

3-6-2017

3-6-2017 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, "3-6-2017 Faculty Senate Minutes" (2017). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 31.
<http://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/31>

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

March 6, 2017

4:00 to 6:00 P.M.

Russell Union Ballroom

Voting members in attendance: Cheryl Aasheim, Lisa Abbott, Sam Adeyeye, Evans Afriyie-Gyawu, Richard Cleveland for Mete Akcaoglu, Rocio Alba-Flores, Dragos Amarie, Dustin Anderson, Kelly Berry, Sarah Bielski, Ted Brimeyer, Chung-Yean Chiang for Alan Mackelprang, Finbarr Curtis, Marc Cyr, Lisa Denmark for Lawrence Locker, Mark Edwards, Matthew Flynn, Richard Flynn, Tim Giles, Alice Hall, Eric Hall, Ellen Hamilton, Jonathan Hilpert, Scott Kersey, Mujibur Kahn, Barbara King, Hsiang-Jui Kung, Jim LoBue, Jorge Suazo for Leticia McGrath, Ron MacKinnon, Ed Mondor, Lowell Mooney, Rob Pirro, Hans-Jorg Schanz for Yi Hu, Fred Smith, Janice Steirn, James Stephens, Linda L. Thompson, Sam Todd, Meca Williams-Johnson

Voting members not in attendance: Moya Alfonso, Adam Bossler, Gavin Colquitt, Larisa Elisha, Ming Fang He, Alina Iacob, Bob Jackson, Eric Landers, Alisa Leckie, Lili Li, Li Ma, Santanu Majumdar, Constantin Ogloblin, Peter Rogers, Jake Simons, Chasen Smith, Valentin Soloiu, Mark Welford, Tharanga Wickramarachchi, Shijun Zheng

Senate Parliamentarian: Karen McCurdy

Student Government Association: Eudiah Ochieng

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

Visitors: William Mast, Eben Risper, Trent Maurer, Alexandra Drake, Amy Ballagh, Christine Ludowise, Chris Caplinger, Jessica Garner

1. [Approval of the Agenda for the March 6, 2017 meeting.](#)

Moved and Approved.

2. [Approval of the February 7, 2017 Minutes: Marc Cyr \(CLASS\), Senate Secretary.](#)

Moved and Approved.

3. [Librarian's Reports for March 2017: Mark Welford \(COSM\), Senate Librarian.](#)

Moved and Approved. Janice Steirn (CLASS) then asked if there was a quorum. A handcount showed 37 present, thus a quorum.

Moderator Flynn noted that he had asked the chairs of the curriculum committees to be brief.

[Undergraduate Committee Report – Ron McKinnon \(COBA\), Chair](#)

McKinnon said he would be short, but noted the committee minutes were 33 pages, with 138 changes. He gave some numbers: Vice President of Academic Affairs, two changes; First Year Experience, two changes; College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, 46 changes; College of Business Administration, nine changes; College of Education, nine changes; College of Science and Mathematics, five; College of Health and Human Sciences, 19; College of Engineering and IT, 46; College of Public Health, nine.

The report was Approved.

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

[Secretary's Note: Anderson was mostly inaudible in the recording. Some microphones were found to be not working, we couldn't get them fixed, and this caused some ongoing difficulties.]

The report was Approved.

[Core Curriculum and General Education Committee, Michelle Cawthorn, Chair](#)

Sarah Bielski (CLASS) delivered the GECC report for Michelle Cawthorn. The committee changed a Kinesiology course name from Endurance Jogging to Endurance Running, and “there had been some confusion about having to fill out the form for just a name change, and the body decided that we should have consistency and they should fill out the entire form electronically, so it was rolled back.” The biggest discussion concerned whether and how General Education Outcomes should align with core outcomes. Some General Education Outcomes are unmeasurable, like quality of life, and while faculty have been asked to track this, faculty participation was poor. The committee decided the unmeasured outcomes from General Education should match with core outcomes. “The

GECC body feels tend to move forward on this because of the merger with Armstrong. The discussion of the body revealed the desire to keep the core versus gen ed step for it, and reveal them as a strong recommendation from our committee to Armstrong. Spoiler alert: We sent that to the Dean and it seems like now this General Consensus is to streamline, so moving forward the question was should we set GEO's next to core outcomes and align them. Some say there's an inherent difference between the two and some are saying they need to be aligned and/or streamlined."

