

Faculty Senate Librarian's Report for October 21, 2009

A summary of business conducted by the Faculty Senate committees since the last Librarian's Report.

Academic Standards Committee

Chair: Stuart Tedders (CHHS)

No report submitted.

Elections Committee

Chair: Patricia Humphrey, Senate Librarian (COST)

No report submitted.

Faculty Development Committee

Chair: Fred Smith (LIB)

September 24, 2009

11:00am to 12 Noon

Attending: Ann Marshall, Lori Lester, Chunsan Zhao, Tony Parillo, Alice Hall, Patricia Hendrix, Alan Altany, William Amponsah, John O'Malley, and Fred Smith. (note on attendance: there is no time we can all meet. We all score the grants then take turns on who misses the meeting)

Budget: After the amounts for previously approved funding were subtracted, the Committee was left with around \$77,000. This is to cover one cycle of development of instruction grants and two rounds of travel.

Grant Funding Decisions for Development of Instruction Grants: Fourteen applications were submitted and five were selected for funding. A total of roughly \$21,800 was allocated for the five. One was only partially funded due to the unusually large amount requested.

October 12, 2009

11:00am to 12 Noon

Attending: Ann Marshall, Lori Lester, Chunsan Zhao, Tony Parillo, Alice Hall, Patricia Hendrix, Alan Altany, and Fred Smith. (note on attendance: there is no time we can all meet. We all score the grants then take turns on who misses the meeting)

Fiscal year budget problem update: Since the last Faculty Development Committee meeting, Alan Altany, Fred Smith, and Patricia Hendrix met with Tabitha Irwin, a budget specialist from the Provost's Office. It was decided that the Committee would continue to support the summer stipends and summer travel unless there was such a budget

crises that the budget for the Faculty Development Committee was completely eliminated. Funding for the summer stipends and summer travel will be added to the grant recipients' first pay check of the following fall semester. A note will be added to the application instructions for summer stipends and summer travel to the effect that even if the Committee approves the funding of these grants, there is a small chance they won't be funded.

Funding decision on first round of travel grants: The Committee started with about \$60,000 to fund the two remaining rounds of travel. So the Committee decided to divide the remaining funding in half and find a stopping point close to \$30,000.

Patricia Hendrix, CET Secretary, had prepared a spreadsheet which included the combined Committee scores and the amounts requested.

A total of 34 grant applications were submitted, but one was withdrawn, which left 33. There was a gap in the scores indicated a good stopping point at \$29,134. Of the 33, all but five were funded.

Faculty Research Committee

Chair: Caren Town (CLASS)

No report submitted.

Faculty Service Committee

Chair: Stuart Tedders (CHHS)

Faculty Service Committee Meeting Report

Friday, September 18, 2009
Marvin Pittman Room 2002
9:30a-10:30a

Committee members
in attendance

Brent Wolfe, CHHS; Cheryl Aasheim, CIT; Morgan Miles, COBA; Bob Lake, COE; Billur Kaymakcalan, COST; Jonathan Harwell, LIB; Stuart Tedders, JPHCOPH/Chair

Others present

Amy Heaston, ex officio, Tabitha Irvin, coordinator

Faculty Service Committee Report

- Dr. Tedders welcomed the committee
- Committee introductions
- \$48,400 original budget
 - \$1,200 unexpected expense (Early year end close)

-\$10,740.34 Excellence in Service Winners
 -\$36,459.66 Available funds

- Discussed committee procedures
- How to categorize funding?
 - Committee unanimously approved to separate travel from projects
 - \$500 to all funded travel more if available funds
- Also agreed to a 60/40 ratio for Round 1 and Round 2 respectively
- Reminder of proposal deadline Oct. 5, 2009
- Proposal uploaded to SharePoint for review by Oct. 12, 2009 earlier if possible
- Allocation meeting reminder-October 21, 11a-1p

Faculty Welfare Committee

Chair: Sonya Huber Humes (COST)

**Georgia Southern University
 Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) of the Faculty Senate Meeting
 1107 Herty Building 10-11:00 AM
 September 23, 2009
 Minutes**

Present: June Alberto, Marie Botkin (recording), Jim Braselton, Joan Ellen Broome, Laura, Gunn, Sonya Huber (presiding), Cynthia Frost, Greg Harwood, Swati Raychowdhury, Manouchehr Tabatabaei, Mark Welford, LeVon Wilson

