

10-31-2016

## 10-31-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "10-31-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2016). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 28.  
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/28>

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

**Faculty Senate Minutes**  
**October 31, 2016**  
**4:00 to 6:00 P.M.**  
**Russell Union Ballroom**

**Voting members in attendance:** (Clint Martin for Cheryl Aasheim); Lisa Abbott, Sam Adeyeye, Mete Akcaoglu, Rocio Alba-Flores, (Haresh Rochani for Moya Alfonso), Dragos Amarie, Sarah Bielski, (Jorge Suazo for Adam Bossler), Ted Brimeyer, (Manuela Caciula for Gavin Colquitt), Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, Mark Edwards, Larisa Elisha, Richard Flynn, Tim Giles, Alice Hall, (Matthew Flynn for Eric Hall, Ming Fang He, Yi Hu, Alina Iacob, Bob Jackson, Scott Kersey, Mujibur Khan, Hsiang-Jui Kung, Alisa Leckie, (Jessica Garner for Lili Li), Jim LoBue, Lawrence Locker, Li Ma, (Chung-Yean Chiang for Allen Mackelprang), Ron MacKinnon, (Dolores Rangel for Leticia McGrath), Ed Mondor, Lowell Mooney, Constantin Ogloblin, Rob Pirro, Peter Rogers, Jake Simons, Fred Smith, Janice Steirn, James Stephens, Linda L. Thompson, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi, Meca Williams-Johnson

**Voting members not in attendance:** Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Dustin Anderson, Kelly Berry, David Dudley, Ellen Hamilton, Jonathan Hilpert, Barbara King, Eric Landers, Santanu Majumdar, Chasen Smith, Valentin Soloiu, Sam Todd, Shijun Zheng

**NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:** Chris Geyerman

**Senate Parliamentarian:** Karen McCurdy

**Student Government Association:** Eudiah Ochieng

**Administrators in Attendance:** Jean Bartels, Martha Abell, Barry Joyner, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker

**Visitors:** William Amponsah, Richard Cleveland, Russell Thackston, Rebecca Ziegler, Chris Caplinger, Alicia Spence, Jason Slone

- 
1. [Approval of the Agenda for the October 31, 2016 meeting.](#)

Moved and Approved.

2. [Approval of the September 6, 2016 Minutes: Marc Cyr \(CLASS\), Senate Secretary](#)

Moved and Approved.

### 3. Librarian's Reports for October, 2016, Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian:

Moved and Approved.

#### Undergraduate Committee Report – Ron McKinnon (COBA), Chair:

Ron MacKinnon (COBA) noted the first business of the committee was to elect a chair, which turned out to be him. The 2016-2017 Undergraduate Committee Schedule was approved. They discussed Course Inventory Management (CIM), which will digitize all the documents they deal with, and he suggested that sometime in future the committee give an overview of that process to the faculty. The report was Moved and Approved.

#### Graduate Committee Report – Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair

Moderator Flynn (CLASS) noted that, as a member of this committee, he would give the report in place of committee Chair Dustin Anderson, who was in class. The committee discussed three topics, along with electing the chair and approving the 2016-2017 Meeting Schedule. There were two updates: The chair provided an update on the Faculty Senate's comments on the Prior Learning Assessment proposal, and the PLA subcommittee agreed to reconvene to address the concerns voiced at the September Faculty Senate meeting. The subcommittee would revise the proposal into a policy to be submitted later to the Graduate Committee for approval before delivery to the Senate. The chair also provided a brief update on upcoming comprehensive program reviews, including a new review matrix required by the University System of Georgia. In new business, the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs presented an item regarding Graduate Faculty Status. The proposal outlined a method of conferring graduate faculty status upon appointment to Georgia Southern University based on the recommendation of that faculty member's Dean and Department Chair. The committee moved to accept this method and requested the policy be revised and submitted to the committee for approval. The committee also requested the VPAA office address the method by which existing faculty would receive Graduate Faculty Status. In old business, in light of the VPAA's proposal for a new method of Graduate Faculty Status, the committee moved to check the previously tabled business item regarding changes to the College of Graduate Studies policy and forms for approving Graduate Faculty Status. The committee requested these items be submitted for approval of the President. The committee's report was Moved and Approved.

#### Core Curriculum and General Education Committee, Michelle Cawthorn

No report.

#### 4. President's Report (Jaimie Hebert)

President Hebert was absent and had asked Moderator Flynn to report on three items.

##### Enrollment

Enrollment is up 1% in terms of headcount and up 2.2% in semester credit hours, the latter statistic meaning that more people are participating as full-time students.

##### Provost's Search

Flynn, a member of the search committee, asked Teresa Thompson, who is the Chair of the Search Committee, to give an update.

VP Thompson (Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) said the President charged the committee, and the committee recommended that we utilize a search firm so that we could broaden the pool of applicants and diversity, which we will do. Also, each member of the committee was asked to provide two to four sentences describing what they would be looking for in a Provost, so that that could be added to the ad going out in the next week or so.

Moderator Flynn added that while they voted to use the search firm, they also voted that the committee be the ones reading all the CV's and letters, so the search firm will not filter for them.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked if the faculty and staff of the University had been officially notified of this search yet by email or some other means. Flynn said they were waiting for one additional member to be appointed before the committee is announced publicly.

##### Strategic Planning Process

In early spring we will begin our strategic planning process, starting with working on a vision and after that the plan to get us there.

#### 5. Provost's Report: (Jean Bartels)

The Military Science Building should be completed by the end of November.

The plans for the Interdisciplinary Classroom Building that will be located between Carroll and CEIT Buildings were underway. Plans had been approved and submitted by

the architects, and the building groups selected, and groundbreaking should happen during Christmas break or in January. There will be some demolition of buildings that are on the site. Construction will block off some current parking space, but faculty will not lose spaces because some of the student parking in that area will be relocated. There also will be some walkway impediments for direct cut-through to get onto the pedestrian, but there will be signage to help in navigating the area.

