

2-7-2017

2-7-2017 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, "2-7-2017 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2017). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 30.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/30>

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
February 7, 2017
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting members in attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Sam Adyeye. Evans Afriyie, Mete Akcaoglu, Rocio Alba-Flores, Ashley Colquitt for Moya Alfonso, DragosAmarie, Dustin Anderson, Ted Brimeyer, Gavin Colquitt, Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, Mark Edwards, Larisa Elisha, Matthew Flynn, Richard Flynn, Alice Hall, Eric Hall, Ellen Hamilton, Ming Fang He, Jonathan Hilpert, Yi Hu, Bob Jackson, Mujibur Khan, Barbara King, Chung-yeon Chiang for Hsiang-Jui Kung, Lili Li, Jim LoBue, Lawrence Locker, Li Ma, Alan Mackelprang, Ron MacKinnon, Santanu Majumdar, Leticia McGrath, Ed Mondor, Lowell Mooney, Constantin Ogloblin, Jorge Suazo for Rob Pirro (after 5:00 p.m.), Peter Rogers, Jake Simons, Fred Smith, Janice Steirn, James Stephens, Linda L. Thompson, Sam Todd, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi, Meca Williams-Johnson, Hans-JorgSchanz for Shijun Zheng

Voting members not in attendance: Lisa Abbott, Kelly Berry, Sarah Bielski, Adam Bossler, Tim Giles, Alina Iacob, Scott Kersey, Eric Landers, Alisa Leckie, Chasen Smith, Valentin Soloiu

Senate Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Student Government Association: EudiahOchieng

Administrators in Attendance: Jaimie Hebert, Jean Bartels, Diana Cone, Rob Whitaker, Martha Abell, Barry Joyner, Curtis Ricker,

Visitors: Trent Maurer, Nicholas Sewak, Amanda Klingel, Alexandria Drake, Lisa Bridges, John W. Stone, Michelle Cawthorn, Candace Griffith, Patrick Novotny, Christine Ludowise, YasarBodur, Olga Amarie, Stephen Vives, Delena Bell Gatch, Amy Ballagh

[**Approval of the Agenda for the February 7, 2017, meeting.**](#)

Moved and Approved.

Approval of the November 28, 2016 Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

Moved and Approved.

Librarian's Reports for February 2017: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Librarian.

Welford moved approval, but noted that one set of Graduate Committee Minutes had been accidentally omitted. Moderator Flynn said both the November and January minutes would be presented for separate approval at this meeting, so there was no impediment to approving the overall Librarian's Report. The report was Approved.

Undergraduate Committee Report – Ron MacKinnon (COBA), Chair

There had been two meetings of the Undergraduate Committee:

November 15, 2016

- under new business, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, there was one new course, five inactivated courses, one new program. Department of Art had one inactivated course; Department of Communications, one inactivated course; Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology, one revised program; Department of Foreign Languages, three inactivated courses, Department of General Studies two revised programs; Department of History had one new course, two revised courses; Department of Literature and Philosophy, one new course, five inactivated courses; Department of Music, one inactivated program; Department of Sociology and Anthropology, nine new courses, three inactivated courses, 14 revised courses, and one revised program.
- College of Science and Mathematics, Department of Geology and Geography, two new courses, one inactivated course.
- College of Health and Human Sciences, School of Nursing, four new courses, one new program.
- There was an update on CIM [*new software from CourseLeaf for the Registrar*].

Also, in order to get the meeting minutes to the Senate in time for it to be engaged before the meeting they agreed to have email votes on the approval of the minutes.

