

11-28-2016

11-28-2016 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, "11-28-2016 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2016). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 29.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/29>

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.

Faculty Senate Minutes
November 28, 2016
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting members in attendance: Lisa Abbott, Sam Adeyeye, Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Mete Akcaoglu, Kelly Berry, Sarah Bielski, Ted Brimeyer, Elizabeth Butterfield for Leticia McGrath, Chung-Yean Chian for Hsiang-Jui Kung, Gavin Colquitt, Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, Lisa Denmark for Janice Steirn, Mark Edwards, Larisa Elisha, Richard Flynn, Jessica Garner for Lili Li, Tim Giles, Alice Hall, Ellen Hamilton, Ming Fang He, Jonathan Hilpert, Yi Hu, Alina Iacob, Scott Kersey, Eric Landers, Alisa Leckie, Jim LoBue, Lawrence Locker, Alan Mackelprang, Ron MacKinnon, Ed Mondor, Lowell Mooney, Constantin Ogloblin, Rob Pirro, Peter Rogers, Jake Simons, Fred Smith, Chasen Smith, Linda L. Thompson, Sam Todd, Mark Welford,

Voting members not in attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Rocio Alba-Flores, Moya Alfonso, Dragos Amarie, Dustin Anderson, Adam Bossler, David Dudley, Eric Hall, Bob Jackson, Mujibur Khan, Barbara King, Li Ma, Santanu Majumdar, Valentin Soloiu, James Stephens, Tharanga Wickramarachchi, Meca Williams-Johnson Shijun Zheng

Senate Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Student Government Association: Eudiah Ochieng

Administrators in Attendance: Jaimie Hebert, Jean Bartels, Diana Cone, Greg Evans, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker, Teresa Thompson, Rob Whitaker

Visitors: William Amponsah, Barry Balleck, Michelle Cawthorn, Richard Cleveland, Terri Flateby, Delena Bell Gatch, Candace Griffith, Steven Harper, Dylan John, Christine Ludowise, Roger Purcell, Brad Sturz, Ashley Walker

1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 28, 2016 meeting.

Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the October 31, 2016 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

Moved and Approved.

3. Librarian's Reports for November, 2016, Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian

Moved and Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report – Ron McKinnon (COBA), Chair

Emergency E-Mail Vote – a motion was made that in case of emergency the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee could have the ability to vote by email rather than scheduling an impromptu meeting. The motion was carried. **Program reviewers** – the Undergraduate Committee was informed by the Provost's office that Physics, Biology, Management, Finance, Graphic Design and Nursing programs are to be reviewed. The following members volunteered to do the program reviews: Gardiner, Khan, Hamilton, Tabi, Aasheim, Amarie, Leckie, and Hendrix. Under new business, College of Science and Math, Department of Geology and Geography, there were two new courses approved; two inactivated courses. Under the College of Health and Human Sciences, Department of Health and Kinesiology, there was one revised course. Under College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, Department of Communication Arts, there was a Selected Topics Announcement. Under other business, there was an update on the Curriculum Inventory Management (CIM). The committee's report was Moved and Approved.

Graduate Committee Report – Dustin Anderson, Chair/Richard Flynn (CLASS) presenting:

Anderson was in class, so Moderator Flynn, a member of the Graduate Committee, gave the report for October. The committee discussed two new business items and three old business items in addition to an update by the Registrar's office.

1. New Business:

- a. The committee approved two new courses in Geography. As part of that discussion, the committee established a practice for “rolling-back” proposals in the new Curriculum Inventory System. Based on feedback delivered during the meeting, the committee would “roll back” any unapproved items to the appropriate college’s Associate Dean.
 - b. The committee discussed the implications of making a change to the existing Graduate Faculty Status process mentioned in the previous month’s report. The committee approved the proposal from the VPAA’s office on retroactive conferral of this status on faculty who are already here.
2. Old Business:
- a. The committee continued the discussion of the change to Graduate Faculty Status forms and policy language. The committee approved the revision of the policy and companion form.
 - b. The Prior Learning Assessment sub-committee provided an update on the revision process of their proposal. The sub-committee would report back to the committee during the November meeting, which Flynn noted they did.
 - c. The committee continued its discussion of the delineation in degree descriptions. The committee asked for additional information from the colleges primarily affected by this delineation to be gathered for an upcoming meeting.