The report was Approved.

4. President's Report: Jaimie Hebert

Consolidation Implementation Committee

The first Consolidation Implementation Committee meeting adopted four recommendations. Two regarded maintaining traditions and legacy at the Armstrong campus, and two regarded athletics.

The first was that the Georgia Southern University campus in Savannah would be named formally the Armstrong Campus; and that in Hinesville would be formally named the Liberty Campus. But they are Georgia Southern University – that is the name of the institution, but the campuses will have those names.

The second was that all edifices which are currently named on the Armstrong campus will maintain their historical names.

The Operational Working Group for athletics was allowed to start a little bit earlier than the other OWG's because of the implications of transfers and setting season schedules and notifying conferences and so forth. Their first recommendation was, essentially, that any student athlete who was on a scholarship who loses the ability to play, will maintain a scholarship, though it will probably be an academic scholarship, through the duration of their eligibility as long as they maintain the same academic requirements that were associated with their athletic scholarship. The second recommendation was to allow blanket transfers for athletes from Armstrong, so they can transfer to Georgia Southern if they wish, but they can transfer to other universities as they see fit.

Operational Working Groups

The CIC formally named 99 Operational Working Groups. This was more than anticipated, but they were named by the Functional Area Chairs, and these are the areas which our folks and the folks at Armstrong really felt we need to address. Faculty were being assigned and he expected we would begin to see the new institution take shape very shortly.

Mission Statement

CIC-approved recommendations will be included in the prospectus for the new institution that the Board will approve in total next January, provided that SACSCOC approves it first. However, we are required to put a new mission statement in place, and unlike those other individual recommendations it must be approved by the Board of Regents. The mission statement deadline puts us under the gun because it needs to be at the April Board meeting. Therefore, he and President Bleicken tasked Curtis Ricker and Trey Denton, who worked very closely with the Strategic Planning process in composing the current mission statement, to prepare the new one along with two people from Armstrong. They will meld the current, very similar mission statements into a new draft mission statement. That draft will then come to the Senates here and at Armstrong for discussion, and then be forwarded to the System “with the understanding that when we have this new institution in place and when we have an idea of what this new institution really looks like, then we will embark on an honest visioning process and strategic planning process and revisit the mission in that regard, from that perspective.”

<http://consolidation.georgiasouthern.edu/>

Meeting with Governor Deal

All of the USG and Technical College Presidents had met with Governor Deal that morning. They talked about Complete College Georgia and his desire to have more students who are ready to access higher education and completing it, so that we can have a positive impact on the workforce, but he also discussed concealed carry. He was opposed to this legislation, but he gave no indication about what his actions would be.

5. Provost’s Report: Jean Bartels

No report.

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

The SEC put on the agenda the report of the ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings of Instruction, but voted not to put the ad hoc Committee’s suggested motions #2 and #3 on the agenda because those recommendations were not part of the Committee’s charge, which was that the ad hoc Committee “draft or recommend for purchase a new Student Rating of Instruction designed to measure teaching effectiveness.” Moderator Flynn and others had “searched high and low” for the charge as printed in the ad hoc Committee’s final report, but they were unable to find it. Pat Humphrey, the previous Senate Moderator, said there was no written charge other than the motion that was made in the Senate to establish the committee. Therefore, Flynn did not know where some things in the report came from, though possibly from the previous ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings that finished its report and was discharged prior to this current committee

being formed, and charged only to come up with the instrument.