January 24, 2017

- The College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, Department Communication Arts, had two inactivated courses; 53 revised courses, six revised programs; Department of Foreign Languages, one inactivated course, 18 revised courses. The Department of History had nine inactivated courses and one revised program. Department of Sociology and Anthropology had four new courses; Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology had one new course, two revised courses; Department of Writing and Linguistics, two special topics, one inactivated program; Department of Literature and Philosophy, one new course, one new program.
- College of Business Administration, School of Accountancy, had three revised courses, one revised program; Department of Marketing, had four revised programs; Department of Finance and Economics, had two revised courses and five revised programs; Department of Management had four revised programs.
- College of Education, Department of Teaching and Learning, one new course, two inactivated courses, 15 revised courses, and two revised programs; Department of Curriculum, Foundations and Reading, one revised course; Department of Leadership, Technology and Human Development, two inactivated courses.
- College of Science and Math; Department of Biology, had one inactivated course; Department of Geology and Geography, four new courses, three inactivated courses, four revised courses, one revised program. Department of Mathematical Sciences, two special topics, and the Department of Physics, two revised programs.
- College of Health and Human Sciences, School of Nursing, one new course, four inactivated courses, one revised course; Department of Health and Kinesiology, two revised courses, and two revised programs.
- College of Engineering and IT, Department of Computer Sciences, two special topics; Department of IT, two revised programs; Department of Civil Engineering and Construction Management, one revised course.
- There was another update on CIM.

The report, including recommendations, was Approved.

Graduate Committee Report – Dustin Anderson (CLASS), Chair

There had been two meetings:

November 10, 2016

In addition to two other new business items, the committee reviewed, discussed, and approved the following curriculum changes:

- 13 new courses, five from the College of Education
- eight from the College of Science and Mathematics
- 12 course revisions, one from CEIT
- 11 from Education
- two course deletions from CLASS
- one new program from COSM
- and six program revisions: one from CLASS, one from CHHS, and one from COE.

The committee was informed of changes to the Comprehensive Program Review format structure by the VPAA's office, and the dates for upcoming training sessions for those changes were announced, and they thanked Candace Griffith for organizing the training sessions for that new process. The committee also heard a proposal for a change to graduate credit regarding senior privilege. This proposal was later withdrawn. The committee was also updated of the Prior Learning Assessment Subcommittee's process based on the questions from the Senate. The subcommittee at that point in time was working with Mr. Whitaker's office on evaluating models for fee structures at other peer institutions. The committee was also updated on the CIM System issues stemming from CourseLeaf. The committee requested clarification of when items would process through the system to make sure that materials submitted actually went to the appropriate committees for their agendas, as well as downtime operating procedures. An RFI was submitted as follow-up to this request and that RFI and its response were discussed at the November Senate meeting.

January 19, 2017

The committee discussed two updated business items. They received a brief update on the Comprehensive Program Reviews and their accompanying workshops. There followed a discussion based on the Content Information Management System update from the Registrar's office. While that update is fully fleshed out in the minutes, the committee expressed continuing concerns about an absence of procedures to ensure items move from submission to the appropriate agendas, "and a ratio of course systems in which certain fields are edited, a misalignment of courses being available in BANNER, and then departmental and college deadlines from posting schedules and the

management systems works for other USG Systems but not for Georgia Southern. The Registrar's office responded." The System was not doing some of the things that the committee thought it would do, and they would have to go back to the drawing board. In the meantime, the Registrar's office reported to this committee that they would focus on manually inputting information into the catalog.

The committee then reviewed and discussed the following:

- 83 new business items: 15 new courses, two from Public Health, two from CHHS, seven from COE, four from COSM
- 34 course revisions: four from Public Health, one from CEIT, one from CHHS, and two from CLASS, 25 from COE, and one from COSM
- 30 course deletions: one from CLASS, 26 from COE, three from COSM
- three new programs, all from the College of Education
- ten program revisions: five from the College of Public Health, one from CHHS, one from CLASS, two from COE, and one from COSM; and two new program preliminary proposals, one from CLASS and one from COSM.

There were also two additional information items for special topics courses from COSM, and given the amount of new curricular items the committee moved to table any old business items to a following meeting.

The minutes and recommendations therein were Approved.

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

[Secretary's Note: Cawthorn is largely inaudible on the recording.]

Moderator Flynn asked if this report was the same as the written report in the Librarian's Report, and on being told it was, the report was Approved.

President's Report: Jaimie Hebert

Consolidation

President Hebert acknowledged that consolidation with Armstrong was creating anxiety, largely as the result of uncertainty about the process. The day before this meeting, he and Armstrong President Linda Bleicken had met with the two consultants who will be guiding the process, and they had received some information re: timelines

and levels of faculty/staff involvement that he hoped would remove some of that uncertainty.

