

# Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate Meeting

October 26, 2022 | 4:00 – 6:00 p.m

Zoom Link for Non-Voting Attendees:

<https://georgiasouthern.zoom.us/j/92447726513>

Zoom Link for Panelists will be sent out by Wednesday, September 28

## Pre-Meeting Notes:

- 1) Read all reports, motions, and discussions included in this agenda *before* the meeting.
- 2) Be able to access copies during the meeting. Copies will not be shown online during meetings.
- 3) To allow everyone a chance to participate and to keep the meeting on schedule, please try to be succinct in your comments.
- 4) Faculty Senate meetings this year will be virtual. The meeting starts promptly at 4 p.m., which means everyone should be online by that time. The meeting space will be open with IT staff available 30 minutes prior to the starting time to help with any technical issues you may have prior to the meeting.
- 5) This meeting will be run as a virtual Video Webinar through Zoom with all Senators and select administrators as Panelists.
- 6) Senators and invited guests are asked to join with video with full name and college affiliation. Video should be on when speaking.
- 7) As a Senator, if you cannot attend, it is your responsibility to confirm a substitution with the Alternates from your college. The name and email address of the alternate should be sent to Bill Dawers ([wdawers@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:wdawers@georgiasouthern.edu)) and David Walker ([davidwalker@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:davidwalker@georgiasouthern.edu)) as far in advance as possible to ensure that the alternate receives the appropriate link.
- 8) Alternates may vote only if they are representing a Senator.
- 9) Please raise your hand via the button at the bottom of the Zoom webpage to be recognized to speak.
- 10) All Faculty Senate meetings are recorded.
- 11) All submissions to the Chat box will become part of the official minutes of the meeting.
- 12) Edited Minutes will be distributed.

## Agenda

4:00 p.m.	<b>CALL TO ORDER</b>
4:02 p.m.	<b>APPROVAL OF AGENDA</b>
4:04 p.m.	<b>APPROVAL OF THE OCT. 6 MINUTES</b> (pg. 5)
4:05 p.m.	<b>LIBRARIAN'S REPORT</b> (pg. 12)
4:07 p.m.	<p><b>FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (SEC) REPORT</b></p> <p><b>New Business</b></p> <p><b>i. Presentation on the new faculty salary study with Carol Mercer, Mary Ann Edwards, and Tina Adams from Segal. Q&amp;A will follow.</b></p>
4:40 p.m.	<p><b>ii. Motion Request: Revise NTT external letter requirements</b> (Annie Mendenhall - CAH) (pg. 31)</p> <p><b>MOTION:</b> Revise the “External Letters” requirements on p. 46, p. 61, and p. 62 of the <a href="#">Faculty Handbook, 2021-2022</a> from the current to the revised version, printed below.</p> <p><b>Current Version:</b></p> <p>External Letters: External letters that comment on a candidate’s quality of work are required for promotion to NTT and Clinical Associate Professor and to NTT or Clinical Professors. Candidates, with the assistance of their department or unit chair/head, may solicit letters from individuals who are qualified to evaluate the candidate’s discipline and primary workload emphasis, for example, individuals in a supervisory role in a professional setting, or individuals outside the college with expertise in teaching or with disciplinary excellence. Unsolicited letters are not acceptable as external letters. Each external letter writer must state the nature of his/her relationship with the candidate.</p> <p><b>Revised Version:</b></p> <p>External Letters: External letters that comment on a candidate’s quality of work are required for promotion to NTT <b>or</b> Clinical Associate Professor and to NTT <b>or</b> Clinical Professor <b>in cases where scholarship is required for major review and promotion.</b> <b>Candidates for promotion to NTT or Clinical</b></p>

4:55 p.m.	<p>Associate Professor and to NTT or Clinical Professor who are not reviewed on scholarship may elect to solicit external letters commenting on their teaching, professional development, or service activities if they wish, but are not required to do so. To solicit external letters, each candidate shall submit to his/her chair or unit head the names and contact information of at least three qualified individuals not directly involved in the faculty member's work (i.e., have not been involved as a mentor or close collaborator) who can objectively review the faculty member's portfolio. The individuals should be experts in the faculty member's field and hold an academic appointment at an institution at least similar to Georgia Southern with rank at or above the rank to which the candidate is aspiring. The department chair or chair of the department's Tenure and Promotion Committee shall solicit letters from two of the individuals that address the quality of work performed and readiness of the candidate for promotion. In addition to submitting names for individuals who may be contacted for external review, the faculty member may submit up to three names (and contact information) of individuals who may not be contacted by anyone involved in the promotion review.</p> <p><b>SENATE PRESIDENT'S UPDATE</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Updates on communication and organization<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Reminder: If panelists send chat comments to "everyone," all attendees should now be able to see those comments</li><li>b. <a href="#">Faculty Senate website</a> being updated, eventually with emphasis on the Current Senate Business page</li><li>c. More user-friendly interface will eventually be implemented for submission of Discussion Items and Requests for Info</li></ol></li><li>2. Update on committee membership needs<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Many open seats remain - please review <a href="#">membership lists</a> and consider volunteering, recruiting, etc</li><li>b. Possible approaches to addressing issues with committee staffing - things to consider for upcoming meetings: fewer SEC appointments and more members elected by units; SEC appointments could include faculty not currently serving as senators or alternates; reduce number of SEC appointments; eliminate committees; reduce size of committees</li></ol></li></ol>
-----------	--

5:05 p.m.

**UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT'S REPORT (Dr. Kyle Marrero)**

5:20 p.m.

**PROVOST'S REPORT (Dr. Carl Reiber)**

5:35 p.m.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**October 6, 2002, 4pm to 6pm**  
**Meeting Rescheduled from September 29<sup>th</sup> due to Hurricane Ian**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

The meeting was called to order at 4:00 pm by Senate President Bill Dawers.

The Senate approved the meetings from the August meeting and the Librarian's Report.

Bill Dawers began the meeting with his update to the senate, speaking about the new staff hire to support the faculty senate, about updates to the faculty senate website enabled by having a new administrative assistant, and about the work of the Armstrong Task Force.

The solo discussion item was about plans for a survey of faculty about their experiences with teaching site synchronous courses. Bill Dawers indicated that he would be working with Kasie Alt (CAH) to apply her ongoing research to design an effective survey mechanism. The floor was then opened to discussion, and several senators and members of the administration brought up concerns and thoughts about the site sync technology and how it is being used.

President Marrero and Provost Reiber both delivered their respective updates from their positions to the Senate, fielding questions from Senators.

The meeting adjourned at 5:11 PM.

**MINUTES**

**Officers in Attendance:** Bill Dawers (CAH, President); Ed Mondor (COSM, President-Elect); Robert Terry (CAH, Secretary); Kymberly Harris (COE, serving as parliamentarian); Christine Bedore (COSM, Librarian).

**Officers Absent:** None.

**Senators in Attendance (by college):** Annie Mendenhall (CAH); Jonathan Murphy (CAH); Lisa Costello (CAH); Jeffrey Riley (CAH); Chris Caplinger (CAH); Kasie Alt (CAH); Steven Elisha (CAH); Virginie Ems-Bleneau (CAH); Dan Larkin (CAH); Kendra Parker (CAH); Marieke Van Willigen (CBSS); Josh Kennedy (CBSS); Wendy Wolfe (CBSS); Jonathan Grubb (CBSS); Jayce Sudweeks (CBSS); Mike Nielsen (CBSS); Tom Sweeney (CBSS); Elizabeth "Betsy" Barrow (COE); Ming Fan He (COE); Karin Fisher (COE); Lucas Jensen (COE); Kathryn Haughney (COE); Raymona Lawrence (JPHCOPH); Bill Mase (JPHCOPH); Hareesh Rochani (JPHCOPH); Tuyin An (COSM); Jay Hodgson (COSM); Yi Hu (COSM); Nathaniel Shank (COSM); Worlanyo Eric Gato (COSM); Divine Wanduku (COSM); Tricia Brown (COSM); Zhan Chen (COSM); Maxim Durach (COSM); Yongki Lee (COSM); Beth Burnett (LIB); Wilhelmina Randtke (LIB); Mujibur Khan (PCEC); Hayden Wimmer (PCEC); Anoop Desai (PCEC); Salman Siddiqui (PCEC); Vladimir Gurau (PCEC); William Amponsah (PCOB); Omid Ardakani (PCOB); Nick Mangee (PCOB); Jun Liu (PCOB); Errol Stewart (PCOB); Sheri Carey (WCHP); Joshua Kies (WCHP); Estelle Bester (WCHP); Kari Mau (WCHP); Chris Hanna (WCHP); Leigh Rich (WCHP); Gregg Rich (WCHP); Paula Tillman (WCHP)