The SEC had put a motion on the agenda to accept the committee's report, discharge them, and forward the report to the relevant consolidation OWG for consideration. However, the SEC also decided to allow the motion of the SRI committee to adopt their instrument to come to the floor after the SEC motion although there was SEC consensus that, given consolidation was underway, this was not the time to adopt a new instrument. Moderator Flynn also noted that the instrument that was piloted met with considerable resistance, as indicated in the committee's final report, and that the instrument being presented for Senate approval was not the instrument that was pilot tested: It removed the list of SLO's and added an additional open-ended question.

External Review for Promotion and Tenure

The SEC had charged the Faculty Welfare Committee, headed by Jim LoBue, to examine the language in the *Faculty Handbook* on external review for promotion and tenure because it is ambiguous, being unclear whether it was just scholarship that was being evaluated, or whether it was the whole package. They discovered that at the department and college levels these decisions are not always the same, but that in light of the consolidation now is not the time to be changing language in the *Faculty Handbook*.

7. Unfinished Business

Presentation of the final report of the ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings of Instruction: Trent Maurer (CHHS), Chair

Maurer thanked current and former committee members for their work on this "herculean task," Provost Bartels for her support and guidance, those faculty and chairs who participated in the pilot, and the staffs in the Center for Academic Technology Support and IT. He urged everyone to read the 72 page report in the Librarian's report.

Maurer said that at its first meeting on March 10, 2015, the committee was charged by Faculty Senate Moderator Humphrey to identify an instrument to replace the current SRI form. The instrument would function primarily as a formative assessment to inform and improve teaching effectiveness (per BOR policy), and be consistent with the recommendations of the 2014 ad hoc Committee on SRIs, namely that it incorporate best practices from the research literature on SRIs; focus on student learning, learning behaviors, and formative feedback; and provide opportunities for students to specify in writing how the instructor promoted learning

Additionally, the committee was charged by Moderator Humphrey to pilot test the new SRI instrument in classes from every college and of various sizes and levels, revise accordingly, and present it to the Faculty Senate for adoption. Further, they were to propose methods to make the evaluation of teaching effectiveness more equitable and consistently defined, assessed, and used across the university, including developing

guidelines for how SRIs should be used in personnel decisions.

Section 2 of the report provides background information that shows that our current SRI form and the manner in which it is used to evaluate teaching is significantly out-of-step with the best or even justifiable practices in the literature.

Section 3 provides information on the design of the pilot SRI instrument.

Section 4 describes the methodology of both the pilot study and the feedback survey of selected faculty and department chairs.

Section 5 presents analysis of the results of the pilot study.

Section 6 presents a qualitative analysis and the results of the feedback survey of selected faculty and department chairs. The number of responses for both faculty and chairs was very small and represented less than half of all individuals selected for the pilot test for both faculty and chairs. He cautioned people not to extrapolate or generalize from the feedback received to the broader population of faculty and chairs.

Section 7 presents the three recommendations of the committee and their rationales.

Recommendation #1: was that the Faculty Senate adopt the proposed new SRI instrument. He noted that while the instrument proposed for adoption differs from the instrument as pilot tested, the committee believed it to be consistent with their charge and a significant improvement over our current SRI instrument. He further noted that their motion codified the responsibility of the Faculty Senate to determine the content of the SRI instrument and to periodically review the instrument for revision or replacement. This recommendation was on the agenda as a motion.

Recommendation #2 proposed changes to three sections of the *Faculty Handbook* that concern how SRIs are used in evaluating teaching. He noted that SRI data was currently being misused, and the changes would refocus the use of SRI data to be primarily formative, as dictated by the Board of Regents. He said this was independent of adoption of a new SRI and that the committee was disappointed to see that the motion making this recommendation was not put on the agenda. They were, however, encouraged that their recommendations would be forwarded to the appropriate Operational Working Group, so this recommendation might be achieved as part of the consolidation process or reconsidered by the Senate thereafter.

