

Georgia Southern University

## Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

---

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

---

9-17-2020

### 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" (2020). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 64.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/64>

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

**Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate  
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes  
September 17, 2020**

**Executive Summary:** Trish Holt (COE) called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM. The Senate approved the agenda for this meeting and minutes from the previous meeting.

The Senate heard reports from the General Education and Core Curriculum, Undergraduate, and Graduate Committees. TaJuan Wilson reviewed the Inclusive Excellence Action Plans.

The Provost answered questions about recent changes to the course schedule for Spring 2021.

A motion to change the waitlist time to 24 hours was discussed and passed.

Senators discussed possible monitoring of instruction. Student guests gave a presentation on the SGA/FS Joint Resolution on Diversity, and senators discussed.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 PM.

MINUTES

**Officers in Attendance:** Trish Holt (President), Amanda Konkle (CAH, Secretary), Barbara King (CBSS, Librarian), Cary Christian (CBSS, President Elect)

**Senators in Attendance:** Lisa Abbott (CAH), Lisa Costello (CAH), Finbarr Curtis (CAH), Bill Dawers (CAH), Katherine Fallon (CAH), Grant Gearhart (CAH), Amanda Hedrick (CAH), Christopher Hendricks (CAH), Carol Jamison (CAH), June Joyner (CAH), Leticia McGrath (CAH), Tony Morris (CAH), Kendra Parker (CAH), Jeffrey Riley (CAH), Jeffrey Secrest (CAH), Solomon Smith (CAH), Robert Terry (CAH), Nicholas Holtzman (CBSS), Addie Martindale (CBSS), Nancy McCarley (CBSS), Eric Silva (CBSS), Wendy Wolfe (CBSS), Daniel Chapman (COE), Nedra Cossa (COE), Lucas Jensen (COE), Dee Liston (COE), Fayth Parks (COE), Nancy Remler (COE), Karelle Aiken (COSM), Christine Bedore (COSM), Yi Hu (COSM), Ionut Emil Iacob, Jim LoBue (COSM), Cathy MacGowan (COSM), Justin Montemarano (COSM), Traci Ness (COSM), Amy Potter (COSM), Abid Shaikh (COSM), Nathaniel Shank (COSM), Divine Wanduku (COSM), Robert Yarbrough (COSM), Jennifer Zettler (COSM), Andrew Hansen (JPHCOPH), Haresh Rochani (JPHCOPH), William Mase (JPHCOPH), Barbara Ross (Liberty), Jessica Garner (LIB), Kristi Smith (LIB), Cheryl Aasheim (PCEC), David Calamas (PCEC), Rami Haddad (PCEC), Chris Kadlec (PCEC), Clint Martin (PCEC), William Amponsah (PCOB), Omid Ardakani (PCOB), Mark Hanna (PCOB), Lowell Mooney (PCOB), Bill Wells (PCOB), Bill Yang (PCOB), Diana Botnaru (WCHP), Sheri Carey (WCHP), Katrina Embrey (WCHP), Ellen Hamilton (WCHP), Chris Hanna (WCHP), Susan Hendrix (WCHP), Joshua Kies (WCHP), Kari Mau (WCHP), Christy Moore (WCHP),

**Alternates in Attendance:** Barbara Hendry (CBSS), Brett Curry (CBSS), Russell Thackston (PCEC)

**Senators not in Attendance:** Josh Kennedy (CBSS), Rocio Alba-Flores (PCEC), Felix Hamza-Lup (PCEC), Jake Simons (PCOB)

**Participating Students:** Zakiya Daniel, KeyShawn Housey, Dantrell Maeweather

**Participating Administrators:** Kyle Marrero (President), Carl Reiber (Provost), Annalee Ashley (Chief of Staff), Amy Ballagh (Enrollment Management), Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs), Amber Culpepper (Title IX), Brian DeLoach (Medical Director), John Lester (VP University Communications), Scott Lingrell (VP Enrollment Management), Shay Little (VP Student Affairs), Christine Ludowise (Associate Provost for Student Success), Cassie Morgan (Registrar's Office), Vickie Shaw (HR), Ron Stalnaker (Chief Information Officer), David Walker (IT), TaJuan Wilson (AVP Inclusive Excellence), Rob Whitaker (VP Business and Finance)

**Guests:** Ameer Adkins, Syeda Ahmed, Ashlea Anderson, Dustin Anderson, Emily Ballesteros, Stephanie Beppel, Brenda Blackwell, Jeremy Bonds, James Braselton, Kara Bridgeman Sweeney, Donna Brooks, Maxine Bryant, Breanna Calamas, Lisa Carmichael, Suzanne Carpenter, Christopher Cartright, Shelli Casler-Failing, Joanne Chopak-Foss, Kay Coates, Tiffany Courdin, Daniel Cox, Kellianne Curley, Christopher Curtis, Janet Dale, Mohammad Davoud, LL Denmark, Nikki DiGregorio, Pearline Doxie, Steven Engel, Brian Feltman, Richard Flynn, Miguel Garcia, Delana Gajdosik-Nivens, Delana Gatch, Zelda Glenmore, Laurie Gould, Candace Griffith, Cindy Groover, Michelle Haberland, Fernando Camacho Hauser, Amy Heaston, Carol Herringer, April Jankowski, Melissa Joiner, Youakim Kalaani, Howard Keeley, Dot Kempson, Linda Kimsey, Jennifer Kowalewski, John Kraft, DeAnn Lewis, Allison Lyon, Annie Mendenhall, Donna Mullenax, Barry Munkasy, Micayla Neal, Erik Nordenhaug, Cliff Padgett, Scott Pease, Marshall Ransom, Elizabeth Rasnick, Gregory Rich, Brenda Richardson, Ryan Richardson, Lynn Roberts, Joseph Ruhland, Salman Siddiqui, Eric Silva, Kim Simpson, Cathy Skidmore-Hess, Megan Small, Amy Smith, Chasen Smith, Trina Smith, Kip Sorgen, Errol Stewart, Brad Sturz, Jennifer Syno, Audra Taylor, Stuart Tedders, Joseph Telfair, Zita Toth Gaddis, Ho-Jui Tung, Laura Valeri, Ashley Walker, Deborah Walker, Ruth Whitworth, Joseph Wilson, Jalynn Wynn, Corinna Zeltsman, Drew Zwald

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Trish Holt (COE) called the meeting to order at 4:00 PM.