**Alternates in Attendance (by college):** Janet Dale (CAH); Dean Cummings (CAH); Samuel Opuku (COPH)

**Senators not in Attendance (by college):** June Joyner (CAH); JenniferKowalewski (CAH); Amy Potter (COSM); Felix Hamza-Lup (PCEC); Kwabena Boakye (PCOB)

**Participating Administrators:** Kyle Marrero (University President); Carl Reiber (Provost); Ashlea Anderson (Interim CIO); Ashley Walker Colquitt (Dean, College of Graduate Studies); Amy Ballagh (Interim AVP Enrollment Management); Amy Smith (AVP Enrollment Management); Ashraf Saad (Assistant Dean, Armstrong Campus, College of Engineering and Computing); Bradley Sturz (Associate Director of Assessment); Breanna Calamas (Assistant Director of Advisement); Brenda Richardson (Assistant Director, First and Second Year Experience); Cassie Morgan (Registrar); Cynthia Groover (Assistant Provost); Delena A.G. Schartner (Assistant Vice President for Strategic Initiatives); Delena Bell Gatch (Assistant Vice President for Institutional Assessment and Accreditation); Diana Cone (Vice Provost); Dominique Quarles (Associate Vice President for Inclusive Excellence and Chief Diversity Officer); Dustin Anderson (Associate Provost for Student Success); Jennifer Syno (Director, Office of Advising); John Kraft (Interim Dean, Collge of Arts and Humanities);John Lester (Vice President, University Communications and Marketing); Kelly Crosby (Director, Risk and Compliance); Lisa Carmichael (Dean of Libraries); Matthew Pulliam (Director, IT Business Operations); Norton Pease (Associate Dean of Academic and Student Affairs, College of Arts and Humanities); Ron Stalnaker (Vice President, Business and Finance); Shay Little (Vice President, Student Affairs); Stuart Tedders (Dean, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health); Whitney Nash (Dean, Waters College of Health Professions); Maura Copeland (Executive Counsel); Scott Taylor (Staff Council); David Walker (Assistant Director – IT Support Automation)

**Attendees:** Karelle Aiken; Nikki DiGregorio; Trish Holt; Carol Jamison; Amanda Konkle; Eliose Pitt; Michael McCurdy; Leticia McGrath; Beth Myers; Brad Sturz; Stuart Tedders; Kelly Tippy; Ellen Williams; Wendy Woodrum.

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

- a. Bill Dawers called the meeting to order at 4:01pm.

**II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

- a. Besty Barrow (COE) moved to approve the agenda. Motion was approved 44 in favor, 0 against, no abstentions.

**III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

- a. No corrections were made to the minutes from September.

**IV. LIBRARIAN'S REPORT**

- a. Betsy Barrow (COE) noted that the Librarian's Report had the wrong version of the Faculty Welfare Committee's minutes, so plans were made to get all committee minutes updated at the next meeting, Kymberly Harris (COE) moved to accept the report. It was accepted with a vote of 46 to 0, no abstentions.

**V. SENATE PRESIDENT'S UPDATE**

- a. The first update provided by Bill Dawers (CAH) was that we now have Kelly Tippy as the administrative support for the Faculty Senate, indicating that she is located in the Savannah Research Labs annex across Abercorn from the main part of the Armstrong Campus.. This is the first time in three years that the senate has received this support.

Bill Dawers (CAH) noted that Kelly Tippy worked at Armstrong more than a decade ago and that he was thrilled to welcome her to Georgia Southern.

- b. Next, Dawers (CAH) indicated that he has been making tweaks to the pre-meeting notes to make them more accessible and quicker to read. In addition, he said that David Walker believes that senators' and other panelists' chat comments made to "Everyone" should now be visible to attendees of senate meetings.
- c. Next, Dawers (CAH) transitioned to talking about Kelly Tippy's contributions over the next few months. He said he will be working with her to update membership lists and address any remaining gaps in the committee memberships. She will also work on updates to the faculty senate website, including posting the videos of the faculty senate meetings. None of this will happen right away, but these updates are in progress, and Dawers (CAH) indicated that he will work with IT to improve the discussion item and request for information forms to make them more accessible and more effective in communicating information. The result, Dawers hopes, will be a new faculty senate business page, making it easier for faculty to be aware of what is happening before any given meeting and during the periods between meetings.
- d. Dawers (CAH) then transitioned to talking about the Armstrong Task Force. He said that a list of programs that could be promoted has been pushed forward and is being discussed. He encouraged people to check the links provided in the faculty senate agenda to dig into the data for a better understanding of what the Task Force is doing and how various programs have fared from 2015 until now. He said that senators who are representing programs that may be struggling in some way or have lost majors should look at this data
- e. Dawers (CAH) then transitioned to the effects of changes in evaluation of service and how it has continued to affect the difficulty of the senate to fill all of its positions, and he urged those who saw gaps that they could address to reach out to him or to their SEC representatives.
- f. He then opened the floor to questions or comments. Lacking questions, he then also stressed that if anyone had ideas for improving communication so that committees could help make their work more well-known, people should reach out to him.

## **VI. NEW BUSINESS**

- a. Bill Dawers then moved to our only discussion item, which was on doing a survey of faculty who are teaching site synchronous courses. He noted that a few important details were in the printed agenda and that he would ask Kasie Alt (CAH) to speak to her experiences and research after his opening remarks. Dawers spoke to his experiences with site sync and the challenges he has faced with the courses, though he noted that without it, some programs would not be able to have courses make or to meet the needs on multiple campuses. The goal of the survey would be to reach out to as many teachers as possible to learn more about their experiences and thoughts about site sync.

Dr. Alt (CAH) was then introduced, with indications that she is currently engaged in a SoTL (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning) study on site sync teaching. Dr. Alt (CAH) spoke to her experiences teaching site sync. She said that based on her experiences and discussion with peers, student disengagement can be a problem. She indicated that she

is currently doing a small case study to learn more about how students engage with and respond to technologies. The study has gone over the past two semesters, and she is hoping that this will reveal best practices and other technologies that could be incorporated.

Bill Dawers (CAH) then opened the floor to see if anyone else had concerns about what the survey attempted to measure or target. Kasie Alt (CAH) started the conversation and wanted to know what other professors had used to engage students successfully. Mike Nielsen (CBSS) asked if there would be data collected on student expectations or their perspective at the end of the semester. Bill Dawers (CAH) responded that the survey probably couldn't go beyond faculty perception of student expectations and satisfaction. He asked Dustin Anderson (Provost Office) to speak to it. He said that measuring student elements would require a different mechanism to be developed and approved, but that his office would be happy to contribute to such a study. Dr. Alt (CAH) said that considering tools was crucial to success with this type of study.

Marieke Van Willigen (CBSS) said that one problem in her department is that she and her colleagues have encountered issues with too few students on one campus (usually Armstrong) and also with making sure that classrooms are unlocked and accessible to students. Mike Nielsen (CBSS) indicated that part of the concern is that the nature of site sync may make it feel like the 'remote' campus is a 'second-class' campus. Bill Dawers, speaking to Dr. Nielsen's concern, mentioned that some faculty who have taught site sync have driven to the remote campus at least one day a week to improve student engagement. Kymberly Harris (COE) talked about the challenge of supporting students at the Liberty Campus, especially non-traditional students who will mostly be taught in the evening. She said that having a fixed, functional version of site sync was essential for what COE wants to do.

Leigh Rich (WCHP) indicated that we might need data for classes at non-traditional time periods. First, she said that we need to make sure that the rooms can be unlocked. Second, we need to make sure that enough classrooms are available. Third, Dr. Rich said that we need to determine if site sync is the mode of delivery preferred by students, especially since some seem to favor Zoom over site sync.