Recommendations from an Operational Working Group (OWG) will go to the Functional Area chair, to determine whether or not we have consensus regarding those recommendations. If there is “unanimous consensus” coming from the OWG’s, those will be placed on a consent agenda with the Consolidation Implementation Committee (CIC). So “when faculty meet and make the decision about academic programs, if there is unanimous agreement amongst the faculty at Georgia Southern and Armstrong on what should be done, those types of recommendations are going to go through a consent agenda process, where they won’t even be discussed at the CIC level.”

We will have over 225 tasks and recommendations that will have to go through this vetting process. There are templates that the OWG’s will use to submit, including consideration of the emotional and the human aspect of what’s going on.

The Consolidation Implementation Committee has twenty members from Georgia Southern, twenty members from Armstrong, and the System has chosen to place one person from Savannah State for the sake of maintaining communication and the established ties between both institutions and Savannah State. The purpose of the Consolidation Implementation Committee is more or less to decide which tasks are next in the timeline. There are some that are set, but the CIC basically governs the timeline and the flow of information, and recommendations will be sent to that committee for final vetting. A vetted recommendation will be submitted to President Hebert and to the Chancellor for final decisions.

The team has identified 26 different functional areas in which we need to be doing work. Those range from organizational structure in academic programs to risk management plans and diversity plans. The team would be meeting Wednesday of the following week -- the Cabinet, as well as a handful of other folks -- to look at possible names, and would be soliciting names for co-chairs for every one of those functional areas. The co-chairs of the functional areas will basically be the governors of the process within those functional areas. Within each of those areas there are sub-areas, ranging from a minimum of 2, like in the organizational area which consists of new org chart and new mission statement, to Business and Finance with sixteen or seventeen.

Every sub-area will have a committee working. There are going to be somewhere between 80 and 100 committees working on very specific tasks and answering very specific questions. Those are the subcommittees which will be referred to as “Operational Working Groups.” We have a person with a military background who is in charge of this at USG, so President Hebert was learning to speak in acronyms. The

OWG's will be required to prepare recommendations. Those sub-committees will be populated by the people who are impacted. Academic sub-committees will be flush with faculty; there will probably be student representation, some administrators like Deans and Chairs and so forth, but where the rubber hits the road we will need the folks who are impacted working on these recommendations.

Those recommendations will be sent back to the USG consultants: that's Randy Stuart from Kennesaw State, and Linda Noble who is an employee of the System office now. They will look at those recommendations for consistency. Those will feed into a parallel process which is the development of the SACSCOC [Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges] prospectus. Everything that is going into the SACSCOC prospectus for the new institution will incorporate the recommendations that are coming from the grassroots. Once all of the recommendations have been vetted and cleared, they will work on a draft prospectus for the new institution and the plan is to have that submitted to SACSCOC in September. So the vast majority of the questions, this large complex process, will be handled between now and late June.

If SACSCOC approves the prospectus at their December meeting, then the Board of Regents will have 30 days to act upon that decision. If the BOR also approves, we will legally at that point begin operating as a single institution with three campuses: one in Statesboro, one in Savannah, and one in Liberty County. We would not switch over fiscally or academically until Fall of 2018, but for legal purposes we would be a single institution beginning in January of 2018.

This is going to be a lot of work for a lot of people, but we don't want these decisions made by people who are not vested in what we are doing as an institution of higher education. President Hebert also felt that the "difficult side to this process" is the emotional and the human side, in Statesboro but especially on the Armstrong campus. But he wanted to note that this is unlike any other consolidation that has occurred in the state of Georgia, and he had heard this from the USG and from the legislature. In previous consolidations, they were really looking to fix something that was broken, and that is not the case here. Armstrong is a very good institution doing a wonderful job with its mission. We are an extraordinary institution, and we have an opportunity to bring these two positives together and an opportunity to create something that we otherwise couldn't have created in this short time period, and that's how he hoped we will look at this, as "an opportunity to create not only the fourth largest institution of higher education in the state of Georgia, but the best example of what a higher education institution should be in the state of Georgia."