The report was Moved and Approved.

Core Curriculum and General Education Committee, Michelle Cawthorn (COSM), Chair Report

The main goal of the GECC this fall has been to review core course assessment reports. During September members of the committee reviewed the rubric used to review them and conducted rubric norming. During October the committee reviewed the reports. There are 73 core classes in areas A-E. The committee reviewed 61 reports. Some classes, such as for the Foreign Language reports, submitted one report for all the languages, which accounts for the discrepancy between the numbers. Each report was reviewed separately by two committee members; as much as possible, one person on the committee of reviewers was a member of the college in which the course is taught. After the independent reviews, the committee members met to reconcile their reviews. And

the colleges and core course report writers either had already received or will receive those reconciled reports. This was an information-only report.

4. President's Report: Jaimie Hebert

President Hebert started by apologizing for missing our last meeting – he was out of town – but he said he would be happy to address any questions from that meeting.

Fall Enrollment

We were up 1.07% for the fall, but a 2.2% increase in semester credit hour production. That is very solid growth because when semester credit hour production is increasing at a higher rate than headcount it is generally a sign that full time enrollments are replacing transient enrollments. In fact, we lost a great number of transient students over the year, and that offset some healthy growth in our graduate programs and our new freshman enrollment, so he was very happy and so was the System because it is a sign of academic health. The spring enrollments were currently slightly down, but he was not overly concerned about them because there were some anomalies in our enrollment data due to the changes in registration deadlines, and so forth, because of the hurricane.

Follow-up from Hurricane Matthew

He thanked faculty for the extraordinary job they did working with students, being flexible, and providing continuity through that trying time. We applied for an exemption to not have to make up those days we were out, and it was approved by USG, which was not the case with all universities, some of whom missed significantly more days than we did, but he saw this as a sign from the System that they trust the job that we are doing.

Board of Regents

Dr. Steve Wrigley has been appointed the new Chancellor, and Dr. Michael Crafton, who is currently serving as Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, will be returning to West Georgia, and they will be doing a national search for a Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs at the System level.

Budget Meetings

Our budget meetings have typically occurred in December, but they're spreading them out over a large period of time. We are not scheduled for our budget hearing until March, but we are already turning in our budget information to the System. We will be

focusing completely on academics and on student success. In highlighting student success, we will be looking for funds to assist this primarily in Financial Aid. We are going to look at Graduate Education competitiveness—that's phase II of our stipend increases there. We are looking for faculty lines for growing areas and asking for help to address faculty salary compression. All of our major capital requests over the next several years will be focused on academic buildings. Some of our smaller capital requests are re: renovations of other buildings and support buildings on campus.

Reorganization

With the retirement of Vice President Salinda Arthur (Advancement and Alumni) he has eliminated that VP position and merged that office into our Government and External Relations division. Trip Addison will continue as the Vice President overseeing all four of those areas. His title will be [Vice President for University Advancement and External Affairs]. All staff will be retained. This move can streamline messaging and develop synergy amongst those groups. In addition, from Research and Economic Development, we will be moving Economic Development to VP Addison's's area.

From within that division of Research and Economic Development, COGS has moved into Academic Affairs, which better aligns our Graduate School with our academic mission, and the remainder of the Research related activities, with the exception of Herty, will move into Academic Affairs as well. Dr. Don McLemore, who is currently serving as the Interim Vice President over that division, will now serve as the Director of the Herty Center. So we are essentially eliminating that Vice President position as well.

Steve Burrell was Vice President for Information Technology; he resigned in June. Ron Stalnaker will take over as Chief Information Officer, not a cabinet-level position. So this is another Vice President's position eliminated.

The Cabinet beginning in January will consist of four Vice Presidents – the Provost; the Chief Finance Officer; Student Affairs and Enrollment Management; and External Affairs and Economic Development. A smaller Cabinet will allow us to streamline our messaging and improve our communication, especially with some reorganization within the divisions. It also provides a significant cost savings by reducing administration, in excess of \$600,000, which we are going to reinvest primarily (meaning substantially) back into our primary mission, academics.

