

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

3-25-2021

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" (2021). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 71.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/71>

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

Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate Meeting

March 25, 2021 | 4:00–6:00 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM.

The Senate approved the Agenda and the Minutes of the February 2021 meeting as well as the Librarian's Report. The Senate heard reports from the General Education and Core Curriculum Committee, the Undergraduate Committee, and the Graduate Committee.

Trish Holt (FS President) provided the SEC Report, which included a brief update on the Faculty Welfare Committee's work on the NTT guidelines and a discussion on how to proceed with completing the Senate Inclusive Excellence plan.

The Senate heard a motion for Casey Keck to be appointed Student Government Association representative. This motion was approved.

The Senate discussed revisions to Articles I and II of the Faculty Senate Bylaws, which will come forward to be voted on at the April Senate meeting.

The Senate heard a report from the Student Government Association. Dr. TaJuan Wilson reported on who completed the Campus Climate survey. President Kyle Marrero gave a report.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 PM.

MINUTES

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

Senators in Attendance: Lisa Abbott (CAH), Lisa Costello (CAH), Finbarr Curtis (CAH), Bill Dawers (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), Solomon Smith (CAH), Robert Terry (CAH), Nancy McCarley (CBSS), Michael Nielsen (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), Jim LoBue (COSM), Ionut Emil Iacob (COSM), Cathy MacGowan (COSM), Traci Ness (COSM), Amy Potter (COSM), Jeffrey Secrest (COSM), Abid Shaikh (COSM), Nathaniel Shank (COSM), Devine 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), Rocio Alba-Flores (PCEC), David Calamas (PCEC), Rami Haddad (PCEC), Felix Hamza-Lup (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: Laura Valeri (CAH), Brett Curry (CBSS), Kara Bridgeman Sweeney (CBSS), Thomas Sweeney (CBSS), Clifford Padgett (COSM), John King (PCOB)

Senators not in Attendance: Katherine Fallon (CAH), Josh Kennedy (CBSS), Addie Martindale (CBSS), Eric Silva (CBSS), Justin Montemarano (COSM), Jake Simons (PCOB)

Participating Administrators: Kyle Marrero (President), Carl Reiber (Provost), Annalee Ashley (Chief of Staff), Amy Ballagh (AVP Enrollment Management), Jared Benko (Athletic Director), Rebecca Carroll (HR), Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs), 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), Vickie Shaw (HR), Rob Whitaker (VP Business and Finance), TaJuan Wilson (AVP Inclusive Excellence)

Guests: Megan Small (Faculty Senate GA), Joanne Chopak-Foss (Chair, Undergraduate Committee, JPHCOPH), Shelli Casler-Failing (Chair, Graduate Committee, COE), Korrina Bryan (SGA)

Attendees: Dustin Anderson, Brenda Blackwell, Caitlin Brady, Donna Brooks, Lisa Carmichael, Ashley Colquitt, Diana Cone, Kelly Crosby, Amber Culpepper, Kellianne Curley, Janet Dale, Nikki DiGregorio, Teresa Durham, Beth Durodoye, Steven Engel, Michael Forest, Karin Fry, Delena Bell Gatch, Amanda Graham, Cindy Groover, Michelle Haberland, Amy Heaston, Melissa Joiner, John Kraft, Allison Lyon, Delana Nivens, Brenda Richardson, Ryan Schroeder, Salman Siddiqui, Trina Smith, Kip Sorgen, Brad Sturz, Jennifer Syno, Audra Taylor, Stuart Tedders, Deborah Walker, Ruth Whitworth

CALL TO ORDER

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

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Rami Haddad (PCEC) moved to approve the agenda for the March 25, 2021 meeting. Andrew Hansen (JPHCOPH) seconded.

The Agenda was approved.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES / FEBRUARY 25, 2021

KONKLE (CAH), SENATE SECRETARY

Bill Mase (JPHCOPH) moved to approve the minutes of the February 25, 2021 meeting. Bill Dawers (CAH) seconded.

The Minutes were approved.

III. LIBRARIAN'S REPORT / MARCH 3, 2021

KING (CBSS), SENATE LIBRARIAN

Barbara King (CBSS) moved to accept that the Librarian's Report was submitted for information purposes. She noted that the Librarian's Report is a bit shorter than usual because of the earlier deadline for reports; those reports will be included in the next Librarian's Report.

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

Bill Wells (PCOB) reported that the GECC has no action items. Their work in the previous meeting was reviewing sub-committees' work to review the core curriculum and learning outcomes, despite the BOR's pause on the Core revision.

The report served as the motion and second. The report was approved, with 58 in favor, no opposed, no abstentions.

B. UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE – CHOPAK-FOSS (JPHCOPH)

The last undergraduate committee minutes were not received in time for this agenda, so there will be two reports next month.

C. GRADUATE COMMITTEE – CASLER-FAILING (COE)

Shelli Casler-Failing (COE) reported on the February 11 meeting. The committee approved 5 new programs and 12 program revisions, 17 new courses, 17 course revisions, and 2 course deletions.