#### **II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Lisa Abbott (CAH) moved to approve the agenda for the September 17, 2020 meeting. Bill Wells (PCOB) seconded. There was no discussion. The motion passed.

#### **III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES / AUGUST 20, 2020 KONKLE (CAH), SENATE SECRETARY**

Christy Moore (WCHP) moved to approve the minutes of the August 20, 2020 meeting. Andrew Hansen (JPHCPH) seconded. There was no discussion. Sixty-two senators voted to approve the Agenda and Minutes.

#### **IV. LIBRARIAN'S REPORT / SEPTEMBER 17, 2020 KING (CBSS), SENATE LIBRARIAN** Barbara King (CBSS) moved to approve that the Librarian's Report was submitted. Tony Morris (CAH) seconded.

A. GENERAL EDUCATION AND CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE – WELLS (PCOB)

Trish Holt acknowledged the hard work this committee has done holding Town Hall meetings for feedback for the new Core Curriculum, especially Delana Gatch, Bill Wells, Jaime O'Connor.

Bill Wells also thanked Cindy Groover and Brad Sturz for their assistance with these meetings. The GECC met on August 14 and elected Bill Wells chair. They have been working closely with Institutional Assessment and Accreditation. The new Core is not approved yet, but the plan is to roll out Fall 2023.

Expect to hear from this office soon if you are working on Core Assessment reports.

#### **B. UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE – CHOPAK-FOSS (JPHCOPH)**

Joanne Chopak-Foss announced that this committee met August 25, oriented new members, and elected Chopak-Foss chair. This committee reviews and vets course offerings and alignments. The Registrar's Office overviewed the CIM system for course proposals and revisions briefly during this committee's meeting; a more detailed workshop will be provided for anyone working with CIM for the first time this year.

#### **C. GRADUATE COMMITTEE – CASLER-FAILING (COE)**

Shelli Casler-Failing reported that the committee met September 10 and elected Casler-Failing chair.

### **V. OPEN FORUM**

#### **A. GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE ACTION PLAN / WILSON (VP IE&CDO)**

TaJuan Wilson defined inclusive excellence as an understanding and recognition that the institution's success depends on "how well it values, engages, and includes the rich diversity of its community members, including its student, faculty, staff, alumni, friends, and affiliates."

He reviewed high-level goals of the Inclusive Excellence plan. The first goal is to create an equitable and inclusive environment for all through recruitment of faculty by engaging in a comprehensive policy review, senior leader training, an allyship development program, a campus climate support team and survey, an audit of physical space, a revamped orientation for new hires, embedding IE competencies into mandatory courses such as FYE/SYE and KINS, and reviewing marketing practices.

For the goal of increasing representation of diverse students, faculty, staff, and community partners, the plan is to develop best practice guides, assess recruitment and orientation structure for students, develop a comprehensive Strategic Diversity Recruitment Plan, assess barriers to success for job applicants, continue salary equity study for faculty and staff, allocate resources for new and existing programs to enhance retention and graduation for underrepresented students, develop implicit bias training programs for hiring, and develop a community resource guide of best practices.

For goals surrounding retention and advancement in the form of access to achievement and recognition for underrepresented individuals, the plan is to examine and make recommendations about improving classroom climate and improve inclusive pedagogical

practices, review technology support structures, develop ways to engage underrepresented minority alumni, including the existing underrepresented minority alumni group, develop and facilitate programming to discuss and mitigate racial battle fatigue, ensure that faculty and staff are given equitable workloads, increase the number of underrepresented individuals serving as faculty and administrators, create a formal mentoring program for faculty and staff, incorporate inclusive excellence as a performance dimension within annual employee reviews, create new initiatives to support students specifically at risk, to identify and support college and central unit inclusive excellence leaders, and to review tenure and promotion and annual review criteria to account for inclusive excellence efforts.

For the goal of implementing culturally inclusive practices reinforcing both the university's strategic plan and the inclusive excellence plan, the plan is to develop inclusive excellence training for students, faculty, and staff, train faculty and staff to lead students in productive discussions, utilize leadership scorecards to provide quarterly updates, provide clear guidelines for students to report discriminatory incidents on campus, develop central unit and college specific Inclusive Excellence action plans, and establish a comprehensive Supplier Diversity Plan.

Wilson reviewed the various surveys, the new Faculty and Staff Inclusive Excellence Fellowship Program, efforts to revamp advisory councils and committees, orientation revisions, NPHC plots, Inclusive Excellence Seed Grants, workshops, and revisions to human resources job descriptions and required prompts as activities already in place to support this plan.

This plan will be rolled out in September with a training video and template to assist the campus community in developing their plans by December 01. Other next steps include alumni updates and engagement opportunities and quarterly accountability checks.

This plan is fueled by a belief in the transformative power of education and student success and requires faculty and staff to make this work.

There was no discussion.