President Hebert called for questions, but there were none.

5. Provost's Report: Jean Bartels

Provost Bartels wanted to know why President Hebert didn't get any questions. When she was President, it seemed like there were a lot. She was just saying.

College of Graduate Studies

Re: COGS, there have been discussions with the Deans, chairs, program directors, and the Graduate Committee. The concern is making sure that COGS stays viable and active, and recognized as an important part of the University's body and life. Everything she had studied in the last year or so indicated that COGS mainly provides critical services. We have moved to having a Director of Graduate Studies and are about to launch a search for that position. The search will be for a faculty ranked person who has an understanding about graduate studies and will be able to oversee the organization and directing of graduate studies services. Under the graduate director will be an assistant, or administrative specialist in a number of areas, such as overseeing DegreeWorks and graduate clearances, looking at graduate assistants (who are under the purview of COGS), and looking at all of the admissions and administrative enrollment activities. We will not separate out recruitment and admissions; those are operating quite effectively and efficiently in COGS. But they will look at how COGS can support the recruitment activities that are happening at the program and college levels, because that's where the expertise and connections are, so resources will be committed to that end that were formerly under lots of people working in their separate arms of COGS. The Director search has been published; we hope to begin screening in January, with a job start time no later than July 1.

Research

We were still in the planning process for what will happen with the transfer of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs to Academic Affairs, set for January 1.

Lowell Mooney (COBA) asked whether Dr. Patterson would be coming back; if so, in what capacity; and what had happened with his position.

President Hebert said that Patterson was still serving as Interim President at another institution. If he returns, we will have a position for him, but it will not be as a Vice President. President Hebert had spoken with the System about this.

Barry Balleck (CLASS) noted a recent ruling by a federal judge in Texas about the Fair Labor Standards Act and that an injunction had been placed nationwide on the new

regulations. He asked if we were going to put a halt to any of the things that have been happening in the last couple of months, or were going to wait until this plays itself out.

Rob Whitaker (Vice President for Business and Finance) said we were told by the System office to continue with the way we have implemented the FLSA changes. They are consulting with the State Attorney General's office and once they have final rulings from them, then they will provide us the direction that we will head.

President Hebert went back to his previous comments to clarify that, re: Dr. Patterson, this was not a decision about him, but an organizational change needed by the University. He did a fine job for the University in his role with Research, and we will have a position available for him appropriate to the new structure.

6. Provost's Search

Teresa Thompson (Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) said the Myers McRae Firm will be assisting with the search, but assist only, which means the committee will see all applications that come through the process. The committee will have an initial meeting likely January 18th or 19th; resume review will begin March 9th; Skype interviews sometime in March; and campus interviews in April. They were gathering information to prepare the ad that will go out to the *Chronicle* and other places, and also marketing materials that they will provide to the candidates.

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

The Senate Executive Committee considered a number of requests for information and discussion items; he would explain why some were not on the agenda. They also discussed some further questions to the Athletics Representative. At the end of the last Senate meeting it was decided those questions were going to be directed to the Faculty Athletics Committee, so they had been forwarded to Ed Mondor to ask of the committee. They also had some concern about language in the *Faculty Handbook* about external review for tenure and promotion. They weren't certain that the language was clear and unambiguous about what sorts of things are supposed to be sent out for external review, for example, just scholarship, or also teaching and service. The Faculty Welfare Committee was charged to look at that language and figure out if they want to change or clarify anything; the SEC added some suggestions to that charge to the committee.

Discussion Item: [Student Ratings of Instruction](#)

This was not on the agenda because the chair of that committee has promised to come to the February Senate meeting, after the committee run their fall trial in face-to-face courses. They've only tested the instrument in online courses from the spring. They will also address any questions about this new instrument. No action will be taken on the SRIs at the February meeting so Senators will have the opportunity to tell them what they think, especially if they have experienced taking part in the pilot. Flynn assumed that the committee will make the instrument officially public before that meeting.

