multiple categories or if the issues seemed complex and might require additional support or assistance. IAA will review recommendations and make determinations about appropriate assistance. Jaime will also follow up with a list of all courses and the campuses they should be including in the presented data.

- Jennifer Zettler asked about the confidential comments fields in the form. Jaime O’Connor replied that that field is provided for any internal notes a reviewer might want to make to remember discussion points for reconciliation or any issues that needed to be addressed internally by the GECC.

- Natalie Logue asked about when the courses would be received and what happens if a reviewer cannot complete the review in the 14 days due to vacation or other obligations. Jaime O’Connor said the committee understands that sometimes there are delays, but we are trying to make sure feedback goes back to courses in time for them to implement any recommendations. Cheryl Aasheim mentioned she was anticipating some delays due to the ABET visit in her department.

- Jennifer Zettler asked about course submissions that were consistently not meeting expectations. Jaime O’Connor explained that IAA monitors those courses closely and has been proactive in addressing those cases. Last year, IAA staff met with over 30 individual core courses to offer additional support. In many cases, there were good processes in place, but the document had not sufficiently captured all of the activities taking place.

- Natalie Logue asked about the check box on the form asking if a course is recommended to be shared with SACSCOC. Jaime O’Connor explained that IAA is looking for examples of how assessment has been used to improve student learning to share in our reaffirmation of accreditation report. IAA is asking the committee members to indicate any courses that have offered a particularly strong assessment process so that we can consider those first when looking for examples.

C. General Education Redesign campus survey – next steps

- Jaime O’Connor updated the committee on plans to distribute a follow-up survey across campus as the next step in gathering information for the General Education redesign. IAA has decided to hold on sending a survey to faculty and staff until after we receive a finalized proposal from the BOR to ensure we are working on student learning outcomes that reflect the final proposal. However, due to low participation from students in the Town Hall sessions, IAA has been working with IR to plan and distribute a survey to all students across campus to collect additional feedback from the student perspective. Jaime shared the most recent draft of survey items which follow a similar pattern to the Town Hall questions, but also including some questions about factors in course selection and optimal places to share information about the new core curriculum. Jaime will share the Google doc with all committee members, and they have until Wednesday, October 21st to add any comments or questions. IAA is also working with Communications and Marketing to promote the survey to
increase student responses.

- Jaime O’Connor mentioned that the survey also requests volunteers to join a student working group that we are hoping to form to get feedback from the student perspective throughout the redesign process.
- Bill Wells asked how all of the open-ended items will be processed and interpreted. Jaime O’Connor responded that Qualtrics has incorporated some text analysis tools that will be used and that IAA, specifically Amara Orji the IAA graduate assistant, will be working to review and finalize the coding. Results will then be shared back with the committee.

V. Old Business

A. Update on submission status for core documents

- Jaime O’Connor shared the core submission dashboard from Smartsheet showing that 83% of core courses have been received with 17% outstanding, most of which have provided an extension request that has been granted by IAA. IAA has followed up with all outstanding courses and will continue to do so.
- Bill Wells asked if the outstanding courses this year are the same ones that lagged behind the deadline in the previous year. Jaime O’Connor shared the list of outstanding courses and explained that some are from small departments that are struggling with COVID-19 related complications, in some cases; department chairs did not accurately identify the appropriate contact person so IAA offered extended deadlines so communication could be redirected. Some who have requested extensions have previously submitted excellent documentation, so that has been taken into account in granting extensions as well.
- Finbarr Curtis asked which courses fall under the Provost Office. Jaime O’Connor stated that those courses were FYE 1220, CORE 2000, and SABR 2960.
- Bill Wells stated that reporting results by campus is a SACSCOC requirement, so courses on multiple campuses, including online, should be reporting on all of those locations. Jaime O’Connor confirmed that results need to be reported by location and that the new template has headings for each campus, so if they used the correct template, it should be easy to identify if they have met that requirement.
- Bill Wells stated that most units put in a good effort to meet the requirements. There are some who struggle because they may not have sufficient knowledge or support to complete the documentation. Most of what you are reviewing will be good. Bill also said the organization of the documents and reviews is an improvement over past systems, particularly having scores and comments from both reviewers to complete the reconciliation.
- Michael Cuellar asked for clarification on which document is the one for review. Brad Sturz responded that the first link in the email is the current document for review and scoring and that at the bottom of the email that link would be highlighted in red.
- Bill Wells recommended committee members to contact Jaime O’Connor or Brad Sturz if they had any questions or needed assistance during the review process.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. Core course assessment documents will go out to the committee via Smartsheet today and reminders will be automatically sent once the 14 day deadline has passed.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Amanda Hedrick motioned to adjourn the meeting. Matthew Flynn seconded the motion. Motion to adjourn approved at 2:07 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,
Jaime O’Connor, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved October 21, 2020 by electronic vote of Committee Members
Voting Members Present: Shelli Casler-Failing, chair (COE), William Amponsah (PCOB), Ann Fuller (LIB), Laurie Gould (CBSS), Andrew Hansen (JPHCOPH), Ming Fang He (COE), Nicholas Holtzman (CBSS), Amanda Konkle (CAH), Michele McGibony (COSM), Jessica Rigg (LIB), Jessica Schwind (JPHCOPH), Caren Town (CAH), Linda Tuck (WCHP), Xiaoming Yang (PCEC), Rocio Alba-Flores [Alternate] (CEC), Elizabeth Barrow [Alternate] (COE), Dr. Bill Mase [Alternate] (JPHCOPH), Taylor Norman, [Alternate] (COE), Krista Petrosino, [Alternate] (CAH), Kristi Smith, [Alternate] (LIB), Ji Wu [Alternate] (COSM)