The report served as the motion and second. The report passed, with 63 in favor, no opposed, and one abstention.

IV. SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

A. FACULTY SENATE NTT / FWC COMMITTEE UPDATE – HOLT (FS PRESIDENT)

Members of the Faculty Welfare Committee have been working on the non tenure-track path to promotion and met with Provost Reiber on March 10. Their motion should be ready for the April Senate meeting.

Trish Holt met with Chris Cartright and TaJuan Wilson on operationalizing the Motion to Counter Discrimination on campus. Options of new officer positions or committees were suggested. Chris Cartright has written action plans which will be put brought to the SEC and Faculty Senate in April. Barb King noted that one of the suggestions of the Elections Committee was to create a position on the SEC as a liaison between SEC and various diversity committees.

B. FACULTY SENATE INCLUSIVE EXCELLENCE REPORT – HOLT (FS PRESIDENT)

Trish Holt (FS President) reported on the Senate Inclusive Excellence plan. She reminded the Senate that a [Motion](#) committing the Senate to uphold Inclusive Excellence was passed in December of 2019, 54 to 3. Many subcommittees that were asked to look at different pieces of the plans requested by the Office of Inclusive Excellence submitted detailed plans addressing aspects of this report.

At the February 12 Senate Executive Committee meeting, which Trish Holt did not attend, the SEC discussed the feasibility of completing the Inclusive Excellence plan as it was laid out in the documents passed on to faculty. The Senate Executive Committee moved to “respectfully recommend returning the plan back to Dr. Wilson’s office incomplete, and requested a

meeting with Dr. Wilson to discuss faculty confusion, what is needed from faculty, and to develop a strategy more in line with faculty abilities and contributions.” The minutes from this meeting are in the Senate Agenda.

In response to this SEC Motion, Trish Holt scheduled a Zoom meeting with TaJuan Wilson and Trina Smith, chair of the staff council, to discuss completing the plan on February 23. Diana Botnaru (WCHP), Bill Mase (JPHCOPH), and Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) also attended.

At the March 5 SEC meeting, Trish Holt volunteered to draft the remainder of the report and bring it before the Senate in April. On Tuesday of the week of the March Senate meeting, Trish Holt was notified by two SEC members of faculty and senators opposed to providing a detailed plan with action steps to the Office of Inclusive Excellence, and would rather forward a short narrative stating:

- That the Faculty Senate’s role in Diversity and Inclusive Excellence is to oversee the work of various committees in its commitment to Diversity and Inclusive Excellence and the processes of the Faculty Senate, acts as a conduit between faculty and administration, and a conduit to discuss needs of students and faculty.

For action steps, the following was sent to Trish Holt in an email: • First thing committees do is identify who is and is not present around the table, and How will the underrepresented groups be accounted for? (jr. faculty, LGBTQ, International, African Americans, Asian Americans, etc.)

- Next, decide if additional committee members are needed? And finally,
- Decide how committee members will represent diversity of others who are not members of the committee? (How will these holes be filled?)

In response, Trish Holt felt that by following this plan instead of completing the form that colleges and other units are preparing, we would not have a plan of action in areas where we should be involved, such as having a voice in defining “Student Success” (2-D.1), defining Collaboration with the Faculty Senate to examine and make recommendations regarding classroom climate and design improvement efforts for inclusive pedagogical practices (3-A.1).

Trish Holt stated that the Senate cannot vote today to reverse the decision of December 2019 since an official motion was not submitted via SharePoint. Trish Holt intends not to drop the plans that many committees already submitted. She will continue to work on the document with anyone who would like to work on it with her, with a proposal to come to the Senate at the April meeting. However, with the new information, she is interested in hearing input on this topic and anyone who wants to may contact her.

Dee Liston (COE) asked to clarify a couple of points. When the SEC met and put forward the proposal to meet with Dr. Wilson, it was because there were so many holes in what the faculty had been putting together from the various committees, and that the SEC felt that the format does not fit well with what faculty typically do and can easily understand and produce. The report’s grid format, and having to return to the grid to document our progress, is a level of detail that faculty are struggling to comprehend and work under. The SEC suggested that the processes that faculty are being pressed to conform to don’t mesh with the ways that faculty understand our contribution to diversity and inclusive excellence. At the meeting earlier this week, it emerged that there are two different ways of addressing these issues. The suggestion emerged there that faculty work in more global ways and don’t have the time and motivation to document at this

level of detail, and that we may be pulling ourselves away from addressing diversity and inclusion by focusing on the very detailed plans. Faculty need to focus on the processes and keep the lines of communication open. That's why it was suggested that some more global actions that faculty can address be suggested to attend to, such as recognizing and addressing how diverse voices do or don't have a seat at the table.