## B. COURSE SCHEDULING REVISIONS

### **Rationale:**

Senators requested discussion and clarification on changes to the schedule for the Spring 20 semester. Those changes, as communicated from the Provost's office, are:

Based on the practical lessons from the reopening scheduling process and the needs identified by schedulers, faculty, and students over the past year, we are recommending the following scheduling advice, guidelines and constraints to promote student engagement, success, and retention, reduce sub-sectioned course density, and minimize the gap between students and direct instruction.

- Our advice falls in elements such as promoting graduate level courses for the Saturday option, creating strategic sequences for term A and term B minimester courses, and reviewing departmental loads.
- Our constraints continue to be not exceeding the number of courses delivered online that the system has approved.

- Our guidelines focus on scheduling courses based on need, extending and evenly populating the scheduling window, appropriately indicating courses elements and delivery types, and aligning with delivery methods with catalog descriptions.

These are broader than the detail-level information included in the schedule resource guide. We ask that schedulers take note of the enrollment by classification data included as a mapping tool rather than re-rolling previous, per-COVID semester schedule plans.

### Considerations for Enrollment by Classification (as of third week of fall term)

- Freshmen enrollment is up 12.6% (+692), with 6,203 enrolled this fall compared to 5,511 last fall. This includes 1,207 returning students with less than 30 hours.
  - Enrollment of new beginning freshmen is up 46.4% (+1,513), with 4,775 enrolled this fall.
- Sophomore enrollment is down 4.8% (-247) with 4,918 enrolled this term
- Upper class student enrollment is down 2.3%
  - Juniors are down 2.2% (-106) with 4,831 enrolled
  - Seniors are down 2.5% (-149) with 5,776 enrolled

### Extend the Scheduling Window

1. Expand M-F day to 8:00am (start time) - 10:00pm (end time for last class); labs already scheduled for 7:30am start times can continue. *Courses should be spread evenly across the day - and throughout the week.* This should be done by each department to ensure distribution.
  - a. 17% of classes offered between 8:00am and 10:00am
  - b. 17% of classes offered between 10:00am and 12:00pm
  - c. 17% of classes offered between 12:00pm and 2:00pm
  - d. 17% of classes offered between 2:00pm and 4:00pm
  - e. 17% of classes offered between 4:00pm and 6:00pm
  - f. 15% of classes offered between 6:00pm and 10:00pm
2. Revised times to include post-2:30pm F for MWF courses, and table MW courses for the time-being are now available for registration. The available MWF course times are:
  - a. 8:00am - 8:50am
  - b. 9:05am - 9:55am
  - c. 10:10am - 11:00am
  - d. 11:15am - 12:05pm
  - e. 12:20pm - 1:10pm
  - f. 1:25pm - 2:15pm
  - g. 2:30pm - 3:20pm
  - h. 3:35pm - 4:25pm
  - i. 4:40pm - 5:30pm

Link to revised times on Registrar's website:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1dzuraDI147JntZQm2Qu657k-eBedss1C/view>.

3. Add Saturday in 3-hour blocks (first consider graduate level courses for this option).
4. **85%** of courses offered by each department in the Spring need to be f2f courses
  - a. Includes in-person and hybrid (H) courses.

5. **15%** of courses offered by each department in the Spring can be online courses according to SACSCOC definitions:
  - a. Includes partially remote/online, fully online (asynchronous), and entirely online courses
6. Large course sections that will have to be sub-sectioned should be offered on a MWF schedule.

### **Loads within Department**

1. Departments may want to look at SCH, seats offered/filled, not just courses to create faculty loads.
2. When scheduling courses based on need, use Business Objects and EAB APS reports to look at DFW rates and historical data for over- and under-enrolled courses. Use the program maps for each degree program--and the 3-year rotation of courses for each program/department--to help determine schedule. Work with the advising office to identify how many students need the course to progress (this may require more seats or an additional section). Please note that departments and programs need to pull the data first and then work with advising to confirm and/or fine-tune the proposed schedule (i.e. do not dump the data requests on academic advisors).
3. Consider sequencing courses and using Term A and Term B strategically. For example, offer sequenced pre-requisite courses in Term A and Term B; offer some sections of ENGL 1101 in Term A and some sections of ENGL 1102 in Term B.
4. Make sure that courses with low-cost textbooks (total \$45 and under) and no-costs (\$0 - perhaps using open source resources or the instructor provides all materials through FOLIO) are designated using the appropriate attributes. Also make sure that capstone courses, internships, and service learning courses are designated using the appropriate HIP attribute. This information provides important guidance to students and is part of our reporting requirements to the USG. Please see the schedule resource guide for the specific attributes and appropriate BANNER screen.

### **Section Coding**

- Course Comments - use the BANNER Comments feature (SSATEXT) to clearly state the type of course, for example:
  - Asynchronous Course: Instruction delivered online without specified meeting days, times, or building/room locations.
  - Remote-Synchronous Course: Instruction delivered completely online at the assigned meeting days/times listed in WINGS.
  - Sub-sectioned Course: Face-to-face course that uses Folio GROUPS feature to designate specific meeting dates and times.
  - Hybrid Course: Course in which instruction is provided both face-to-face and online.

### **Room Scheduling**

The COVID-19 room capacity spreadsheet must be consulted when assigning a classroom space. 25Live now reflects most instructional spaces with up-to-date capacities. Since chairs currently have those capacity numbers, we will move forward with the traditional scheduling method (rather than funneling through AA or RO). Course enrollments should approximate their standard

numbers, not be adjusted to fit specific spaces. There will be greater need for flexibility in what have been referred to as “owned” spaces. Where conflicts arise in space and scheduling needs, we will ask the deans to work inter-collegiately to resolve those scheduling issues.