President Hebert noted as an example that research has been and always will be a piece of what we do, and that it will be difficult for faculty members at another state university

who are moving into different standards. He asked GSU faculty to access their “human side” while developing new standards of performance. We need to consider how we attract people, and how we grandfather people. There are great faculty on the Armstrong campus who have not been given the opportunity to be productive re: research, and we want to make sure that we have avenues for them to develop. We want to embrace who they are and embrace what we all want to be together. Also, they are rich in traditions, and we want to try and maintain their cultures and their traditions along with our own. We’re going to be nearly 28,000 students, but that large scale and small feel is still our goal. We need to look at the positive side of this and “create one of the most magnificent institutions this state has ever imagined.” He is “scared to death, but [has] a lot of confidence because I know who I’m going in with. It’s you, it’s Cabinet, it’s the good people that work at this institution, and the people who work at the Armstrong institution.” He hoped all would be “willing to roll up your sleeves and do things above and beyond over the next six to eight months so that we can do this right.”

Provost’s Search

In all other consolidations that have occurred, the USG have stopped all senior level administrative searches. We were actually given the option to stop or continue, and we will continue, but we will be searching for the Provost of the new institution. That requires rewriting the profile for the advertisement, and we cannot write the profile until we have our new mission statement written. That will be approved at the end of April. We could go forward with the search at the end of April, but that would over-compress the vetting process. President Hebert thought it critical that we wait one year and continue the Provost’s search next year, hiring our full-time Provost for the new institution. We will include faculty members from Armstrong on that search committee. We have had over 100 inquiries already, and he believed the new institution would be even more attractive to applicants. We will appoint an interim from within who will shadow Provost Bartels so that the transition will be as seamless as possible. We will reconvene the search committee in September with members from Armstrong, rewrite the profile at that point, and advertise very early in the Fall with the intention of hiring July 1, 2018.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked about the process if an OWG recommendation is not unanimous.

President Hebert said one of two things will happen. Either it will be sent back to the OWG with a charge that they come up with an alternative recommendation that all members agree on; or it will be left to the CIC to have discussions, and then there will be a looping process between the OWG and the CIC until some consensus is reached. If no

consensus is ever reached on a particular item, his hunch was that the Chancellor will call him and tell him to make a decision.

[Secretary's Note: Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked several mostly inaudible questions. Fragmentary audible bits indicate that some questions were in regard to administrative structure, and some in regard to consolidation of programs and location of programs and what he called "non-negotiables."]

President Hebert said he would answer the questions "kind of in order."

He has been named as the President of the new institution. There will be one President. Linda Bleicken will be involved in the consolidation process and they are co-chairs of the Consolidation Implementation Committee, so they are now working very closely together as we go through this process. His first charge is to develop an organization chart. There will be only one Provost. Beyond that, he didn't know. He had upcoming meetings with three different people at the System office to get some guidance on the organizational structure. He identified some "pillars": We have to have a fiscal officer. We have to have someone who is working with alumni, advancement, and external relations. We have to have a person who is handling enrollment management and a person handling student services. We have to have a person who is handling IT. He believes in setting up an org chart without people in it, in terms of function, and then going back and populating that org chart.

As for who will be in charge of Armstrong campus, in one of the consolidations they named a dean of a campus, but he didn't think that would fit us. Just thinking out loud, he thought a Vice Provost for the Savannah and Liberty County campuses would make sense because it's a primarily academic mission. The person would be located there as a point person, but answering to the Provost, not directly to the President, because you really want to keep the academic mission flowing smoothly amongst those campuses. He and VP for Finance Rob Whitaker had talked about doing an entire facilities team down there, and whether we'd need a vice president for facilities, or do we need a superintendent for the Armstrong campus and a superintendent over at the Liberty Center. Right now, though, they are thinking in terms of function, and he hoped in two weeks to have an organizational chart laid out for the CIC to consider. There will not be multiple vice presidents or multiple provosts or presidents. We may have more vice presidents than we see now on our campus, but probably fewer than Armstrong currently has on their campus. He believes in streamlined administration.

In terms of the academic programs, Provost Bartels is co-chairing that functional area. As for "non-negotiables," President Hebert called those "lines in the sand" and said there were no such lines. He said there'd been much talk on the order of "Health

Sciences will never leave Savannah” and “Engineering will never leave Statesboro.” No such decisions have been made. He had a good idea about what should and shouldn’t happen in some cases, and thought the vast majority of folks involved in this feel the same way, but those pieces of the recommendation will come up through consensus. But then there will be some areas that are puzzlers. For example, if you have two History programs, do we have two History Departments? If we have one History Department, where will it be located, and do you have one track only, or one track in Statesboro and a different track with a different emphasis in Savannah? This was the kind of situation that needed to be recommended on by an OWG.

