AGENDA

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: April 3, 2019 – Carol Jamison (CAH), Senate Secretary

IV. LIBRARIAN’S REPORT: May 21, 2019 – Meca Williams-Johnson (COE), Senate Librarian
  a. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee – Michelle Cawthorn (COSM), Chair
  b. Undergraduate Committee – Chris Cartright (CAH), Chair
  c. Graduate Committee – Brandonn Harris (WCHP), Chair

AGENDA, cont.
V. ACTION ITEMS
   a. *Motion* – Update to sections 321.04 (Retirement) & 321.05 (Emeritus/a Policy) in the Faculty Handbook – Jonathan Hilpert (COE), Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair (pages 3-6)
   b. *Motion* – Revision of section (Non-Tenure Track Faculty Fifth Year Review) 314 in the Faculty Handbook – Jonathan Hilpert (COE), Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair (pages 7-11)
   c. *Motion* – Faculty Workload Policy – Jonathan Hilpert (COE), Faculty Welfare Committee, Chair & Dustin Anderson (CAH), Faculty Workload AdHoc Committee (pages 12-17)
   d. *Motion* – Temporary Nature of Workload Increases – Marc Cyr (CAH) (pages 18-19)

VI. PRESIDENT’S REPORT – Kyle Marrero

VII. PROVOST’S REPORT – Carl Reiber (VPAA)

VIII. Presentation on Campus Data Security (DOU) – Ron Stalnaker (CIO)

IX. SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
   a. RFI – Credit Hour Production (page 20)
   b. RFI – Withdrawal from Courses after WWAP date (page 21)
   c. RFI – Recourse for Missing Policies (page 22)
   d. RFI – External Review of Lecturers (page 23)
   e. RFI – Notification of a Death in the University Community (page 24)

X. OLD BUSINESS
   a. Discussion Item – Faculty’s Practical Role in Student Success (pages 26-31)

XI. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES: Vice-Presidents & Committee Chairs
   a. Update on University Budget – Rob Whitaker (VPBF)
   b. Update on Strategic Plan – Helen Bland (JPHCOPH) (pages 32-36)
   c. Announcements and Updates from VPs and Chairs

XII. ADJOURNMENT

*All Senate Meetings are recorded. Edited Minutes will be distributed.*
Faculty Retirement Policy

Submitted by: Jonathan Hilpert
4/30/2019

Motion(s):

Motion to Approve the Faculty Retirement Policy

Rationale:

The proposed faculty retirement policy implements changes required to bring the handbook policy in alignment with the BOR policy. No senate changes to BOR wording can be accepted.

Response:

SEC: Approved to move to the floor.

Attachment: Retirement-Emeritus Policy (Faculty)
321.04 Retirement

All faculty employed one-half time or more on a regular basis at the University are required as a condition of their employment to participate in the Teachers Retirement System of Georgia or the Regents Retirement Plan. A faculty member has 60 days from the date of hire to choose a retirement plan, or the faculty member will default into the Teachers Retirement System of Georgia plan.

Board of Regents policy, Section 8.2.8.2, identifies the criteria that a faculty member must meet to retire from the University System of Georgia. The following language outlines the definition and eligibility for retirement.

Effective October 1, 2015, a University System of Georgia employee will be eligible to retire with University System of Georgia retiree benefits if he/she meets one of the following three conditions at the time of his/her separation from employment:

1. An employee must have attained age 60 and have 10 years of service established with a state sponsored retirement plan, and the last year of service must be in a fully benefited position with the University System of Georgia; or

2. An employee must have at least 25 total years of service established with a state of Georgia sponsored retirement plan and have eligibility to retire under that plan and the last year of service must be in a fully benefited position with the University System of Georgia. An early pension benefit penalty will apply to an individual who elects to participate in the Teachers Retirement System of Georgia, or in the Employees Retirement System, if he/she decides to retire with between 25 and 30 years of benefitted service, prior to attaining age 60; or

3. An employee must be deemed to be totally and permanently disabled, as documented through the receipt of disability benefits from Social Security, the Teachers Retirement System of Georgia, or the Employees Retirement System, and have 10 years of service established with a state of Georgia sponsored retirement plan.

Effective November 1, 2002, to be eligible for retirement with benefits from the USG, an employee must meet one of the following four conditions at the time of his or her separation from employment, regardless of the retirement plan elected by the employee:

1. An employee must have been employed by the USG for the last ten years in a regular, benefited position and have attained age 60;

2. An employee must have at least 25 total years of benefited service established with a State of Georgia sponsored retirement plan, of which the last five years of employment must have been continuous and with the USG. An early pension benefit penalty will apply to an individual who elects to participate in TRS or ERS if he or she decides to retire with between 25 and 30 years of benefited service, prior to attaining age 60;

3. An employee must have at least 30 total years of benefited service established with a State of Georgia sponsored retirement plan, of which the last five years must have been continuous and with the USG; or,

4. An employee must be deemed to be totally and permanently disabled, as documented through the receipt of disability benefits from Social Security or from TRS following ten years of continuous service to the USG in a regular, benefited position.

After completing their academic contract in the year that represents completion of their 10th or 25th year of employment, a faculty member will be considered service eligible for retirement if they meet the other requirements for health and retirement plan participation.

Upon meeting one of the above conditions, an employee will be eligible for University System of Georgia retiree benefits upon retirement. An employee must be enrolled in the benefits coverage at the time of retirement or disability to be eligible to continue coverage in retirement. For employees hired on or after January 1, 2013, the employer contribution for healthcare will be based on years of service with the University System of Georgia. An individual who has retired from another state of Georgia sponsored retirement plan may not count such retirement service toward meeting the eligibility criteria for retirement from the University System of Georgia (Board of Regents Minutes, August 2015).
The University System does not guarantee a retirement allowance to any retiring faculty member with fewer than 10 years of service, but credit for military service and service in other systems can be purchased under specific conditions. A complete description of this program is available in the Human Resources Department.

Regular, limited-term faculty (visiting or temporary) and/or part-time employees who are not eligible for Teachers Retirement System of Georgia or the Regents Retirement Plan must participate in the Georgia Defined Contribution Plan (GDCP). This contribution is refundable to the member in a lump sum upon termination of employment.

321.05 Emeritus/a Policy

Purpose

The purpose of the Emeritus/a Policy is to outline the process for faculty and/or administrative officers to apply for emeritus/a status and to define the rights and privileges associated with this title. Emeritus/a status is granted to encourage continued association with the University for the purposes of university service, instruction, and scholarly investigation.

Policy

The Emeritus/a title is an honorary title awarded to full-time faculty and/or administrative officers who, at the time of retirement, had 10 or more years of honorable and distinguished University System of Georgia service. In accordance with Board of Regents policy (Board of Regents Policy Manual, § 2.11), only the president can confer the title of emeritus/a. The title of president emeritus/a can only be conferred by the Board of Regents upon the recommendation of the Chancellor (Board of Regents Minutes, January 2009). A faculty member and/or administrative officer must have met the length of service requirement prior to beginning a phased-in retirement to be eligible for emeritus/a status. An application for emeritus/a status must follow the procedures outlined below and must be submitted either during the final academic/fiscal year of employment or no later than one year after the date of retirement.