## Hybrid & Definitions

It is imperative to create student-friendly language at the beginning of the syllabus that fully explains the nature, pattern, rationale, and expectations of a hybrid-type course. Students must have access to this information ahead of the semester. This means Folio sites with syllabi included should be available to students by the end of Thanksgiving break (November 30).

## Align Course Delivery with Catalog Type

We have been dealing with a significant number of student and parent questions (and complaints) in regards to how courses are delivered. Please make sure that the design of a sub-sectioned course aligns with the course description, course level, and delivery type in the catalog.

The image shows a screenshot of a course registration form. The form is titled "Is this a variable credit hour course?" and contains several sections with checkboxes and input fields. The "Credit hours" field is empty. The "Weekly contact hours" section has three input fields for "Lecture/Seminar:", "Lab:", and "Other:". The "Is this course repeatable for credit that can count towards graduation?" section has a "No" checkbox selected. The "Course fees" section has a "No" checkbox selected. The "Primary Grade Mode" dropdown menu is set to "Normal (N)". The "Other Grading Mode(s)" section has an "Audit" checkbox selected. The "Schedule type" section has several checkboxes, including "Asynchronous Instruction", "Directed Study (one-to-one)", "Dissertation", "Independent Study (Correspond)", "Internship/Practicum", "Lecture", "Lecture/Supervised Laboratory", "Lecture/Unsupervised Lab", "Practice Teaching", "Seminar", "Supervised Laboratory", "Synchronous Instruction", "Thesis", and "Unsupervised Laboratory". The "General Course Description" and "Student Learning Course Outcomes" sections are empty text boxes.

For instance, if a course is coded as Lecture--especially those at the 1000 and 2000 levels--a flipped model might not be the best delivery method. Students in these introductory and non-majors courses have expressed serious and thoughtful concerns about the lack of *direct* instruction during their in-person classroom time. On the other hand, a flipped model might be perfectly appropriate for an upper-division course for majors or a Seminar.

One level of this is, of course, managing student expectations under the circumstances, but aligning with those expectations to a greater degree will help significantly. A second level is clear and thorough communication with the class as a whole. However, a course sub-section design that stands counter to what the catalog offers *should not* be employed. It is incumbent on department chairs to ensure appropriate delivery is designed and adequately communicated to students.

## Schedule Timeline



The Spring 2021 course schedule will be rolled from the Spring 2020 version, and the Summer 2021 will be generated from Summer 2019. Please note that there may be newer classes that will need to be added manually.

### **Planned Schedule**

- Wednesday, September 9, 2020 - Spring 2021 schedule rolled from Spring 2020
- Monday, September 21, 2020 (8 AM) - Schedulers deadline for modifications Spring 2021
- Monday, September 21, 2020 (9 AM) - Spring 2021 schedule will be 'live' for advisement purposes
- Monday, September 21, 2020 - Summer 2021 schedule rolled from Summer 2019
- Monday, October 5, 2020 (8 AM) - Schedulers deadline for modifications Summer 2021
- Monday, October 5, 2020 (8 AM) - Summer 2021 schedule will be 'live' for advisement purposes

### **Provost's Report:**

Prior to this meeting, Trish Holt (COE) forwarded questions that had already been asked to Carl Reiber (Provost) to allow him to answer the questions in a report.

Reiber noted that the changes to the schedule are in response to Covid in order to work within the environment of the USG and reduce the density of students on campus in classes between 10 and 2. We are trying to make use of times outside that window. In calculations prior to these recommendations being made, the Provost determined that these changes would impact less than 5% of sections currently scheduled. Added benefits to spreading the schedule include that some faculty have reported that they felt they had no say in when they taught because previous schedules rolled over. Evening and morning classes allow faculty to move their course times, especially for those who need flexibility for caregiving responsibilities. Reiber reports that he has heard constant discussion of courses later in the day on the Armstrong campus to cater to the non-traditional working students.

Reiber reported that we are trying to keep our online offerings as a whole campus at 15%, which is our typical number of online courses. This doesn't mean individual colleges need to be at 15%, but rather that the courses that were taught online in Spring 2020 in any department should guide the number of online courses offered in Spring 2021. New programs that were supposed to come online in the spring can be defended as an increase in online courses.

Concerns were voiced about the late reveal of these changes for chairs adjusting schedules. Reiber suggested that most chairs have completed their schedules.

Reiber added that none of this was mandated besides the number of no more than 15% of online courses.

Several thousand students, as well as parents and the USG, have contacted the Provost's office to say they want a face-to-face environment rather than an online environment.

Reiber reviewed specifically what was changed in the schedule. These impact two timeslots on Mondays and Wednesdays, as 50 minute classes beginning at 2:30 have been added for Monday, Wednesday, and Friday. Monday and Wednesday 75-minute classes were pushed to 5:30 and 7:30. Tuesday and Thursday 6:30 and 8:00 75-minute courses have been added. Saturday 175-minute courses are open to all programs.

None of these scheduling changes include any lab-based, studio-based, clinical, rehearsals, or practices. If a faculty member specifically has an issue with the scheduling changes, they should be working with chairs as these are recommendations rather than requirements.

Regarding a question regarding religious conflicts, Reiber suggested working with the students for accommodations. These are currently concerns for graduate seminars in particular. Faculty should also speak up if something is scheduled on a religious holiday.

We anticipate Covid problems in the spring as well, so these changes are in anticipation of that. This can be reevaluated in the fall or once we have a vaccine to see if they work and should be kept or revisited.