Non-Voting Members Present: Donna Brooks (Provost), Candace Griffith (Provost), Delena Gatch (IAA), Ashley Walker (COGS)

Guests: Brenda Blackwell (CBSS), Dina Walker DeVose (CBSS), Checo Colón-Gaud (COGS), Audie Graham (COGS), Tiffany Hedrick (Registrar’s Office), Jolyon Hughes (CAH), Brian Koehler (COSM), Doris Mack (Registrar’s Office), Nandi Marshall (JPHCOPH), Norton Pease (CAH), Rand Ressler (PCOB), Stephen Rossi (WCHP), Christina Samuel (GSO), Wayne Smith (Registrar’s Office), Kathryn Stewart (Registrar’s Office), Randi Sykora (COGS), Deborah Thomas (COE), David Williams (PCEC), Wendy Sikora (COGS), Wayne Smith (Registrar’s Office), Kathryn Stewart (Registrar’s Office), Randi Sykora (COGS), Deborah Thomas (COE), David Williams (PCEC)

Absent: Christine Bedore (COSM), Timothy Cairney (PCOB), Greg Ryan (WCHP)

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Shelli Casler-Failing called the meeting to order on Thursday, October 8, 2020 at 9:00 AM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Ming Fang He made a motion to approve the agenda as written. A second was made by Dr. Michele McGibony and the motion to approve the agenda was passed.

III. CHAIR’S UPDATE

A. Member Rotation

Dr. Casler-Failing said it has been strongly suggested by Faculty Senate that 50% of the voting Graduate Committee members should rotate out each term. After reviewing this year’s membership list Dr. Casler-Failing asked for volunteers to rotate out at the end of term 2021. As members appointed by the SEC, Dr. Amanda Konkle and Ann Fuller volunteered to rotate off after this fiscal year. Dr. Nicholas Holtzman volunteered to rotate off as a member elected by the college. Dr. Casler-Failing thanked the members who volunteered, and said she will share this information with the Faculty Senate.

IV. DEAN’S UPDATE

Dr. Ashley Walker shared the following updates:

- The College of Graduate Studies (COGS) launched Slate, the new graduate admissions application system, on Thursday, October 1. Applications are now being submitted for the Summer and Fall 2021 terms. Graduate Admissions has already been in contact with some Program Directors to
conduct training sessions. Megan Murray will be reaching out to more Program Directors to schedule training. If you have questions contact gradadmissions@georgiasouthern.edu.