The bestowal of the emeritus/a title is a privilege, not a right, and requires a two-step process: (1) a completed and approved Application for Emeritus/a Status; and (2) a completed Emeriti Designation Packet, which officially confers the emeritus/a title effective immediately (if the individual is already retired) or upon retirement.

Nomination Criteria

The criteria used in the selection of retired(ing) faculty members and/or administrators for this honor shall include, but not be limited to, professional recognition in one or more of the following areas:

- excellence and/or innovation;
- University or college recognition, awards, honors;
- professional association recognition, awards, honors;
- community and/or professional service contributions, recognition, awards, honors;
- a consistent record of quality performance as demonstrated by one or more of the following:
  a) a substantive record of achievement commensurate with national and international standards within the specific discipline;
  b) a recognized record of outstanding teaching, educational, or employment field contributions; and/or
  c) clear evidence of service to the University beyond normal expectations.

Benefits/Privileges/Recognition

1. Invitation to participate in public ceremonies of the University, including commencement, open houses, and selected university functions.
2. Invitation to certain departmental, college, and university events.
3. Complimentary copies of university publications.
4. Inclusion in the faculty/administrator listing on the university emeriti webpage (http://jobs.georgiasouthern.edu/about/emeritus/).
5. Inclusion in the Commencement bulletin immediately following awarding of emeritus/a title.
6. Certificate with name and emeritus/a rank.
7. Eligibility to enroll and attend classes for free, subject to space availability and approval of the instructor.
8. Upon recommendation of the department chair and approval of the dean and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, eligibility to work on sponsored grants, including serving as principal investigator or co-investigator.
9. Entitlement to use official university stationery and other departmental office privileges for the purposes of university service.
10. Eligibility to serve on doctoral dissertation or project committees, as appropriate.
11. Emeritus/a faculty members and administrative officers are entitled to all benefits the University grants to retired faculty and staff members as follows.
   • Free parking hang tag
   • Georgia Southern University email account
   • Georgia Southern University ID
   • Library privileges
   • Reduced RAC membership—½ price
   • Bookstore discount
   • Retiree health benefits

Procedure

• The immediate supervisor of the unit in which the candidate held his/her full-time appointment determines whether a faculty member and/or administrative officer should be recommended for the emeritus/a title and, if so, initiates the Application for Emeritus/a Status. Requests should include a letter of recommendation that stipulates the individual’s qualification for emeritus/a status based upon the nomination criteria identified above.

Spring applications for the awarding of emeritus/a titles are due in the Provost’s Office no later than February 15th. Summer/fall applications for the awarding of emeritus/a titles are due in the Provost’s Office no later than September 15th.

• The completed application is submitted to the next higher level for review and endorsement, culminating with the provost and vice president for academic affairs’ review and endorsement, and the president’s final decision.

• If the application is approved by the president, the retiring faculty member and/or administrative officer is sent a letter from the Provost’s Office, on behalf of the president, awarding the title of emeritus/a.

• Upon receipt of a copy of this letter, department chairs or unit heads complete the Emeriti Designation Packet, which consists of the Emeritus/a Designation Form, a brief bio on the emeritus/a candidate, the candidate’s curriculum vitae, and a completed Personnel Action Form officially awarding the title of emeritus/a. Emeriti Designation Packets are due to the Provost’s Office no later than March 1st (for spring applications) and October 1st (for summer/fall applications).
Non Tenure Track Evaluation Policy

Submitted by: Jonathan Hilpert

4/30/2019

Motion(s):

Motion to Approve the Non Tenure Track Evaluation Policy

Rationale:

The proposed faculty non tenure track evaluation policy fulfills the need to provide a policy that outlines the requirements for non tenure track fifth year review. The policy was approved unanimously in favor by the faculty welfare committee and was vetted by non tenure track faculty members across campus during the committee approval process. The policy lays out a clear and fair path to fifth year review for a non tenure track faculty members which is required for their advancement.

Response:

SEC: Approved to move to the floor.

Attachment: 314 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Fifth-Year Review (FWC edits)
314 Non-Tenure Track Faculty Fifth-Year Review

Introduction
All tenured faculty are expected to undergo a post-tenure review—a systematic, periodic, and cumulative review—in their fifth-year following a major review. The purpose of the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Fifth-Year Review policy is to replicate the post-tenure review practice for faculty providing a standard review process for faculty serving in non-tenure track lines (i.e., non-tenure track: clinical instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors).

Criteria
The criteria for the fifth-year review of non-tenure track faculty are as follows:
· to provide faculty development and recognition opportunities for non-tenure track faculty for the primary purpose of enhancing teaching, or contributions to the learning environment, but also service, or professional growth and development, in a way that is mutually beneficial to the individual and the University; and
· to provide a systematic faculty development plan to remedy instances where a non-tenure track faculty member's contributions in teaching, contributions to the learning environment, service, or professional growth and development, teaching or contributions to the learning environment and/or service or professional growth and development, are found to be deficient with respect to the missions of the department, college, or University.

The fifth-year review not only focuses on the period under review, but also considers the cumulative contributions of the faculty member. For this reason, and because it focuses on continuing a mutually beneficial relationship between the institution and the individual, judgments regarding the fifth-year review should be based on contributions over one’s career as well as those since the last review. A satisfactory fifth-year review indicates that the individual continues to make contributions which benefit the University, its students, and the faculty member’s field of study and its other constituents.

In an institution devoted to “teaching first,” teaching and contributions to the learning environment are of paramount importance in the fifth-year review process. Evidence of contributions in the area of service or professional growth and development is also required. Each unit should define the evaluation exact criteria and how they will be assessed (see Roles and Responsibilities), taking into consideration the uniqueness of the individual, the variations within disciplines, and the differing expectations and assignments that influence faculty contributions. Individual differences are reflected in varying combinations of emphasis in teaching and service; however, teaching and contributions to the learning environment are the primary focus of the fifth-year review.

Schedule
Each non-tenure track faculty member is to be reviewed in their fifth year following the most recent major review unless the faculty member submits a written declaration to retire within five years (submitted through the appropriate dean’s office to the Provost’s Office). Non-tenure track faculty members undergoing fifth-year review will submit their materials for evaluation to the department chair or unit head according to the evaluation timeline defined by the unit, department, or college by mid-January.

Roles and Responsibilities
Each department, school, college, and the library will develop written procedures and specific criteria for fifth-year review as outlined below and will provide a copy of the procedures to each non-tenure track faculty member serving in a clinical, instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor position. Reviews may be carried out at the department, school, or college level as agreed upon and
described in the unit’s written procedures. The phrases “department chair” and “unit head” as used in this document refer to the line officer who is the immediate supervisor of the non-tenure track faculty member undergoing fifth-year review.