As for the building, there will be several larger classrooms, as well as relocation of some of the displaced people, those from Forest Drive Building in particular, since that will be disappearing as well. In December, there will be a number of moves: CHHS departments are going to be moved to the old Student Health Sciences, Health Services Building, which has been renovated and will be able to be used as swing space during construction. ROTC will move into their new building. Academic Affairs will return to its remodeled location in Pittman on the second floor.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked Provost Bartels if it was strange procedure that the official announcement of a search was going to come at some indiscernible time in the future, while the search is already underway.

Provost Bartels noted she was not a party to the search process in any way, and the announcement about the search committee really is the President's to make, but the President did announce at a senate meeting that the search would begin shortly. She thought Pirro's question would be a good one for the President.

*[Secretary's Note: Some voices cannot be heard at this point in the recording, but a question was asked about moving December commencement outside to Paulson Stadium.]*

Provost Bartels said that one of the primary drivers for it was logistics. We have too few seats in Hanner because of the success of our graduation numbers to accommodate all of the people who need and want to be part of the graduation ceremony, even with severe restrictions, and even with more than three graduation ceremonies. The Student Government Association did some surveying, and had several thousand responses requesting that the ceremony be moved, so that was the basis for the decision by the President's Cabinet and the President.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) noted that Hanner would still serve as a rain location, and that in the event of needing to move to Hanner then the students would need tickets for their guests and would be limited to four. She asked if students would be told to go ahead and choose their four or get their tickets as a contingency plan, because they won't be able to do it at the last minute.

Provost Bartels said they would, and that it is the same process as used in May. She noted that those without tickets could use multiple places where they can observe the ceremony, such as Nessmith-Lane and the Union, then join up for celebration afterwards. She noted it is not unusual for some families to want 25 people as guests, and that a limit of 4 was not popular. She gave credit here to what VP Thompson and her people in Student Affairs have done over the years, but we got to the point where even parents weren't able to get seats. We have become a victim of our own success, and breaking into seven/eight different conferrals would not solve the problem either and would cost the University a significant amount of money that would then not be available for the other things.

*[Secretary's Note: Again, speakers cannot be heard, but a question was asked about why faculty were not consulted about this move of the ceremony.]*

Moderator Flynn said it never would have occurred to him that he should be asked about this decision, that since the day hasn't changed he can't see how this would inconvenience any faculty, and didn't really see what there was to discuss about it.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) said he thought it would have been "smart institutionally to include the faculty" in the discussion because they are obligated to attend this ceremony and it is a different, longer ceremony, and at just the last Senate meeting we had had questions about how faculty weren't getting grades in on time. This may cause more problems in that respect. But he called this a "process question," and faculty discussion would have avoided "a needless alienation of some faculty members." He had heard from many that they felt left out.

Mark Edwards (COSM) did not mind not being asked about the change, but thought the valid reasons for it should have been announced at the same time the change was, but there was no explanation in the announcement email.

Moderator Flynn recalled that the question of tickets was mentioned, and there was a story about it in the *George-Anne*. Edwards responded that the announcement had been two weeks ago and had not mentioned reasons.

*[Secretary's Note: Again, a portion of the recording is inaudible, but a question was asked about commencement speakers.]*

Provost Bartels said no official invitations to speakers had yet been given. Moderator Flynn thought faculty should have input on choosing graduation speakers. Provost Bartels noted that "we do not pay our speakers to come, so all those great ideas you have

about wonderful people that would speak, would be out of our league to probably invite.”

## 6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Richard Flynn [CLASS], Chair.

There was one Motion on the agenda: This was from Chris Caplinger on changes to the early alert system, which was sent to the Academic Standards Committee because such proposals generally go to that committee. The Academic Standards Committee supported items 1, 3 and 4 but had two objections to item #2. The first was that it wasn't worded clearly regarding whether students were going to get a notification telling them that they were not receiving the alert; Caplinger clarified that language for the revised motion that was posted on the Senate site. Flynn noted that we have a standing order for a projector for Senate meetings, and he had planned to put up the revised motion, but no projector had been provided. The second objection was that some of the committee, and it was a 6-3 vote, thought that it was too much work for faculty.

There was also a discussion item from the Henderson Library Committee about potential cancellation of subscriptions.

Finally, the previous week Flynn had attended the USG Faculty Council meeting. Among those gathered were incoming Chancellor Wrigley; Michael Crafton, the Interim Chief Academic Officer; and Marti Venn, Deputy Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Among items discussed was the Presidential Search for Kennesaw, and problems with consolidations. Flynn thought “that not much light was shed on those things,” but he would provide a link to the minutes when they are published. They did say that the default for Presidential appointments is that we do a search rather than directly appoint presidents, but discussion revealed that about a third of the presidents in the University System were direct appointments right now, so many of the faculty members there complained about having no voice in that process and no voice in the process of consolidations. The representative from Armstrong, who that morning found out that her president was retiring, said she didn't want to become Georgia Southern Lite. Regarding changes to the health benefits, they are now having a fixed amount of money that they're going to contribute towards whichever plan you choose. He guessed this was similar to, though maybe not quite as bad as what goes on for retirees since retirees have to shop for their health care on the exchange. There was some talk about whether schools had active programs to help employees make good transitions into retirement. They also found out that there's been a 244% increase in part-time faculty members throughout the System. There was discussion about diversity problems; about the new categories of institutions, including how what is called the dual function of certain institutions affects promotion and tenure; and about the invalidity of the 33⅓ salary cap

for summer work since it apparently is no longer a federal requirement. And so the council voted to have somebody draft something to send to the Board of Regents about that.