Provost Reiber said the goal here was not only to make site sync classes better but also to consider what tools are being used properly. He stressed that the technology is expensive and that outfitting more classrooms is a budgetary concern, and he indicated that in some situations, Zoom may be a better pedagogical option. He also stressed that it's important that people be trained to use the rooms, and he indicated that he has worked with IT so that when rooms are scheduled as site sync, people will be notified to take the training. He stressed that the goal here is not just to 'fix' site sync but determine the best available technology for different programs.



Dr. Van Willigen (CBSS) asked if it was an ‘urban legend’ that a class was counted differently depending on its mode of delivery, with site sync classes being treated as face to face classes and Zoom classes as online. Provost Reiber responded that that was the case, but that it was mostly a holdover from the period beginning in Fall 2020 in which the USG was categorizing courses as part of the pandemic response. However, Provost Reiber indicated that this measurement has changed, and that it isn’t such a problem at this time.

Dr. Alt (CAH) indicated that there is a challenge to what site sync is considered by different evaluating institutions. SACSCOC, she said, views site sync as online, but we view it as face-to-face. Other universities use “hybrid” or some other term. She also noted that internally, sometimes the courses are viewed as two sections, and this has caused her to have to deal with her courses being reported as low enrolled when they are not.

Dr. Anderson (Provost Office) echoed Provost Reiber in indicating that we need to view the site sync as a solution based on the technology of the time, and after the pandemic, we have learned more about remote learning options. However, he stressed that he didn’t want to leave the discussion with the idea that site sync is broken. He said that site sync solves specific problems.

Ming Fang He (COE) suggested making the topic of site sync classes more researchable by organizing a forum and working toward publication in a journal like the International Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Dr. Alt (CAH) said she agreed entirely, and said that even a more informal forum would be appropriate. She stressed that she agreed with Dr. Anderson that site synchronous and Zoom synchronous classes are different and can solve different problems, speaking to the ability for those in site sync classes to work with each other in a physical form. Bill Dawers also spoke to the concern that with synchronous classes on Zoom, a challenge that hasn’t been discussed well has been the need for on-campus spaces for students to use Zoom.

Provost Reiber wanted to have it noted that training has already been activated.

Dr. Van Willigen (CBSS) said that given the recent negative commentary about site sync, this work on addressing these problems may be received by the student government association in a positive way. Dr. Nielsen (CBSS) said that as the representative to the SGA, he would be willing to speak to them and would report back to Bill Dawers.

At 4:40, Bill Dawers turned the meeting over to President Kyle Marrero.

ySS **UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT’S REPORT (Dr. Kyle Marrero)**

- a. President Marrero began his comments with Hurricane Ian, saying that he was sorry that faculty senate was pushed back but because of the school closures, it was necessary to push it back so that nothing could prevent faculty with family who needed to pick up

children from doing so. He also shared his hopes for Florida and wished positive things for those affected by the storm.

- b. He then spoke to October 17-20th, the spirit week on the Armstrong campus that will culminate with the Celebrate! event on October 20<sup>th</sup>.
- c. He then spoke to the annual faculty awards and commented on the simplified forms that had been created over the last year to make applying for these awards easier.
- d. President Marrero then transitioned to discussing the Governor's Honors program. He spoke about how the administration had responded to a state Request for Proposals (RFP) to bring this program to Georgia Southern. About 700 students will be selected from a large pool of applicants and will live on campus in July. We have a four year contract with the state to deliver the program, which fiscally is a breakeven opportunity for us but helps as a recruiting event as it exposes students to the campus.
- e. President Marrero then transitioned to the Hyundai plant, indicating that the most exciting update was that there have been subsequent meetings with their leadership to improve internship opportunities. Hyundai will be seeking to hire 40 engineers at an upcoming career fair.
- f. President Marrero then transitioned to discussing the Armstrong Task Force. He confirmed that he has received the recommended programs list and that the administration is going through the evaluation of these suggested programs. However, they are not yet ready to unveil the program. He expected that updated information would be available around the time of the next faculty senate meeting.
- g. President Marrero then provided an update regarding enrollment. As of October 1, we are down 5.8% in head count and down about 6% in credit hours. We are driving towards B term, which the university is pushing and promoting as hard as possible. The current declines would equate to about \$6.9 million. After withholding some money already, the cut to our budget will be about \$5 million. The recent declines will impact state formula funding in fiscal year 2025.
- h. President Marrero then explained that the other part of the revenue puzzle is that fewer students mean not just lost tuition but also lost fees. However, he suggested that there is a silver lining in that the USG is now going to allow a full recruitment cycle of 3.2 GPA high school based recruitment without SAT or other tests. That means that for spring 2023, we may be looking at enrollment numbers much closer to spring 2022 than fall 2023 is to fall 2022. He indicated that the PBFC committee, which has recently received an updated charge, met with Ron Stalmaker and Justin Janney with the goal of helping faculty have a better understanding of the financial situation of the university.
- i. President Marrero closed his updates by saying that the consulting firm Segal will be presenting the latest salary study at the next faculty senate meeting.

**VIII. PROVOST'S REPORT (Dr. Carl Reiber)**

- a. Provost Carl Reiber began his report by saying that he had asked for clarification of comparisons in the Segal salary study, and that it would be published on My Georgia Southern before Segal presented their findings, so we would all see the data in advance.
- b. Regarding the Armstrong Task Force, Provost Reiber indicated that since Scott Lingrell will be leaving the committee as he is leaving the university, Amy Ballagh is cycling in to

take his space. He is pleased with the work of the committee, and he said that the task force is finishing phase 1 and is moving into phase 2, which takes a longer view. He believes that the task force has led to a spread of really creative ideas that could benefit the entire university.

- c. Last, Provost Reiber said that the Post Tenure Review document was submitted to the Board of Regents, and as soon as administration hears back, he will communicate with the ad hoc committee chaired by Dr. Van Willigen (CBSS).

**IX. QUESTION AND ANSWER**

- a. Bill Dawers then opened the senate to questions at 5:04pm.
- b. Leigh Rich (WCHP) asked for a clarification of the nine programs that had been selected for promotion at the Armstrong. President Marrero clarified that the nine included bachelor degrees as well as several associate programs. Asked if he would consider all nine, he indicated that it would come down to resources.
- c. Chris Caplinger (CAH) asked about the pending update to the Fall 2023 calendar. Carl Reiber said that the Calendar Committee had some recommendations, and those recommendations would be brought to President Marrero soon, noting that elements were delayed because of Hurricane Ian.

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

- a. Following a motion by Betsy Barrow and seconded by Mike Nielsen, the senate was adjourned at 5:11pm.

**Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate  
Librarian’s Report  
October 17, 2022**

<b><u>Standing Committees</u></b>	Page
FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE .....	2
FACULTY SENATE WELFARE COMMITTEE .....	4
GENERAL EDUCATION AND CORE CURRICULUM .....	7
PLANNING, BUDGET AND FACILITIES COMMITTEE .....	11
SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE .....	14
UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE .....	18

Submitted respectfully by Christine Bedore, Faculty Senate Librarian, in preparation for the October 26, 2022 meeting of the Georgia Southern Faculty Senate.

**Faculty Research Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**September 16, 2022 - 12:00 – 2:00 PM**  
**Virtual meeting via Zoom**  
[Workspace](#)

## Attendance:

Review access #	Name	Delegate	Term expiration	Attendance	
				Present	Minute
R1	Brett Curry Elected Chair	Senate Representative	2023	Present	
R2	Caroline Hopkinson	University Libraries	2024	Present	
R3	Hayden Wimmer	Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering and Computing	2024	Absent	
R4	TBD	College of Arts and Humanities	2024	TBD	
R5	Amanda Graham	College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (CBSS)	2024	Present	
R6	Antonio Gutierrez de Blume.	College of Education	2023	Absent	
R7	John Carroll	College of Science and Mathematics (COSM)	2023	Present	
R8	John Barkoulas	Parker College of Business (COB)	2023	Present	
R9	Mary (Estelle) Bester	Waters College of Health Professions	2023	Present	
R10	Isaac Chun-Hai Fung	Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health (JPHCOPH)	2024	Present	
	Ele Haynes	Provost Delegate	Ex Off.	Present	