• COGS has started the Graduate Executive Council (GEC). The purpose of the council is to meet with Program Directors who were nominated by their Deans on a monthly basis to discuss issues and proposed policy changes related to graduate education. The council has met once and the members include the following:
  Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss – Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health
  Dr. Linda Kimsey – Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health
  Dr. Abby Brooks – College of Arts and Humanities
  Dr. Marcela Ruiz-Funes – College of Arts and Humanities
  Dr. Thresa Yancey – College of Behavioral and Social Sciences
  Dr. Eric Silva – College of Behavioral and Social Sciences
  Dr. Gursimran Singh Walia – College of Engineering and Computing
  Dr. Francisco Cubas Suazo – College of Engineering and Computing
  Dr. John Carroll – College of Science and Mathematics
  Dr. Christine Hladik – College of Science and Mathematics
  Dr. Lowell Mooney – Parker College of Business
  Dr. Stephanie Hairston – Parker College of Business
  Dr. Shelli Casler-Failing – College of Education
  Dr. Cordelia Zinskie – College of Education
  Dr. Brandonn Harris – Waters College of Health Professions
  Dr. Linda Tuck – Waters College of Health Professions
  Dr. Rebecca Hunnicutt - University Libraries
  Dr. Checo Colón-Gaud – Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies (Ex-Officio Member)
  Dr. Ashley Walker – Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies

Starting in the spring the GEC meetings will be publicized to allow guests to attend the meetings.

• The Graduate Student Organization’s next grant cycle deadline is November 13. Please encourage your students to submit proposals for travel/research funding. COGS will send emails reminders to students.

The Statesboro GSO will be hosting virtual Graduate Writer’s Boot Camp sessions on October 19-22 and November 16-19. The registration deadline for the first session is 5 PM on October 14th. During the October session the GSO will be offering a motivational week to help students meet their writing goals, buddy system style. The registrants will be paired with a fellow graduate student to communicate with throughout the week via email, text, call or video chat. The boot camps are open to graduate students on both campus. COGS will be sending additional information and reminders to students regarding these events.

• The first COGS webinar/social hour was held September 24th with Amber Culpepper as the guest speaker who shared Equal Opportunity & Title IX information. The next COGS social hour for graduate students will be held on Thursday, November 5, from 5:30-6:30 PM. The guest speakers for the virtual session will be Dr. Tracy Linderholm and Dr. Amy Hackney and they will provide an Imposter Syndrome presentation. COGS will send emails to graduate students with additional information as the date approaches.
The admission’s team in COGS will be participating in the Carolina HBCU Career Talent Showcase Graduate Fair on October 20. We are also in the planning process of developing our own virtual recruitment event. Details will be shared as plans are finalized. If programs would like additional information on the virtual fairs please contact Megan Murray, meganmurray@georgiasouthern.edu. COGS has also registered to participate in the SACNAS Conference (Society of Advanced Chicanos/Hispanics & Native Americans in Science) on October 19-24th. Dr. Walker thanked the following areas who helped contribute to the registration fee expense: College of Science and Mathematics, Office of Inclusive Excellence, College of Engineering and Computing, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health, and the Waters College of Health Professions. Representatives from various areas on campus will participate in this conference. Dr. Checo Colón-Gaud, the COGS new Associate Dean, has been very involved in this conference and is excited to have this opportunity. If you have questions about the SACNAS conference contact Mrs. Murray or Dr. Colón-Gaud.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. College of Arts and Humanities

Mr. Norton Pease presented the agenda item for the College of Arts and Humanities. Department of Literature

Revised Program:
MA-ENGL: English M.A.

JUSTIFICATION:
We would like the change in admission requirements to apply to students who are seeking admission for Fall 2021. We wish to eliminate the GRE as an admission requirement for the M.A. English program. This follows national trends and recognizes research that suggests the GRE under predicts success for minority students and women over 25. In addition, requiring the GRE disadvantages low income students because of the high cost of taking the test.

MOTION: Dr. Krista Petrosino made a motion to approve the agenda item submitted by the College of Arts and Humanities. A second was made by Dr. Andrew Hansen, and the motion to approve the Revised Program was passed.

B. Waters College of Health Professions

Dr. Stephen Rossi presented the agenda items for the Waters College of Health Professions. Department of Rehabilitation Sciences

Deleted Courses:
PHTH 9901: Physical Therapy Project 1

JUSTIFICATION:
During recent program faculty self-assessment of the Program of Study and trends in the profession, it was decided to shift the research focus to emphasize research application instead of project completion.

PHTH 9902: Physical Therapy Project 2

JUSTIFICATION:
During recent program faculty self-assessment of the Program of Study and trends in the profession, it was decided to shift the research focus to emphasize research application instead of project completion.
PHTH 9903: Physical Therapy Project 3

JUSTIFICATION:
During recent program faculty self-assessment of the Program of Study and trends in the profession, it was decided to shift the research focus to emphasize research application instead of project completion.