Fred Smith (LIB) asked over what time period this 244% increase in part-time faculty occurred. Flynn did not have that in his notes, but did not think it was longer than five years. It would be in the USGFC minutes.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked if the health insurance change was already in place or was coming up. Flynn was not sure, but said they would contribute \$413.03 a month no matter what plan you were on. He also noted a significant decrease in support for dependents, but didn't have the numbers. Nobody at the USGFC meeting was happy about these issues.

## 7. Motion on [Early Alerts Changes](#)

Chris Caplinger (Director, First-Year Experience): After Academic Standards met, he called that committee's chair, Bill Levernier, to ask for clarification about what he'd like to see going forward because the committee had expressed some concerns about not really knowing exactly what the provision that they voted down was about. Caplinger offered clarification and asked if Levernier wanted to take that back to Academic Standards, but Levernier said he thought it best to go directly to the Senate. There are four provisions in the motion:

- A name change from "early alerts" to "academic alerts" to reduce the confusion with other types of alerts, such as "Eagle Alerts."
- The big change is from issuing alerts based on the student's classification as a freshman student, to making it automatic for all students who are in core courses, Areas A-E, or in any other courses that departments would opt into, and they would have the opportunity to do that annually by April 1.
- Parts 3 and 4 are subsets of 2, identifying courses subject to the alert process.

*[Secretary's Note: Janice Steirn (CLASS) spoke, but is inaudible. It was about non-freshmen already knowing how they are doing in their classes.]*

Mark Edwards (COSM), a member of the Academic Standards Committee, said they had discussed this and the key point isn't that students don't know that they aren't doing well, but that the alert "mobilizes infrastructure because some students know that they are not doing well, but they can't do anything about it. They're depressed. They're

financially strapped and there are outfits at the University that can help them, but they won't help them unless they know about it, and that's what the alert is for."

Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked Provost Bartels what happens when an alert goes out.

Provost Bartels said we "have begun to implement across all of the colleges' advising centers, intervention advisors, so this is a place where that information goes so that they actually can identify and know which students are having difficulty and then make appropriate appointments with them to bring them in, talk to them and try to figure out what the problems are. Get them directed to resources that might be helpful." Caplinger added that the alert also goes to others, including those in the Academic Success Center. And the proposal would make it "a real alert." Currently, at mid-term students actually have to check to see if they have an alert, and they haven't been doing that. With the proposed system, it will grey out the back of their screen when they log into myGeorgiaSouthern and say in text that they have an early alert posted for a course and the reason for that alert. This was designed by a group of faculty.

Moderator Flynn noted that currently, when he issued alerts, he has an option to mark everybody S, and asked if that option would remain, thus saving the time of people who have 300 students or so.

Caplinger said that option would remain, allowing faculty to mark all as No Alert and then only changing those that need an alert, and they were working with the IT folks to alter the program so that one click, instead of two, would be needed for each student alert. They are also looking at other ways to streamline the process.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) said that is only part of the issue. Before any clicking, faculty like her may have to review 300 grades because she was not aware of how each student is doing in her large classes.

Provost Bartels said one major concern is our Complete College Georgia work in terms of retention of students, with students not necessarily understanding where they stood, nor getting the kind of attention that they might need or the direction they might need if they were having difficulties, so this also is intended to improve our retention rates. She noted a plethora of literature about how this kind of early intervention actually does make a difference in retaining students and correcting their poor performances. Our retention rates beyond the freshman are still not so good. Her personal and professional opinion was that, in a place that prides itself rightfully on being student-centered, this was an important step for us to take in terms of making sure that we are assisting students in a timely fashion so they can be successful in their work.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that at any time before end-of-term the best he can do is give a guesstimate as to whether students are okay or not. He also noted that it was 5-6 weeks into a term before he had enough grades in to make that guesstimate, and asked how early “early” would be.

Caplinger understood concerns about how accurate such an early grade could be and whether it can be accurately predictive, but the concept of an early alert based on something not being turned in or poor attendance or other legitimate reasons is “a shot across the bow of students to say this type of behavior or this type of performance is not going to bode well.” It will have no permanent grade impact but might help turn things around.

Cyr favored the proposal, but was concerned that too early a date might drive him to alter his curriculum to suit the date, and he thought that was the reverse of how things should work. So he wanted to know how “early” the deadline would be.

Caplinger said that would remain as it is now, the 34<sup>th</sup> calendar day of the regular Fall or Spring term. He noted that even earlier, if a problem is detected, would be better.

*[Secretary’s Note: Jake Simons (COBA) spoke but is inaudible except for his name, though it seems to have been about classes outside areas A-E.]*

Caplinger did not know how many departments would opt in, but just A-E would increase the students helped, and while that number was knowable, but he would have to work it out. He added that the proposal would also fix the current problem of faculty wanting to alert some students but being unable to do so because they have sophomore status. The same frustration can occur when there is a student with freshman classification in an upper division course.

*[Secretary’s Note: Lowell Mooney (COBA) spoke but beyond his name is inaudible, but it seems to have to do with faculty setting even earlier dates for themselves.]*

Caplinger thought faculty could set those dates for themselves and “do it again closer to that thirty-fourth day.”

Mujibur Khan (CEIT) said his experience was that these kinds of student are doing badly not because of some academic reason, but for reasons that lie somewhere else. He asked if guardians or parents would be alerted as well because frequently it is family reasons that are involved. Moderator Flynn noted that that is against the FIRPA law, though Caplinger noted that students can give permission for such communication.

[Secretary's Note: There is an inaudible patch here in the recording.]