- 1) **CALL TO ORDER** - Meeting was called to order at 12:00 PM by Chair, Dr. Brett Curry.
- 2) **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 3/18/22** – Minutes were approved by the committee via email and sent to the Senate Librarian on 5/2/22.
- 3) **CHAIR’S UPDATE - Dr. Brett Curry**
  - a) The fall Excellence Award schedule has not been posted yet for the 22-23 academic year. More information will be forwarded as it becomes available.
  - b) The CAH election for a FRC committee member is still in progress. We expect a new committee member in the next few weeks.
  - c) The committee workspace for FY23 (Academic 22-23) will house all committee working documents, minutes, agendas and applications. It is restricted to current committee members and is located at [https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1Fer7XR4BmMmrnGHOS5-59xitm7\\_if-2G](https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1Fer7XR4BmMmrnGHOS5-59xitm7_if-2G)
- 4) **OLD BUSINESS**
  - a) None
- 5) **NEW BUSINESS**
  - a) Research Advocates: Dr. Amanda Townley & Dr. Tilicia Mayo-Gamble presented information about new programs and resources to support emerging researchers.
  - i) Impact Area Accelerator Grants target active researchers who are already engaged in substantive research but need a bump to move them to the next level. The funding opportunity does not have a specified project cap and can accommodate summer salary. The program allows for collaboration with multiple budgeted faculty. The program can support student wages at all levels for spring and early summer. Researchers may apply through their Dean’s nomination process. Nominated faculty will be

asked to complete an abbreviated application for funding. First round review will be by the Research Associated Deans with a final decision by the Office of Research. Nominations are expected to be announced by November 23, 2022.

- ii) The full funding announcement can be viewed at [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1pxg0kJvQ3MKU0JC\\_PujSiHopSTtNjG9/view](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1pxg0kJvQ3MKU0JC_PujSiHopSTtNjG9/view)
  - b) Supplemental travel awards are available for fall and spring. The fall application deadline was Sept 13 but the Spring applications will be accepted until January 13. Supplemental travel grants require a cost sharing by a secondary source. This can be anything from departmental funds to self funded portions. The grants are not tied to impact areas and are available for all travel for presentation of research findings.
  - c) Professional Development sessions are offered every month for pre-proposal and proposal development topics. Additional sessions are offered every other month to assist with post-award compliance and accounting topics. Future plans include making these sessions available on demand and creating office hours for research advocates to assist individuals with their individual and small group collaboration project questions.
- 6) **ANNOUNCEMENTS and OTHER BUSINESS**
- a) The Chair introduced the new members to the committee.
- 7) **ADJOURNMENT**-Committee adjourned at < 12:48 pm> <Minutes will be sent to committee for approval via email and submitted for the Faculty Senate Librarians Report. Minutes approved by the committee via email and uploaded to the Senate Librarians Report on **9/26/22**>  
 \*<<Faculty Research Committee>> meetings are not recorded.>>

**Faculty Senate Welfare Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
09/14/2022  
2022-2023 FWC  
1:00-3:00 pm  
Location:**

<https://georgiasouthern.zoom.us/j/89797074322>

**FWC Members Present:**

Amy Potter, COSM	Rongrong Zhang, Parker College of Business	Lili Li, Libraries
Amanda Konkle, CAH	Tamerah Hunt, WCHP	
Dziyana Nazaruk, JPHCOPH	Marieke Van Willigen, CBSS	
Austin Francis, COSM	Marla Morris, COE	
Betsy Barrow, COE	Gus Molina, PCEC	
Wendy Wolfe, CBSS	Marina Eremeeva, JPHCOPH	

**I. Call to Order**

1:03 PM

**II. Approval of Agenda**

**III. Faculty Welfare New Business**

- A. Elect Chair and Secretary  
Betsy Barrow elected Chair.  
Amanda Konkle elected Secretary.
- B. Review Charge:

**SECTION 17. FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE**

1. The responsibilities of the FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE shall be as follows:
  1. conduct an on-going study of campus, University System of Georgia, state and national policies affecting faculty benefits and working conditions; solicit suggestions and concerns related to faculty welfare from individual faculty members and groups of faculty; monitor existing evaluation procedures, instruments, validity, collections and distribution of data; and
  2. address other specific questions in this area that may be requested by the Senate Executive Committee.

In addition, members should bring faculty concerns forward.

**IV. Faculty Welfare Unfinished Business**

**A. [Chair Evaluation \(Revisit Senate Discussion\)](#)**

This committee submitted a Chair Evaluation Policy for discussion at the April 2022 Faculty Senate meeting. The Senate discussion revealed that faculty did not want chairs to have to leave after 10 years but largely supported aspects of the policy that codified the procedures for collecting faculty and staff feedback on chair performance, as well as the procedures ensuring that Deans would let faculty and staff know the results of their evaluations.

Leti McGrath had brought this forward to FWC a couple of years ago.

The Provost's Office has policies already, so revisit how those policies differ from what we are interested in now.

Some discussion occurred in this subcommittee as well regarding how the faculty would provide their feedback.

The faculty handbook might not include staff, as the revised policy does.

Discussion of the consequences of a negative review. Chairs work at the pleasure of their supervisor, so they can be put on a performance plan or cycled out of their position at any time, including after the results of a negative review.

What initiated this discussion of the term limit? In some universities, the chair is a rotating position in order for faculty to gain experience, and a head is a permanent position. This conversation began 10 years ago. The Provost was familiar with rotating chairs in the past. In order to make budgetary decisions, to keep the same number of faculty, someone from faculty has to step up to chair when a chair steps back. Some faculty are in interim chair positions now, but the Georgia Southern model right now and institutional history leads to most chairs staying in their positions.

Chairs don't have to be full professors, but many of them are. Smaller departments don't have the people to be able to rotate the chairs. Interim chairs and deans would also complicate this. These are reasons to not have term limits, as was discussed in the Senate.

What differs at Georgia Southern from other institutions is that the job is more complex here than it is in many other places. Fewer staff members here means more responsibility for institutional memory and management falls on chairs (e.g., budget, evaluation, policy, etc.).

Suggested that we remove the term limits and leave the rest of the policy as it is. Any other change would be an institutional culture change. We're contributing how the feedback from faculty is collected in this policy. There will be more pressure to ensure that Deans are evaluating chairs routinely and reporting those results.

Committee decided to remove the term limits, send back to a subcommittee to review the language to make sure it complies with policies already in place, and bring it back to the next meeting.

A subcommittee of Wendy and Marieke will review to bring back to the next meeting.

**B.**        [Faculty Annual Report Form](#) - update based on BoR changes and disseminate information to chairs/faculty (Marieke)

The ad hoc committee dealing with the post-tenure review and evaluation policies, which Marieke worked with, notes that the reporting form that was just approved by Senate in April is not in compliance with the post-tenure review policy and guidelines the ad hoc committee submitted to the BoR. (Only slight adjustments need to be made.)

Committee feels that we need to add in some prompts to ensure that faculty address student success. Professional development was also part of the changes and prompts to be added.

Chairs need to indicate whether faculty are making progress toward their next major review.

Annual evaluations are supposed to be written within the context of the last 3 years of work. Colleges might approach this differently. This is important for recognizing research and publishing timelines. The annual report should be tweaked to prompt people to provide this context.

Faculty are supposed to be notified each year of when their next major review is on the annual evaluation form.

Discussion of how to define student success. What is evidence of student success? There is some language in the BoR policies with some examples. The ad hoc committee developed the Student Success Supplement, which provides some examples of the kinds of activities that faculty might be engaged in that are related to student success. The next job will be for college and department committees to determine which aspects relate to them.



Are we balancing out the report, or tacking on additional pages to the report? Part of the reason student success is not a second category; teaching is also central to student success, so a separate category would be repetitive.

There is supposed to be a standard Reporting form and a standard Evaluation form. The Board Policy provides a standard scale.

The forms used are still not completely standardized. Policy is standardized for annual evaluations to be returned to faculty in March/April every year. Diana Cone holds a meeting with each chair to review policies and due dates, and that meeting is occurring within a week of the FWC meeting.

Subcommittee:

Marieke will chair and draft. Amy Potter, Dzyyana Nazaruk, and Tamerah Hunt will join the subcommittee. They will run it by members of ad hoc committee as well.

**C.** Course Caps and Position Allocation (Senate Budget committee?)

Amanda will contact the budget committee and bring updates to next meeting.

**V. Faculty Welfare Concerns**

**A.** [Spreadsheet to Report Faculty Welfare Concerns](#): Please reach out to your colleagues in each of your colleges to request that they submit concerns that we should address in future meetings. Report them in the spreadsheet linked [here](#), and include any supplementary information as needed.