Faculty are responsible for providing documentation of their performance as follows:
· an up-to-date curriculum vitae and copies of the annual performance review for each of the five years under consideration;
· measures of effectiveness in teaching, contributions to the learning environment, service, or professional growth and development teaching or contributions to the learning environment and service (including but not limited to a combination of written (or online) student ratings of instruction and peer evaluations);
· a self-evaluation narrative of accomplishments for the period under review and projected goals for the next five-year period; and
· other documentation as specified by the college or department/unit.

Faculty may submit other materials which may enhance the review committee’s understanding of their performance. The faculty member and the department chair or unit head will develop the documentation and provide it to the review committee.

The fifth-year review process will be conducted by a committee of at least three faculty peers, with the committee composition and selection process to be determined at the department, school, or college level in consultation with the appropriate dean. Units should strive to ensure diversity of membership in fifth-year review committees. After reviewing documentation of performance as outlined in the unit’s fifth-year review document, the committee will be expected to provide informed and candid feedback in a written report on the quality of the faculty member’s performance, accomplishments, and contributions in teaching and/or service. Meritorious accomplishments should be noted by the committee in any review. Likewise, major, chronic, or ongoing deficiencies should be identified and supporting documentation provided.

The committee will provide a written summary of its findings and any recommendations for faculty reward (e.g., promotion and salary increase) or development to the department chair or unit head who will transmit the written summary to the faculty member and discuss it with him or her. The unit head should append his/her comments, and both the faculty member and the unit head should sign the document to indicate that they have discussed the committee’s report and the unit head’s comments. The faculty member must be given the opportunity to append a written response before the report is passed from the department chair or unit head to the next administrative officer. A copy of the committee’s report, the unit head’s comments, and any written response by the faculty member will then be sent to the administrative officer at least one level above the faculty member’s administrative unit where they will be reviewed and commented on by the dean/administrative director. All written comments will also be forwarded to the faculty member. These comments, along with all other documents that played a substantive part in the review not readily available elsewhere, will then be placed in the faculty member’s personnel file at the department/unit level. The dean composes a memorandum to the provost, summarizing the findings at each level of review for each candidate and including a final assessment on whether the candidate meets, exceeds, or falls below expectations. This memorandum is submitted electronically to the Provost’s Office by the deadline established in the timeline for evaluation by mid-March.

In response to fifth-year review, the unit head will be responsible, in consultation with the faculty member, for deciding whether the faculty member should be rewarded for meritorious accomplishments (see
“Relationships to Other Campus Processes” below) and/or engage in faculty development activities that would be helpful to the faculty member and in the best interest of the institution. Funding for any required development plan will be arranged by the unit head and the administrative officer at least one level above. In most cases, the results of the fifth-year review are likely to reveal that the faculty member is performing well, and any development plan would focus on further enhancing the faculty member’s performance (e.g., enhancing knowledge and skills in the use of current technologies in teaching). Faculty development is an important opportunity for all faculty members as they seek to reach their full potential and perform at their full capacity.

In cases where a faculty member is identified in the fifth-year review as having deficiencies, the administrative unit head, in consultation with the faculty member, must establish a formal plan of development. A formal plan includes identifying appropriate resources for faculty development on campus, on other campuses of the University System, at the System level, or in other locations. The plan for faculty development should (a) define specific goals or outcomes that the plan is designed to achieve; (b) outline the activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals or outcomes; (c) set appropriate times within which the goals or outcomes should be accomplished; and (d) indicate appropriate criteria by which the faculty member will monitor progress. The faculty member’s unit head will be responsible for forwarding the formal faculty development plan resulting from a fifth-year review to the appropriate administrative office at least one level above the faculty member’s unit. The unit head and the administrative officer at least one level above are jointly responsible for arranging for appropriate funding for the development plan, if required.

At the time of the annual evaluation, the administrative unit head will meet with each faculty member who is working on a development plan because of deficiencies to review progress toward achieving the goals of the formal faculty development plan. In the event a faculty member is put on a development plan, a progress report, which will be included in the annual review, will be forwarded each year to the appropriate administrative officer at least one unit above the faculty member’s unit. The administrative unit head with meet with the faculty annual to review progress. It will be the responsibility of the unit head and the current fifth-year review committee to determine if, after a specified period of three years, the faculty member has been successful in completing the formal faculty development plan; they will report that finding to the appropriate administrative officer at least one level above the faculty member’s unit. An individual who successfully completes a development plan will be reviewed five years from the date of the original fifth-year review. If the faculty member has not been successful in completing the formal faculty development plan, the University may move for dismissal for cause under existing Board of Regents policy, Section 8.3.5.4, provided that the deficiencies meet the strict requirements of that policy.

A faculty member who disagrees with the results of a fifth-year review, including the need for a development plan, shall have the right to appeal as defined by the unit in implementing this policy. Each unit will develop an appeal procedure. The unit will provide the provost as well as all non-tenure track faculty with a copy of this procedure.

Relationships to Other Campus Processes

Academic Freedom - This policy is written in the spirit of upholding the University’s commitment to academic freedom, and committees and individuals who act under this policy must ensure the academic freedom of faculty under review. The policy is not designed to abridge academic freedom, hinder the tenure or annual review process, or facilitate the dismissal of faculty (see the Academic Freedom Policy, approved by the Faculty Senate in June 1998, in § 301 of the Faculty Handbook).
Termination for Cause  Nothing in the fifth-year review policy alters current Regents policy on dismissal for cause or its due process requirements. While dismissal for cause as the result of the fifth-year review process will be rare, it may be justified in certain instances as defined in Regents policy, Section 8.3.9.

Approved by Faculty Senate, XXXX, and President, XXXX.
Faculty Workload Policy

Submitted by: Jonathan Hilpert

4/29/2019

Motion(s):

Motion to Approve the Faculty Workload Policy

Rationale:

The proposed faculty workload policy will position faculty to secure and maintain workloads that are ideal for their success and productivity. It was approved by the faculty welfare committee by a vote of 16 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstain. The proposed text, a revised version of the policy developed by the ad hoc committee, rectifies problems with the current policy which may lead to increased workloads for faculty without clear recourse. The proposed policy contains important protections for tenure track and non-tenure track faculty that will allow them to pursue their career objectives in differentiated ways.

Response:

SEC: Approved to move to the floor.

Attachments: Faculty Workload Policy Proposal (for vote)
Faculty Workload Policy FWC tracked edits (4-23-2019)
Purpose:
The goal of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Workload policy is to distribute workload responsibilities among faculty in a way that most equitably and efficiently advances the university mission. The policy is designed to promote quality teaching, support excellent research and creative activity, and encourage meaningful service to the institution, profession, and community. It is also designed to enable colleges, schools, departments, and individual faculty to pursue and plan for unique objectives and commitments among the faculty activities, allowing individual assignments to vary.