Cyr noted that issues like depression and financial stress mentioned by Edwards are not confined to freshmen, and he had seniors in his core classes who needed lots of help. Caplinger noted that the group that developed the proposal considered that situation and this was one reason for designating A-E classes for reporting because in some senior classes there is no early grade on which to base an alert. Pirro noted that strategy left freshmen in upper division courses out of the net. Caplinger thought those numbers were small, and that advising needed to take that into consideration for freshmen who might benefit from greater oversight.

[Secretary's Note: Janice Steirn (CLASS) spoke, but beyond her name is inaudible.]

Moderator Flynn asked to move the motion to a vote. It was Moved and Seconded. Then Ted Brimeyer (CLASS) asked if there was a quorum present because there have been cases where the validity of such votes on policy was questioned later when a quorum might not have been present. Counts were done and a quorum was present. The motion was Approved.

#### 8. Discussion Item from [Henderson Library Committee](#)

Russell Thackston (CEIT) spoke as a representative of the University Library Committee. He distributed a [fact sheet](#) for the project he was there to discuss. The Library will conduct a review of the electronic subscriptions we have on campus to see which are either no or low-use, and which might be considered low impact in order to identify candidates for subscriptions “that can be moved . . .” They’re avoiding the word “cancelled” because such items will “move” from being instant online to available via Interlibrary Loans. You’ll still be able to get most of the materials you are looking for, it just may take up to four or five days for it to come in paper form from another library. The Library has reviewed the current subscriptions and there are some journals or databases that have not been accessed over the last year, and some have been accessed a very few times at a very high cost per access. They will send out to each of the colleges a list of what they see as the 150 lowest accessed publications or databases. The Deans will pass that on to the Department Chairs to solicit feedback from their faculty. They want faculty to drive this project. The Library wants to know what databases faculty find critical to both their academic programs and individual research activities, and want faculty to justify keeping them. The Library will then be able to determine if there are any “undefended” and switch them to an interlibrary loan model. The reason is budgetary. Right now we are about \$900,000 in deficit for the Library budget for those particular items. Since the 1970s electronic subscriptions have gone up about 6% a year

and our funding has not kept pace. In previous years, the University has covered that budget shortfall through year-end money, but that amount is unknown until we get to the end-of-the-year and so no amount is guaranteed. The deficit is so large this year the Library doesn't want to wait on uncertain funding and also be unable to get feedback from the faculty on this. Also, the survey that went out a few months back on the Library and the quality of services they provide found that the largest area of dissatisfaction among faculty was the information resources that were being provided. So in order to address that, we're either going to need more funding or we're going to have to adjust existing funding. He added that the Library might make this a regular procedure for the sake of fiscal responsibility to taxpayers to make sure that we are not subscribing to things that aren't needed or that aren't being used regularly.

*[Secretary's Note: There was an inaudible question.]*

Thackston said they didn't want to make any assumptions about what a department may be using, so they're going to start off with 150 of the least used, or highest cost per use subscriptions, and everybody will get the same list to start with. He noted that the Library could provide, if it is wanted, the full list of the more than 800 subscriptions we have for the University. Some very obviously are not going to get cut; they are used tens of thousands of times a year.

Moderator Flynn recommended that Senators read the Library report in the Senate Librarian's Report because there is a chart in there that shows that, compared to our peer institutions, we have a very low per FTE expenditure. The lowest on the list. He thought it might be an appropriate factor to consider how underfunded our Library is when we are making these decisions.

Ming Fang He (COE) praised the Library as an important academic foundation of the University and praised the job being done by Dean Mitchell. She asked Provost Bartels if it would be possible to maintain or increase the end-of-year money that goes to the Library.

Provost Bartels said that giving end-of-year money to the Library is routine, the amount is usually significant, and GSU always looks for ways to increase that funding. She had already asked that for the 2018 budget we think about formalizing some part of that so that it is consistent. She added that the low-funding number might be misleading and asked Dean Mitchell to comment.

Dean Bede Mitchell (LIB) noted that we are thirteenth out of fourteen in per FTE student spending in the Library, and twelfth out of fourteen in terms of total budget.

Our so-called peers actually are much better funded than our institution is. Moderator Flynn asked if he meant “our institutions as a whole,” and Dean Mitchell said yes.

Matthew Flynn (CLASS) asked what our savings would be if we move those 150 subscriptions from direct access to the interlibrary loan model format.

Thackston said the goal is to not to target a dollar amount, but to actually target the subscriptions that are not defended/justified by departments. A dollar target might end up with the cutting of something that is considered critical. The goal is to remove what is obviously easy to take out and then look for year-end money to make up the difference.

Moderator Flynn noted that some research sources have tiers of service that include certain journals, so you can’t go journal by journal. He felt that already our tier of service isn’t high enough. How would the Library make that kind of decision?

Dean Mitchell (LIB) noted such sources have such high usage figures that they will not be on the list.

Li Ma (COSM) asked if we will be able to maintain the response time for interlibrary loans. Thackston said there will probably be an increase in the amount of work that the Library has to do for interlibrary loans. He also thought that increase might not be as much as it appears because some people might decide an item isn’t all that urgent and not put in an ILL request. Whatever, they believed they could “keep up to a point with the increase in requests coming in.”

Moderator Flynn foresaw a problem with students getting needed items for their papers via ILL since he already has a hard time motivating them to do so.

## 9. Unfinished Business

NCAA Sanctions: Chris Geyerman, Faculty Athletic Representative, answering questions posed by Marc Cyr ([link to questions here](#)) re: [Geyerman’s report included in the Librarian’s Report for October 2016](#) ([Link to Transcript](#)--[Link to Recording](#)-These may need to be shared with you since they are on Google Drive.)