Recommendation #3 was inspired by President Hebert's invitation to use the consolidation as an opportunity to envision changes in how Georgia Southern works. One repeated piece of feedback was that the existing SRI administration process was too time-consuming. A centralized model for SRIs with a single office responsible for the entire process would remove that burden from every department and simultaneously reduce inefficiencies and inconsistencies. Again, the committee was disappointed to see

that the motion making this recommendation was not put on the agenda. But he hoped that the forwarding of the committee's report to the responsible OWG would result in their work resulting in needed and meaningful changes.

Moderator Flynn allotted 15 to 20 minutes for questions.

Dustin Anderson (CLASS) asked why some feedback from chairs was not included in the report.

Maurer said they analyzed feedback for "emergent themes"; they did not attempt verbatim representation of every reply. Every member of the committee read every single comment, and they then selected exemplars of themes.

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) asked if they had considered piloting the current draft of the SRI form because it was different from what was piloted.

Maurer said they had been charged to conduct a pilot, revise on that basis, and present the revision to the Senate, which is what they did. They were not charged to pilot a second time. He said "it's pretty much accepted standard practice that if all you are doing is deleting quantitative items, but not adding any quantitative items, there's no need for an additional pilot test. The changes were all deletions of quantitative items, not additions of any quantitative items."

Rob Pirro (CLASS) asked why all of the SLO's had been deleted.

Maurer said Section 7 of their report gave a detailed explanation, but the short answer was that it was a technical issue: The Remark Office Software that is used to read this is extremely sensitive to user error. In the pilot, three departments returned entirely unusable data because of user error. Given how many different administrative assistants would have to be trained and the possibility for even a tiny error to make all the data in an entire department unreadable, the committee found the possibility of that type of catastrophic failure unacceptable.

Pirro (CLASS) said deleting the SLO's only for technical reasons worried him. He thought including SLO's was problematic because it "is consistent with this model of pushing content to students and then they have to measure whether or not in week 13 or 14 whether they have gotten all the content, and . . . half the students when I ask them what have you learned? They said it takes them a semester or a year or maybe many years to understand fully what they've learned in a class, and this idea that in week 13 or 14 or 15 through some set of . . . SLOs they'll be able to accurately and helpfully assess what we have taught them I think is really problematic." Another problem was that he could foresee a day when SLOs won't be chosen by the professor, but people above us, and that would be a major infringement on academic freedom. He hoped that even if the technical difficulties could be overcome, SLO's would still be omitted.

Mark Edwards (COSM) commented that the Senate could be a very differently

constituted body after consolidation and so he wasn't sure that were a new SRI adopted now it would have any effect at all.

Alice Hall (CHHS) said her experience on P & T committees made her find the committee's work and recommendations valuable; they should be kept in mind when the merged institution develops, as she thought it would, a new SRI. She also asked if there are online SRI's available for purchase.

Moderator Flynn said there were and that Armstrong uses one of those.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) clarified that the upcoming SEC motion was in part to forward the committee's report to the responsible OWG, so it was not just being thrown away.

Jim LoBue (COSM) wondered if it was premature to discharge the committee when the SRI issue was going to continue.

Moderator Flynn noted they were being discharged because they had finished their work by submitting their final report.

Maurer totally agreed with Moderator Flynn.

LoBue opined that voting on the proposed SRI seemed to him to be an "inconsequential or premature or not sensible thing to do."

Moderator Flynn said the whole thing could be tabled, but that the SEC thought the issue was important enough to be put to a vote. He also noted that there was confusion about the charge, which apparently was not put in writing, but which he assumed came from the original SRI committee's report. He advised that in future the Senate be sure to put ad-hoc committee charges in writing.

Maurer noted that the Librarian's Report contains the minutes of his committee's first meeting, on March 10, 2015, where Moderator Humphrey verbally charged them, but agreed that they had not been given a written charge. Essentially, they were told to carry out the recommendations of the 2014 committee, which are all in writing.