**B.** Ongoing Faculty Welfare Concerns

**1.** [Faculty Pay - 10 Months vs 12 Months](#)

To add to next month's agenda:

There is some discussion about DEI and willingness to engage in these activities following the RFI last year.

Some people have to leave these meetings early. We can make sure the voting items are earlier in the agenda to make sure that a quorum is still available (committee consists of 15 members; quorum is 8 with majority of quorum being 5).

**VI. Adjourn**

Adjourned at 2:17 PM.

**Meeting Calendar:**

Wednesday, September 14, 2022

Wednesday, October 12, 2022

Wednesday, November 9, 2022

Wednesday, January 11, 2023

Wednesday, February 8, 2023

Wednesday, March 8, 2023

Wednesday, April 12, 2023

## GENERAL EDUCATION AND CORE CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MINUTES

### General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Meeting Date – Friday, September 23, 2022

**Present:** Dustin Anderson, Office of the Provost; Bettye Apenteng, Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health/Health Policy and Community Health; Nikki Canon-Rech, University Libraries; Adam Carreon, College of Education/Elementary and Special Education; Justine Coleman, Waters College of Health Professions/Health Sciences and Kinesiology; Caitlin Criss, College of Education/Elementary and Special Education; Finbarr Curtis, College of Arts and Humanities/Philosophy and Religious Studies; Austin Francis, College of Science and Mathematics/Biology; Delena Gatch, Institutional Assessment and Accreditation; Julia Griffin, College of Arts and Humanities/Literature; Jonathan Grubb, College of Behavioral and Social Sciences/Criminal Justice and Criminology; Yi Hu, College of Science and Mathematics/Mathematical Sciences; Eric Kartchner, College of Arts and Humanities/World Languages and Cultures; Rick McGrath, Parker College of Business/Economics; Jessica Mutchler, Waters College of Health Professions/Health Sciences and Kinesiology; Taylor Norman, College of Education/Middle Grades and Secondary Education; Brenda Richardson, First and Second Year Experience; Errol Stewart, Parker College of Business/School of Accountancy; Jennifer Syno, Office of Advising

**Guests:** Cindy Groover, Office of the Provost; Tiffany Hedrick, Office of the Registrar; Barb King, Institutional Assessment and Accreditation; Jaime O'Connor, Institutional Assessment and Accreditation; Brad Sturz, Institutional Assessment and Accreditation

**Absent:** Suzy Carpenter, College of Science and Mathematics/Chemistry and Biochemistry; Amy Ballagh, Enrollment Management; Amanda Kingel, Office of Advising; Peggy Mossholder, Waters College of Health Professions/Nursing

### I. CALL TO ORDER

Finbarr Curtis called the meeting to order on Friday, September 23 at 1:03 p.m.

### II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Rick McGrath motioned to approve the agenda; seconded by Julia Griffin and passed unanimously.

### III. GECC CHAIR INTRODUCTION/CHAIR UPDATE

Finbarr Curtis will serve as GECC chair this year. Jaime O'Connor announced that there were three nominees, but the other two declined to serve this year. Finbarr has previously served in this role and was happy to accept the nomination.

Finbarr Curtis updated the committee on membership status, mentioning that GECC will be tight on meeting the quorum for each meeting, so it is critical for members to RSVP for each meeting, coordinate with alternates, and notify the committee when they will not be able to make it. Delena Gatch added that there are some committee members who are alternates, but because the college does not have two voting members, these alternates will need to attend every meeting to ensure at least two voting representatives are present. College of Arts and Humanities have two representatives and one alternate. College of Behavioral and Social Sciences has only one representative and no alternates, making that representative's participation critical. College of Education has one representative on the committee, but two alternates, so one alternate will need to be present at every meeting. The same thing applies to the College of Science and Mathematics, which has one member and two alternates. Public Health, we have only one member and no alternates, so it is essential for that member to attend. Parker College of Business, we have two members, but no alternates, so if either member is not present it can prevent the committee from making a quorum. University Libraries has only one member with no alternates. Waters College of Health Professions has one member and two alternates. If we do not have a quorum, we will not be able to meet, and we will not be able to pass curriculum items. Full participation is critical to ensure that we can pass core curriculum proposals. Without a quorum on the committee, curriculum could be stopped at an institutional level. Finbarr added that we could still add members to the committee,

depending on appropriate procedures within colleges. Delena mentioned that the Faculty Senate president made a call

1 for senators to fill empty SEC appointments. Some colleges have a significant stake in the core but are lacking representation on the GECC. That applies not just here, but on the undergraduate and graduate curriculum committees as well. Barb King mentioned that College of Behavioral and Social Sciences has the option for the Dean to make an appointment if an elected position is missing. Finbarr added that the lower membership also impacts the workload and disciplinary distribution of the review of assessment documents, possibly meaning that those with the appropriate expertise may not be available to review the applicable assessment documents. Nikki Cannon-Rech asked what committee members should do who have a conflict on a particular meeting date. Delena responded to check with the college Dean to see what the bylaws allow in terms of having an alternate appointed to attend. Finbarr restated that if committee members know about a conflict ahead of time, to let us know as soon as possible.

Finbarr also mentioned that he is not on Senate, so he asked who would be responsible for presenting meeting minutes in Faculty Senate meetings. Dustin Anderson responded that Finbarr could present from the gallery in Faculty Senate meetings or to designate a proxy to present on his behalf. Delena agreed but mentioned that there is now a summary included as part of the minutes, so a presentation is not required, but that the chair should be present in case of any questions.

Finbarr said that there have been no official updates about the Gen Ed Redesign. Delena responded that we are anticipating a possible update in mid-October at a state-level meeting and will report back to the committee at that time. In the meantime, we continue to remain on hold.

#### **IV. OLD BUSINESS**

##### **A. BIOL 1320 Diversity of Life**

- Jaime O'Connor reported that this course was approved by the USG BOR Council on General Education in their July 15<sup>th</sup> meeting with the condition that the ENGL 1101 prerequisite was removed. The department has already agreed to remove this prerequisite, but the GECC should also agree to this change since it represents a significant edit to the original proposal. BOR policy states that a course in the core cannot have a prerequisite course from another area of the core.

MOTION: Rick McGrath motioned that prerequisite be removed and the proposal be returned to the USG BOR. The motion was seconded by Nikki Cannon-Rech. The motion passed unanimously.

B. USG Council on Gen Ed meetings May 20 and July 15<sup>th</sup> • Jaime O'Connor provided a summary of course change proposals and new course proposals approved by the USG Council on Gen Ed since the last GECC meeting. Course change proposals approved include: ARTH 1531 Art History I, CHEM 1152K Survey of Chemistry II, PHSC 1211 Physical Science. Course additions include: ARAB 1001, ARAB 1002, ARTH 2532 Art History II, CHIN 1001, CHIN 1002, DATA 1501 Introduction to Data Science, FREN 1001, FREN 1002, FREN 1060, GRMN 1001, GRMN 1002, GRMN 1060, JAPN 1001, JAPN 1002, JAPN 1060, SPAN 1001, SPAN 1002, SPAN 1060. Courses approved with conditions include BIOL 1320 Diversity of Life and BIOL 1103 Concepts of Biology.

#### **V. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **A. Curriculog Committee Member Training**

- Barb King from Institutional Assessment and Accreditation and Tiffany Hedrick from the Office of the Registrar provided an overview and committee resources for Curriculog, the new curriculum management system for the university. The new system replaces CIM/CourseLeaf, is more streamlined, is all online, and committee members will receive notifications of new proposals. Yi Hu asked if the notifications are just for information in preparation for the GECC meetings. Delena Gatch replied that the notifications are just to keep committee members informed as items are added to the meeting agendas so they will know what curriculum items to review prior to the meeting. Barb explained that IAA has developed training materials and flowcharts to help clarify specific roles and responsibilities within the curriculum process. Finbarr Curtis asked if the proposal has to

be approved by all committee members in the system or just a designated person on each committee. Barb responded that the committee chair is responsible for entering the approval in the system based on the result of the committee vote. Delena added that the system allows for variations in college and department bylaws, so the way that the system is implemented may look a bit different but ultimately there will be a designated person in the approval role for each stage of the process.

## **VI. IAA UPDATE**

### **A. Updated Core Curriculum Course Requirements 2022-2023**

- Jaime O'Connor announced that the listing of Core Course requirements on the IAA website is now updated to reflect all of the approved changes mentioned previously.