*[Secretary’s Note: FAR Geyerman requested – see below, bottom of page 14 – that his remarks be included verbatim in these minutes. Barring a couple of points where I messed up the formatting and couldn’t figure out how to reverse it, they are presented here unaltered from the transcript except that I have put them in bold to differentiate them from the edited sections spoken by others. As with all Senate meetings since at least 2013, the recording and transcript*

*are available online or by request from Ginger Malphrus – no Freedom of Information request required – for anyone who wants to check the validity of the minutes.]*

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS): Thank you, Richard, and my colleagues on the Senate. I'm happy to be here. One of the main things that I think is frustrating people right now with my responses was my refusal to give responses that could not be grounded in facts. My academic training taught me when I am reporting to report only facts, not opinions, not evaluations, and not inferences, and that's exactly what I tried to do. And that's exactly what I will do every time I'm on any committee or any official endeavor for the University that requires reporting, but by me personally on behalf of any committee or on behalf of the University or any group it's affiliated with. Now, I have a suggestion that I think I can do that will clarify it will give Marc answers to what I think he was getting at with his questions. I won't have to pass them off as fact because they will not be factual responses; they will be nothing more than my opinions as the faculty member closest to this investigation based on what I gleaned from the process. Obviously, my memory at the beginning of the process will be much fuzzier than it will at the end of the process because of the length of the process which is point out periodically throughout the back and forth between Marc and I. But what I will request and I would like some folks to weigh in on that is that make sure everyone in this room right now is absolutely fine with me giving my opinion because I do have four examples:**

- **On RE: page 1 – Why did the NCAA Committee on Infractions panel reject the initial Summary Disposition Report made by Georgia Southern? I put unable to verify response, and put the recording of my telephone call to the NCAA. I don't know why they did that, and they won't tell me, so I can only give my opinion. There is no basis in fact for that. I have definite ideas on why they did, but those ideas are only opinions, so what I respectfully request ~~from my sentence~~ from my colleagues in the Senate is to proceed responding and I'll go through and every one of them with my opinion and see if that addresses the questions that are asked.**

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said he had asked for facts, such as whether we asked the NCAA their reasons, and didn't ask for Geyerman's opinions.

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: With all due respect, the question, and I quote your question: "Why did the NCAA Committee on Infractions reject the Initial Summary Disposition Report**

**made by Georgia Southern?” There is no way to answer that question in fact if the people that authored the report will not talk to you and tell you why.**

Cyr said he had asked for a fact, that is, whether we inquired why the report was rejected, or we just accepted the rejection and dropped the matter.

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: Those questions you just mentioned came to me Friday afternoon. This is the first time I’ve had an opportunity to address those questions, and I will address those as well, as I go through this. But they will be all addressed and they will be with my best guess. I cannot get facts, but I will tell you the questions that require facts, Marc, I’ll be happy, if I know what the facts are to share them.**

Cyr said that was part of his problem, that the Athletics Department didn’t know much and didn’t want to know much. He was concerned that we do not have a culture of compliance in Athletics because we have the same problem recurring since 2007 of our employees cheating for students.

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: I understood that, and I read that, and I will address it as I go through. I’m going to go through it from RE, your RE page 1, all the way through the correspondence, systematically.**

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: Okay. Is there anyone out there that doesn’t have the documents, because one of the things I did in preparation for this was I merged the initial report for this meeting with the document that Dr. Cyr sent around on Friday afternoon so that for example RE page 1, you have my response and then the stuff that came in on Friday right there in the same, it’s all merged together. All I’ve done is cut and paste. I haven’t edited a thing. I’ll be happy to pass those out if you folks would like them.**

Moderator Flynn asked him to do so.

**(Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: I can send a paper bill to AD Kleinlein maybe. Do all of my colleagues have one? There’s some left over. Okay, I respectfully request that I be allowed to go through this uninterrupted so that all of my responses can be completed before we begin any further discussion. I’ll go as fast as I can, and that my, not report, and that my opinions be recorded in the minutes to this meeting verbatim.**

Moderator Flynn said that would be on the assumption that the recording worked.

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: Good point.**

Mark Edwards (COSM) pointed out that Marc Cyr was the Senate Secretary.

Cyr said he would “put them in pretty much verbatim anyway,” but might clean up some of the grammar.

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: I would appreciate it being known as someone that can occasionally have bad grammar and have them go in verbatim. Now if those of you that know me well, know that in private life I do not talk like a quaker and if there’s something along those regards that slips out by all means feel free that, but I would like them in verbatim.**

**Page 1 Re: page 1, Why did the NCAA Committee on Infractions reject the initial Summary Disposition Report made by Georgia Southern?**

**In my opinion, it’s because primarily why they rejected that was we were caught in a transition in re-organization with the NCAA and I believe it’s my opinion that the Committee on Infractions and the Committee on Enforcement were engaged in dialogue to define territory, and we got caught up in that, and that they wanted to have a public hearing so that they could begin to establish precedent for the rules on academic misconduct versus impermissible benefit that were passed in April and became effective on August 1, 2016. As for the other questions, all the ones that we asked, no we didn’t. We absolutely did not and I wouldn’t have at the time. I wouldn’t advocated it. The representative from the compliance group wouldn’t have advocated it. It’s a courtesy that they allow institutions to kind of make a petition for a summary disposition and the Committee on Infractions is certainly free to reject that and require a hearing, and that’s exactly what happened. All of the folks in the room I believe that it would be a total waste of time and they’ve all worked with the NCAA in particular the compliance counsel that we hired has over a 20-year enforcement career working in the Committee on Enforcement with the NCAA, so he’s very familiar with all of that.**