Mark Edwards (COSM) asked if such decisions are supposed to be decided by January Of 2018.

President Hebert said those are things that are going to be decided by June of 2017. He emphasized, though, that what we do “is not going to be carved in stone for all of eternity. Institutions are dynamic. We’re going to make some mistakes when we go through this process. We have processes we can go through to rectify those problems.” The main thing is to keep students, faculty, and our disciplines in mind.

He also wanted to make another point very clear, one he has made from the Governor’s office to Rotary Clubs: We have a 21:1 teaching student to faculty ratio here, and at Armstrong they have a 19:1. We both struggle to meet our instructional mission. Therefore, “We not losing faculty in this process. We cannot afford to lose faculty in this process, and continue doing what we’re doing at the level or better than we are currently doing.” He would be very surprised if this consolidation didn’t result in additional faculty. As he has said before, any savings we gain from administrative changes, he wants to reinvest in our academic mission. The Chancellor has told him that USG is not expecting a single penny back from us in this consolidation.

Lowell Mooney (COBA) asked if President Hebert will be given a pool of money to implement this, or will it have to come through formula funding, which tends to lag so will we have to bear some financial hardships until the money catches up. And he asked if the kids who finish Armstrong in the spring and summer of 2018 will have the option to choose whether they get a Georgia Southern degree, or an Armstrong degree.

President Hebert said we are not receiving a consolidation budget, but we can identify a pocket of money on campus. He did not think travel and so forth would be that expensive. The biggest expenses will be down the line, involving such things as changing signage, but we will earmark enough money from the savings from the consolidation to address those one-time expenditures. There should be no impact on our current mission. As for students getting diplomas, he did not know; that would have to be a

recommendation. For his part, he will want to err on the side of making those students happy. He went through a similar name change situation when he was an undergraduate and so is sensitive to the issue.

[Secretary's Note: Name inaudible] (CEIT) asked if we are expecting name changes similar to what has occurred in Augusta.

President Hebert said the name has been decided and it will be Georgia Southern University. We may have naming conventions at one or more campuses, not all campuses, but those will be decided via recommendations.

[Secretary's Note: The same unidentified person] asked if the sub-committees will have proportional participation based on the number of faculty and students at the two institutions.

President Hebert did not know, but noted that was not how the Consolidation Implementation Committee was constituted. He projected that for some OWG's there would be, but not for others.

Alice Hall (CHHS) asked if the June deadline pertained to Athletics given the various sports' timelines, and about scholarships.

President Hebert said the Operational Working Group for athletics had already been charged. It consists of the two Athletic Directors, the two Faculty Athletic Representatives, so Chris Geyerman's on there from here in Statesboro, and the NCAA Compliance Officers. Within two weeks they will have their full recommendations and those recommendations will incorporate what we will do for the seasons, how we will handle waivers and exemptions for students, and how we will handle scholarships. He knew that among the coming recommendations would be that any student who has chosen to attend either Armstrong or Georgia Southern on an athletic scholarship, if they lose their scholarship spot, or if their athletic team is abolished, if they choose to stay at the institution, we will convert that over to an academic scholarship. We'll use athletic scholarship funding, but we will rename it an academic scholarship. It will be subject to the same academic eligibility requirements that they had to maintain for that scholarship when they signed on. And it will be for the duration of their athletic eligibility, if that's what their scholarship agreement said. Large numbers of student-athletes at Armstrong are already transferring to other institutions, many have been identified by our coaches for open slots here, and others will have their teams play out next season, such as the seniors on the Volleyball team at Armstrong; they don't have any place to go, and their senior year is coming next fall, so they will play.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) expressed concern that faculty are already fully loaded with work and will be overloaded, trying to complete all this in four months, and that it will negatively impact our mission.