PHTH 9904: Physical Therapy Project 4

JUSTIFICATION:
During recent program faculty self-assessment of the Program of Study and trends in the profession, it was decided to shift the research focus to emphasize research application instead of project completion.

MOTION: Dr. He made a motion to approve the agenda items submitted by the Waters College of Health Professions. A second was made by Dr. McGibony, and the motion to approve the Deleted Courses was passed.

Dr. Casler-Failing asked if there is a plan to substitute other courses in the place of the four deleted courses. Dr. Rossi said yes, the department will do substitutions for students currently in the program. He said the department will be submitting new/revised course(s) and program revision(s) to update the Program of Study in future meetings.

Dr. Donna Brooks said as we move forward it would be helpful to include the new course proposals along with the course deletions so that the committee can make an adequate comparison of the courses. Dr. Rossi agreed that this would be ideal, and said in the future they will hold off on deletions until all curriculum proposals are ready to be submitted.

Dr. Petrosino asked for clarification on the course substitutions for students currently in the program. Dr. Rossi said most will be current courses.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

A. Registrar’s Update – Mrs. Kathryn Stewart provided a brief demonstration of how the committee members can access the red/green markup for curriculum proposals in the CIM system. The steps are listed below:

   a. Login to the CIM Approve Pages
   b. Under the "Your Role" dropdown (top right of screen), select "Graduate Committee Chair - OCT"
   c. Click on each proposal listed under this role to view changes made (will display the red/green markup)

   Mr. Wayne Smith said to contact the Registrar’s Office if anyone has questions about the red/green markup and if they need CIM training. Their office has trained many people in the last two months. Mr. Smith stated the CIM forms have been updated and he asked people to provide the Registrar’s Office feedback if they notice anything that needs to be edited.

   Mr. Smith reminded everyone that SARC (Student Accessibility Resource Center) registration for Spring and Summer 2021 begins on October 26th, and early registration begins on November 2nd.

   Mr. Smith reminded everyone that the priority deadline to get curriculum submitted so that it will be ready for students to register for Fall 2021 is the February 11, 2021 Graduate Committee meeting. He said information can be submitted during the March
and April meetings. SARC registration for Fall 2021 will begin March 8th, and early registration will be March 22nd.

○ Dr. Nick Holtzman asked who the best person is to contact for CIM training, and Mr. Smith said to email cim@georgiasouthern.edu.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. Hansen asked if the CIM link that shows red/green markup could be added to the agenda each month. Mrs. Audie Graham confirmed the link would be included on the agendas moving forward.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on October 8, 2020 at 9:29 AM.

Respectfully submitted,
Audie Graham, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved October 20, 2020 by electronic vote of Committee Members
FACULTY SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
October 13, 2020
Via Zoom: 3:30 pm - 5:00 pm

Attending: Ruth Whitworth, chair (JPHCOPH), Julia Griffin (CAH), Barbara Hendry (CBSS), Stephanie Jones (COE), Shainaz Landge (COSM), John O’Malley (PCEC), Jessica Rigg (LIB), Hyunju Shin (PCOB), Maliece Whatley (PCOB)

Non-Voting Members: Lisandra R. Carmichael, Dean of the GS University Libraries

Guests: Beth Burnett, Asst. Head of Collection Services; Jeff Mortimore, Collection Services - Henderson Library; Debra Skinner, Head of Collection Services

Absent: Christian Hanna (WCHP)

I. CALL TO ORDER
Dean Carmichael called the meeting to order on Tuesday, October, 13 at 3:39 PM. Dean Carmichael asked the committee members if they wanted to add items to the meeting agenda. There were none. Dean Carmichael then asked for a motion to approve the Faculty Senate Library Committee minutes from September 10, 2020. Dr. Whatley made a motion to approve the minutes. Dr. Landge seconded the motion. All approved. Motion passed.

II. NEW BUSINESS
Faculty Senate Charge: Commitment to Diversity & Inclusion
Dr. Whitworth began the meeting by discussing updated information regarding the Diversity & Inclusion charge, which she shared with everyone. The charge for the Faculty Senate Library Committee is as follows:

1. Strategy 1-A Identify and address historical and current institutional barriers, including potentials for marginalization.