- **Page 2: Let's see where, and the dispute was over Bylaw 10.1b, ) Knowing involvement in arranging for fraudulent academic credit or false transcripts.**
- **Questions 2-5: Serious responses Questions 2-5. Okay, again, the NCAA did not comment, but throughout the process did we never ask these questions? No we didn't. Did the outside counsel asked these questions? No, or make representations to the NCAA about why we should not be hit with more penalties? That doesn't even make sense, because they don't announce the penalties until the public decision is posed, rendered, and at that point they won't talk to you about them, and if someone's going to penalize me and I know what the penalty is I'm probably not going to ask them why is it isn't more severe than it actually is. I'm probably just going to take the penalty as it is. Would that not require knowledge of what does and does not constitute grounds for various penalties? Probably not in my opinion, and these people are our hired counselors-not the NCAA-what do they say in this regard? Again, with their vast experience I have no reason to doubt that the guidance they gave us wasn't right on the money. There doesn't seem to be much of a desire on the part of our Athlet, oh, that's an opinion, okay, I'll move on.**
- **Response #6: OK.**
- **Re: page 2, Regarding the case of the Assistant Athletic Director of Student Services, How did she obtain the student athletes' usernames and passwords?**
- **The Other Response 6: You get two humanities people and between Marc and I we illustrated that one of us can't count and one of us can't number, so that goes with the turf I guess. How did she obtain? And I put unknown. Serious response. This response states that is is unknown, my guess is she asked. That's what my guess is. It's just a wild guess. She's working with these student athletes and you know the response states, I agree that it's not a res, a faculty response to the question, but I don't believe in my opinion the analogy about robbing a bank and obtaining a student's password doesn't hold much water either. The strength of analogy rests in this similarity of the two things being compared. If this is where that is. Yeah, it, I just don't believe robbing banks and obtaining a student's password are suitably**

similar for an analogy. And even if we know how banks are robbed and they still get robbed, so the analogy breaks down there anyhow.

- **Page 2: The first case began on September 16, 2013, but was not reported to the NCAA until February 10, 2014 (after the football season was over). Why so long? The implicit premise grounding this question has no basis in fact. In fact, the COA, COI on page 10 of its July 7, 2016 published the decision listed “prompt self-detected and self-disclosed violations and affirmative steps to expedite the final solution of the matters two of the four mitigated factors for the institution. Serious response: FAR Geyerman says my question about why a case began on September 16, 2013 and was not reported to the NCAA until February 10, 2014 (after the football season was over) has an implicit premise that has no basis in fact. In fact, that’s not what my, whay my response said. It says it has an implicit premise grounding the question that has no basis in fact. There is a very subtle, yet critical difference there. Marc and I ??? will be happy to give my views on that, if someone wants them. Serious Response continued, I would like to point out that the dates on which the question is based are facts. I agree with that, but they don’t serve as the grounds for the question, so there is a basis in fact for the question, but perhaps he is disputing my implicit characterization of this five month gap between the violation and the report of the violation as long because he then cites the NCAA characterization blah, blah, blah. Marc goes on then to say the only fact in FAR Geyerman’s rationale is that NCAA opinion Re: What is prompt and not prompt for expeditiously. That is not what I offered up as a basis statement of fact. I will repeat what I offered up as a statement of fact. In fact, the COI on page 10 of the July 7, 2016 public decision listed blah, blah, blah, the definition of a fact is that it must be verifiable. If you turn to 10 pages of that report that’s exactly what it says. Thus, it meets the criteria for being a fact, whether or not one agrees with the characterizations of expeditious, etc., is a matter of opinion not a matter of fact. The fact remains they appear on page 10 of the NCAA Violation. Then after we get a Geology lesson, we go to but maybe what the NCAA is actually referring to so now we are into hypothetical land, but maybe what the NCAA actually is referring to is not in its blah, blah, blah and then at the very end, but why then is the case was in this state of preparation in just three days did it take five months later to report it? So we’ve gone from facts to a maybe and then based the question on that. And I can clarify quite easily I believe that in my**

**opinion the cases are mixed up. The three day case refers to the time it took the institution to marshal the evidence sufficient to terminate the employment of person involved. The other case refers to the entire case I believe that we were preparing for the NCAA.**

- **Re: page 2, The report notes that is this the instance specified on page six, I, I couldn't answer that, but I can give you my opinion on those for sure. The report notes that the enforcement staff requested records, let's see this is the one (someone coughed right when he was speaking and I could not hear what was said) right? We are told that, if so a bird went where, question, we are told, is this, I believe it is. I believe it is. Yes, I do. That is my opinion. I believe it is that. What was this other matter? The employee in question some of the people that were working in that office notified their supervisor that this employee they thought they overheard offering to give a ride to the student-athletes to a camp. That is a minor, but an NCAA violation, so that would have been an NCAA violation and there were other things that play, too, that aren't even in the report that surfaced right about this same time that this employee was writing professors asking for extra credit, etc., which the Director of Student-Athlete Services needless to say frowns on.**
- **Page 2: Okay, here's response, FAR Geyerman cites the unwillingness, however, the questions asked for information, the question didn't ask for institution, it begins with the premise that report notes that.**
- **Page 2: The report notes that GSU fired the assistant director of student-athlete services on February 19, 2015, and okay, that one is done.**
- **Page 4: Re: page 4, We are told that student-athlete admitted that he and the former assistant compliance director became social friends. What does social friends mean in this particular case? Only Marc, rhetorical question**