Request for Information: [Faculty input regarding activities in which the University expects them to participate.](#)

This was about the change of the graduation ceremony, which was already addressed at the last Senate meeting, but Moderator Flynn had passed on the written query in order to get a response in writing.

Unfinished Business

None

8. New Business

Election of Faculty Senate Moderator for the 2017-2018 academic year

Moderator Flynn announced that Robert Costomiris had nominated Robert Pirro for Senate Moderator, and he would give him a chance to speak for a couple of minutes. He asked if there were other nominations, but there were none, and his motion that nominations be closed was seconded and Approved. He then asked Pirro to speak.

Rob Pirro (CLASS) noted that he had been told the job of Moderator was a thankless one, so he wanted to explain why he wanted to do it anyway. From observing Faculty Senate Moderators, he had deduced that there are three aspects of the job: One is administrative housekeeping. The second is communication, sort of listening to faculty and administrators, responding to their concerns, modeling civility during the meetings, and so on. It is the third aspect of the job that attracted him – the Moderator as an advocate for the central importance of academics to this institution or to any university. He brought a perspective from his field of study, political theory, to the question of how

important academics are. The word and concept of “academics” originated with Plato and Socrates and involves examination of self, society, and nature; and looking for the better argument, interpretation, or analysis. That is what is important, and it is what we do, and he believed President Hebert had demonstrated a commitment to these ideals, and that encouraged Pirro to apply for the Moderator position, especially given that we will have a new Provost coming in. He thought it important for the Faculty Senate Moderator to advocate for the central importance of academics.

Pirro was elected by acclamation to be Moderator for 2017-2018.

9. RFI: Discussion of Curriculum Inventory Management (CIM): Velma Burden, Registrar

Registrar Burden noted that her report was mailed out to everyone on November 21st, that the CIM system was back up and live as of the 18th, and that there were several workshops that would be offered to give in depth training.

Moderator Flynn said he had a question about the workflow, noting he had a large number of emails in his inbox asking him to review and approve essentially every curriculum change that had been made so far by the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees. He said this was not an official way to do things; he couldn't approve them because they hadn't been passed by the Senate yet, and they also have to be approved by the President before he could do anything. He also said that reviewing every course change in the University is not in the Senate Moderator's job description. He asked Registrar Burden to address this situation.

Burden said that in collaboration with the Provost's Office they were working on streamlining workflow and considering returning to having approvals done from the minutes. Moderator Flynn thought that would be a big help.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) wondered why the workflow started with the Registrar's office before proceeding to Department Curriculum Committees, College Curriculum Committees, and University Curriculum Committees.

Burden said this allowed them to spot problems before it goes through to other steps. That is only a temporary phase which let them know they needed to take the system down and work with our CourseLeaf programmers to make things right.

Moderator Flynn asked about a backup system for when the system fails, as it had this semester.

Burden said they added a print button, so that if we should have an instance where the system goes down, people will still be able to use CIM to submit requests, then print them, and then follow the normal manual approval process that was previously in place.

10. Report and discussion of issues raised in Lisa Abbott's RFI on Student Employment: Rob Whitaker, Vice President for Business and Finance

VP Whitaker said the policy on student employment regarding students holding multiple jobs on campus has not been changed. No policy exists. We do have a 24 hour per week policy. That was the answer to the RFI.

The background is that we employ 2,316 institutional work study students. VP Whitaker thought we do a very good job of providing students with employment to help them financially. Of those 2,316, 745 are employed in the Auxiliary Services area. Of those 745, about 269 were not recording their time using a time clock. Auxiliary Services also employs 439 non-exempt staff who are a part of FLSA, and who were transitioned to reporting their time via a time clock. So the Auxiliary Services area made the decision to transition all of their "time clock or all their time stamping employees to a time clock requirement so they could be consistent across all 1,184 time recording employees within the department. The unintended consequence of that decision was that the ADP time clock system does not allow an employee to clock in at multiple locations, thus not having two jobs on campus if they are in a time clock situation somewhere else on campus." On September 15th the department met with the 269 students that were impacted by this, of whom 12 had a second job on campus. Of those 12, 3 left the Auxiliary Services area to go work at the other department on campus, 9 stayed within the Auxiliary Services area. Total, they received three complaints about this transition: Two of those involved community leaders who had work study issues, and both of those had been resolved; the one other student decided to work at the University Store.