Diana Botnaru (WCHP) seconded Dee Liston's points. She reiterated that as a Senator, as a member of the SEC, and as a member of the Faculty Development Committee, she knows that all her colleagues are dedicated to diversity and inclusive excellence. It is difficult for many faculty to wrap their heads around the format of the document that came out of the Office of Inclusive Excellence, with many goals with multiple subgoals. Instead of demonstrating our commitment to Inclusive Excellence, it becomes an exercise in filling in the boxes. We want it to be meaningful because we are devoted to Inclusive Excellence. Diana Botnaru noted that the motion Trish Holt read from December 2019 stated our commitment to Inclusive Excellence, but not that we need to fill in this particular plan. We are a self-governing body and should be allowed to determine the best commitments. The process as it is now was rushed, imposed from above, distributed amongst committees, and not consistently relevant to the work of the committees. In the meeting with Dr. Wilson, he made broader suggestions, such as the Senate developing an official mentoring program, or Senate working on equitable promotion and tenure guidelines. She doesn't think anyone on Senate is opposed to diversity and inclusive excellence, but rather don't understand the process by which the plan is being constructed. The group that met on Tuesday committed to more work before the plan was brought forward.

Robert Terry (CAH) reported that he was heavily involved in the FDC's work on the plan. He felt that this fell under what project management calls "scope creep," in which it becomes difficult to contribute meaningful, relevant, and attainable suggestions in this area.

Ellen Hamilton (WCHP) reported from the Faculty Wellness Committee, noting that many of the sections that were assigned to them were items that they would have no power over and that really applied to Human Resources, which made it difficult to fill meaningful information into the form. She concurred that a different process is needed to make this meaningful.

Chris Hanna (WCHP) stated that it's noble for Trish Holt to take on the work, but for it to be more inclusive and representative, it would be better if the group took that process to its conclusion rather than one individual. Trish Holt asked him to clarify what he meant by the group. He stated that he meant whatever level would be more inclusive, whether it's the SEC or faculty committees.

Bill Wells (PCOB) stated that he is also on the SEC and wants to reiterate that in no way is the SEC opposed to the plan, but there are items in the plan that are not relevant to Senate work, for example, item 2.I.1 is to conduct an audit of partnerships. That is an impossibility outside of the scope of any faculty member on this campus. Those are the things that are troubling us, not diversity or inclusiveness, but that items on the plan are items that we cannot accomplish. That's what we are trying to resolve. We have no intention of stopping the process, but we need to simplify and clarify.

TaJuan Wilson (CDO) reminded the Senate that he has stressed holistically taking the

items and determining if those items fit the work we do. The goal was never to fill in every item on the plan, but rather to look at action items that are relevant to Faculty Senate. While the plan may be overwhelming, these are the steps that are needed to move the institution toward IE. Each one of us is responsible for moving this forward. He is completely comfortable saying Senate can develop whatever kind of plan works for us. The plan was divided into 14 groups so that the work of reviewing the items and determining what Senate could split up. He encouraged Senate to review the plan again because the work we do can fit into the plan.

Chris Hanna (WCHP) asked if the Library Committee and each committee could modify the format in order to write their goals.

Diana Botnaru (WCHP) reiterated that the meeting with TaJuan Wilson was helpful to her, and she envisioned working on the plan in the ways that were discussed in this subcommittee for further drafting the plan. She is surprised to hear us talking about the plan today, especially that Trish Holt said that she would finish the plan herself. She would like to clarify the miscommunication, because the subcommittee agreed to work from a list Dr. Wilson shared, but it hasn't been further discussed so perhaps is not ready to be under discussion. Trish Holt said that she brought this up because she was told that faculty didn't want to check the boxes, but she hadn't heard that and wanted to hear from faculty. Until there is a motion to negate what was decided in December 2019, we are obligated to complete the report.

Lisa Abbott (CAH) stated that the Motion approved in December 2019 was in no way in danger of not being completed. The goal was to clarify what we needed to do and how to do it. There is no intention on the part of the SEC to not follow the Motion, but rather discussion of how to do it effectively.

Trish Holt asked for input regarding how the faculty on Faculty Senate want to address this going forward. Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) asked when the deadline is. TaJuan Wilson said April 16, but he is interested in a quality product, and President Marrero reiterated that. He stated that this is a central pillar of our strategic plan, and we need it for our accreditation review in 2025. It needs to be a plan that we can use to set achievable goals. Trish Holt said we need until the May meeting to vote on it.

Jessica Garner (LIB) suggested that the SEC could schedule a meeting to tweak the plan.

Diana Botnaru (WCHP) stated that the plan was for the subcommittee to draft and bring to the SEC.

Barbara King (CBSS) stated that we could form a summary of what has been completed and then devote focus to the parts that still need attention.

Dee Liston (COE) suggested that the Senators hearing this discussion could bring additional thoughts and ideas to the table, and please help the SEC approach this in a more global format.

Trish Holt reiterated that many committees have already completed work on this document, and that work will not be thrown out, but additional insights are encouraged.

C. MOTION REQUESTS – SGA REPRESENTATIVE

MOTION: Approve Casey Keck to serve as the Faculty Senate Student Government Association representative for the remainder of the AY 2021.