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: A rhetorical question in this particular response I think in my opinion is the kind of employee-student relationship that especially, well, I won't, that many folks would deem inappropriate. That's a personal-social relationship. I think I've made my point. The NCAA report states in regard to the case of assistant director of student services, she wrote and submitted were two**

questions here: First, had the professor pursued charges against the students would this have caused the charge against the institution to rise? I don't believe so. I don't believe so at all. For lots of different reasons that I could talk about. If so, did our institution make the professor aware of his decision that he would be helping the institution avoid more serious penalties if he did not pursue? There are so many assumptions in that question. I can't even begin to unpack them. I will tell you that Assistant Provost Allen Woodrum and I reached out to this professor because we wanted to inform this professor that there was a chance he could be getting called to testify, not testify, interviewed by folks from the NCAA if they were to come on campus, and we wanted him to have a heads-up. We notified him of the academic dishonesty and told him in no uncertain terms to proceed as he would with every other student and I let him know if anyone from Athletics contacts him in any way to let me know immediately and I will push that up the line and I will say that to all of you right now. If anyone from Athletics, not student-athlete services, because the director may reach out to you to say thank you for filling out a form, or the director may have some questions, but if a coach ever calls, that's not Athletic policy. Let folks know. We'll get that rectified right away. Serious responses: see comments above. Okay. The NCAA will not comment. Did our counsel never ask these questions. Oh, I left out one. I will not presume to speak for Georgia Southern or the NCAA and Marc said I could ask those people. I'm not going to call the NCAA and ask them to make a Senate appearance even via email. They will blow me off. I have no doubt about that. You know, in all of us are free to ask the only institutional representative to speak for Georgia Southern to speak to that. It is not me.

- **Appendix One: I have several questions regarding this list of Corrective Actions as taken.**
  - **Why does the compliance office still report to Business and Finance? I guess the powers that be, I'm assuming, my opinion is that that's the best place for it. I happen to agree. I don't think it's an academic affair.**
  - **When we established the office of student-athlete services, did the tutoring and all of that kind of stuff that in my mind and we didn't have one until then was most definitely an academic affair, and I suggested to our new, then new athletic director, in fairly certain terms, that that was my opinion. He agreed and that's the story there.**
  - **Why, I don't think it would be in my opinion, a good fit for student affairs, is they have to do the compliance office, has to**

monitor a lot more than just academic misconduct. They have to monitor coaching, practice times, and CARA (countable athletic related activities) and a host of other things that clearly are non-academic. It's more kind of a similar to an HR function, actually, when they have to lots of different rules and HR reports in the Business and Finance line as well. Good. Glad to hear it. Compliance is **off???**. Six says we are in compliance then in this case it's JumpForward and then Serious response: A compliance vendor is a software program and my million years. I provided the link anybody can go study that as much as they want to answer any questions that they want. So by all means do and you know I think that would be great.

- **Suggestion for Further Corrective Action:** I find this suggestion in my opinion it's both presumptuous and arrogant. It's presumptuous in the fact that it's not typical to make suggested corrective actions in units that we have never, that we don't have much knowledge of and I think it's arrogant to think that we are qualified to make those kinds of suggestions without ever having taken the time to walk across campus and talk to the folks and find out how they operate. I hope we don't teach our students that the proper way to go about listing a corrective action is to read a report from a party that's never talked to the unit or body that were making the corrective action with respect to and then making that corrective action without ever, without ever even talking or finding out about the place, or the activities to which we're making the corrective action.
- **General Query:** The cases began in September 2013 and concluded in July 2016, a period of time. This seems to me unconscionably long time frame. I can't verify the unconsciously part. It seemed really long to me, too. I can't tell y'all how many times I stopped by compliance and asked the compliance coordinator have we heard anything yet? I have some, I thought I jotted it down. For example, and this is one that I missed. It started in September 2013. The NCAA, excuse me, Committee on Enforcement conducted their last interview in the investigative process with this student-athlete on November 17, 2014. That's the NCAA. They took 12 months plus I guess 13, 14 months to conduct their and when you're in that situation and you're waiting on them before you can respond and they don't respond, there's not a whole lot you can do, so do

**I think it took a long time, yes, trust me, I wish it would have been taken care of real quick. Would have made my life personally a lot better, but it wasn't. There was a back and forth between the Committee on Enforcement and the Committee on Infractions for six months regarding Bylaw 10.1b. Where we were sitting in limbo. So that, those are some of the reasons, I think, at least, in my opinion. Okay. Yes, the suggestion that Marc offered up for the office is exactly what's going, that's exactly the policy and that's verified by the appropriate people.**

- **Marc's General Query: The compliance with the penalty. I really appreciate Marc in bringing that to my attention. And I acted on it immediately, and it got taken care of, and I think Senator Mondor can testify to how much I appreciate that, if he remembers and I have a feeling that he does because the students ??? Three years ago, Ed called me up, this was after he just rotated off University Athletic Committee and said hey, Chris, I'm freaking out, I think we've got a student-athlete that might be competing ineligibly because of a credit hour situation and I wanted to reach out to you and find out what you know about it, and if that's true. Please, I, I, I, my recollection of that conversation, it was a telephone conversation, I got right on it, and I got back to Ed and at the end. Ed said well I didn't really want to buy it and I didn't want to bother you, that's not the word he used, but I don't want to be a pain in the butt and I believe I told Ed, Ed I appreciate you doing this. I wish we had more faculty members that are as attuned to the situation as you are. So any time faculty members have something that they think will be helpful I am all ears in terms of especially compliance. Okay, if you could go to page 7, page 2, I do believe we have a culture of compliance. We have different definitions of a culture of compliance I believe. I go by the NCAA's definition of culture of compliance. What we always hear in these seminars, does the institution have procedures and policies in place to sufficiently monitor what's going on, detect violations, and report them in a timely manner and carry out the investigations. They don't focus on prevention; they understand we report, every institution, I'm guessing, reports several minor violations, every year. You know, so that's to be expected, but I do believe because the employees in the office are the ones that picked up on it. Because Assistant Provost Woodrum and I went to the faculty member and informed**