The remedy: Auxiliary Services will put hiring procedures in place for the spring semester to avoid such disruption in student employment. He also noted that we are all transitioning from ADP to OneUSG. That new system will not have the same limitations about clocking in and out.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) thanked him for clarifying that it was an error in evaluating that the system coming in wouldn't work with the current system, and noted that 2 of the 12

students he listed were hers, which was why she was a little hot under the collar about this. She raised a related issue, “the failure of the professionalism on the part of HR” because “none of the supervisors, programs, departments, were contacted except for Auxiliary Services.” She only found out when she had students coming to her in tears because they had to quit their job with her. She said HR’s lack of communication was “a huge problem.” It took four emails before she got an answer from HR regarding her students, and if it weren’t that the Director of Theatre is married to the Manager of the University Store she would not have found out that one student was about to lose her job at the Store because HR had not removed her from Abbott’s ADP. Then they wanted a PAF. And they had never contacted her. She called this approach “disrespect to both the students and to their supervisors in their program” and said it was “offensive.”

VP Whitaker said Abbott’s “comments . . . are well taken,” but noted the decision was made in Auxiliary Services, not HR. He said he had taken note to make sure decisions are better communicated in future. He was confident that in HR things are being done properly, and that while Auxiliary Services need to communicate better with their students and with departments, he thought they had assumed that once they met with the students on September 15th that the students would talk to the departments, but obviously that didn’t happen very well.

Abbott thought it was a problem that they put it on the students. It put them in an incredibly awkward position, and they felt like they were failing the people in the Theater Department because they were told they had to quit.

Mark Edwards (COSM) asked for a timeline for transitioning away from ADP.

VP Whitaker said this was a System-driven decision to move from ADP to PeopleSoft. All he knew was that pilots will start in Spring 2017. There will be three pilots, and all we know is that we’re not in the last one. We expect it to impact us in the next fiscal year.

[11. Discussion Item on QEP: Teresa Flateby, Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness will update and answer questions.](#)

VP Flateby introduced her two assistant directors, who are also Associate Professors, and noted they would join in this discussion.

The QEP was developed about two and a half years ago with a team of faculty members, students, and administrators. The QEP is called *Georgia Southern! Eagles! Write! Write! Write!* The emphasis is on the development of students' analysis, argumentation, and synthesis skills communicated through writing: "So you could equally say that this is, think, think, think QEP as well." The plan is being phased in over five years. We started it in fall 2015 with fourteen programs in which a course was identified as a writing enriched course. There was already writing in these classes, but some changes were introduced by the faculty members. This year, we have those fourteen programs continuing with that initial course and they have identified a second writing enriched course. Over five years, the goal is to build to 60% of all programs in each college participating. We're in year two and have eleven new programs involved. Next year, the first group of programs will be offering three enriched courses. After five years three classes in each of the programs will be initiated. Two of the writing enriched courses are supposed to be sequential. Two are required. The third can be an elective.

Brad Sturz (Associate Professor of Psychology) said one activity is the involvement of "student writing fellows," mostly undergraduate students. Often, the student writing fellows can spend the time that we all would like to spend with our students, but can't, for example, seeing multiple drafts of a piece of writing before it is turned in for a grade.

Ashley Walker (Associate Professor, Community Health) said they also offer faculty development opportunities. For example, Michael Pemberton, Director of the Writing Center, offers sessions during the semester on writing instructions to make sure you are getting the product you want your students to be producing, since data showed faculty instructions and writing prompts were not always as clear as they thought. There's another on providing effective feedback without making it too time-consuming. There are also workshops in which faculty experienced in the QEP share their strategies with each other and with new faculty.

Sturz added that they hold a summer retreat that features an external speaker. There are also monthly meetings within each college. The goal is collaboration and sharing of what does and does not work. The ultimate goal is to change the culture at Georgia Southern University with respect to appreciation of writing and its importance.