**Discussion:**

Bill Dawers (CAH) noted that some chairs are treating this as a recommendation and still scheduling MW afternoon classes and some are not. As a Covid response, having students meet more often during the week is a problem in terms of a public health response. Furthermore, the stated reading of the nontraditional Armstrong students may be incorrect; this change will force some of them to take fewer credits because they want to be on campus only two days a week. This also poses problems for scheduling departmental and committee meetings.

Barbara King (CBSS) asked if the 85% of not-online courses includes various modalities such as hybrid, flipped, etc. within the face-to-face. Frustration from students has not been with any particular modality, but with the fact that they did not know what they were getting into when they signed up for classes. Students need to know in Banner the course format, whether it will be subsectioned, if they will have a Zoom option, etc. These seem like issues to address prior to the first week of the semester. Reiber responded that there is a column in Banner to indicate this now, and that they are asking that some aspect of the syllabus will be uploaded to Folio before the end of the semester so that students will know the format of their class. A hybrid course is 50-50, and that goes under face-to-face courses, but that will be indicated in Banner.

Amanda Hedrick (CAH) asked a follow-up question about the students who are writing to the Provost about formats they don't like. Genuine online pedagogy differs from an instructor zooming in from home and subsections. Is any particular type of online education more difficult or frustrating for students? Reiber responded that he can't indicate in Banner if a faculty member is Zooming from home due to an ADA accommodation. He noted that complaints have arisen from courses that are being delivered with an extraordinary amount of reading material posted on Folio for each week. Students complained that they couldn't navigate through that volume of material. The Zoom session for this same course was tailored toward questions and answers rather than lecture. Folio shells for most undergraduates should be more prescriptive and focused. The overarching complaint is that faculty have not provided enough

guidance regarding how to navigate Folio or that faculty have told students to not attend in-person sessions for safety reasons. This is not true and contradicts what faculty have been asked to do. Students value the instructor relationship.

Finbarr Curtis (CAH) asked a follow-up question regarding how feedback from students is collected. His students dislike the subsections and they are confused. A number of faculty also polled the students in their courses to see what they preferred, and students requested everyone meet on the same synchronous Zoom over subsections for clarity. When faculty are not allowed to follow through with this, the class gets worse. Students do have complaints about online, but they have more complaints about seeing faculty only once a week. What can faculty do to communicate this back to Atlanta so faculty can determine what is best for their classes?

Traci Ness (COSM) stressed that we should rely on data as we make these decisions. Has there been an attempt to survey *all* students and make decisions as opposed to relying on data only from those who are complaining to the Provost's office. She also clarified that the 10:00 to 2:00 scheduling window is not inconvenient for parents and saying it is neglects to consider the school day, which is from 8:00 to 2:00. In addition to surveying all students before making this kind of change to the schedule, *all* faculty should also be surveyed. There is also contradictory evidence regarding previous scheduling issues on the Armstrong campus than what has been addressed here, and senators are developing an RFI on this.

Brett Curry (CBSS) asked for the data that informed the course times. This was not communicated from Atlanta, and faculty sense is that students don't want courses at 8:00 AM and this will hurt enrollments.

Christopher Hendricks (CAH) added that the Armstrong campus has previously surveyed faculty and students about preferred times for course offerings, and did not find students to want these times. In addition, it seems disingenuous to say that this is optional when so many chairs interpreted it as required. Hendricks requested data-driven responses. Reiber responded that the documents say recommendations and guidelines; these were never mandated.

Robert Yarbrough (COSM) added that the reality is that regardless of the language and intentions, the fact is that these scheduling changes have been interpreted as a dictate by chairs and deans. Chairs have been scrambling for a week to change the schedule. Perhaps this is a communication issue that needs to be addressed quickly. Reiber reiterated that this was never an edict or a mandate.

Lisa Abbott (CAH) noted that it doesn't read as a recommendation when the schedule made available for where classes can be placed eliminates longer blocks for Monday and Wednesday afternoon classes. She also raised a point of order that we don't need to end this conversation due to time if the faculty want to extend this conversation. Kendra Parker (CAH) moved to extend the discussion for ten additional minutes. The motion was seconded.

Diana Botnaru (WCHP) spoke in support of colleagues' call for systematic data. We cannot make decisions based on those who are most vocal. It is an additional concern that we have three different campuses with unique needs and we are trying to implement a one-size-fits-all schedule.

Chris Hanna (WCHP) asked the Provost if the chairs are misinterpreting recommendations as a mandate and that is not what he intended, would it be good to follow up with them and clarify? Reiber stated that they have been doing this.

Wendy Wolfe (CBSS) noted that fewer than half of the students are coming face-to-face despite the fact that they could come face-to-face. They are voting with their feet 60% of the time to not attend class in person. Students complaining about online courses are potentially speaking about modified courses and using that to explain their performance. Wolfe asked a question about the early deadline for posting syllabi and noted that this is a difficult time in the semester as we are grading and have not yet received feedback from students regarding course delivery. Reiber explained that 10-15% of faculty had not posted their syllabus on Folio as of last week. The November deadline is to get ahead of that. The purpose is for students to understand the delivery method, so if that is all that is posted, that would serve the purpose. Although the Provost's office said they wanted the entire syllabus by Thanksgiving, really all they want is the mode of delivery for the class.

Ionut Emil Iacob (COSM) spoke to his colleagues' concern regarding the schedule changes, especially regarding Core calculus classes that meet 5 hours with 75-minute exams. He asked if we want to minimize the number of days students are present on campus or maximize by spreading out to MWF. Students have suggested that they would not enroll in late classes on MWF due to their work schedules, additional gas, etc. Reiber noted that he had spoken with the dean and associate dean of COSM weeks ago about this and agreed that this course could be structured differently because it is a unique format.