**them, not the other way around. To me that speaks of a system, a culture of compliance. Okay, we get the Press Release from the AD, I don't think it was ever intended like that. Here's my opinion of what happened. The compliance office called the sports information office and said we need to get this up there and he just took that press release. In my opinion, it was never intended for use like that. And that getting that up there was something we had to do and we had to do right away. Marc was kind enough to characterize me as a nice guy and note that people think I'm a nice guy, which I appreciated, but for the three days after, 2 1/2 days whatever it was about my, there were people in Athletics that I think would dispute that characterization. Nonetheless, that has to be done as does the monitoring for 9E. That's one and I appreciate that suggestion as well. I had already long before this meeting with, right after this happened I went to the compliance and I said we need to be sure to reporting our progress on this to the University Athletics Committee at our meetings, so that there's a track record when we get audited for compliance. Marc's suggestion made me think of one additional step I can take and I thank him for that and that is, is Eric [Hall] here he is the chair of the committee, no, our numbers are dwindling and that is to be included as a standard agenda item until we are off probation, full-well recognizing that oftentimes the compliance director will say I have nothing new to report, but at least having it be there, so I plan on doing that. Finally, at the end, Marc says FAR Geyerman sees sunshine in the fact that since 2007, I find it in a report to colleagues again remarkably presumptuous and remarkably arrogant to speak for how any of other human being sees the world. I don't even think most people know how they see the world. And I think it is an extremely poor collegiality to do that publicly and in front of one's peers when they know that this is an ongoing process. And I wanted to go on record as letting everyone know that I do not appreciate that and in my humble opinion I think Marc that you owe me a public apology.**

Cyr said he owed no apology because he was referring to Geyerman's opinion that we have "a culture of compliance," and objected to being called arrogant.

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: I did not say that. I said the response demonstrated presumptuous and arrogant, I did not call you arrogant.**

Cyr thanked him and began a remark about “the employment business.”

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: Mr. Moderator**

Cyr began a comment.

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: Mr. Moderator**

Moderator Flynn asked Geyerman if he had concluded his report.

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: I have two or three more points and then I’m done.**

Moderator Flynn noted the Senate had agreed to let him finish before responding.

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Representative: In conclusion, I would rather most definitely solve problems than complain. I think that academic integrity in athletics is the faculty business, and I think we have hit on a common ground. I, The promotion of athletics within academics is it. I think we’re also at a time, because we have a chance to re-define what the culture of the Senate is and it involving administration. When I go around campus and I ask colleagues that I think would be excellent Senators to run, many of them say they’re not interested. I asked them why? They say because all those people do over there is sit around and complain. For the last, I don’t know how many semesters, our Dean, and I don’t know about other Deans, has had to basically help in the recruiting effort because not enough people want to be on Faculty Senate. And I think that’s part of the problem. That’s my opinion. I, I, I think there’s a low opinion that **now in AA** what I would suggest really for you, Marc, if you want all of information, is just to do a simple open records request for all of the correspondence that Georgia Southern sent to the NCAA and the NCAA sent to Georgia Southern, study it and make a report. That’s devoid of assumption and opinions. That concludes my opinions on the matter at hand.**

Moderator Flynn noted only six minutes remained in the scheduled meeting time unless the senate voted to extend, which he did not recommend.

*[Secretary's Note: The recording becomes briefly inaudible at this point.]*

Cyr noted that he had asked a lot of questions and Geyerman had engaged the questions. He said that he thought he and Geyerman would both invite others to get involved.

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) FAR: I know I certainly would. I think one of the reasons that we have trouble getting folks drawn to run for Senate is they perceive like that we tend to talk and talk and talk about things that not everyone is interested in but one or two or three people. I believe in my opinion that's been one of our defining patterns over the last 8 or 10 years, and I think it's detrimental to us being productive, deliberative, policymaking body that rather than complain, I'm all for complaining, but I think it ought to end pretty quick. We ought to find an area and try to do something constructive and those complaints ought to lead to the recognition of a problem that we can agree on and work on and that we work collaboratively to provide recommendations to the administration that if not solved certainly lessen those problems and I know I would welcome personally as the Faculty Athletic Rep any kinds of such efforts on the part of the Senate and I will help in any way I can to facilitate those. I think my track record over the year has proven that.**

Jim LoBue (COSM) thought a number of philosophical issues had been touched on regarding the role of the faculty in oversight beyond what the representative on the Faculty Athletic Committee does. He thought these were questions that we should have brought up as a body since we've moved up in football status: "What is the meaning of a student-athlete now? Has that changed? Or have we ever really debated what the meaning of a student-athlete is and what our role as a Faculty Senate or as a faculty in general should be?" He thought an open senate meeting was the wrong forum, and asked what the right one might be.

**Chris Geyerman (CLASS) FAR: Some ideas that I had just wandering through this off of the, about the 9E, because that really disturbed me, Marc. What's the role of the Senate appointee on the University Athletic Committee? There is one. It's in the Bylaws. It said is there something that Senate would like the Senate appointee on the University Athletic Committee to do? Is there something the Senate would like the FAR who right now happens to be me to do and include systematically in all of the reports that I make to the Senate? I would be more than happy to engage in conversations like that. But I do not believe it's productive to have situations where we have someone announce publicly I don't have a**

**problem with Chris, my problem is with Athletics, and maybe the NCAA, which is a verbatim quote from the email that Marc sent. I don't think that's productive to sit around and say I have problems so let me start bashing, bashing, bashing. I think it's productive to say if we have problems let's sit down and isolate some ways to that we can convert those into actionable items for the administration to take up. That is what I think shared governance is supposed to be. But I think we sit around and gripe too much. Way too much.**

Alice Hall (CHHS) said she had been a member of the University Athletic Committee several times and applauded Geyerman for all of his hard work. She noted the composition of the committee and said that was the forum for these issues.

#### 10. Announcements: Vice Presidents

None.

#### 11. Announcements from the Floor

None.

#### 12. Adjournment

Moved and Approved.

***The next Senate meeting is scheduled for November 28th, 4-6 p.m. in the Russell Union Ballroom.***