**B. Status update on Folio course completion** • Four committee members are still outstanding on completing the Folio course; Jaime will follow up on Monday. Seven core course documents have been submitted so far out of the 80 we are expecting this year. All documents are due by Friday, September 30th .

**C. New Smartsheet portal for peer-review** • There is a new Smartsheet portal that was introduced in the Folio course with some video tutorials and walkthroughs. With this new system, instead of receiving individual emails with links to assigned documents and rubric links, all of your assigned documents and rubrics will be found in a portal unique to you. You will also be able to save reviews in progress. This system was developed by Brad Sturz based on feedback from the committee and we've received positive feedback from a preview with IAA Faculty Fellows who have served as peer-reviewers. Errol Stewart asked if he would use his email to log in. Brad replied that users should use Google to sign in with their Georgia Southern credentials. Delena Gatch added that the new system will also facilitate easier reconciliation reviews since scores and comments will be presented side by side. Please continue to make suggestions for where we can make improvements.

**D. SACSCOC Compliance Certification Team – Student Outcomes update** • Compliance certification teams met on August 30 on the Armstrong campus and were charged with beginning to draft narratives for specific standards; 9.3 is the first standard due for gen ed. due on November 30. Jaime O'Connor wrote the first draft over the summer and shared it with the subcommittee (including Finbarr) for feedback before the submission deadline. The 8.2.b first draft will be due on Feb. 28. This is the narrative based on the gen ed assessment process and a summary of data for three years. To prepare for this, Jaime O'Connor has created abstract versions of all assessment documents from 2020-2021 and is scheduling meetings for each Core Area to extract themes around student learning and assessment to capture Core Area level analysis of results and plans for improvement. The first of these meetings took place on Tuesday with Area A2 core course coordinators. Jaime will be scheduling and planning for the other core areas, probably starting in early spring semester.

## **VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **A. GECC meeting dates**

- Friday, October 21
- Friday, November 18
- Friday, December 9
- Friday, January 20
- Friday, February 10
- Friday, March 24

### **B. Upcoming BOR Council on General Education Meeting dates**

- October 8, 2021 (Proposal submission date: September 3, 2021)
- December 10, 2021 (Proposal submission date: November 5, 2021)
- February 25, 2022 (Proposal submission date: January 21, 2022)
- May 20, 2022 (Proposal submission date: April 15, 2022)
- July 15, 2022 (Proposal submission date: June 10, 2022)

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Rick McGrath motioned to adjourn. Nikki Cannon-Rech seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 1:58 p.m. on Friday, September 23.

Respectfully submitted, Jaime O'Connor, Recording Coordinator

Minutes were approved 10/1/2022 by electronic vote of Committee Members

**Georgia Southern University**  
**Faculty Senate: Planning, Budget, and Facilities Committee 2022-23**  
**Minutes**

**Date:** 9/21/2022

**Location:** Hollis 2109

**Meeting Convened:** 9:00 am

**Voting Members Present:** Nedra Cossa, Jamie Cromley, Bill Dawers, Christina Gipson, Mark Hanna, Christopher Kadlec, Lauren McMillan, Stephen Vives

**Non-Voting Members Present:** Ron Stalnaker, VP Business and Finance

**Guest:** Justin Janney, Associate Vice President & Chief Financial Officer  
 Ron Stalnaker, Vice President for Business and Finance

**Minutes:** Chair Christina Gipson convened the meeting and introduced the guests who were invited to provide the committee background on the university's financial structure. This presentation was the only agenda item. Mr. Janney provided an overview of the current total university budget and explained that these funds fall into two categories, "Lapsing" and "Non-lapsing." The majority of lapsing funding is made up of the state appropriation and tuition revenue. Mr. Janney explained the two-year lag in the state appropriation that is based on enrollment. In summary, declining or increasing enrollment leads to a change in the state appropriation two-years in the future. System institutions can lobby for changes in the state appropriation, but strong justification must be provided. Only three percent of the state appropriation in one fiscal year can be carried over into the next fiscal year.

An example of non-lapsing funding is the revenue produced by Auxiliary Services. Components of auxiliary revenue include housing, food services, university stores, health services, and parking. These enterprises must be self-sustaining, i.e., shortfalls cannot be fixed with state funds.

Declining enrollment has immediate consequences in decreased tuition revenue and auxiliary revenue, followed by a reduced state appropriation two years later. Planning now is necessary to both increase enrollment and prepare for the demographic cliff (steep decline of high school graduates) expected in 2026.

In response to a question about how our student fees compare to other institutions, Mr. Janney responded that ours are comparable to other comprehensive institutions in the state. Currently new student fees or fee increases are not being approved by the University System unless they are to decrease debt service. Mr. Stalnaker added that student fees are reviewed each year in a process that includes student input. Even when students have requested an additional or increased fee, the University System has declined over the last approximately eight years. Students are included in the approval process for student fees. Each institution can change auxiliary fees, for example dining plan fees, parking fees, etc.

Departmental revenues include course fees. A few years ago, those funds were no longer allowed by the state to reside in non-lapsing accounts and must be spent out each year.

Facilities and Administrative (F&A) funds also known as indirect cost recovery are generated from externally funded grants. Currently these are non-lapsing funds. The State Legislature and University System are asking for reports on the spending rate from those accounts. Georgia Southern is periodically monitoring the F&A accounts to be in a position to respond to requests for information about the accumulation of F&A funds.

Fund 50 funds are used for minor renovation and repair projects. These are lapsing funds.

Major Repair and Renovation (MRR) funds come from the state usually from bond sales. Examples of MRR expenditures are replacement of chillers, windows, roofs, and flooring.

GSFIC funds result from bond sales and are used for major renovations and new buildings. These are one-time funds and typically each institution applies to place these projects on a list that is prioritized by the University System with input from state government.

Mr. Janney and Mr. Stalnaker responded to several questions related to the following topics.

Merit raises are authorized by the State Legislature and administered by the University System. In recent years, the state has provided 75% of the funds to implement merit raises, but institutions had to cover 25%. Therefore, merit raises can lead to corresponding cuts in the budget in other fund categories. Personnel in auxiliary services are not always included in merit raises to faculty and staff; and were not included in the recent cost-of-living raise. Georgia Southern identified internal funds to provide cost-of living raises to the staff in auxiliary services.

Year end funds accumulate each year from vacated positions. Even though at the beginning of the year all funds are allocated, vacancies from resignations and retirements produce these one-time funds. These year-end funds are then allocated by the President's Cabinet to each Vice President for distribution.

Athletics do not currently break even from generated revenue. Although the goal is to break even, and the institution is moving in that direction, other funds support the athletics programs. This investment is justified by brand exposure and student recruitment.

Mr. Stalnaker discussed possible solutions to address allocation-related issues. Quarterly review meetings are being discussed and financial dashboards are being developed which would allow adjustments both within and between fiscal years. Both Mr. Janney and Mr. Stalnaker expressed their desire to promote transparency in the budgeting process and offered to spend additional time with the Planning, Budget, and Facilities Committee as needed.

**Adjournment:** 10:35 am

**Minutes submitted by:** Steve Vives

**Minutes approved:** 10/19/2022

**Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate:  
Planning, Budget, and Facilities Committee 2022-23 Minutes  
Date: August 17, 2022  
Location: Hollis 2109**

Meeting Convened: 9:00 am

Voting Members Present: Jamie Cromley, Nedra Cossa, Bill Dawers, Christina Gipson, Mark Hanna, Marcel Maghiar, Steve Vives

Non-Voting Members Present: Carl Reiber Guest: Kyle Marrero

Minutes:

Dr. Marrero provided an overview of the Budget Prioritization Process and some highlights of budgeting successes and challenges leading up to this academic year. He discussed the potential benefits of having an active Planning, Budget, and Facilities Committee (PBF Committee) and his desire that the budgeting process be transparent. This committee can provide input on budget and facility planning and also provide information to the Faculty Senate. He recommended that the PBF Committee invite the Chief Financial Officer, Justin Janney, and VP for Business and Finance, Ron Stalnaker, to attend the next 1-2 meetings. Dr. Reiber discussed the difference between recurring funds and year end funds generated from salary savings and some of our enrollment challenges. Drs. Marrero and Reiber left the meeting at 9:45 am. The PBF Committee discussed filling committee vacancies and appointed Dr. Cristina Gipson the Chair, and Dr. Steve Vives the Secretary, for 2022-23. The committee members agreed that future meetings would be every 3rd Wednesday, from 9 to 10 am.