Barbara King (CBSS) noted that having the explanation of the course delivery modality on Folio seems to be too late to meet the stated goal. The Banner description needs to be longer to do this. Reiber clarified that the longer description will be in Banner this spring.

Solomon Smith (CAH) voiced confusion because MWF is the least popular course schedule, and faculty have to have an attendance policy to get students to show up on Friday. How will we be able to keep this up in the spring? Reiber responded that we want to offer 85% of our classes face-to-face, but to reduce density mid-day by opening up more sections later and earlier. This expands the time that faculty can deliver a class so that faculty can access large classrooms early or late to deliver face-to-face.

## **VI. SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT**

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

#### **A. MOTION REQUEST ON CHANGE THE WAIT TIME FOR WAITLIST TO 24 HOURS – MORGAN & LEE**

**Rationale:** Students that are on a waitlist have 12 hours to respond to an opening in a class before losing their position on the waitlist. This seems unrealistic and can potentially hurt student success. Many of our students work off campus and/or have families. 1) Not every student is attached to the University through email 24/7. Faculty are not expected

to be, so why do we expect students. 2) Additionally, students that work 12 hour shifts (medical, military, etc.) can easily miss the opportunity because they are working. We should not expect them to check their GSU email right before reporting to work and then right after work. 3) If a student has a question about the respective course or other changes that adding this course may cause, who will respond to their questions within 12 hours, especially in the evening or during the weekend? 4) For students that are involved in activities such as athletics, drama, etc, 12 hours could be while they are on the road, training, etc. A more realistic time would be 24 hours during regular business days. So if an opening occurs at 7:48 PM on a Friday, the student has until 7:48 PM on Monday at the minimum to respond.

Bill Wells moved that we remove this motion from the table and discuss it at this meeting. Bill Mase seconded. This motion passed.

**Discussion:**

Finbarr Curtis (CAH) spoke in favor of the motion because of students' work hours, especially in the weekend before classes begin. He is not in favor of taking up the whole weekend, but 24 hours would help avoid penalizing students who work.

Mark Hanna (PCOB) noted that we wanted further information last time and now this comes to us without further information. Was there an attempt to collect the data?

Trish Holt noted that the Student Success Committee gathered data and asked for them to discuss that.

Cassie Morgan (Registrar's Office) noted that some of the data, especially student preferences, would take more time to collect, but she does have some answers. The waitlist time cannot be variable. Students are notified via email, there is no text option through the system, but they do get a high rate of return via email. When considering obstacles, the Registrar's Office has only received three student complaints about not having enough time. A larger issue is that students get overridden into the course and then take a seat that was on offer through the waitlist. Any change will not burden the registrar's office because it is a simple setup. The way the waitlist is used and how many seats there are on waitlists vary by department. They have no data on how many students were on a waitlist and didn't get a seat, but that could be set up to track. Out of 8845 sections, 1196 had a waitlist in the fall: biology, kinesiology, and psychology use waitlists the most. Waitlists ranged from 10-100 seats. Some departments create additional sections based on the waitlist. The committee would need additional time to determine if there are other solutions.

Diana Botnaru (WCHP) asked if this policy disproportionately affects Armstrong students, where the waitlist used to be 24 hours and many students work long shifts overnight.

Nathaniel Shank (COSM) noted that these details were part of the original Request for Information, asking why the decision was made to push this from 24 hours to 12 hours when there were competing systems in place with consolidation.

Trish Holt noted that if we do not vote today, this will need to start over from the beginning. Lisa Abbot moved to end the discussion, and Christy Moore seconded. In the future, Senators should be sure to log in using the personal panelist link as opposed to the general faculty link. Forty-five senators voted in favor of ending the discussion, 10

were against, and 2 abstained. The vote to approve changing the 12-hour period to a 24-hour period to respond to a seat available notification was passed with 36 votes in favor, 13 against, and 2 abstaining.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

In the interest of time, Senators are asked to review these RFIs and responses on their own. Some brief discussion on two items followed.

### **REQUEST FOR INFORMATION – SEPTEMBER 2020**

#### **A. INTER CAMPUS SHUTTLE RIDERSHIP TALLY FOR 2019-2020 ACADEMIC YEAR – MACGOWAN**

#### **B. PARKING PERMITS – JAMISON**

**Question:** Why are those faculty who must teach face-to-face during the pandemic this semester being asked to purchase parking permits when their colleagues who are able to teach from home will not need to do so? Why are parking tickets being issued for lack of permit when no reminders or instructions about purchasing those permits were sent? Why can't faculty purchase permits while parking appeals are in process? Why were some faculty issued parking tickets before the website for purchasing those permits was operational? What process determines which ticket appeals are approved?

**Rationale:** Faculty did not receive any kind of notification about parking permits this year or any instructions about purchasing them, and yet we are being ticketed. Some faculty members were ticketed on the very first day of class. Particularly for those of us on the Armstrong and Liberty campuses, paying for parking is relatively new and not something we automatically remember to do. Further, the website was not initially working as some faculty who tried to purchase online permits for cars found that they were being charged for an Armstrong motorcycle at \$25. One colleague who repeatedly had this problem was told that she must come in person to parking services to purchase her permit. There was no notice online that faculty wanting to pay in full for a permit had to make the purchase in person and according to one colleague, even after multiple phone calls, no one answered. Faculty cannot purchase permits until outstanding tickets are paid. Thus, we cannot appeal an outstanding ticket without risking more tickets each day until the appeal is processed and affirmed or denied. Further, appeals seem to be arbitrary as some are approved and others are not for the same parking violation. More importantly, it seems unfair that those of us who are teaching face to face must pay parking fees this year at all considering the unusual circumstances of COVID19. Many of our colleagues are working from home and will not have to pay for a permit this year. Those of us who are teaching on campus are thus being penalized for not having an underlying condition that allows us to work from home and avoid these fees. Further, with reduced faculty traffic on campus, I again question why we should have to pay for parking under the present circumstances. We are risking our health to teach in person, and some of us are travelling at our own expense between campuses. We lost the battle about paying to park last year, but under the circumstances, I'm hoping something can be done to help out those of us teaching face-to-face in a pandemic. At the very least, we need to be able to buy permits online, to receive instructions about how to do so before the semester begins, to have a process that is in working order before tickets are issued, and to avoid further ticketing while appeals are in process.