Policy:
The superseding guidelines for this policy are the faculty workload expectations established by the University System of Georgia. In meeting the system expectations, Georgia Southern University faculty members are expected to be productive in the areas of teaching, service, and (for tenure-track and tenured faculty) scholarship and/or creative activity. The distribution of effort among these areas of responsibility may vary among faculty members and from year to year through the course of their careers.

Teaching
Teaching is the primary function of university faculty. The teaching load for faculty in tenured and tenure-track lines is 12 credit hours each semester; however, it is generally expected they will teach the equivalent of a 3-3 course load annually (Fall/Spring) to allow for their scholarship expectations (pre-tenure) and/or continued scholarly production (post-tenure). The teaching load for other faculty classifications with no scholarly expectations is 15 credit hours each semester; however, it is generally expected they will teach the equivalent of a 4-4 course load annually (Fall/Spring) to allow for service or professional development activities. Limited-term and temporary faculty are expected to teach 15 credit hours a semester with no service or scholarship expectations.

Scholarship and Creative Activity
Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to actively pursue research or creative activity. Tenure-track and tenured faculty are generally expected to focus 30% of their workload toward scholarship and/or creative pursuits; however, scholarly workload and creative activity assignment will depend upon faculty career objectives and scholarly outcomes.

Service
All permanent faculty are expected to assume an adequate share of departmental committee work and/or service to the institution, profession, and community, including institutional governance. Attendance at departmental, college, and university meetings is expected of all faculty regardless of workload. It is generally expected for tenured and tenure-track faculty, as well as non-tenure track faculty in positions with service expectations, to focus 10% of their workload toward service work; however, service activity assignment will depend upon faculty career objectives and service outcomes.

Colleges, schools, and/or departments are required to establish, in writing, specific explanations outlining the outcomes, expectations, and timelines for faculty effort in each of these areas. As a department, faculty will establish course load norms appropriate to the discipline relative to particular teaching effort assignments (e.g., number of courses for particular loads, adjustments for very small or very large courses, etc.), as well as equivalencies for non-standard faculty activities (e.g. supervision of significant student research or clinical/practicum activities) and for courses where contact hours differ considerably from credit hours (e.g., clinical supervision and laboratory courses). Likewise, disciplines with writing-intensive courses, laboratory courses, studio and field experiences, and the like, or with unusually heavy supervising and mentoring responsibilities, shall establish teaching load equivalencies through shared governance processes outlined in the faculty handbook.

For all full-time faculty, workload percentages must add up to 100%. Specific percentages should follow departmental norms related to actual teaching load assigned, scholarly expectations, and service assignments. These should generally be made on an annual basis to support an individual faculty
member's career objectives as well as departmental needs and/or resources. Workload assignments for faculty members will be negotiated with the department chair as part of annual review. No workload assignment or negotiation can yield a workload that will prevent a faculty member from achieving requirements for advancement (tenure, promotion, post-tenure, or any other) described in the faculty handbook, college guidelines, or department guidelines.

**Procedure:**
During the annual review process, Department Chairs, in consultation with faculty members, will recommend a workload for each faculty member that divides effort between teaching, scholarship, and service. The recommendation will be based upon the faculty classification (e.g. tenured/tenure-track, lecturer, etc.) as well as the service, scholarly, and creative activities of the faculty member. The negotiated workload must support the faculty member in meeting tenure and/or promotion expectations of the unit, while ensuring fair distribution of work assignments by the point of major evaluations (P&T, 5-yr review, etc). Department Chairs must clearly articulate the outcomes expected for a particular workload division of effort, and appropriately reflect that division of effort in the annual review process. The dean will either accept or modify the teaching load. Faculty members whose workloads are not commensurate with the expectations of their position, hiring agreement, or career objectives can utilize 1) college faculty executive committees and 2) college and university grievance processes to reach a compromise. In the event a faculty member contests a workload agreement, no changes in workload will take place until the faculty member's grievance can be heard through the college and university grievance processes.

**Appendix:**
References: Language used in portions of this policy were developed using materials from Boise State University (Faculty Workload Policy) and Kennesaw State University (Faculty Handbook).

**Ad hoc Committee Members:**
Diana Cone, Chair (Vice Provost, Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs)
Dustin Anderson (SEC, College of Arts & Humanities)
Alicia Brunson (College of Behavioral & Social Sciences)
Sungkon Chang (College of Science & Mathematics)
Nedra Cossa (College of Education)
Daniel Cox (Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering & Computing)
April Garrity (Waters College of Health Professions)
Catherine Gilbert (Waters College of Health Professions)
Brian Koehler (College of Science & Mathematics)
Dan Pioske (College of Arts & Humanities)
Rand Ressler (Parker College of Business)
April Schueths (College of Behavioral & Social Sciences)
Stacy Smallwood (Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health)
John Stone (College of Science & Mathematics)
Georgia Southern University Faculty Workload Policy

Purpose:
Georgia Southern University is a public comprehensive and Carnegie Doctoral/Research university with a tripartite responsibility: to provide transformative learning opportunities to students, support collaborative efforts to discover and disseminate knowledge, and to serve and strengthen society. The goal of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Workload policy is to distribute these workload responsibilities among faculty in a way that most equitably and efficiently advances this tripartite mission among teaching, scholarship (including research and creative activity), and service the university mission. The policy is designed to promote quality teaching, support excellent research and creative activity, and encourage meaningful service to the institution, profession, and community. It is also designed to enable colleges, schools, departments, and individual faculty to pursue, plan for, and recognize the fact that specific individuals and units will have unique objectives and will make different commitments among the faculty activities, roles, allowing individual assignments to vary.

Policy:
The superseding guidelines for this policy are the faculty workload expectations established by the University System of Georgia. In meeting the system expectations, it is recognized that Georgia Southern University faculty members are expected to be productive in the areas of teaching, service, and (for tenure-track and tenured faculty) scholarship and/or creative activity. The distribution of effort among these areas of responsibility may vary among faculty members and from year to year through the course of their careers.

Teaching
Teaching is the primary function of university faculty. Preparing lectures, instructing students, revising curricula, responding to students, holding office hours, evaluating assignments - these activities are all part of normal instructional duties. Additionally, the design, implementation, and analysis of programmatic assessment for our accrediting agencies are also a responsibility of instruction. The base teaching load for faculty in tenured and tenure-track lines is 12 credit hours each semester although, particularly for those seeking tenure and promotion, it is generally expected they will teach the equivalent of a 3-3 course load annually (Fall/Spring) to allow for their scholarship expectations (pre-tenure) and/or continued scholarly production (post-tenure). The base teaching load for other faculty classifications with no scholarly expectations is 15 credit hours each semester; however, it is generally expected they will teach the equivalent of a 4-4 course load annually (Fall/Spring) to allow for although adjustments may be allowed for such faculty with considerable service or professional development activities responsibilities to their unit. Limited-term and temporary faculty are expected to teach 15 credit hours a semester with no service or scholarship expectations.