Adjournment: 10:00 am

Minutes submitted by: Steve Vives

Minutes approved by email vote: 9/26/2022



Minutes from Senate Executive Committee Meeting

9/16/2022

1pm to 3pm

In attendance: Bill Dawers (President/CAH); Ed Mondor (President Elect/COSM); Robert Terry (Secretary/CAH); Christine Bedore (Librarian/COSM); Linda Thompson (WCHP); Bill Mase (JPHCOPH); Hayden Wimmer (PCEC); Wilhelmina Randtke (Libraries); Kymberly Harris (COE); Kwabena Boakye (PCOB); Annie Mendenhall (CAH)

Absent: Marieke Van Willigen (CBSS)

Bill Dawers began the meeting at 1:03pm.

Bill Dawers began by saying that the Faculty Senate agenda cannot be ready before the SEC meetings due to lack of administrative support and that there were other unforeseeable delays this month. He said that, in any case, he thinks it makes more sense for the agenda to be finalized and approved after the main SEC meeting each month.

Bill Dawers said that the administrative assistant hiring process is still on track, as he understands it.

The next topic of discussion was the sense that email may be overwhelming members with its frequency combined with all other emails going on. Hayden Wimmer suggested that Google Groups might help. Rob Terry said that Google's competing product to Slack or Microsoft Teams, Google Spaces, might be a better target. After discussion, the decision to try using Groups or Spaces was made, and Hayden Wimmer said that he was willing to set up a beta Groups space to see if it would work.

After that, Bill Dawers asked about sharing links to Senate recordings and posting them to the website. Ed Mondor said that he felt it was a good idea because all senate meetings were under open records anyway, and after discussion, all members of the SEC agreed. Bill Dawers said that he would move forward with placing links to the videos of meetings on the website, though he said that this may be delayed because of the lack of administrative support until the hire discussed above is complete. Annie Mendenhall suggested that we consider a timeframe for older sessions to roll off after a certain amount of time. Rob Terry suggested that Sharepoint be considered to require Georgia Southern credentials to access the video, though Kwabena Boakye advised that this would not prevent screen capture from Georgia Southern individuals to record segments. Bill Dawers noted that one objection would be that in the past, meetings were not recorded, but he recognized that regardless, as they are recorded now, they are still on the record.

Bill Dawers then talked about the low enrollment and low awarding program reports that had been gathered from the deans of all colleges except one. He pointed out that there were several B.A. degrees in subjects where B.S. degrees are also offered. He encouraged members of the SEC to share their suggestions and ideas. Christine Bedore asked about the purpose of this list. She wanted to express aspects about College of Science and Mathematics (COSM) programs, including the ways in which some of the programs are contributing to the core. Rob Terry clarified that this wasn't a university-level initiative but a unit of analysis done by the USG. Annie Mendenhall said that her understanding was that Provost Reiber had discussed low enrollment programs in the context of finding innovative solutions for departments to think about how their majors might produce more students with their degrees while also honoring the contributions to the core.

Christine Bedore said that pressures are being felt on the Statesboro Campus where faculty are taking on larger sections due to reduction in faculty. Ed Mondor agreed, citing a request to add more students to a course already at capacity, and Annie Mendenhall concurred that the same pressure is happening in the core courses Writing and Linguistics offers. Hayden Wimmer said that in Paulson College of Engineering and Computing (PCEC), similar concerns are happening as well. Ed Mondor suggested that an RFI may be an excellent way to get more feedback. Bill Dawers cautioned that an RFI with too many questions would not be the best option, so he suggested working with other Senate committees. Kwabena Boakye spoke to the challenges he had faced of making more out of less resources from his time as an assistant professor before he was promoted to associate. Annie Mendenhall concurred. She spoke about the experimental sections of English 1101 that Writing & Linguistics is running, which could make it easier to gather data on how larger classes are working. She suggested data analysis looking at increases in course size and retention rates.

Next, Bill Dawers transitioned to discussing the potential site-sync survey. He spoke about student representations (including the recent editorial in *The Inkwell*) of frustration with site-sync experiences. He said that Kasie Alt of College of Arts and Humanities (CAH) is already doing research on site-sync and that she is willing to help design the survey. He said that the survey would certainly cover several areas: technology, support, pedagogy, and rooms and scheduling. Bill Dawers spoke to the importance of the design of the classroom space on the success of teaching site sync. Wilhelmina Randtke spoke about how two classrooms, one at Lane Library and one at Henderson Library, are being updated for remote instruction with a single camera in each (site sync rooms typically have two cameras). Rob Terry wondered if the software on the Cisco equipment has been updated to address the problems with the algorithm making less than optimal choices. Bill Dawers will work up a Discussion Item about the site-sync survey for the September Senate meeting.

Bill Dawers then changed to the next topic, which was about academic dishonesty, specifically the use of Chegg and similar websites. The discussion was a followup to an RFI from spring 2022. Hayden Wimmer shared experiences where students had been abusing Chegg and similar platforms to share materials. Chegg's policy is that only universities can request the removal of materials - not instructors. In their investigation, Hayden Wimmer and other IT professors investigated how other universities had been handling it. They found that some other universities had proactive teams to search and purge materials on Chegg, CourseHero, and other sites. Kwabena Boake said that he too has experienced similar problems, and spoke about the potential to use publishers to remove content related to their textbooks. Ed Mondor said that his experience helping the Office of Student Conduct gave him the impression that no resources are currently available to help with the problem. Bill Dawers said that one problem is that RFIs in the past haven't been used as springboards to discussion, and in this case, the RFI was probably too broad and had too many questions.

Hayden Wimmer illustrated how other schools update this by pointing to [Michigan Tech's faculty guide to Chegg](#). Annie Mendenhall said how useful it was to see this policy and suggested that the Student Code of Conduct might need to be revised. Further discussion covered many issues, including which steps to address the problems would actually be meaningful. Christine Bedore, Ed Mondor, and others said that cheating via the websites in question seems to be common. Bill Dawers suggested that this be an October discussion item, giving time to draft the DI and share it in advance with the Provost's office so they could be prepared for the meeting with points and information they wanted to share.

Christine Bedore brought up concerns about the use of universal standards in the Student Code of Conduct, while within some disciplines, the definitions of academic dishonesty would be stricter. Bill Dawers suggested that documents could be revised so that discipline-specific standards could be acknowledged. Christine Bedore proposed that she reach out to other universities to see how they handle this challenge. Kymberly Harris said that within her area in education, syllabi define plagiarism within the discipline, which has led to high degrees of success with the Office of Student Conduct. Others said that they had had a range of experiences, and Ed Mondor said that in his experience, the volunteer makeup of the juries has led to a wide range of experiences. However, on average, he said that faculty cases tend to be successful when faculty present those cases well.

Kwabena Boake asked about the Provost's comments at the SEC meeting on September 9, 2022 regarding flexible workload policies that would allow faculty to devote higher or lower percentages of their time to teaching, research, and/or service. He wanted to know if SEC members were aware of situations where the policy was being implemented. Several members said that they had seen no variance, where regardless of research production, all faculty in a department had the same teaching load. Several members discussed the challenge of securing grants in areas that aren't

STEM-related. Several said that reductions in the weight given to service have harmed professors providing key service to the university. Others said that within their colleges, regardless of the stated weight, teaching is not being valued as much as research, and they feel that regardless of promises to provide a way forward for all faculty, some tenured faculty will never advance to full professor if they accept a 4/4 teaching load. As a result, some faculty will not ever accept the idea of a teaching-first position because it will harm them professionally.

Others said that in their experience, teaching is given little to no weight in the tenure and promotion process. Members questioned the effort to maintain an R2 status without the necessary resources. It was also suggested that the competition created by the changes to the post-tenure review process might prevent tenured professors from taking on increased teaching loads to support faculty who are earlier in their careers. The new PTR policies might encourage faculty to focus only on themselves and rather than try to improve their departments overall.