Trish Holt spoke to Parking Permits to note that anyone who received a parking ticket in the first weeks of classes should review that RFI for instructions on how to appeal those tickets.

#### C. FACILITATING & ENCOURAGING OUTDOOR COURSES / GROUP MEETINGS – BECK

#### D. MONITORING OF INSTRUCTION – HEIDI ALTMAN

**Question:** What methods are being used to monitor faculty instruction? Are Face to Face classes, Folio shells, and Zoom sessions all being monitored? Who is performing this monitoring? What are they being paid and from what source?

**Rationale:** This is an issue of general concern for several reasons. Based on communications faculty members have received from department chairs and deans, instruction monitoring systems are in place. Some faculty have reported people who are unknown to them standing outside their classrooms, and apparently observing their courses. Others have noted the appearance of unauthorized files into their Folio course pages and are concerned that the ability of administrators to use software back doors, combined with requests that faculty include department chairs as members of their courses, allow for electronic monitoring of both students and instructors. Taken together, these actions and notifications imply that faculty members are not trusted to deliver instruction in the ways listed on the Course Schedule without direct oversight and creates a general atmosphere of distrust. Aside from creating a climate of apprehension, this practice does not take into account all of the possible scenarios that might be taking place in any given course. With multiple possible models in place, multiple scenarios in each model, the variability of student wellness and behavior, the relaxation of attendance policies to discourage students who know that they have been exposed or are ill from coming to class, it would be very difficult for a monitor to get an accurate picture of what is actually happening in any particular class. In addition to indicating that faculty are not trusted to do as they have agreed to do, not allowing faculty to decide what works best for their content and their individual students is a violation of academic freedom. Page 29 of the Faculty Handbook states: “301 Academic Freedom Georgia Southern University supports the statement on Academic Freedom by the American Association of University Professors. PREAMBLE The purpose of this statement is to promote public understanding and support of academic freedom. Academic freedom exists within the institutional framework of shared governance in which collegial forms of deliberations are valued, responsibilities are shared, and constructive joint thought and action are fostered among the components of the academic institution. Institutions of higher education are conducted for the common good and not to further the interests of either the individual or the institution. The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition. Academic freedom is essential to these purposes and applies to both teaching and research. Freedom in research is fundamental to the advancement of truth. Academic freedom in its teaching aspect is fundamental for the protection of the rights of the teacher in teaching and of the student to freedom in learning. Membership in the academic community imposes on students, faculty members, administrators, and board members an obligation to respect the dignity of others, to acknowledge their right to express differing opinions, and to foster and defend intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry, and free expression on and off the campus. ACADEMIC FREEDOM Teachers are entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing issues relevant to their subject. Pedagogical decisions should be made by the faculty in accordance with the policies of that academic unit. Pedagogical decisions should be consistent with university policies, codes of professional ethics and conduct as well as the educational goals of the course

and the evaluation standards held in the academic unit. Teachers are entitled to full freedom in scholarly activities and in dissemination of the results, subject to the adequate performance of their other academic duties. Scholarly activities for pecuniary return should be based upon policies established by the governing bodies of the institution and the University System.” The threat of instructional monitoring is an insult to hardworking faculty members in a semester when most, if not all, instructors have already received CARES notifications for students who need to complete their coursework in ways that might not align with the mode of instruction listed on the schedule. Signed, Heidi M. Altman, Ph.D. College of Behavioral and Social Sciences Diana T. Botnaru, M.D. Waters College of Health Professions Jeffrey D. Burson, Ph.D. College of Arts and Humanities Kathleen M. Comerford, Ph.D. College of Arts and Humanities Christopher B. Cartright College of Arts and Humanities Michelle A. Haberland, Ph.D. College of Arts and Humanities Nancy G. McCarley, Ph.D. College of Behavioral and Social Sciences Robert A. Yarbrough, Ph.D. College of Science and Mathematics

Diana Botnaru (WCHP) asked a question about the RFI on Monitoring of Instruction and whether there is a USG mandate that states that faculty should be monitored to see if they are in their classrooms. President Marrero noted that he is not aware of the USG monitoring on campus, but they do have access to Banner and Folio. There is no indication that they are interested in this specifically. He noted that the administration are interested in whether students who were out for Covid are now reengaging in their courses. Botnaru (WCHP) added that students might not come to class on Zoom for a variety of reasons, and to put that on faculty is not fair. Provost Reiber added the USG does have access to Banner and Folio and they can look to see what activity takes place in Folio. That has always been the case. They do not see the material but rather that there is material posted, that Attendance Verification is there.

#### **DISCUSSION ITEMS – AUGUST 2020**

##### **A. SGA & FACULTY SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION ON DIVERSITY – HOLTZMAN**

**Rationale:** The authors of the SGA-FS Joint Resolution on Diversity would like the opportunity to discuss the Resolution with the Senators.