Scholarship and Creative Activity
Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to actively pursue research or creative activity to improve their instruction and extend their disciplinary knowledge. Tenure-track and tenured faculty, particularly those seeking tenure and promotion, are generally expected to focus a minimum of 30% of their workload toward scholarly and/or creative pursuits; however, continued scholarly workload and creative activity assignment will depend upon sustained scholarly production and outcomes. Faculty career objectives and scholarly outcomes.

Service
Service activities are vital to the mission and function of the University. As such, all permanent faculty, both tenure and non-tenure track, are expected to assume an adequate share of departmental committee work and/or service to the institution, profession, and community, including institutional governance when selected. Attendance at departmental, college, and university meetings is expected of all faculty regardless of workload. It is generally expected for tenured and tenure-track faculty, as well as non-tenure track faculty in positions with service expectations, to focus a minimum...
10% of their workload toward service work; however, service activity assignment will depend upon faculty career objectives and service outcomes, but not more than 30%.

This policy provides a foundation for the expectations of faculty workload while allowing for assignments to vary for individual faculty. This policy requires that each college, school, and/or department are required to establish, in writing, more specific explanations outlining the outcomes, expectations, and timelines for faculty effort in each of these areas. It requires Department Chairs to establish outcomes expected for a particular level of scholarship or service workload assignment in their department. It also requires As a department, faculty will establish course load norms appropriate to the discipline relative to particular teaching effort assignments (e.g., number of courses for particular loads, adjustments for very small or very large courses, etc.), as well as equivalencies for non-standard faculty activities (e.g., supervision of significant student research or clinical/practicum activities) and for courses where contact hours differ considerably from credit hours (e.g., clinical supervision and laboratory courses). Likewise, disciplines with writing-intensive courses, laboratory courses, studio and field experiences, and the like, or with unusually heavy supervising and mentoring responsibilities, shall establish teaching load equivalencies through the shared governance processes outlined in the faculty handbook on the basis of this model.

Typical assignments in teaching, scholarly/creative activity, and service for different faculty classifications are listed below. For all full-time faculty, workload percentages must add up to 100%. Specific percentages should follow departmental norms related to actual teaching load assigned, scholarly expectations, and service assignments. These should generally be made on an annual basis to support an individual faculty member’s career objectives as well as departmental needs and/or resources. Workload assignments for faculty members will be negotiated with the department chair as part of annual review. No workload assignment or negotiation can yield a workload that will prevent a faculty member from achieving requirements for advancement (tenure, promotion, post-tenure, or any other) described in the faculty handbook, college guidelines, or department guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure-Track Faculty</th>
<th>Workload</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Workload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>40-80%</td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly/Creative Activity</td>
<td>10-50%</td>
<td>Scholarly/Creative Activity</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>10-30%</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>80-100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly/Creative Activity</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>0-20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limited-Term/Temporary Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly/Creative Activity</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Actual workload assignments for each faculty member will be negotiated with the department chair as part of annual merit review.

Procedure:
During the annual merit review process, Department Chairs, in consultation with the faculty members, will recommend a workload for each faculty member that divides effort between teaching, scholarship, and service. The recommendation will be based upon the faculty classification (e.g., tenured/tenure-track, lecturer, etc.) as well as the service, scholarly, and creative activities of the faculty member. The negotiated workload must also support the faculty member in meeting tenure and/or promotion expectations of the unit, while ensuring fair distribution of work assignments by the point of major
evaluations (P&T, 5-yr review, etc). Department Chairs must clearly articulate the outcomes expected for a particular workload division of effort, and appropriately reflect that division of effort in the annual review process. The dean will either accept or modify the teaching load. Faculty members whose workloads are not commensurate with the expectations of their position, hiring agreement, or career objectives can utilize 1) college faculty executive committees and 2) college and university grievance processes to reach a compromise. In the event a faculty member contests a workload agreement, no changes in workload will take place until the faculty member's grievance can be heard through the college and university grievance processes. In the event the faculty member contests a workload agreement, no changes in workload will take place until a compromise is reached.

Appendix:
References: Language used in portions of this policy were developed using materials from Boise State University (Faculty Workload Policy) and Kennesaw State University (Faculty Handbook).

Ad hoc Committee Members:
Diana Cone, Chair (Vice Provost, Office of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs)
Dustin Anderson (SEC, College of Arts & Humanities)
Alicia Brunson (College of Behavioral & Social Sciences)
Sungkon Chang (College of Science & Mathematics)
Nedra Cossa (College of Education)
Daniel Cox (Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering & Computing)
April Garrity (Waters College of Health Professions)
Catherine Gilbert (Waters College of Health Professions)
Brian Koehler (College of Science & Mathematics)
Dan Pioske (College of Arts & Humanities)
Rand Ressler (Parker College of Business)
April Schueths (College of Behavioral & Social Sciences)
Stacy Smallwood (Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health)
John Stone (College of Science & Mathematics)
Temporary Nature of Increased Workloads Imposed by Current Extraordinary Circumstances

Submitted by: Marc Cyr

5/4/2019

Motion(s):

That the Provost and/or President provide a policy in writing that states that any increases over stated norms in faculty workloads imposed by current abnormal circumstances will not be permanent, will not set a precedent for future faculty workloads, and will expire as soon as we return to what the Provost calls "normal times" or within one contract year, whichever comes first.

Rationale:

In the CAH spring meeting, the Provost repeatedly noted that the University might, on a temporary basis, need to increase the workloads of some or all faculty. He called this, alternately and several times, either faculty "taking one for the team" or "doing it for the gipper." He said that such increases would be terminated when we return to "normal days." When I asked him to put that termination commitment in writing because my experience has often been that verbal promises or agreements at this University often go unhonored, that only those in writing are dependable, he replied that he had made the same promises at a Faculty Senate meeting and therefore they were recorded in the written minutes of that meeting. There are two
problems with the Provost's position on this, however: First, I do not think that two relatively colloquial statements, even when both have been recorded, are any better than just one such statement, and certainly do not have the same status or concreteness as a written policy statement. Second, verbal statements can be (or can be represented as) inaccurate because delivered "on the go" rather than being the result of considered composition (with definitions) and revision.

Response:

SEC: Approved to move to the floor. Forwarded to VPAA.
Credit Hour Production Numbers and Calculation
Submitted by: Dustin Anderson
4/16/2019

Question(s):

1) Where is the formula for calculating the credit hour production located?
2) Where are the current credit hour production numbers posted?

Rationale:

Submitted on behalf of multiple faculty members: Departments are being told that credit hour production is a metric on which they are being evaluated and that those numbers already exist. In the interest of transparency, those numbers should be made available to departments. Similarly, faculty and departments should be able to calculate their credit hour production. While the calculation is likely not complex, it would be helpful to have the official calculation published for clarity and transparency.

Response:

SEC: Approved to move to the floor, with the additional clarification of who sets the targets for departments, and when and how often these targets are set.