SEC members spoke about their experiences within their departments in trying to rewrite policies to support differential workload, and that hearing these concerns would be helpful moving forward. Some members talked about a previous “pathways to success” initiative that would allow for various teaching, research, and service avenues to tenure and promotion, which was voted down by the faculty senate of the time. Ed Mondor was able to locate [this white paper from 2021 on differentiated workloads and “pathways to success](#), in Digital Commons. He felt that the administration and faculty might be interested to know how far this process had gone in the past.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00pm.

## **UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE MINUTES**

**Tuesday, September 13, 2022 3:30 P.M.**

**Present:** Dr. Christopher Barnhill, WCHP; Dr. David Calamas, AEPCEC; Dr. Nedra Cossa, COE; Dr. Austin Francis, COSM; Dr. Jeff Jones, COPH; Dr. Amanda Konkle, CAH; Ms. Nikiya Lewis, WCHP; Dr. Jiun Liu, PCOB; Dr. Denice Rios, CBSS; Dr. Dwight Sneathen, PCOB; Dr. JinJing Yin, JPHCOPH.

**Guests:** Dr. Dustin Anderson, Provost Office; Dr. Yasar Bodur, COE; Ms. Seana Clay, Office of the Registrar; Dr. Delena Gatch, IAA; Dr. Cynthia Groover, Provost Office; Mrs. Tiffany Hedrick, Office of the Registrar; Ms. Barbara King, IAA; Dr. Brian Koehler, COSM; Ms. Doris Mack, Office of the Registrar; Dr. Nandi Marshall, JPHCOPH; Mr. Norton Pease, CAH; Mr. Wayne Smith, Office of the Registrar; Dr. David Williams, AEPCEC.

**Absent:** Dr. Anoop Desai, AEPCEC; Dr. Nathan Palmer, CBSS.

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

Dr. Christopher Barnhill called the meeting to order on Tuesday, September 13, 2022 at 3:30 PM.

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

Dr. David Calamas made a motion to approve the agenda. A second was made by Dr. Dwight Sneathen, and the motion to approve the agenda was passed.

### **III. UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE CHAIR INTRODUCTION**

Dr. Barnhill introduced himself as Committee Chair and noted that he was elected as the chair of the undergraduate Committee at the April 2022 meeting.

### **IV. APPROVAL OF 2022-2023 UNDERGRADUATE COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE**

Dr. Barnhill presented the proposed meeting schedule for the academic year.

Mr. Wayne Smith expressed to the committee that a December 6, 2022 meeting has been added to the schedule. He went on to remind the committee that the January 17, 2023 meeting will be the last meeting to have final program curriculum approvals in Banner for early registration on March 6, 2023. He also stated that the February 14, 2023 meeting is the final meeting to have course curriculum in Banner before early registration begins on March 6, 2023. This is the final meeting for curriculum approvals for the 2023-2024 Georgia Southern University catalog. Items requiring Board of Regents system office approval may still not make the catalog if submitted by the later deadline, if the submission is still pending System Office Board of Regents and Department of Education approval at the time the catalogs are finalized.

Dr. David Calamas made a motion to approve the Undergraduate Committee Schedule for the 2022-2023 academic year. A second was made by Dr. Dwight Sneathen and the motion to approve the schedule was passed.

### **V. NEW BUSINESS**

#### **A. Curriculog Committee Member Training**

Ms. Barbara King presented to the Undergraduate Committee an overview of the new curriculum management system, Curriculog, which replaced the old CIM/CourseLeaf System. She reviewed the management process comprising the review steps and approval of curriculum processes is entirely online, and committee members will receive notifications of new proposals. She went over the workflow steps and described that each proposal has a unique workflow based on the provided answers to specific form fields. She brought up a visual of Curriculog to show an example of what the page will look like when using the proposals. She also brought up the IAA website to show resources that individuals can use when working with the curriculum forms, in particular the Undergraduate Committee Curriculum Handbook which contains a structural overview of the

committee, Curriculum deadlines, general information about Curriculog and checklists for proposals. She finished the presentation with a resources and contact information slide on where to find information/who to contact: [CCS@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:CCS@georgiasouthern.edu) for Curriculog questions and [IAACurriculum@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:IAACurriculum@georgiasouthern.edu) for Curriculum Review and Approval Process questions.

## **VI. OLD BUSINESS**

### **A. Registrar Updates**

Mr. Wayne Smith wanted to remind everyone that if there is a 5000 level course there also needs to be a 5000G course.

## **VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

No additional announcements were presented.

## **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned on September 13, 2022 at 4:00 p.m.

# Senate Executive Committee Request Form

SEC via campus mail: PO Box 8033-1

E-Mail: [fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu)

Standard View

Close

## Motion Request

10/20/2022 

### SHORT TITLE:

(Please provide a short descriptive title that would be suitable for inclusion in the Senate Agenda.)

Motion Request: Revise NTT external letter requirements

### MOTION(s):

(Please write out your motion in the exact form/wording on which you want the Senate to vote.)

MOTION: Revise the "External Letters" requirements on p. 46, p. 61, and p. 62 of the Faculty Handbook, 2021-2022 from the current to the revised version, which is attached.


### RATIONALE(s):


(Please explain why the motion should be considered by the Faculty Senate, remembering that the Senate does not deal with issues limited to individual colleges or administrative units. Include pertinent data and source references for information and/or language.)


The original language of the faculty handbook requires external review letters for all NTT/Clinical Faculty. This requirement may be appropriate given the assigned work duties. However, where an NTT faculty has primarily teaching responsibilities, external letter requirements are not needed and present an undue burden on non-tenure-line faculty for extra, uncompensated service work.

If you have an attachment, press the button below to attach to form.

 Motion to revise NTT External Letters Requirement in Faculty Handbook.docx  
7.43 KB

 Click here to attach a file

 Click here to attach a file

 Click here to attach a file

Submitted by:

wdawers

Phone:

912-344-3603

E-Mail:

amendenhall@georgiasouthern.edu

Re-Enter Email:

amendenhall@georgiasouthern.edu

### ACCEPTABLE USE POLICY

**This site is for use exclusively by Georgia Southern University faculty, staff, and administrators. Submissions are reviewed by the SEC for relevance to the mission and business of the Faculty Senate. This site is a tool not for debate but solely for information exchange. Redundant and contentious submissions will not be accepted.**  
**Note to faculty users: Double-check your data before submitting, because the data cannot be edited afterward.**

### Approval

Response:

SEC Response:





SEC discussed, made some changes to wording, and decided to bring the motion to the full senate.

Senate Response:



Presidents Response:



-  Click here to attach a file
-  Click here to attach a file
-  Click here to attach a file
-  Click here to attach a file



Motion to revise the “External Letters” requirements on p. 46, p. 61, and p. 62 of the [Faculty Handbook, 2021-2022](#) from the current to the revised version, printed below.

**Current Version:**

External Letters: External letters that comment on a candidate’s quality of work are required for promotion to NTT and Clinical Associate Professor and to NTT or Clinical Professors. Candidates, with the assistance of their department or unit chair/head, may solicit letters from individuals who are qualified to evaluate the candidate’s discipline and primary workload emphasis, for example, individuals in a supervisory role in a professional setting, or individuals outside the college with expertise in teaching or with disciplinary excellence. Unsolicited letters are not acceptable as external letters. Each external letter writer must state the nature of his/her relationship with the candidate.

**Revised Version:**

External Letters: External letters that comment on a candidate’s quality of work are required for promotion to NTT or Clinical Associate Professor and to NTT or Clinical Professor in cases where scholarship is required for major review and promotion. Candidates for promotion to NTT or Clinical Associate Professor and to NTT or Clinical Professor who are not reviewed on scholarship may elect to solicit external letters commenting on their teaching, professional development, or service activities if they wish, but are not required to do so. To solicit external letters, each candidate shall submit to his/her chair or unit head the names and contact information of at least three qualified individuals not directly involved in the faculty member’s work (i.e., have not been involved as a mentor or close collaborator) who can objectively review the faculty member’s portfolio. The individuals should be experts in the faculty member’s field and hold an academic appointment at an institution at least similar to Georgia Southern with rank at or above the rank to which the candidate is aspiring. The department chair or chair of the department’s Tenure and Promotion Committee shall solicit letters from two of the individuals that address the quality of work performed and readiness of the candidate for promotion. In addition to submitting names for individuals who may be contacted for external review, the faculty member may submit up to three names (and contact information) of individuals who may not be contacted by anyone involved in the promotion review.