RATIONALE: Through an email request to the Faculty Senate listserv for a representative to serve on the Student Government Association, the only name received was Casey Keck. Casey has agreed to serve in this role for the remainder of the AY2021.

Lisa Abbott (CAH) moved that Casey Keck would serve as the SGA Rep for the remainder of the year. Barb King (CBSS) seconded. The motion passed, with 61 approved, none opposed, and no abstentions.

D. REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION

1. ONE SUBMITTED / RESCINDED
2. FACULTY SENATE AD HOC BYLAW REVISIONS

Note: The SEC voted to treat this item, which was submitted as a Discussion Item, as a Request for Information, because the format fit the format of an RFI rather than a Discussion Item. Senators can still ask for clarification of an RFI during the meeting. The text of the submitted item follows.

SUBJECT: This Discussion Item is submitted by Helen Bland on behalf of a few faculty members representing various colleges who compiled the following questions. In the February Faculty Senate meetings, it was announced by the Faculty Senate President, Trish Holt, that a sub- committee has been set up to review Faculty Senate Bylaws. Dr. Robert Yarborough then asked if the membership of the sub-committee has been posted anywhere that the Faculty might be able to view it. Additional questions we have and would like to have the opportunity to discuss among the Senators are: 1. List of sub-committee members and who they represent within the SEC structure? 2. How the membership for this sub-committee was chosen? 3. Is the membership representative? 4. What is the scope and the charge of the committee? 5. Have they begun to meet? And/or how often do they meet? 6. How many meetings have been conducted thus far? When did they start meeting? 7. Are there minutes to share from said meetings? 8. How many times have these drafts been presented to the entire SEC for discussion? 9. What is the mechanism for all faculty to review proposed changes and provide feedback/ recommendations as an intermediate step (prior to voting)? 10. Are there drafts posted of the various proposed changes that all faculty within the institution can have access to review? 11. Where would we find these drafts? 12. Will substantive proposed changes to the governing processes of Faculty Senate have individual motions submitted? If the changes are substantial enough to require the formation an Ad Hoc Committee, then Senators deserve a chance to review and discuss this with faculty that they represent before it comes to the Senate floor for a discussion and/or a vote.

RATIONALE: Any changes to the governance structure of the Faculty Senate would impact all colleges within Georgia Southern. If the changes are substantial enough to require the formation an Ad Hoc Committee, then Senators deserve a chance to review and discuss this with faculty that they represent before it comes to the Senate floor for a discussion and/or a vote.

The following written response has been submitted for the record.

This Discussion Item is submitted by Helen Bland on behalf of a few faculty members

representing various colleges who compiled the following questions. In the February Faculty Senate meetings, it was announced by the Faculty Senate President, Trish Holt, that a subcommittee has been set up to review Faculty Senate Bylaws. Dr. Robert Yarborough then asked if the membership of the sub-committee has been posted anywhere that the Faculty might be able to view it. Additional questions we have and would like to have the opportunity to discuss among the Senators are.

It is important to note that the current bylaws were approved by the Faculty Senate on April 3, 2019 and by the President on May 2, 2019. Section 12 of the Georgia Southern Statutes state: *The Faculty Senate shall operate in accordance with its Bylaws which must be approved by the corps of instruction.*

Faculty Senate Bylaws Article V Section 1 states: These *Bylaws* were approved by the Faculty Senate on April 3, 2019. Subsequent revision must be included as an agenda item and shall require a two-thirds vote of those present at a meeting of the Faculty Senate.

In addition, this is an SEC sub-committee, not an ad hoc committee as written in the title line of the discussion item.

1. List of sub-committee members and who they represent within the SEC structure?

Lisa Abbott, CAH - voting member on the SEC
Diana Botnaru, WCHP - voting member on the SEC

Cary Christian, CBSS - president-elect and voting member for CBSS
Barbara King, CBSS - Senate Librarian

Bill Wells, COB - voting member on the SEC

Helen Bland, JPHCOPH - past president and non-voting member - resigned on February 5, 2021 and was replaced with Patricia Holt, CoE-current Faculty Senate President, voting member only in case of a tie. Dr. Holt resigned following the March 4th meeting due to personal reasons. She only attended one meeting.

Dr. Holt agreed to post the membership of the subcommittee on the Faculty Senate website during the February Senate meeting.

2. How the membership for this sub-committee was chosen?

SEC Chair Trish Holt asked for volunteers from the SEC who wanted to work on the review. Dr. Botnaru and Professor Abbott volunteered to chair the subcommittee.

3. Is the membership representative?

The membership represents 5 colleges. Note for clarification, the committee is reviewing and making recommendations to the full SEC, who will vote on what they want to send to the senate. So all colleges are ultimately represented by their SEC rep who has the final vote on the recommendations going forward for Senate review.