Forwarded to VPAA.
Withdrawal form Course after Semester Mid-point

Submitted by: Bill Wells
4/26/2019

Question(s):

Under whose authority, and under what conditions, can exceptions be made to the BOR and University policies for withdrawal from a single course after the final day to Withdraw without Academic Penalty?

Rationale:

Currently, students may be withdrawn from a course after the Last Day to Withdraw Without Academic Penalty, when the course instructor has not certified that the student has met the four (4) criteria outlined in the GS Policy Manual, Faculty Handbook, and the PETITION TO WITHDRAW FROM A SPECIFIC COURSE - CURRENT TERM ONLY form.

Response:

SEC: Approved to move to the floor. Forwarded to VPEM.
Recourse when policies are not in place

Submitted by: Jonathan C Hilpert
4/30/2019

Question(s):

When college or department level policies that are clearly required by the faculty handbook are missing or are not being developed properly, what is the proper recourse for faculty?

Rationale:

Currently there are many colleges and departments across campus where policies that are required by the faculty handbook have not been put into place. Examples of these include college bylaws and guidelines for tenure and promotion for tenure track and non tenure-track faculty. In these cases, the process for developing these policies described in the faculty handbook is not being followed. This has put many faculty in difficult situations; for example, there are missing guidelines for promotion or the proper committees required to develop bylaws have not been convened.

Response:

SEC: Approved to move to the floor. Forwarded to VPAA.
External Letters of Review for Lecturers
Submitted by: Jonathan C Hilpert
4/30/2019

Question(s):

Are lecturers across campus being asked by deans and/or the provost to submit external letters of review as a component of the evaluation process for promotion?

Rationale:

Many faculty have reported in recent weeks that lecturers have been encouraged to submit external letters of review for their promotion portfolios. The external letters of review policy clearly stipulates that these letters are required only of tenure-track/tenured faculty. In addition, faculty handbook does not have any references to letters for lecturers. Unless formally stipulated in a written policy, external letters or review should not be required or used as a component of the evaluation process for lecturers.

Response:

SEC: Approved to move to the floor. Forwarded to VPAA.

Previous Motion:  
https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1011&context=faculty-senate-index
Notification of a Death in the University Community

Submitted by: Jonathan C Hilpert
4/30/2019

Question(s):

1. The “Notification of a Death in the University Community” motion is approved by the Georgia Southern Faculty Senate on October 29, 2007 and approved by the University President on November 14, 2007:

https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1225&context=faculty-senate-index. Why is this motion no longer protocol?

Rationale:

An email dated November 5, 2018, from the VP for Armstrong and Liberty Campus Operations indicated that it is not part of Georgia Southern’s protocol to send out a general announcement of employee or student deaths. However, this protocol is in conflict with the Faculty Senate Motion, “Notification of a Death in the University Community” approved by the Senate on October 29, 2007 and approved by the University President on November 14, 2007:

https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1225&context=faculty-senate-index, which states that: “an announcement of the death be issued by the President’s Office, subject to the wishes of the individual and family; a notice of details regarding final arrangements be made to the University community should family members wish such details be made public; the counseling center be notified so that adequate staff may be available to help other members of the University community begin the grieving process and provide ways for emotions to be recognized and expressed; the individual’s department head or department representative, after issuing condolence to the family, consult with them about an appropriate form of remembrance/memorial service from the GSU community should the family so desire; University administrators allow family members adequate time to collect the individual’s personal belongings.”

Response:
SEC Response: "Why is this motion ("Notification of a Death in the University Community") no longer protocol?" The SEC found that this question had been answered a previous motion during the discussion of the motion at the February Senate meeting, and during the update to the motion at the March meeting.

*However*, the SEC requests that the university protocol be published, in clear terms, on a publicly-facing site. The SEC also requests clarification on:

- who is able to send announcements of faculty deaths,
- to whom they can be sent,
- the appropriateness of holding memorial services on campus, and
- who is allowed to arrange such services.

Forwarded to Director, Human Resources; Chief of Staff; Vice Provost; VPSA; VPSMC
Faculty's Practical Role in "Student Success"

Submitted by: Dustin Anderson

3/22/2019

Subject of Discussion:

This is a continuation and development of issues surrounding "student success" and the role faculty play in that process. This discussion should result in a clear, articulate description of what student success means in regards to faculty work and responsibility.

Rationale:

Based on the brief discussions surrounding the two RFIs from the March 2019 meeting, the Senate should continue its discussion on the practical roles and expectations of "Student Success" initiatives. The Senate invites members of the Student Success Committee to participate in this discussion to share specific measure they've discussed or taken over the course of this academic year. See the March minutes for previous discussion points.

Response:

In March of 2019, the Student Success Committee recommended support in engaging with and helping facilitate the implementation of all elements of the USG Momentum Approach by working with university units that are invested in student success. These include, but are not limited to, First Year Experience, Sophomore Year Experience, academic advising and the Academic Success Center. With faculty engagement, support and commitment to the development of all students, the SSC believes students will be better prepared, both academically and emotionally, to meet the demands of a rigorous university education. In addition, students will perceive the academic challenge in a more positive light, make a more substantive contribution to society and enjoy a more fulfilling life after college. The SSC believes these elements are important in reducing the number of D, F and W course grades, in increasing retention, and in helping a larger percentage of Georgia Southern students succeed professionally after graduation. In addition, it will benefit the academic reputation of Georgia Southern University.

Attached are examples of practical elements for Faculty and departments in Student Success as discussed in the SSC. The Associate Provost for Student Success has also distributed more detailed information and recommendations on topics such as Realigning Resources to Meet Changing Enrollment Patterns; Course Scheduling and Curricular Alignment Strategies; Promoting Timely Degree Completion; Reconciling Student Choice and the Four-Year Graduation Goals, and Equity in Student Success, etc... to deans and department chairs for discussion at the college and departmental levels.
Six Roles for Faculty in Student Success

How the academy can support institutional efforts to improve retention and completion

Faculty play a critical role in shaping the student experience but are surprisingly underleveraged as allies in student success strategy. Here are six key ways that academic units and individual faculty members can help students successfully navigate their academic careers.

1. Addressing Curricular Barriers to Completion
   Decisions about curricula are often made within departmental silos, underestimating or even ignoring their institution-wide impact on student success. How can we equip academic units to enact progression-based curricular reforms?

2. Redesigning Academic Policies
   Rules and regulations that govern degree planning, course registration, and advising can unintentionally force students off track. How can we identify and adjust these obstacles?

3. Evolving Academic Advising Models
   Helping students register for courses is only the tip of the iceberg—faculty and staff advisors are now expected to counsel, coach, and intervene with struggling students on a regular basis. How can we prepare our departments for these broader expectations?

4. Enhancing the Learning Experience
   It's clear that great teachers have an outsized impact on students' success in college and in their careers. How can we encourage more faculty to innovate in the classroom?

5. Flagging Signs of Student Risk
   By tracking student attendance, performance, and engagement in class, faculty can help inform your early intervention strategy. How can we build greater awareness and utilization of early warning systems?