Discussion	Action	Responsible Person/Comments
Introductions and welcome to new member, Swati Raychowdhury		
Agenda topic- Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading of draft to be inserted into the Faculty Handbook • Discussion of the contrast between Senior Lecturer and Temporary Lecturer • Discussion of maximum course hours lecturers teach for a full load • Discussion of striking specific requirements for promotion from Temporary to Senior Lecturer • Discussion of the use of specific language from 	<p>Sonya Huber will redraft and bring back for next meeting</p> <p>Gregory Harwood will consult with Jean Paul Carton about the BOR</p>

	the BOR	
Agenda topic- College-wide policy for class size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of varying requirements for the number of students in a course that make it count for two courses • Queries set forth to all deans regarding the issue of the number of students in large classes that make the course qualify as a double load 	Issue suggested by Mark Welford All members of the FWC were asked to find out this information from their respective deans
Future Business - Topics / Action to be determined by the SEC and FWC members.	Expected to be on the agenda: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New draft for Lecturer Policy • Comparison of numbers of students in large classes that make the course qualify as a double load from each college 	
Future Meetings of the FWC- Change in meeting time	To be held in Herty 1107 every other Wednesday at 8:00 a.m. to accommodate new member. Next meeting 10/7/09.	

Library Committee

Chair: Greg Harwood (CLASS)

No report submitted.

Graduate Committee

Chair: Bob Fernekes (LIB)

GRADUATE COMMITTEE MINUTES

Chair: Dr. Robert Fernekes

Graduate Committee Meeting Date - September 10, 2009

Present: Dr. Deborah Allen, CHHS; Dr. Jim McMillan, CHHS; Dr. John Dyer, CIT; Dr. Richard Flynn, CLASS; Dr. Delores Liston, COE; Dr. Lisa Schulz, COE; Dr. Risa Cohen, COST; Dr. Robert Vogel, JPHCOPH; Mr. Jonathan Harwell, Library; Dr. Simone Charles, JPHCOPH; Dr. Robert Fernekes, Library; Dr. Charlie Hardy, Dean, JPHCOPH, [Academic Affairs]; Dr. Dick Diebolt, COGS; Mrs. Audie Graham, COGS

Guests: Dr. Amy Heaston, VPAA; Ms. Candace Griffith, VPAA; Mrs. Perla Middleton, Admissions; Dr. Deborah Thomas, COE; Ms. Ann Evans, Registrar; Mr. Toby Ziglar, Admissions; Dr. Jim Harris, CIT; Ms. Pam Deal, ITS; Mr. Ron Stalnaker, ITS

Absent: Dr. Delores Liston, COE; Dr. Ardian Greca, CIT; Dr. Bill Yang, COBA; Dr. Pat Walker, CLASS; Dr. Jonathan Copeland, COST

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Robert Fernekes called the meeting to order on Thursday, September 10, 2009 at 9:00 AM.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Jim McMillan made a motion to approve the agenda as written. A second was made by Dr. Lisa Schulz. The motion to approve was passed.

III. SHAREPOINT PRESENTATION BY PAM DEAL AND RON STALNAKER

Ms. Pam Deal began by asking the committee what information they would want to know about SharePoint. The major concerns were what SharePoint is, the document storage usage, training, and how it is different from GeorgiaVIEW.

Mr. Ron Stalnaker explained that SharePoint is still in the beginning stages of intranet use, and it is currently being used by project management and committees. Some of the uses consist of collaboration and sharing documents back and fourth, reporting and responding to issues, and assigning tasks. SharePoint also allows the user to do contact management and integrates with desktops, so it removes the technological expertise that is needed when updating a website. It has the feature of workflow that GeorgiaVIEW does not have. This feature eliminates the paper documents that are needed when someone is requesting access to a website. Ms. Deal shared that another feature is that users can set up personal alerts to notify them of any changes to the website. Mr. Stalnaker stated that technical issues are being worked out and they are still in the planning stage.

Dr. Richard Flynn asked if there are restrictions of what Colleges can put on their websites and Mr. Stalnaker informed the committee that Marketing and Communications is addressing that issue. Dr. Fernekes asked if there is faculty involvement to help identify faculty concerns and who the point of contact would be if they have questions. Mr. Stalnaker stated that Mr. Christian Flathman, in Marketing and Communications, is setting up an advisory council and there will be faculty on the council. Ms. Deal added that the council will also have student representation.