4. What is the scope and charge of the committee?

To review and offer potential updates of the bylaws to be presented to the Faculty Senate for a vote. There are inconsistencies within the Faculty Senate ByLaws as they appear in the Faculty Handbook as opposed to what appears in the Senate Handbook as well as potential conflicts with the University Statutes. This is a task assigned to the SEC in the bylaws, Article III, Section 4. Subsection k.

review all the foundational documents of the University as they relate to the faculty, including, but not necessarily limited to, the *Statutes, Bylaws*, and various handbooks; examine extant committee structure of the Senate, including charges and composition; and recommend to the Senate such revisions or amendments as appropriate and necessary;

5. Have they begun to meet? And/or how often do they meet?

First meeting was January 21, 2021, with subsequent meetings on February 4; February 18 and March 4 as of today, March 4, 2021. The sub-committee is scheduled to meet every two weeks till the end of the spring semester.

6. How many meetings have been conducted thus far? When did they start meeting?

See 5 above.

7. Are there minutes to share from said Meetings?

There are no minutes from the sub-committee. There is a working document with comments from the committee members that has been made available to the SEC for review. Minutes will be recorded when the bylaws are brought for discussion to the entire SEC. The subcommittee reports to the SEC at each of their meetings.

8. How many times have these drafts been presented to the entire SEC for discussion?

Article I and II are being presented to the entire SEC for discussion on March 5, 2021. The

sub-committee will present the drafts in chunks to facilitate a meaningful discussion in the SEC and the Senate. The full SEC has access to the working document for comments.

9. What is the mechanism for all faculty to review proposed changes and provide feedback/ recommendations as an intermediate step (prior to voting)?

The committee was originally tasked to present all the potential changes in the April meeting. However members of the SEC have asked that material be provided sooner. The first two articles will be discussed by the SEC during the March 5 SEC meeting and have been written as motion requests that will be adjusted based on the decisions made by the SEC. These will go out to the faculty senate as a part of the agenda for the March Senate Meeting. As with all motions that go before the senate the option to amend the recommendations is available to any senator. In addition, if the senate feels more time is needed to review the recommended changes any senator can propose sending back to committee or to table the recommendations for a later vote.

10. Are there drafts posted of the various proposed changes that all faculty within the institution can have access to review?

Drafts are not posted as of March 4, 2021, as they have not been discussed in the SEC. Drafts will be posted to all faculty as soon as the SEC decides which recommendations they want to bring before the senate.

11. Where would we find these drafts?

The SEC can decide on how to better facilitate sharing the drafts. Probably on the senate share point? They could also be sent out as attachments to all senators or to the full faculty through the faculty email.

12. Will substantive proposed changes to the governing processes of Faculty Senate have individual motions submitted? If the changes are substantial enough to require the formation an Ad Hoc Committee, then Senators deserve a chance to review and discuss this with faculty that they represent before it comes to the Senate floor for a discussion and/or a vote.

Absolutely. As with all motions that come before the senate. Again, the sub-committee is doing the work tasked to the SEC by the bylaws and will only be making recommendations to the faculty senate to vote on. Any changes in the bylaws will go through the process of a motion as established by the faculty senate, will be open to amendments from the floor, and any senator can put forth a motion to table for further review.

Discussion: Robert Yarbrough (COSM) clarified that, although his name is invoked in this RFI, he is not a sponsor of this RFI and was not asked about it, and this is not a concern that he has. Multiple SEC members contacted him directly to ask about his concerns. Notwithstanding the fact that his name is invoked here, he did ask for the membership of the committee but did not have anything to do with this Request for Information.

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) asked for clarification about whether Robert Yarbrough's name is in the text of the item, and he stated that it is because of his question about committee membership at the last Senate meeting. He wanted to clarify because his name was invoked in the RFI. Helen insisted that she did not submit his name, and then she was referred to pages 57 and 59 of the Agenda. Robert Yarbrough reiterated that he was not involved in the RFI.

Trish Holt (FS President) added that the subcommittee that is working on the revisions will be reporting to the SEC and the revisions will be in the SEC minutes. However, that is not what happened at the SEC meeting, as a motion was made and passed to forego discussion at the SEC meeting because the SEC was comfortable that the subcommittee had done its job and felt ready to bring it to the Senate for Senate input. This was changed from a Motion to a Discussion Item so that the Senate can look at the revisions and provide feedback.

Helen Bland reported that she did not invoke Robert Yarbrough's name, that his name came up in the responses to the item. She submitted pages 55 and 56 and the responses were on pages 57 and 59.

E. DISCUSSION ITEM –

Note: The SEC voted to treat this item, which was submitted as a Motion, as a Discussion Item. The text of the submitted item follows.

1. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW REVISIONS ARTICLE I

DISCUSSION ITEM: The SEC submits the following revisions to the Senate ByLaws for Article I 325 Faculty Senate Bylaws The operating rules of the Senate are set forth in the Bylaws which were approved by the Faculty Senate, January 22, 1996, and last

amended on April 3, 2019, to reflect the consolidated Senate for Georgia Southern University's Statesboro, Armstrong, and Liberty campuses. These Bylaws establish the Faculty Senate Policies, and committee structure and membership. ARTICLE I--- POLICIES SECTION 1. The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort. The Faculty Senate at Georgia Southern shall serve as the representative and legislative agency of the faculty. As such, it shall serve as the official faculty advisory body to the president in the spirit of shared governance (Shared Governance at Georgia Southern is viewed as a structure and process for partnership, equity, accountability, and ownership).

Within the policy framework of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, and with the approval of the president, the recommendations of the Faculty Senate shall be the academic policy of the University to be implemented by the administration. SECTION 2. The academic affairs of the University are the concern of the Faculty Senate who are responsible in formulating, recommending, and reviewing policies and procedures including academic activities, general educational policy of the University, the welfare of the faculty, and other matters which maintain and promote the best interests of the faculty and the University as specified in the Policy Manual of the Board of Regents. SECTION 3. The Bylaws allow the Faculty Senate to accomplish its responsibilities and objectives provided such interpretation does not directly conflict with the Statutes of Georgia Southern University.

RATIONALE: These suggested changes are to clarify and strengthen the language of Article I of the bylaws.

See Appendix for content of the Proposed Revisions.

DISCUSSION:

Diana Botnaru (WCHP) commended Lisa Abbott (CAH) for putting the changes in a column next to the original document as well as creating a column with rationale for the changes. She suggested the body review the whole of Article I rather than going line by line, as the table makes it easy for Senators to see changes.

Lisa Abbott (CAH) recommended going line by line to make sure that everything is covered and everyone has had a chance to speak up.

Trish Holt (FS President) asked for questions about the changes to Article I. Section 1. Trish Holt asked where the first sentence in Section 1 came from, as Senate does not interact with the governing board. Lisa Abbott (CAH) said this change was about clarifying the role of the Senate in shared governance within the university. Diana Botnaru (WCHP) stated that this statement came from an article on shared governance that Trish Holt shared with the SEC. Trish Holt stated that she sees this statement as trying to expand what the Senate does as they do not interact with the governing board. Diana Botnaru said that it did not state that we are in communication with the governing board but that we need to share communication with the governing board.

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) stated that we would have to check because the bylaws state that we cannot pass anything that is in conflict with the Statutes. She

recommended that we run these through Legal Affairs. Maura Copeland (Legal Affairs) stated that Legal Affairs will happily look at anything that is proposed. Lisa Abbott (CAH) clarified that the committee is working with the Statutes, the Faculty Handbook, and the Senate Handbook. They have already found things that were voted on in 2018 that violate the Statutes. The only way for Statutes to be revised is for the President to put together a committee to review the Statutes. The committee was charged to locate where bylaws contradicted themselves, contradicted the Statutes, and contradicted what is in the Faculty Handbook. The Statutes will have to be reviewed because many of them do not fit the consolidation. This will be part of the process. Diana Botnaru (WCHP) added that the opening statement does not indicate that Senate is trying to expand what the Senate does. Article II reinforces that Senate is responsible for Academic Affairs. This statement in Article I is only to reiterate and define shared governance.

Barbara King (CBSS) referenced what Lisa Abbott was indicating about the Statutes, and said part C presents a conflict with the bylaws and statutes, and, the way that the Statutes are written, they state something that is not mathematically possible (Article V, Sections 8 and 9). The Statutes provide a certain number of faculty members along with an apportionment of faculty members per campus that needs to change as the number of full-time faculty change.

2. FACULTY SENATE BYLAW REVISIONS ARTICLE II

DISCUSSION ITEM: The SEC submits the following revisions to the Senate By Laws for Article I 325 Faculty Senate Bylaws The operating rules of the Senate are set forth in the Bylaws which were approved by the Faculty Senate, January 22, 1996, and last amended on April 3, 2019, to reflect the consolidated Senate for Georgia Southern University's Statesboro, Armstrong, and Liberty campuses. These Bylaws establish the Faculty Senate Policies, and committee structure and membership. ARTICLE I--- POLICIES SECTION 1. The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort. The Faculty Senate at Georgia Southern shall serve as the representative and legislative agency of the faculty. As such, it shall serve as the official faculty advisory body to the president in the spirit of shared governance (Shared Governance at Georgia Southern is viewed as a structure and process for partnership, equity, accountability, and ownership).

Within the policy framework of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, and with the approval of the president, the recommendations of the Faculty Senate shall be the academic policy of the University to be implemented by the administration. SECTION 2. The academic affairs of the University are the concern of the Faculty Senate who are responsible in formulating, recommending, and reviewing policies and procedures including academic activities, general educational policy of the University, the welfare of the faculty, and other matters which maintain and promote the best interests of the faculty and the University as specified in the Policy Manual of the Board of Regents. SECTION 3. The Bylaws allow the Faculty Senate to accomplish its responsibilities and objectives provided such interpretation does not directly conflict with the Statutes of Georgia Southern University.