Moderator Flynn noted that some of that earlier committee's recommendations led to changes to the *Faculty Handbook*, including about how it is inappropriate to make SRIs the sole or even majority factor in personnel decisions. He also noted that Moderator Humphrey had told him something different from what Maurer reported, and he had gone on what she said.

Maurer said he had gone on what could be found in that Librarian's report.

Jonathan Hilpert (COE) asked, were the new SRI approved, when it would go into effect because he thought it likely implementation would require some training.

Maurer said the motion would implement it this coming Fall. However, now that it was a one-size-fits-all form, training would be minimal.

Barbara King (CLASS) said that question 18, which asks “how interesting was the subject matter of this course,” had been moved from evaluation of the instructor to evaluation of the course, “yet the question as it pertains to instructor offering a before and after essentially, or the equivalent, that seems to generate much more information than the information we currently have in question 18.” She asked him to comment.

Maurer was not clear on her question. He rephrased it: “What you’re saying is that on the current form there are two questions. One asks about their interest in the course before they took the course, and one asks about the interest of the courses at the end of the course, both of which are asked at the end of the course. Whereas on the proposed measure we ask one question about interest in the course and that’s what you’re asking me to comment on.”

King said, “Sort of.” She really wanted to know why the proposed new SRI asked this about the course rather than the instructor.

Maurer said it did not: “Section 2, the course question 7, how difficult was the subject matter? Question 8, how interesting was the subject matter? That’s in the course, that’s not in the instructor.” King said, “Right, but currently I believe it was the instructor.” Maurer said, “If I’m not mistaken, it’s after question 18, in the stand-alone section in our current form.”

Moderator Flynn said this discussion would be more appropriate when the actual motion was debated.

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS) wondered whether, should the SRI motion fail, the report would be forwarded to the OWG. Moderator Flynn said that should the SEC motion pass, the committee’s report would go to the OWG whether the SRI motion passed or failed.

8. New Business

[SEC Motion to Discharge the ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings of Instruction](#)

Moderator Flynn read the motion:

The SEC moves that now that the ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings of Instruction has completed its charge "to draft or recommend for purchase a new Student Rating of Instruction designed to measure teaching effectiveness" and has presented its report to the Senate, the committee be dissolved with our thanks and that the final report of the committee be forwarded to the appropriate Operational Working Group under Faculty Affairs to consider in their consolidation of faculty evaluation policies in the Georgia Southern-Armstrong Consolidation.

The motion was moved and seconded.

Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) asked if only the first motion proposed by the ad hoc committee would be forwarded, or all three.

Moderator Flynn clarified that not the motions, but the entire 72 page report would be forwarded to the Operational Working Group.

Curtis asked if that meant that the OWG could then consider the other best practices issues even though those weren't in the charge of the ad hoc committee.

Moderator Flynn hoped they would.

Curtis liked the first part of the motion, but given that the senate might vote against the SRI motion, he opposed voting to send it to the OWG no matter what.

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) clarified that the whole report, not just the proposed SRI form, would be sent to the OWG so that they have this research.

Ted Brimeyer (CLASS) feared that forwarding the report would be interpreted by the OWG as signifying Senate approval of its recommendations.

Moderator Flynn thought the motion did not make that implication.

Jonathan Hilpert (COE) said that while that might be true, the motion doesn't offer senators the opportunity to split their votes regarding the motion's two parts, discharging the committee and forwarding their report. He offered a friendly amendment to split the motion into two to allow a more "nuanced" vote.

Moderator Flynn asked if Hilpert wanted to make that motion.

[*Name unintelligible*] (CLASS) said the motion on the floor had to be dealt with first, adding that forwarding the report would only give the OWG valuable information to work with; its recommendations would not be rubber stamped as "final decisions."

Hilpert (COE) understood that, but still wanted senators to have the opportunity to vote to dissolve the committee, and a separate vote against moving the document forward to the Organizational Working Group.