6. Mentoring Rising-Risk Student Groups
   Talented, high-achieving students seek out mentorship opportunities on their own, but many don't establish connections with faculty until it's too late. How can we engage more students in meaningful interactions with faculty mentors?

Recommendations

Arm Units with Data
On-demand enrollment analytics help faculty to assess the consequences of proposed curricular changes.

Create Role-Based Working Groups
Subcommittees with specific tasks make better use of faculty time (and expertise) than large task forces.

Skip the "Pilot" Phase
Curricular reforms are most effective when treated as full-scale, managed projects, rather than one-off experiments.

Balance Forgiveness with Proactive Advising
Course repeat and probation policies should encourage students to explore alternative pathways to graduation.

Use Degree Plans as Guardrails
Critical course and grade "milestones" can help faculty and staff evaluate students' academic risk.

Incentivize Timely Progression
Students are more likely to graduate on time if attempting (and completing) 30 credits per year is treated as default.

Outline and Differentiate Roles
Faculty time is best spent on mentoring and academic consultation, not transactional or administrative activities.

Leverage Faculty in Advisor Trainings
Involving faculty in regular staff trainings builds mutual trust and collaboration.

Consider Units’ Unique Staffing Needs
Moving to a centralized advising model requires an investment in distributed administrative support.

Harness Grassroots Activity
Grassroots activity gives innovative instructors a way to apply for course redesign grants and generate scalable pedagogical models.

Reduce the Risk of Adoption
Targeted support and recognition alleviates the pedagogical, technological, and social concerns of instructors.

Focus on Critical Courses
Courses with high failure rates should be prioritized to maximize the impact of funded reforms on student success.

Make It Simple
Early warning systems should be easy for faculty to use, with a single referral point for academic and behavioral concerns.

Make It Flexible
Faculty should be able to determine the time period and performance threshold for early academic assessments, within reasonable boundaries.

Communicate the Impact
Messages about the importance of early alerts in helping to connect students with critical support services should come from senior academic leaders.

Target Less-Engaged Students
Faculty mentoring efforts should be focused on students who aren't already participating in honors programs or living and learning communities.

Monitor Transcript Requests
Students may reconsider transfer to another institution after connecting with faculty in their field of interest.

Conduct Exit Surveys
Exit surveys provide information gathered from stop-outs and transfers can help to guide your intervention and engagement strategies.

Ready to learn more about faculty support for student success? Download the full study. www.eab.com/facultyrole
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Challenge
Conventional program mapping advice instructs administrators to work backwards from graduation requirements, with the unintended consequence of prioritizing institutional needs over student goals.

Best Practice
**Student-centered program design principles:** Remove institutional bias by establishing an agreed upon hierarchy of student-centered criteria with student services and faculty at the outset of program map sequencing.

Challenge
Despite reforms, students remain unaware of program maps and necessary courses due to confusing academic terminology.

Best Practice
**Jargon-free map design:** Simplify internal and external communication of program maps and meta-majors with a colorful, concise, and jargon-free template.

Roadblock 4
\(\text{Biased meta-major course composition}\)

Challenge
Inclusion of courses in meta-majors is politically contentious or opaque.

Best Practice
**Expedited course overlap identifier:** Use a data query to objectively determine meta-major composition and major declaration points based upon course overlap frequency.

Roadblock 5
\(\text{Ineffective marketing to students}\)

Challenge
Despite reforms, students remain unaware of program maps and necessary courses due to confusing academic terminology.

Best Practice
**Jargon-free map design:** Simplify internal and external communication of program maps and meta-majors with a colorful, concise, and jargon-free template.

To design successful pathways with students at the center, program maps and meta-majors must be based on clear principles that eliminate institutional biases and maximize the amount of time for student exploration.
THE MURKY MIDDLE

Profiling campus segments based on early academic performance to determine which students succeed, which fail, and where schools should focus their efforts

Most student success initiatives target freshman students, but 52% of attrition occurs after the first year. And of these late stage departures, over half are within the “Murky Middle.”

Where are you focusing your student success efforts?

Murky Middle 33%
(20% Graduate, 13% Depart)

Large numbers of students finish their first year with a GPA between 2.0 and 3.0. Even though they aren’t on probation, nearly two-fifths of these students won’t complete. Yet these students are traditionally overlooked at most schools—in part because it is difficult to distinguish those who ultimately graduate from those who eventually depart.

The fate of the murky middle student is just that—murky. This population demands attention, but with limited resources it isn’t possible to target the entire group.

Emerging research from the Student Success Collaborative suggests that rigorous analyses of academic data can separate the hidden population of struggling students from the likely graduates, enabling targeted intervention efforts and ultimately improved outcomes.

Phoenixes

Despite facing early challenges, these students are able to course correct and ultimately graduate. Unfortunately, fewer than one in ten students who finish their first year below a 2.0 GPA will eventually right the ship, despite considerable investment from their institutions.

Failed to Launch

These students fail to hit the ground running and struggle in the initial phase of college. More than three-fifths of the students who finish their first year below a 2.0 GPA will eventually depart, despite considerable investment from their institutions.

The Ones That Got Away

Anecdotal evidence suggests that the vast majority of these students are transferring to and graduating from other institutions after the first year. Most institutions would love to retain these high-performing students and don’t want to see them enroll with a competitor. Though many in this group leave due to fit, the question remains whether more customized support could help retain a portion of these strong students.

Unsolved Mysteries

Sometimes even the best students won’t complete. It can be hard to isolate the cause of attrition for this group of delayed departures. Perhaps they decide to transfer, encounter personal hardship, or are unable to persist due to finances. Whatever the reason, it isn’t showing up in their academics, leaving many institutions wondering how they can be reached and whether this group’s attrition is ultimately outside of their control.

All-Stars

Three-fourths of students who make it to their second year with above a 3.0 GPA go on to graduate. While anecdotally we know these students aren’t at risk, they tend to consume considerable advising resources through voluntary self-improvement efforts. This has prompted a national dialogue about understanding student self-direction.

Most student success initiatives target freshman students, but 52% of attrition occurs after the first year. And of these late stage departures, over half are within the “Murky Middle.”

Where are you focusing your student success efforts?
Barriers to Student Success
Achievement Gaps Across the Student Lifecycle

Common Student Success Metrics
- First-year retention rates
- Term-to-term persistence rates
- DFY rates
- Four-year graduation rates
- Six-year graduation rates
- First destination surveys
- Cut data by race, gender, ethnicity, income, first-generation status, and other demographics aligned with your population.