RATIONALE: On March 5, 2021, SEC voted to change this from a Motion to a Discussion Item. These suggested changes are to clarify and strengthen the language of Article I of the bylaws.

See Appendix for content of the Proposed Revisions.

DISCUSSION:

Lisa Abbott (CAH) introduced revisions to Article II, Section 2, which states that the University President is to provide abbreviated minutes regarding Action Items. The President stated that he has assumed that this is related to decisions made during the Senate meetings. He did state that sometimes this may take more than 10 days depending on Legal, but he hopes that would not happen because of collaborative efforts in developing motions before voting on them.

Regarding Article II, Section 3, the President asked if it would ever be the case that a Motion would come through within 2 days before the meeting so that Senators and others can review the Motions. Lisa Abbott (CAH) stated that the committee interpreted this as stating that no Motions can come from the floor, which can at times keep us from being flexible and timely, in the event, for example, that a Discussion Item on the floor led to a Motion during the meeting. Lisa Abbott (CAH) clarified that Senate couldn't make a statement about the book burning for a month because no Motion was allowed to come from the floor. As this is written, it does not allow for a Motion from the floor. Nothing about the idea of Motions from the floor suggests that the Senate can make policy, because the Senate is an advisory body with no power to pass policies. President Marrero added that in a perfect world, we would all work well together, but at times there are impassioned moments that might prevent the entire body from reflecting on Motions that were proposed from the floor. He added that sometimes there are things he cannot do, usually based on legal matters, and that he wants Senators to have time to think about any Motions.

Barb King (CBSS) added the context of different colleges preferring different approaches to Motions from the floor.

Cary Christian (CBSS) said he would reiterate what Barb said. His college wants the ability to discuss as a group and get faculty input on Motions that come before the Senate. While this might not matter for many issues, he does want to avoid the situation where faculty feel that they do not have an opportunity to provide feedback and input.

Diana Botnaru (WCHP) stated that the document does not make a decision one way or the other. But the Statutes do not prevent Motions from the floor now, because that part of the Statutes applies to general Faculty Meetings, not the Senate. Motions can also always be tabled if someone is not comfortable voting without input from faculty. It is up to the entire Senate body to decide how we want to phrase this in the bylaws.

Trish Holt (FS President) asked to hear from Senate members in addition to SEC members because it is all of our faculty Senate. Bill Dawers (CAH) stated that while he understands the concern about impassioned moments, he thinks that a body of responsible academics could entertain motions from the floor, especially in times of crisis, and that issues could be tabled as needed. Leticia McGrath (CAH) asked a question about when we stopped being allowed to have Motions from the floor, and

that we did have them before consolidation. Senators reported in the chat that Motions from the floor were allowed at Armstrong and Statesboro prior to consolidation. Lisa Abbott said this was in the update passed in April 2019. Chris Hanna (WCHP) agrees with what Bill Dawers said, that Senators can handle the responsibility in times of crisis and that there are instances wherein a timely response is needed, with the caveat that Motions can also be tabled and reason can prevail in a body of this size if someone is trying to put through an irrational Motion. Bill Wells (WCHP) agreed with Bill Dawers and Chris Hanna. He leans toward fewer restrictions on Senate actions. This does not always have to be a crisis, but rather could also be an innocuous motion that needs to be voted on by the Senate body. Robert Yarbrough (COSM) also agreed. He was surprised to find that Motions from the floor were not allowed when beginning service this term. He recalls Motions from the floor in previous Senate sessions and agrees that we can govern in this way responsibly. A number of people expressed their support in the chat, which could not be copied in the Appendix because of a Zoom outage.

No discussion on Article II, Sections 4 and 5. Section 6 is a new section being proposed. Lisa Abbott (CAH) stated that this section came out of switching to a Zoom format and adequately recognizing technology within the Bylaws.

Michael Nielsen (CBSS) asked to clarify Section 6. It seems to him that it could be read that the format would need to be available two days before the meeting. Barb King (CBSS) stated that the link to the meeting has to be made available two days prior, so perhaps that language could be added to the item.

Mark Hanna (PCOB) asked a question on Article 4, which was included with the Discussion Item in the Agenda. Lisa Abbott (CAH) said these are not changes up for discussion here, but are from the university Statutes and included here as reference points.

V. REPORTS

A. SGA REPORT – BRYAN (SGA CHIEF OF STAFF)

Trish Holt (FS President) introduced Korrina Bryan, the Chief of Staff for the Student Government Association. SGA Elections will take place April 5-7. They are bringing back the Clothing Closet on the Armstrong campus in the fall. They are still working on the IE Action Plan and encouraging other student orgs to work on one as well. They are also starting a Food Pantry on the Statesboro campus. The SGA has two scholarship recipients for this year's scholarship. They also meet with Shay Little.

B. FACULTY CLIMATE SURVEY – DR. TAJUAN WILSON (AVP FOR IE & CDO)

TaJuan Wilson presented an overview of the Campus Climate Survey; the data will be shared later. This survey was designed as a snapshot of perceptions of General Climate, Commitment to Inclusive Excellence, Mental Health, Programming and Resources, Discriminatory Instances, Value and Voice, and Consolidation.