2. Research Histories

3. Strategy 2-E Develop, assess, and strengthen both external community partnerships and campus collaborative partnerships that further the goals of the Inclusive Excellence Action Plan.
   Strategy 2-E.4 Develop a Community Resource Guide that serves as a repository of businesses and organizations who demonstrate a commitment to diversity, equity, and
inclusion by completing our annual Inclusive Excellence training.

Develop Comm Resource Guide

4. **Strategy 4-B Foster communications and data-driven decisions by maintaining a centralized, institutional-wide repository of data and metrics related to Inclusive Excellence goals and objectives.**
   
   Strategy 4-B.1 Annually, provide a comprehensive update on progress made on the institutional Inclusive Excellence Action Plan.

   Comp Update on Progress

5. **Strategy 4-B Foster communications and data-driven decisions by maintaining a centralized, institutional-wide repository of data and metrics related to Inclusive Excellence goals and objectives.**
   
   Strategy 4-B.2 Utilize Leadership Scorecards to provide quarterly updates on outcomes associated with Inclusive Excellence.

   Leadership Scorecards

6. **Strategy 4-C Incentivize and require new programming and initiatives for students, faculty, and staff that enhance diversity, equity, and inclusion.**
   
   Strategy 4-C.9 Develop a leadership book club

   Leadership book club

Dr. Whitworth discussed each strategy assigned to the Faculty Senate Library Committee. In order to better understand how the institutional repository can assist the Committee in meeting the Diversity & Inclusion charge, Dean Carmichael invited Debra Skinner, Dept. Head of Collection Services, Beth Burnett, Asst. Dept Head & Institutional Librarian, and Jeff Mortimore, Discovery Services Librarian, to give a presentation on the institutional repository and suggest ideas on how the Libraries can assist the Committee with fulfilling their charge.

After the presentation, several ideas were considered. It was agreed that Dr. Wilson should meet with the committee members to further clarify the charge. He was invited to this meeting but he was unable to make it. Dr. Whitworth will arrange a meeting with him and the Committee before the next monthly meeting. All committee members were encouraged to send questions for Dr. Wilson to Dr. Carmichael and Lizette Cruz.

III. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

   None.

IV. **ADJOURNMENT**

   As there was no further business the meeting was adjourned at 5:09 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Lizette Cruz, Recording Coordinator
Student Success Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
September 10, 2020  
Via Zoom: 1:00 pm- 11:00 am

Voting Members Present: Elizabeth Rasnick, chair (PCEC), Alicia Brunson (CBSS), Vivian Bynoe (LIB), Kathleen Crawford (COE), Justin Evans (PCOB), Yi Hu (COSM), Katie Mercer (JPHCOPH), Amy Jo Riggs (WCHP), Salman Siddiqui (PCEC), Leigh Ann Williams (CAH)

Non-Voting Members Present: Christine Ludowise (Provost), Amy Smith (Enrollment Management)

Absent: Melanie Miller (Dean of Students Office), Mark Whitesel (Dean of Students)

I. CALL TO ORDER  
Dr. Elizabeth Rasnick called the meeting to order on Thursday, September 10, 2020 at 1:04 PM.

II. CHAIR’S UPDATE  
Dr. Rasnick called for nominations for chair. She nominated herself. No other nominations were made. The vote was unanimous in favor of Dr. Rasnick as chair.

III. OLD BUSINESS  
A. Registration Waitlists  
   • Dr. Rasnick gave a summary of the findings from the SSC’s meeting with David Lee and Casey Morgan from the Registrar’s Office. She also gave brief walk-through of the report that the SSC will give to the Faculty Senate in response to its request to the SSC.  
   • Amy Riggs, Leigh Ann Williams, and Salman Siddiqui engaged in discussion of alternative communication channels.  
   • Christine Ludowise commented that in our recommendations we should suggest that departments should have guidelines, under a University policy, that determine when new sections could be considered based on waitlist volume. The University policy should be broad enough to be suitable for all departments. Departments employing waitlists can then create guidelines that work for their courses and resources.  
   • Dr. Ludowise reported back on the option of text notifications for students on a waitlist. The difficulty with this option is that Banner does not currently communicate with the systems that send text notifications to students. A link between Banner and the notification apps would need to be found or developed. Any requests for modifications for Banner must go through the USG. Amy Smith added that changes to Banner are not easy or fast. Salman Siddiqui asked what systems enact with Banner and this lead to further discussion of possible texting platforms.  
   • Dr. Riggs asked where the change in the waitlist window to 12 hours originated and what other schools have. Dr. Ludowise explained there is great variation among schools.  
   • The topic of surveying students was discussed and Dr. Ludowise suggested working with the SGA is this will be done. Whether this issue warrants a student survey was
discussed. Vivian Bynoe supported the idea of having SGA help if a student survey is conducted. The Faculty Senate will make that determination.