Dr. John Dyer asked if Information Technology Services could be scheduled to meet with the Graduate Committee in a computer lab so that SharePoint's features can be better explained and demonstrated with committee members. Mr. Stalnaker and Ms. Deal accepted and the committee agreed to use the first part of the October Graduate Committee meeting for a training session in SharePoint and that the remainder of the meeting would follow. Dr. Fernekes suggested that Dr. Dyer work with Mr. Stalnaker to get a Graduate Committee template set up to use during the training section. Different locations were discussed for the October meeting.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. College of Information Technology

Dr. Jim Harris presented the program agenda item for the College of Information Technology.

New Program:

Master of Science in Computer Science

JUSTIFICATION:

Despite the current economy, the outlook for software professional is quite good. According to the U.S. Department of Labor (<http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos267.htm>) "Computer software

engineers are one of the occupations projected to grow the fastest and add the most new jobs over the 2006-16 decade” Money magazine’s top 10 jobs of 2008 are (in order):

1. Software Engineer
2. College Professor
3. Financial Adviser
4. Human Resources Manager
5. Physician Assistant
6. Market Research Analyst
7. Computer IT Analyst
8. Real Estate Appraiser
9. Pharmacist
10. Psychologist

Also, according to the U.S. Department of Labor (<http://www.bls.gov/oco/ocos042.htm>), “The rapid and widespread use of computers and information technology has generated a need for highly trained workers proficient in various job functions. These computer specialists include computer scientists, database administrators, and network systems and data communication analysts. Job tasks and occupational titles used to describe these workers evolve rapidly and continually, reflecting new areas of specialization or changes in technology, as well as the preferences and practices of employers.”

Finally, according to the Georgia Tech Research News (April 2005, <http://gtresearchnews.gatech.edu/newsrelease/occupations.htm>) “Though Georgia’s technology industry has been in a downturn since 2001, the number of state residents employed in high tech occupations – paying high wages has actually grown during that time, a Georgia Institute of Technology analysis of employment and wage data shows. Computer systems and software specialists are enabling a lot of different industries, not just information technology services firms, said Jan Youtie, a principal research associate in Georgia Tech’s Economic Development Institute. Analyzing data from both federal and state sources, Youtie and collaborators Philip Shapira and Jue Wang found that jobs requiring high levels of education grew 12 percent in Georgia from 2001 to 2003. While these high tech occupations added approximately 9,000 jobs to the state’s economy, employment in the rest of the state’s occupations declined by two percent.” In fact, according to Youtie, Shapira, and Wang, the number of computer systems and software specialists grew 26% over that period of time.

Dr. Flynn expressed concern that the MS in Computer Science would have a negative impact on undergraduate education. He also commented on the larger class sizes for undergraduate courses, since they would only be offered at certain times instead of each semester. There was a discussion of how non-tenured faculty would possibly be teaching undergraduate courses while full faculty may be involved in the graduate courses during the development of the new graduate program.

Mr. Jonathan Harwell questioned the library resources that would be needed to support this new program. He shared a message that was sent to library contacts from Dean Bede Mitchell. The message stated:

“No one from CIT has indicated to us that anything in the way of library resources are needed to support this proposed new program. As you know, if additional information resources are necessary to support a new proposed program, the program proposal should either include specific costs in the budget request, or a plan should be developed with the Dean of the Library to redirect funds from other information resources to cover the costs of the new resources. Funding will not be available for information resources not specified in the program proposal unless the funds are raised privately.”

Dr. Harris explained that the library resources are already available through the Mathematics Department. Dr. McMillan asked if the College of Information Technology had talked with the Mathematics Department to see if their students plan to move from the Computer Science concentration over into the MS in Computer Science, if approved, and what kind of impact that would make on the MS in Mathematics graduate program.

There was some discussion of the dual listed courses involved in the proposed program. Dr. Dick Diebolt asked if the College of Information Technology would consider changing them to 6000 level courses.

MOTION: Mr. Jonathan Harwell made a motion to table the New Program submission until a later meeting date, to give the College of Information Technology time to address the issues listed below.