There were three different survey instruments for faculty, staff, and students. They were unable to validate whether people accurately indicated the areas in which they worked.

Executive Summary Reports will roll out soon, with reports on each category of perceptions and

the Open Response Feedback to be shared, along with specific Recommendations curated by the Office of Inclusive Excellence. We haven't seen the data yet because the Academic Colleges data is not yet done. Each college report is averaging 35-40 pages. The Central Unit plans will go to members of the President's cabinet. The Academic college reports will go to Provost Reiber and the Deans, who will determine how to disseminate that data. All reports will be delivered no later than April 5. The full presentation of data will happen on Wednesday, April 7, in a live event that will take place at 1:00 PM, with a Q & A following the session. The full Executive Summary and a copy of the live session will be posted on the Inclusive Excellence website, with opportunities to chat about the data. This initiative is tied to the university's commitment to Inclusive Excellence, including the four goals of the Inclusive Excellence plan.

They are creating the Eagle Support Network to help individuals know how and to whom to report instances of discrimination. This program is slated to roll out in Fall 2021. CLEC and IE Action Plan Seed Grant applications are open (on a rolling basis) and information is available on the OIE website. The Idea Catcher on the OIE website is also a place to submit your feedback about the Campus Climate data.

Bill Wells (PCOB) moved to extend the meeting 15 minutes. The motion was seconded and passed, with 48 approved, 2 opposed, no abstentions.

Bill Dawers (CAH) suggested that it would be easier to submit questions in advance of the live presentation if data was available a bit in advance. Amanda Hedrick (CAH) asked for clarification if the presentation was on Tuesday or Wednesday. It is on Wednesday.

C. SENATE ELECTIONS – KING (CBSS)

Barbara King (CBSS) reminded everyone to look for nomination forms for Senate officer positions, which will be open until April 4. The election will take place during the April Senate meeting, with a sample ballot and biographies to come out two weeks prior to that meeting.

VI. PRESIDENT'S REPORT – DR. KYLE MARRERO (PRESIDENT)

President Marrero stated that Covid-19 numbers are down in the state and region. Bulloch County positivity rates were 33 per 100,000, Chatham County rates were 113 per 100,000, and Liberty County were 207 per 100,000. Cases on campus have been around 20 in the past several weeks, with a small uptick expected as a result of return from Spring Break.

Medical Director Brian DeLoach provided an update on vaccine distribution. Drive-through POD at Paulson Stadium delivered 469 doses in 3 hours on April 24. Drive-through POD scheduled for the 30 at Armstrong, with some appointments still available. Additional PODS are scheduled on each campus next week. We're starting to get into recipients of second doses, so we're trying to maximize spots for new first doses as well.

President Marrero stated that we're working with partners for possible open walk-in POD partnerships, with the issue always being vaccine availability. The university provides Moderna, which is available for those 18 years and over. Individuals are highly encouraged to get the

vaccine. The Civic Center in Savannah is opening April 1 as a new walk-up mass distribution site.

Seventy-seven percent of faculty and staff engagement in the Employee Engagement Survey, the results of which will be presented on a Monday, April 12 Town Hall, and the video will be posted. All leader reports will be sent, and training will begin on April 13 and 14, with training sessions throughout the week of the 19. Department-level meetings with chairs and deans to develop drafts of Action Plans will take place April 26 through May 6. This is a tool to be used along with the Climate Survey for improving the institution.

The legislative session ends March 31. Senate passed the budget with growth formula funding. The Jack and Ruth Ann Hill Convocation Center was fully funded. Both have to get through conference and be voted on. We'll know by mid-April the allocations for our FY22 budget, which will be presented at the April Senate meeting.

HEERF-II funds have been disseminated to students. The remaining \$25 million is going through some revisions because of lifted restrictions on how to use that money. The American Rescue Plan will result in \$32 million in grant aid directly to students to be applied over the next two years and \$32 million to the institution to be used over the next two years. It is not the type of funding that can be used to hire faculty but can be used to help us bridge through this time.

Fall and Summer enrollments look good. University Performance Excellence Awards will take place April 2, with 21 individual awards, one team award, and 408 service awards.

Vice President of Business and Finance finalists are on campus this week and next.

VII. PROVOST'S REPORT – DR. CARL REIBER (PROVOST, VPAA)

Provost Reiber ceded his time to President Marrero. He was going to talk about the Return to Normalcy plan for the fall, which will largely be a communications plan, but he does want everyone to have an opportunity to provide input. We recognize that about a third of our students don't know what normalcy looks like. We also want to catch any really good ideas that have come out of Covid.

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES

Trish Holt (FS President) thanked all stakeholders for their input.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Diana Botnaru (WCHP) moved to adjourn at 6:15 PM. Mark Hanna (PCOB) seconded.

Respectfully submitted,
Amanda Konkle