A video created by students was presented on the SGA-Faculty Senate Joint Resolution on Diversity. This resolution is the result of a year-long effort to resolve these issues: The faculty population does not reflect the diversity of the student population, to be addressed with financial resources from the Provost’s office; students have little opportunity to participate in hiring faculty, to be resolved by giving students a chance to serve on departmental search committees; the university climate regarding diversity and inclusion needs to be improved, to be addressed by specialized training; initiatives at the college and departmental levels to promote recruitment, retention, and advancement are underutilized, to be solved by optimizing College Diversity Committees efforts to engage with Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion initiatives and programming; and there is no official GS standard for reporting recruitment, retention, and advancement for inclusive hiring, to be addressed with published guidelines and reporting methods to establish a baseline and track progress over time.

The benefits of increased diversity include building relationships, increasing a sense of belonging and comfort, and providing role models and mentors for students, and for faculty, broadening teaching and research perspectives can increase the attractiveness of their disciplines and create a more equitable workplace.



Many students go through their educations without having a faculty of color, and improving opportunities for this would benefit students directly.

**Discussion:**

Guests from SGA introduced themselves: Dantrell Merweather, Keyshawn Housey, Zakiya Daniel.

Rami Haddad (PCEC) commended the students on their hard work on getting this resolution before the Senate. He asked for clarification on how having a faculty population whose diversity would reflect the student population would be measured. Dantrell Merweather noted that 40% of students are minority, 24% of full-time faculty are minority. Haddad (PCEC) followed up by noting that his department is entirely of faculty from other parts of the world, and asked whether that counts as diversity. Keyshawn noted that while PCEC is quite diverse, other colleges, such as CAH and CBSS, are not as diverse.

Diana Botnaru (WCHP) thanked those who developed the resolution and asked what the goal is for this resolution and what this group would like for the Senate to do with it. Nick Holtzmann (CBSS) responded that they are asking for money from the Provost's office to support these recruitment efforts, and they are asking for students to be involved in the hiring process. Zakiya Daniel added that students are already involved in other search committees for administrative hires and noted that student involvement in departmental searches would give them a voice in decisions that will affect their educations.

Motion and second were received to extend the meeting by 15 minutes.

William Amponsah (PCOB) congratulated the students on the initiative they have taken to advance and resolve this need in our community. We are raising leaders at Georgia Southern. When students enjoy this relationship with faculty, it makes Georgia Southern a better place to work. These students are influencing our campus for good.

Trish noted that we will vote on this at our next meeting as an SGA and Faculty Senate joint resolution.

Karelle Aiken (COSM) asked if this resolution considers gender diversity as well. Dantrelle Merweather answered that Georgia Southern is a more gender diverse than racially diverse institution. Karelle Aiken (COSM) followed up by noting that there is an intersectional factor as well, not just for women in general but for women of color. Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs) noted that the EEO report the students used to develop this report does address gender and race.

Ellen Hamilton (WCHP) also congratulated the Student Government and their leadership. She noted that there are schools and programs that do include their students in faculty searches, including the School of Nursing. Nick Holtzmann noted that they do in psychology as well, and that this resolution is to standardize this practice across campus. Zakiya Daniel added that not all colleges do the same thing and that should be standardized.

Amanda Hedrick (CAH) asked about how SGA is currently operating and how the changes in their meetings have affected their ability to push this through. Keyshawn Housey noted that they have been working on this resolution since the book burning in

October 2019, and that when SGA meeting changes shifted in March, they presented the resolution as it was at the time and received Senate approval to move forward. Zakiya Daniel noted that SGA is currently revising minutes and bylaws and hopes to be back up and running in spring semester.

Grant Gearhart (CAH) added his congratulations to the committee. He noted that the faculty probably support this, but our ability to do so in actuality depends on how many lines we have to hire diverse faculty. He pointed out that other universities have post-docs for hiring diverse faculty and asked if that is an option for us. President Marrero echoed the congratulations for these students. Departments have opportunities for pods and diverse hiring groups as well as other ways to ensure this hiring. This initiative is aligned with our Inclusive Excellence plan. Provost Reiber noted that we have modified the budget so that the \$100,000 in support of this is set aside. His office has also worked to supply money to expand the advertising in order to diversify the applicant pool and created a pool of money for deans to use to make competitive offers to minority faculty members. But the point is well taken that we have to have vacant lines to hire and diversify our faculty. A better budget situation will result in more lines and more diverse hires.

Diana Botnaru (WCHP) noted that it seems that faculty are on board and informed on this and asked if we could vote at this meeting rather than the next one. Trish Holt (President) noted that the students worked on this with the SEC and brought this before the Senate last year. Botnaru repeated the question regarding whether we would vote. Holt added that a vote is scheduled for a vote in October.

Trish Holt (President) reiterated how proud she and the faculty are of these students. Nick Holtzmann commended Michelle Haberland for her work on the students with this from the beginning.

#### **B. COUNTERING DISCRIMINATION AT GEORGIA SOUTHERN – ABBOTT**

Lisa Abbott offered to table this discussion item for the next Senate meeting since we were beyond time.

#### **VIII. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – DR. KYLE MARRERO (PRESIDENT)**

Updates from the President and Provost will be given to the SEC at a meeting the day after this Senate meeting, and notes will come forward from that meeting.

#### **IX. PROVOST'S REPORT – DR. CARL REIBER (PROVOST, VPAA)**

#### **X. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES**

#### **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

Kendra Parker (CAH) made a motion to adjourn. William Amponsah (PCOB) seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 PM.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Dr. Amanda Konkle (CAH)**