Karen McCurdy (Parliamentarian) said that if it was the will of the Senate to have two votes on the two clauses of the current motion, a motion to amend would need to be made and passed, and then the two motions voted on separately.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said he understood that, but thought the split was an odd move given that there was nothing in the current singular motion directing that the OWG do anything with the report, and that not forwarding it would simply deprive them of three years' worth of information gathering.

Hilpert said Cyr might find it odd, but others might not, and moved to split the motion. He noted that he intended to vote “yes” on both sections, but liked the idea of separating them.

The motion to amend was seconded and Approved without opposition.

The motion to discharge the committee was Approved without further discussion.

Flynn then put the motion to forward the ad hoc committee’s report to the OWG up for discussion.

Barbara King (CLASS) suggested a further amendment, that the report be forwarded with any reservations that the Senate might have. Someone unidentifiable noted that not all had reservations. King said the amendment could be to vote on sending it with or without reservations.

Meca Williams-Johnson (COE) said the upcoming discussion and vote on whether to adopt the proposed new SRI would provide information to the OWG. Flynn noted, though, that only people at GSU currently had access to the minutes.

King made her motion and it was seconded. She asked for a hand count vote. Moderator Flynn agreed.

Matthew Flynn (CLASS) asked if the report was already publicly available information.

Moderator Flynn said yes; it was up on the [current business of the Senate website](#) and you can get a copy that is not password protected.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) was unclear if they were about to vote on forwarding the report, period, or on whether or not we would forward it with or without reservations.

Moderator Flynn said, first, it was just to forward it, then corrected that to being on whether to forward with or without reservations noted. Then King said, “Basically it’s one of two options: complete forward or just forward with reservation, a vote between those two options.” Karen McCurdy (Parliamentarian) said, “You must decide, Barbara, which way you want it because we can’t vote on either/or. The body must have something to vote on, so you have to choose how you want the wording of the amendment to be, and then the Senate will vote on that wording.”

[Secretary’s note: Portions of the discussion at this point are inaudible, so the recording is fragmentary.]

King said, “I’d like to amend the motion that it be forwarded without an official endorsement, is that *[inaudible]* for informational purposes.” It was seconded.

[Secretary's note: At this point, some speakers fail to identify themselves and some portions are inaudible, so the recording is fragmentary.]

A hand-count vote on the amendment gave 10 in favor, an unexpressed number opposed, and Moderator Flynn declared the motion to amend to have failed.

He read the next proposed motion: "The final report of the ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings of Instruction will be forwarded to the appropriate Operational Working Group under Faculty Affairs to consider in their consolidation of faculty evaluation policies in the Georgia Southern-Armstrong Consolidation." A hand-count voted showed 26 in favor, 6 opposed. The motion was Approved.

[ad hoc Committee on Student Ratings of Instruction motion to adopt new Student Ratings of Instruction instrument](#)

Lisa Abbott (CLASS) said that given the current circumstances with consolidation, it would be unfair to our future colleagues at Armstrong and Liberty to introduce any kind of instrument without their input. She opposed the motion.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that the motion had not been seconded. Moderator Flynn said he had been trying to get the motion properly presented. It was duly Moved and Seconded. Abbott said her point remained.

Jim LoBue (COSM) asked Trent Maurer if the proposed instrument was essentially the same that was tested except for the removal of some components.

Maurer said the old Section 1 of the SLOs had been removed. There was one addition, a new third open-ended question specifically about student learning because they had removed all of the questions about SLOs.

Moderator Flynn noted that the new question was, "What is the one important thing you learned in this course?" Maurer said that was correct. Flynn said that was actually two questions. Maurer said, "Fair enough."

Janice Steirn (CLASS) said because of consolidation we would only use this instrument for a short period of time, and she thought to use it for 18 months then switch to a new one would cause a lot of confusion. She opposed the motion.

A hand-count vote showed 3 in favor of the motion, 33 opposed. The motion failed.

[9. Announcements: Vice Presidents](#)

Provost Bartels asked that any deans present stick around for a second so she could talk with them for a minute.

10. Announcements from the Floor

None

11. Adjournment

Moved and Approved.