1. Address the concern raised about the impact of the graduate program on the undergraduate program. How can the program be implemented without negatively impacting the undergraduate program? Rethink how the narrative is written.
2. Provide a more realistic and detailed budget that reflects how current resources will be expended to support the program, what new resources will be needed, and how these expenditures will be financially supported? The narrative needs to better explain the impact of the proposed program on current resources (including faculty).
3. Confirm discussions with the Library that describes library resources that will be used or needed to support the program and can meet accreditation standards as needed and a budget of the items.
4. Provide a summary to be shared with the Graduate Committee of discussions between the Computer Science and Mathematics Departments regarding:
 - a. the development of the MS in Computer Science and how it will affect the MS in Mathematics-Computer Science concentration.
 - b. Whether or not the Computer Science concentration in the MS – Mathematics program would be dropped.
5. Address the concern raised regarding having three 5000G courses comprising the core requirements of the program of study. How will these courses truly be graduate level work? If the intent (as explained by the department chair) is not to allow undergraduate students to enroll, then why hasn't the program developed 6000 or 7000 level courses for the core requirements of the degree program?

A second was made by Dr. Flynn. The motion to table the MS in Computer Science Program until it is brought back for further consideration was approved.

V. A. OLD BUSINESS

- i. **Dual Listed Courses** – A handout was distributed to the committee with the proposal of the Dual Listed Courses that was drafted by Dr. Diebolt. Dr. Diebolt reported that he reviewed other university policies along with the Board of Regents and SACS policies. The proposal is as follow:

Policy on Dual-Listed Undergraduate-Graduate Courses

Policy Statement: (Proposed Catalog Copy)

The Board of Regents Academic Affairs Handbook, (Section 203.02, New Academic Program, part IV.4.d) states that if courses in a proposed masters program are cross-listed as undergraduate courses it must be indicated what safeguards are employed to ensure that courses taken as undergraduates are not repeated or that requirements are significantly different for graduate students and undergraduates enrolled in the same course. Therefore, it is the policy of Georgia Southern University that new course curriculum forms and syllabi for dual-listed courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels (courses in which both graduate and undergraduate students attend the same class but receive credit under different course numbers) clearly specify how the nature of the work expected of the students and the criteria for evaluation of the work produced be appropriate with the degree level¹. A proposed dual-listed course (numbered 5000 – 5999 with a “G” suffix) will also include the reason(s) the course is considered as sufficiently rigorous and of such an advanced nature to challenge graduate students. It will be the responsibility of the department to determine the number of dual-listed courses or credits to meet the requirements for an advanced degree providing the number does not exceed 50 percent of the degree requirements. Academic units heads (department chairs and/or program directors will be responsible for assuring that course syllabi within their unit satisfy this policy through timely syllabi audits. The College of Graduate Studies will be responsible for ensuring that graduate degree students comply with the number or percentage of dual-listed courses or credits that are permitted to be counted toward degree requirements.

Justification:

Currently, dual listed courses are only required to include a statement that graduate students will be required to do extra work to receive graduate credit. However, there is no current formal institutional policy on dual-listed courses that specifies that requirements be commensurate with degree level. SACS Accreditation Standard 3.4.6 requires that, “The institution employs sound and acceptable practices for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for courses, regardless of format or mode of delivery”. Therefore, the policy will address the SACS accreditation standards and provide direction on dual-listed course expectations.

¹The nature of work and work products may vary by quality and/or quantity. The differential expectations of additional work for graduate students compared to undergraduate students should be described not in abstract terms (such as “more in-depth participation) but in terms of concrete measurable out-comes of other tangible evidence. This may include specific examples of the additional assignments with details about paper length; the number of additional readings; the length and frequency of oral presentations; portfolio expectations; studio presentations; indications of how these graduate requirements are weighted in the course grade; comparisons with undergraduate expectations. Graduate level work products may also be required to show a greater degree of analysis, synthesis or evaluation of knowledge. The quantity of graduate work may be differentiated by requiring more work products (i.e., additional assignments, projects or examination) at the graduate level compared to the undergraduate level.

Implementation:

Modify #5 (Student Assessment Procedures: Briefly describe how student learning will be assessed) on the curriculum amendment New Course Form to:

5. Student Assessment Procedures:

- (a) Briefly describe how student learning will be assessed.
- (b) If a dual-listed course, differentiate expectations for graduate students and undergraduate students in terms of concrete measurable outcomes.