President Hebert said, “Well I can’t, I can’t address whether or not that will affect your teaching or not. That’s ultimately up to you.” He said no one would be required to participate in the process, but added that he had already had a couple dozen faculty contact him and offer their participation, unsolicited. They will go with volunteers, though if we are talking about six or seven hundred folks involved in sub-committees, we may have to do something. Will working in this process impact a faculty member? Yes. Will it impact the quality of teaching or research? In many cases, no. The biggest impact will be personal “because you are going to get two jobs done, kind of like everybody else is doing. Is that fair? Not necessarily.” He noted that consolidation had not been in his job description, but he was now doing it on top of his regular work. He would try very hard to make sure that doing that second job would not negatively impact his first job as President.

Ed Mondor (COSM) expressed shock at the quick timeline. He noted the President’s projection had the detail work starting only in March, that May is finals, and after that many nine-month employees will be gone re: field work or committed to other things. People who want to participate won’t be able to.

President Hebert said, “Yes.”

Jonathan Hilpert (COE) asked if questions related to tenure and promotion and how to sort out programs and the physical divide between the campuses and other such academic decisions will be organized under one functional area and, if so, when those OWG’s will be announced.

President Hebert was not sure about the timing, but was pretty certain all of those will be different sub-points under the academic functional area, though they may be subdivided into different functional groups as well. They hope to have all OWG’s appointed by mid-March. But one OWG will not handle all those issues. Each OWG will have a very specific issue to deal with so it can be worked out quickly.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) noted that we currently have many committees, such as the curriculum committees, working on things that might be rendered irrelevant in four months, and asked if it is fair to keep them doing that work right now.

President Hebert agreed some decisions we’re making now may be rendered moot, but they may not; it depends on the new institution that is created via the process. He

thought we should take the position that we are going to continue functioning as usual because the curriculum committees' work is relevant now and may be needed in future. He also reiterated Provost Bartels' point that much of the consolidation work can be done electronically and telephonically, which can reduce the time and work burden.

Ming Fang He (COE) noted the large number of students of color at Armstrong and rumors that some would go to Savannah State rather than sign on with Georgia Southern. She asked if we had plans to organize an office of diversity to help attract those students.

President Hebert said that Diversity and Title IX are one of the functional areas that will be considered. Armstrong has a very active diversity office, and we have diversity plans, and a handful of people who have responsibility for diversity, but not to the extent that they have in a diversity office. We have to consolidate their function, and our function. How this will be done will come from recommendations from OWG's. He added that the consolidation is an opportunity for faculty to change the way we have been doing things.

Moderator Flynn reminded everyone that that we did not have a reconvene date.

Barbara King (CLASS) noted that the quick timeline meant that the OWG's will likely not be able to get much feedback from faculty and was concerned that recommendations will not actually be representative of faculty at both institutions.

President Hebert said some issues will likely require further discussion beyond June, but he didn't want to hold off everything until July or August re: the September prospectus. But re: a lot of issues, particularly the administrative ones, it's really a matter of just making a decision and moving on.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked if our USG classification as a "comprehensive state university" would be changing.

President Hebert (President) said that hadn't been announced, but he assumed it would not change.

Matthew Flynn (CLASS) asked when the consolidation plan with all the bullet points would be available for us to view.

President Hebert said the plan will be posted on the [consolidation website](#). It will have every OWG on there, their tasks and milestones listed out. He suggested people look at the [Darton/Albany consolidation website](#) as a great example of what we're trying to emulate.

Lowell Mooney (COBA) asked what impact this would have on our capital campaigns and on fundraising over the next couple of years.

President Hebert said that Trip Addison was working on that. They didn't feel, in talking with our donors, that it is having a negative impact; in fact, there are some folks that are getting really excited about what is to come. Addison was also working closely with the Advancement person at Armstrong; we will be pulling those two efforts together.

Provost's Report: Jean Bartels

Suspecting that consolidation would lead to a long conversation, she had not prepared any formal remarks. However, that conversation had led her to one item to report, which was that she was wondering why her retirement date had not been December 31st.

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

The SEC received two RFIs. One asked for information on the effect of the [2016 Revision to the Grade Point Average Policy](#) and [one asking about staff involvement in compiling of tenure and promotion documents](#). Both of these RFIs were referred to the Provost's office and they are working on them. The first one in particular requires an awful lot of tracking down information.