- Kathleen Crawford mentioned that in the COE waitlists are not used. She explained when students need a class, they are overridden into it. There are likely programs that also operate in this way. Dr. Riggs explained that her department students are added to classes when there is physical space for them. The issue of resource limitations was discussed leading to the idea of quality versus quantity in higher education. Katie Mercer added that a trend toward larger courses seems to have started. Dr. Mercer stressed her concern that in her department, students are added to classes and class sizes grow without additional staff support.

- Dr. Crawford said there is an equitability issue between campuses with the size of classes, resources, and the types of students.

- Dr. Riggs, Dr. Crawford, and Dr. Mercer engaged in a discussion of the effect of the stresses on resources as a motivation for using waitlists.

- Dr. Crawford mentioned the importance of advisors in the process designing a waitlist policy.

- Dr. Smith added that there are online resources for students

B. Measures of Student Success

- Dr. Rasnick summarized the work of last year’s SSC work on how the Colleges measure student success. She introduced the current SSC members to the spreadsheet of student success measures survey results.

- Dr. Rasnick explained the intent of the survey was to identify how various Colleges and Department define student success and what obstacles to student success exist.

- Dr. Siddiqui referenced the University pillars of student success. He asked what we are going to do with the data we have collected, will it make a difference, and who asked us to do this.

  - Dr. Rasnick responded that the SSC set this task on its own last year.

- Dr. Rasnick suggested running the survey again considering Covid. Dr. Mercer agreed.

- Dr. Crawford agrees that new roadblocks to student success will be discovered this semester. She said the shift to online learning will change the results.

- Dr. Riggs asked who completed the surveys the first time.

  - Dr. Rasnick replied that the Dean of each College was asked to reply and to ask every Department Chair to reply.

- Dr. Riggs expressed the need to have faculty complete the survey to get a more complete picture. She suggested having the Deans and the Chairs complete the survey again and then ask the faculty to complete it.

- Dr. Williams mentioned that timing needs to be consider if the survey will be sent to faculty. Her concern is overloading faculty email.

- Dr. Mercer stated the previous survey results provide a range of student success measures and there are qualitative and quantitative results present. She feels the SSC should be using this information to create new programs to help alleviate the roadblocks that are identified.
Dr. Smith said there many online resources for students already. She posted links to them in the meeting chat. They are listed here.  
https://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/success/tutoring/  
https://its.georgiasouthern.edu/lts/tools/folio/  
https://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/success/presentandconsult/  
Dr. Bynoe posted a link for student research help.  
https://georgiasouthern.libguides.com/researchhelp  
Dr. Mercer said she read an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education on student success initiatives and the most successful program one was a 24-7 tutoring center for academic and non-academic topics.  
Dr. Smith said there are 24-7 tutoring services for core courses.  
Dr. Rasnick summarized future actions of the SSC for the student success measures survey. It will be sent out in tiers, first to the Deans and Department Chairs and then to the faculty and staff.  
Making changes to the survey was discussed. Members will review the survey and changes will be discussed along with distribution methods in the October meeting.

IV. NEW BUSINESS
None

IV. ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on September 10, 2020 at 2:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Rasnick
UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE
Meeting Minutes
October 13, 2020
Via Zoom: 3:30pm - 4:00pm

Voting Members Present: Joanne Chopak-Foss, chair (COPH), Cheryl Aasheim (PCEC), Christopher Barnhill (WCHP), Beth Burnett (LIB), David Calamas (PCEC), Nedra Cossa (COE), Caroline Henderson (PCOB), Autumn Johnson (LIB), Josh Kies (WCHP), Yongki Lee (COSM), Beverly Miller (COE), Lowell Sneathen (PCOB), Jason Tatlock (CAH), Lauri Valeri (CAH), Clare Walsh (CBSS),