Dean Charlie Hardy asked if specifics should be included on the implementation. After some discussion it was agreed that the proposal of the implementation did not have change, but for attention to be made to highlight the need for further detail in the justification. Dr. McMillan made a motion to approve the proposed catalog paragraph and the revisions of #5 on the curriculum new course forms. A second was made by Dr. Flynn. With no objections from the committee, the motion to approve the Dual Listed Course proposal was approved.

B. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS & UPDATES

- i. Vision For Graduate Education (BluePrint Ad Hoc Committee)** – Mr. Harwell announced that the BluePrint Ad Hoc Committee met with Dr. Amy Heaston last week and that feedback was provided from Dean's Council. He stated that they are in the process of developing a completely new draft of the Vision for Graduate Education, and that this draft will be much shorter than the previous ones. The plan is to have the new draft available to the Graduate Committee before the October Graduate Committee Meeting and to Dean's Council, via Dr. Heaston, so that any revisions can be addressed in the October meeting.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Dr. Fernekas stated that the October 8, 2009 Graduate Committee meeting location will be announced and included on the October Agenda.

Dr. McMillan reminded the committee that the first presidential candidate will be on campus Friday, September 11, at 8:00 AM for a faculty forum. He encouraged faculty members to attend the meeting. Dr. Heaston stated if Friday's meeting conflicted with anyone's schedule then all faculty and staff may attend the Open Forum today at 4:00 PM in the Performing Arts Center.

Dr. Fernekas announced that the Fall semester Library Workshop Schedule is now online, and includes research and computer workshops.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on September 10, 2009 at 9:57 AM.

VIII. INFORMATION ITEM (October Meeting Location)

The October 8th Graduate Committee meeting will be held in the Professional Development Center (PDC), in room 3314, and will start with the SharePoint demonstration and discussion. Ms. Deal has reserved the room from 9:00 -11:00 AM so that the Committee may address all agenda items.

Respectfully submitted,

Audie Graham, Recording Secretary

Minutes were approved September 22, 2009 by electronic vote of Committee
--

Undergraduate Committee

Chair: Bob Jackson (COBA)

No report submitted.

Summary of the Academic Advisory Council

Chair: Gary Means, Acting Provost

The AAC met September 22.

Sarah Smith gave a report on admissions status for Spring, Summer and Fall 2010 to date. It's extremely early to make any projections at this point. She did point out that we had a 35.6% matriculation rate of admitted students for Fall 09. They started accepting students for Fall 10 on September 10; the target (possibly a moving target) is approximately 2900 Freshmen next year. The current acceptance criteria are a minimum 1000 SAT (21 ACT composite) and a 2.0 College prep GPA. Students with SATs between 920 and 990 may be accepted into EIP (they anticipate this number to be about 500 – the same as for Fall 09).

Mike Deal (Registrar) gave the enrollment update (which would be finalized October 7). At that point, there were over 19,000 students enrolled. He also discussed coding courses/sections as on-line/hybrid/technology enhanced. This information is used at the BOR.

Steve Burrell (VP - Information Services) gave an update on this year's Student Tech Fee process. In order to make the process more transparent, all applications will be submitted through SharePoint. The deadline for applications for money will be October 23. Deans will have until October 30 to prioritize the departments' requests. Executive Review is to take place on November 4. The Committee (6 students and 5 faculty/staff – the same members as last year) will meet November 6 and 20 to discuss the applications and make allocation decisions. In 2008-09, \$3,649,388 of tech fee money was allocated. They keep approximately \$500,000 for an emergency reserve fund (fire, theft, etc).

Jayne Perkins Brown presented information on graduation and retention rates. Our Fall 2003 cohort had a 6-year graduation rate of 47.7%, which continues an increasing trend. The Fall 2005 cohort had a 4-year graduation rate of 20.8%, again on an increasing trend. Our 6-year graduation rates are near the bottom of our peer and aspiration list. However, our freshman retention (81% last year) was in the middle of that list.

Acting Provost Gary Means presented information on the Graduation Rate Task Force. This is a priority from the USG office. Regent Potts will serve as chair. The task force will be comprised of two other regents, two directors of institutional research, and representatives from the System office. Their first milestones are: January 2010 – analysis of data that identifies predictors of graduation rates and June 2010 – Institutions submit three-year plans for improving graduation rates.

--by Pat Humphrey, Senate Librarian