Walker said they have an implementation team of faculty, students, and staff that is split into three subgroups: one looking at changing the culture of writing from a student perspective; one looking at how to involve the staff who work with students on a day-to-day basis to model good writing skills, such as good email composition; and one seeking

to incorporate other things on campus where students are using high-level thinking skills outside the classroom. There is also discussion of involving Residence Life in the process, maybe doing some writing workshops within the residence halls. One to-do item is to have the Writing Center open during all summer terms.

Sturz said a running theme through all of this is collecting information and identifying what resources individuals need to be successful in this implementation.

VP Flateby moved to indicators of change in students' writing. The QEP gathers data through the programs' annual assessment reports, which include QEP-related outcomes. One goal is the understanding that writing is a process, not an event, and they are trying to get students to use that process beyond just the classes that they are currently in. Almost all program reports have indicated that from the beginning assignment to the last, there were changes. They specifically mentioned students' facility in finding and using credible sources increasing over past students' performance. They also seem to have a better awareness of audience needs. As for writing being a process, when they first asked students why they were engaged in this, they said to improve their grades, but they're saying something a little bit more than that now.

Walker noted that she teaches these courses in rotation with Raymona Lawrence. One positive change is students coming to her office to ask specific questions. But they have found that students are still struggling with the synthesis of information and reading the peer review literature, so Lawrence created a new teaching strategy for students to analyze and synthesize articles and this created strong improvements; Walker planned to adapt the strategy and they would collect data on its efficacy and continue modifying approaches as directed by the data. Her students complain less because they know she expects a lot from them and they understand that, and because everything is related to their field of study and what they are going to be doing as practitioners. The biggest changes are with students who tend to struggle because she takes more time to walk them through this process. She and other colleagues have also noticed that the comments from the student ratings of instruction are more thoughtful – complete thoughts instead of little blurbs and bullet points; the same occurs on discussion boards. And in their writing there is less Wikipedia and more peer reviewed literature and websites.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) noted that faculty and student writing fellows do not edit students' papers; feedback helps them learn the process themselves.

Sturz noted that this term he implemented some QEP strategies in a non-QEP class, starting the first week on breaking the term paper down into subcomponents. He had one student tell him she'd been struggling, but then she presented her ideas to him in exactly the way we hope students will, and she thanked him for starting the process from the start of the semester. He had provided the steps to help her skills grow.

VP Flateby noted a University-level assessment process that includes the faculty member submitting the students' writing enriched papers to the office, where some are selected at random to be evaluated and scored by other QEP faculty during summer. They use a rubric that sometimes has to be adjusted depending upon the discipline. So far they have produced some discipline-specific data that shows students are improving re: revision, research, and thoughtfulness, but right now this really is baseline data.

Walker addressed the expansion and modification of the QEP implementation. They are trying to modify the initial written plan via information gathered from the college meetings and the course reports. For example, it is on this basis that plans have been made to keep the Writing Center open throughout the summer terms. This coming summer's retreat for QEP faculty may develop further modifications

Rob Pirro (CLASS) noted that many of his students complain they have too many papers due at the same time at the end of a term and so he sensed that they approach papers strategically, giving only some full effort depending on what grade they want in any specific course. He wanted to know if we considered it a success or failure that students can write A papers, but often write lesser quality papers because of the schedule.

VP Flateby noted that this QEP is focused on writing in the disciplines, so probably the writing in these particular courses is fairly important to the students. She also noted that these assignments are given throughout the term, so this is not necessarily a huge research paper at the end of a term. Many of these are called "writing to learn" assignments, so there's a lot more writing going on, but they may not be graded as heavily. All of this writing is in the discipline so they would be more interested in developing their writing and their thinking more than maybe in a course they're not as interested in.

Pirro noted that it had been said that their goal was 60% to begin with, and asked if we are looking for 100% participation in future.

VP Flateby said they'd love 100%, but the goal was 60%. They will continue to encourage more participation, and in some colleges it will be 100%.

Pirro asked for clarification that going from 60% to 100% would be through a voluntary process, and not through bureaucratic fiat. VP Flateby said, "Right."

Announcements: Vice Presidents

None.

Announcements from the Floor

None.

Adjournment

Moved and Approved.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate is February 7, 2017, 4-6 p.m. in the Russell Union Ballroom.