The SEC Chair requested a written response by Vice President Whitaker about the [Student Employment Policy](#) in addition to the comments at the senate meeting on November 28, 2016, but had yet to receive it.

There were two requests for motions. One of them was the revised motion submitted by Ed Mondor/Marc Cyr, which was put on the agenda. The second was discussion of the draft final report by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Student Ratings of Instruction. The SEC voted unanimously that in light of the upcoming consolidation with Armstrong, it would not be appropriate to adopt a new evaluation instrument; rather, one should be adopted in consultation with all faculty in the new institution. Secondarily, while appreciating the very hard work of the ad hoc committee, the SEC also found that the results compiled do not demonstrate a compelling case for widespread support for the proposed instrument. The SEC recommended that we accept the draft report as the final report and make a motion to dissolve the committee. The ad hoc committee objected that it had not completed its work, so the SEC decided that the committee should submit its final report to the March meeting, at which time the Senate may act as specified by Article 4, Section 35 of the Senate *Bylaws*, which reads "Ad hoc committees shall have the following reporting responsibilities: a. provide an interim report to the Senate

Executive Committee in writing at least once each semester; and b. present a final report in writing to the Senate Executive Committee by the requested due date. The report shall be submitted as a regular agenda item at a meeting of the Faculty Senate by the ad hoc committee chair.” In the meantime, since the draft report has been distributed to the Senate, Senators are encouraged to send feedback to the ad hoc committee and to the SEC in advance of the March meeting. Moderator Flynn assumed that the final report would be submitted by the February 22nd agenda deadline and distributed to senators shortly after that.

Unfinished Business

None

New Business

Resolution to Rescind President Trump’s Immigration Order

Ed Mondor (COSM) noted that President Hebert had spoken earlier about having a human perspective on elements of consolidation, and the impact on people underlies this motion. This was not coming from any political perspective at all, whether Republican, Democrat, or Independent. He had started sending out emails to people “and the only one crazy enough to reply was Marc Cyr.” The whole point was that this policy directly affected people at Georgia Southern. He then read the motion: *“The Faculty Senate of Georgia Southern University condemns President Trump’s executive order banning travel by people, including students and scholars, even those with current legal visas, from Iran, Iraq, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen as detrimental to the principles and functioning of higher education in the United States, and specifically in Georgia. We call upon the University System of Georgia to urge Georgia’s state and federal legislators to work toward getting President Trump to rescind this ill-conceived and ill-implemented order.”* Part of his impetus was that he had seen statements from other universities around the US, but hadn’t heard anything from ours or the University of Georgia. He wanted to start a conversation about how that order directly impacts our Eagles right here at Georgia Southern.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said he thought there had been a statement by the President of Georgia State, but he could be wrong about that. However, besides other reports, he noted a report on this in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* from the day before stating that the judge's order stopping the ban temporarily was supported by statements from the University of Washington and Washington State University, and by a number of high-tech companies, all of whom wrote about the economic damage to the United States and the damage to the functioning of higher of education, the interchange of ideas, of scholars and students from here going there, from there coming here, and the

human cost to the families of people like that. It seemed to him that the order was ill-conceived and even more badly implemented and that we ought to make a statement about it because it impacts people that we know, it impacts our students, it impacts all the principles of our profession and what we do.

Ming Fang He (COE) said she belongs to the American Educational Research Association, and that large organization sent out a position statement asking President Trump to rethink this executive order. She wanted GSU to be in solidarity with all the other institutions against this order that she saw as almost violating our Constitution. She noted many scholars worldwide had signed a petition to protest the order by not attending conferences in the US.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) raised a point of order, noting the motion had not been seconded. Mark Welford (COSM) seconded the motion.

(Secretary's Note: Inaudible name) (Public Health) wanted to tone the language down, wondering if instead of condemn, it could be “we have concerns” or something similar.

Cyr said that the first word he used was “damn,” and thought that anything less than “condemn” was at best mealy-mouthed and cringing.

Mondor (COSM) said he completely agreed with the wording, and noted the resolution did not condemn any political party but only this specific act.