Non-Voting Members Present: Donna Brooks (VPAA), Delena Gatch (IAA), Candace Griffith (VPAA), Tiffany Hedrick (Registrar), Doris Mack (Registrar), Wayne Smith (Registrar), Kathryn Stewart (Registrar)

Guests: Karin Fry (CAH), Brian Koehler (COSM), Nandi Marshall (COPH), Britton McKay (PCOB), Norton Pease (CAH), William Powell (CAH), Stephen Rossi (WCHP); Jonathan Roberts (Honors), Daniel Skidmore-Hess (CBSS), David Williams (PCEC)

Absent: Asli Aslan (JPHCOPH), Patsy Kraeger (CBSS), Chunshan Zhao (COSM)

I. CALL TO ORDER
Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss called the meeting to order on October 13, 2020 at 3:30 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Ms. Laura Valeri made a moon to approve the agenda. A second was made by Dr. Josh Kies and the moon to approve the agenda was passed.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Office of the Registrar
Presented by Wayne Smith.

Mr. Wayne Smith stated that if anyone would like CIM (Curriculum Inventory Management) training, please contact the Office of the Registrar. Mr. Smith reminded the committee that Spring 2021 and Summer 2021 registration begins for SARC (Student Accessibility Resource Center) on October 26th, and full registration begins on November 2nd. The February Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meeting is the priority deadline for Fall 2021 registration, it is encouraged to submit all curriculum information during or before the February meeting. Departments may submit curriculum to the March and April means, but the courses will not be in Banner for the students to be able to register for classes. Mr. Smith reminded the committee that early registration for SARC begins on March 8th for Fall 2021, and remaining early registration begins on March 22nd. Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss requested that the committee review remaining meeting dates during the first spring meeting.

B. College of Behavioral and Social Sciences
Presented by Dr. Daniel Skidmore-Hess
School of Human Ecology

Revised Course(s):

RECR 4430: Financial and Legal Dimensions of Recreation

JUSTIFICATION:

RECR 2530 (Leadership and Programming in Recreation) is moving to once per year so we are removing it as a prerequisite to facilitate progression and graduation.

Dr. Chopak-Foss mentioned that the Student Learning Outcomes for this course are the same for another course that is being submitted during this meeting. She stated that we need to stay aware regarding Student Learning Outcomes so that it doesn’t get flagged during assessment. Dr. Chopak-Foss stated due to the Student Learning Outcomes being numbered, they may relate to an accreditation or some type of body of competencies that are being included in their program. She also mentioned it may be helpful to follow up with faculty from that department to clarify. Then, an adjustment can be made and we bring it back to committee. She stated that the committee can approve the prerequisite changes for all three courses but the Student Learning Outcomes need to be looked over again and updated.

RECR 4435: Managing Recreation Organizations

JUSTIFICATION:

RECR 2530 (Leadership and Programming in Recreation) is moving to once per year so we are removing it as a prerequisite to facilitate progression and graduation.

RECR 4530: Marketing Recreation Services

JUSTIFICATION:

RECR 2530 (Leadership and Programming in Recreation) is moving to once per year so we are removing it as a prerequisite to facilitate progression and graduation.

Ms. Laura Valeri made a moon to approve the revised course(s) submitted by the School of Human Ecology. A second was made by Dr. Josh Kies and the moon to approve the revised course(s) was passed.

Revised Program(s):

653C: Recreation and Tourism Management Minor

JUSTIFICATION:

We are deleting courses that are no longer being offered and adding two new courses. We also removed a lower division course (RECR 2530) to be more consistent with what is required in other minors within our new college (CBSS).
Dr. Chopak-Foss mentioned that the Student Learning Outcomes are the same as another program and will need to be updated. Dr. Daniel Skidmore-Hess states he has communicated that information back to the program to address this request.

Ms. Laura Valeri made a moon to approve the revised program(s) submitted by the School of Human Ecology. A second was made by Dr. Josh Kies and the moon to approve the revised program(s) was passed.

C. College of Arts and Humanities
Presented by Dr. Karin Fry

Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies

Revised Program(s):

BA-PHIL/LAW: Philosophy B.A. (Concentration in Law)

JUSTIFICATION:
These are newly created courses in Political Science that have relevance to the Law track of our major. We would like to include them to interdisciplinary section of the major to expand options for students.

Ms. Laura Valeri made a moon to approve the revised program(s) submitted by the Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies. A second was made by Dr. Josh Kies and the moon to approve the revised program(s) was passed.

D. College of Health Professions
Presented by Dr. Stephen Rossi

Department of Rehabilitation Sciences

Revised Course(s):

CSDS 2003: Introduction to Interpreting

JUSTIFICATION:
Add SLOs

CSDS 5000: Multicultural Issues in Health Care

JUSTIFICATION:
Correct course title and add SLOs

Ms. Laura Valeri made a moon to approve the revised course(s) submitted by the Department of Rehabilitation Sciences. A second was made by Dr. Josh Kies and the moon to approve the revised course(s) was passed.
Department of Health Sciences and Kinesiology  
Presented by Dr. Christopher Barnhill

Revised Course(s):

**SMGT 2230: Social Issues of Sport**

JUSTIFICATION:
Removed unnecessary prerequisites

**SMGT 3236: Financial Management of Sport**

JUSTIFICATION:
Changes to the prerequisites to account for changes to Area F courses. Added SLOs.

**SMGT 3238: Management of Sport Organizations**

JUSTIFICATION:
Removed unnecessary prerequisites & Added SLOs

**SMGT 3735: Sport Management Practicum**

JUSTIFICATION:
Removed unnecessary prerequisites

**SMGT 4330: Facility and Event Management**

JUSTIFICATION:
Removed unnecessary prerequisites & Added SLOs

**SMGT 4337: Legal Aspects of Sport**

JUSTIFICATION:
Removed unnecessary prerequisites. Added SLOs

Ms. Laura Valeri made a moon to approve the revised course(s) submitted by the Department of Health Sciences and Kinesiology. A second was made by Dr. Josh Kies and the moon to approve the revised course(s) was passed.

Department of Physical Therapy  
Presented by Dr. Stephen Rossi

Revised Course(s):

**RHAB 4000: Appl of Research to Rehab Prof**
JUSTIFICATION:

Add SLOs

Dr. Stephen Rossi stated that this course should be listed under the Department of Rehabilitation Sciences. Dr. Chopak-Foss asked if it should be listed with the other courses on the agenda and Dr. Rossi stated that it is its own department. Dr. Chopak-Foss asked if this is a course that is taught in the Physical Therapy program. Dr. Rossi stated that RHAB 4000 is an undergraduate course and the program is Rehabilitation Sciences.

Ms. Laura Valeri made a moon to approve the revised course(s) submitted by the Department of Physical Therapy. A second was made by Dr. Josh Kies and the moon to approve the revised course(s) was passed.

Revised Program(s):

BS-REHAB: Rehabilitation Sciences B.S.

JUSTIFICATION:

Add PLOs

Ms. Laura Valeri made a moon to approve the revised program(s) submitted by the Department of Physical Therapy. A second was made by Dr. Josh Kies and the moon to approve the revised program(s) was passed.

Department of Radiology
Presented by Dr. Stephen Rossi

Inactivated Course(s):

RADS 4050: Quality Mgmt in Radiography

JUSTIFICATION:

Course is no longer offered and not part of any program of study.

RADS 4420: Senior Radiography Seminar

JUSTIFICATION:

Course is no longer offered and should be removed from the catalog

Ms. Laura Valeri made a moon to approve the inactivated course(s) submitted by the Department of Radiology. A second was made by Dr. Josh Kies and the moon to approve the inactivated course(s) was passed.

Inactivated Program(s):

CERO-NUMD: Nuclear Medicine Certificate
JUSTIFICATION:

This program has never admitted a student since its inception. This is not a graduate program. At this point the program is not serving anyone. Maintaining this program would require a faculty teaching an overload if a student were enrolled in this offering. Additionally, this would require a separate clinical course and scheduling offerings.

*Ms. Laura Valeri made a moon to approve the inactivated program(s) submitted by the Department of Radiology. A second was made by Dr. Josh Kies and the moon to approve the inactivated program(s) was passed.*

IV. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

V. ADJOURNMENT

*Dr. Joanne Chopak-Foss called a motion to adjourn. Dr. Cheryl Aasheim made a motion to adjourn the meeting. A second was made by Dr. Beverly Miller and the motion to adjourn the meeting passed at 4:02 p.m.*