Jake Simons (COBA) shared the concern for potential impact on people at Georgia Southern, but also had concerns about the proposal: First, given that the faculty senate has no direct control of this issue, he thought it was arguably outside the scope of this body. Second, he said “the proposal is likely to be perceived as presumptuous and could be detrimental to our credibility as a group.” Third, he thought the policy’s impact on faculty and others was “sufficiently apparent to the President and the Board of Regents that the proposal is probably not necessary or helpful to their desire or ability to advocate a desirable resolution.”

President Hebert did not want to get in the middle of the discussion, but noted that USG was in the process of preparing a statement; he did not know when it would be released. Also, the system presidents received written notification requesting that they not make public statements regarding this until after USG issues their statement. He added that he did not disagree with the discussion he was hearing because he had looked into this, and we have four students who could potentially be affected by this. They are currently in the US, but they can’t travel home and risk not being able to have their visas renewed to come back in.

Cyr said that this was not a “public statement” in terms of alerting the media, but a statement to be forwarded to the USG, going up through the system, and focused on the educational elements involved with that order.

President Hebert said that even if the motion did not pass, he thought the rationale was great and he would bring it to the System as they prepare their statement. If that statement did not align with the current motion, it could be pursued then if it had not already been passed. He was meeting the Chancellor the following Monday and was hesitant to bring the motion itself forward because “the language would be inflammatory in that audience,” but thought the rationale would be beneficial.

(Secretary's Note: Someone from CLASS spoke, but is only audible in fragments. It seems both she and a graduate student in her department were personally affected by the order, and both were anxious because they were unsure of the status of their visas.)

Lowell Mooney (COBA) reminded everyone that the ban was only temporary; if it were a permanent ban, he would favor the motion. “In respect to all of the Americans whose lives have been inconvenienced forever . . . waiting two or three months for them to get the system revamped is [not] too much to ask or expect.” He thought we should wait and see how the order and the stay on the order turn out.

Ming Fang He (COE) said that even though it is temporary, faculty and students with a green card or a visa will be tracked every time they cross the border. She called the order “a direct threat to anybody who comes from other countries.”

Mark Edwards (COSM) wondered if the authors of the motion would be open to tabling it for a month given that the ban may be struck down, when they might be in a better position if the Board of Regents does craft a statement that they could get behind, at which time they could modify the motion to specify what they did or did not support in the System’s statement. He thought also this would put Dr. Hebert in a stronger position.

[Secretary's Note: The recording of the following statement is fragmentary.] Janice Steirn (CLASS) said she’d be comfortable with that if we knew when the USG statement would come out. Since that could be a long time or never, she wanted the senate to voice disagreement with the order now.

[Secretary's Note: The speaker's name is inaudible, but may be Jake Simons (COBA).] It was proposed that when the vote came, it be by show of hands. Moderator Flynn agreed.

James Stephens (Public Health) said “if we speak as one voice we have a more powerful voice and a louder voice.” He preferred to wait for the System statement so we would speak as one. He thought waiting for up to a month was a short time.

Hans Schanz (COSM) said he understood this to be a letter to the USG, not a public letter or public statement. We would be expressing our sentiment to the USG, not “going rogue here.”

Marc Cyr (CLASS) agreed, and said the motion might act to bolster or direct the System's statement.

Jake Simons (COBA) asked if he was correct that the motion would be a recommendation to the President, who would ultimately decide whether or not to send the resolution to the USG.

[Secretary's Note: The following remarks are audible only in fragments.] Moderator Flynn said that was generally the case, but he would have to find out if that process applied to such a resolution. He called for a show of hands vote, and the motion was Approved 29-8. Someone asked for abstentions to be counted, but Flynn noted that "abstentions are not votes" and therefore are not counted.

Announcements: Vice Presidents

Rob Whitaker (Vice President for Business and Finance) noted that he had been asked to prepare a report from the University Athletics Committee on some questions that were proposed. Given the short time left in the meeting, he asked if the senate would prefer that he post them rather than present them. Both Moderator Flynn and the senate representative on the Athletics Committee, Ed Mondor, agreed posting them was the best option.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked where they would be posted. Flynn asked VP Whitaker to send them to him, and he would see they were sent to the Senate Listserv and probably to gsfac as well.

Announcements from the Floor

Ming Fang He (COE) thanked Cyr and Mondor for making their motion, which she said was very important to her and all other foreigners on campus.

Adjournment

Moved and Approved.