Pre-College Academic Preparation
1. High school teacher expectations
2. Access to AP courses
3. Access to ACT/SAT prep courses
4. ACT/SAT test taking rates
5. Placement in developmental education
6. Success in developmental education
7. Disciplinary rates and experiences in high school
8. Writing ability by ELL status
9. Geographical access to higher education institutions
10. Diversity of high school teachers
11. Segregation of high schools
12. Access to guidance counselor
13. SAT score by income quintile
14. AP exam pass rates
15. Family expectations of student’s ability to go to college
16. Family expectations of student’s ability to succeed in college
17. Student expectation of their own ability to succeed
18. Resilience during the job search
19. Impact of first failed course
20. Acceptance rates in competitive majors
21. Family perception of importance of HEPs
22. Undermatching in college selection process
23. Undermatching at the course-level
24. Impact of academic probation and dismissal language
25. Parental pressure on major choice
26. Disparity between high school and college GPA

Climate
27. Sense of belonging
28. Perception of inclusivity in major
29. Treatment by local businesses
30. Treatment by local community
31. Impact of negative diversity event
32. Diversity of student organization leadership
33. Success rates based on demographics of faculty encounters
34. Responsiveness of faculty to students
35. Consideration of racial justice activism in admissions decisions
36. Interactions with campus and local law enforcement
37. Access to facilities (e.g., building accessibility, gender affirming restrooms)
38. Faculty and staff diversity in relation to student diversity
39. Perception of cost of college
40. Ability and desire to take on debt
41. Application fee waiver request rates
42. FAFSA submission rates
43. Financial aid verification selection rates
44. Financial aid verification completion rates
45. Impact of uncertain financial need
46. Ability to afford social experiences
47. Internet access at home
48. Ability to afford course materials
49. Need to work
50. Supporting dependents
51. Impact of financial emergencies
52. Loss of scholarship rates
53. Rate of recovery from loss of financial aid
54. Exhaustion of financial aid eligibility
55. Food insecurity
56. Housing insecurity
57. Access to transportation
58. Ability to afford graduation regalia
59. Access to employer-sponsored tuition reimbursement programs

Pedagogy
60. GPA in lecture-heavy courses
61. Perception of representation within curriculum
62. Impact of grading practices
63. Perception that curriculum is relevant to students’ goals and values
64. Teaching in First Nations’ languages
65. Effect of pre-requisite course sequencing
66. Grades in online courses
67. Completion of online courses
68. Major switching patterns
69. Likelihood to register late for classes
70. Student expectations of coursework rigor
71. Utilization of mental health resources
72. FAFSA re-submission rates
73. Summer melt rates
74. Unproductive credit accumulation
75. Enrollment in toxic course combinations
76. Graduation application submission rates
77. Understanding of re-enrollment policies
78. Perceptions of time needed to study
79. Parental engagement by ELL status
80. Expectations of frequency of faculty interactions
81. Understanding of academic honor codes
82. Impact of academic jargon
83. Knowledge and use of medical withdrawal policies
84. Enrollment by discipline

Financial
85. Participation rates in undergraduate research
86. Participation rates in study abroad opportunities
87. Experience during study abroad
88. Ability to use social network for career advancement
89. Post-graduate employment rates
90. Alarm engagement rates
91. Post-graduate economic mobility
92. Career fulfillment and engagement
93. Impact of student debt
94. Career boost from non-degree credential
95. Student loan default rates
96. Participation rates in internships
97. Participation rates in learning communities
98. Participation rates in service-learning
99. Need and ability to apply for financial independence
100. Ability to access required courses
101. Faculty dropping students from courses
102. Need for on-campus housing during breaks
103. Misalignment between aid and billing
104. Mismatch between credit accumulation and financial aid awards
105. Placement on academic probation
106. Referral to honor board
107. Impact of registration and bursar holds
108. Impact of differential tuition rates

College Navigation

Post-Graduate Outcomes

Policies and Procedures
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Disparity Snapshot Across the Lifecycle

Demographic Gaps from Campuses, National Datasets, and Academic Studies

What are the most important leading indicators of demographic gaps on college and university campuses?
The most common measures of student success—retention, graduation, and post-graduate outcomes—rarely help campuses understand how they should change policy or practice to promote equity. EAB has compiled some of the most surprising, challenging data below that can direct member action to specific causes of demographic disparities. Use these data as well as the 108 gaps on the reverse side to guide your own campus' analysis.

Climate

Campus Climate
20%
Of students have reported bias and harassment incidents on campuses
Southern Poverty Law Center

Engagement with Campus Community
38%
Of Native and Indigenous students do not feel like a part of their campus community, compared to 25% of white students
NSSE

Sexual Violence
23%
Of undergraduate women have experienced rape or sexual assault
Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network

Pedagogy

Impact of Grading Practices
37%
Of students who did not pass in courses using norm-referenced grading were underrepresented minorities when they made up 19% of enrollments in these courses
Elite Public University

Major Switch Patterns
80%
Of underrepresented STEM first-year students switched their major out of STEM
Small Polytechnic Institute

Impact of Lecture-Based Teaching
1 in 3
African American students and 1 in 7 Hispanic students received a D or F in a lecture-based introductory biology course, compared to 1 in 5 white students
Elite Public University

College Navigation

FAFSA/Rejection Rates
16%
Of first-year Pell recipients in good academic standing did not reenroll in the FAFSA in their sophomore year
Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study

Utilization of Mental Health Resources
26%
Of African American students with clinically significant symptoms of a mental health condition received mental health treatment, compared to 46% of white students
Boston Globe

Summer Melt Rates
13%
Of low-income students who intend to go to college do not enroll, compared to 8% of affluent students
Social Science Quarterly

Financial

Loss of Scholarships
18%
Of first-year students lose their GPA-restricted scholarships
Rapal Private University

Access to Basic Needs
56%
Of Aboriginal post-secondary students experience food insecurity
Five Canadian Universities

Cost of Materials
6%
First-generation students acquire 6% fewer textbooks than their continuing-generation peers
The Chronicle of Higher Education

Pre-College Academic Preparation

High School Segregation
75%
Of Hispanic students in New York City attended an "intensely" segregated high school
The Civil Rights Project

Access to School Counselor
1.4x
Hispanic students are 1.4x as likely to attend a school with a school resource officer than a school without one
U.S. Department of Education Office of Civil Rights

Placement in Developmental Education
37%
Of African American students are enrolled in math remediation, compared to only 19% of white students
Complete College America

Parental Expectations
39%
Of parents of first-generation students expect their child to obtain a BA or higher degree, compared to 58% of parents of continuing-generation students
Child Trends Data Bank

Self Expectations
2x
Hispanic students are twice as likely as comparable students to require academic remediation if students lack academic self-confidence
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America

Post-Graduate Outcomes

Prioritize 2-3 gaps to target per year
No campus can tackle every gap simultaneously. Many campuses will begin prioritizing their work by conducting analyses with strategic goals such as promoting experiential learning or accelerating time to degree. After determining the most important gaps, campus leaders should select a small number of goals to prioritize and task student success, faculty, and staff leaders to craft solutions.

Undergraduate Research
18%
Of first-generation seniors engage in research with a faculty member, compared to 27% of continuing-generation seniors
NSSE

Internship Opportunities
40%
Of African American seniors engage in an internship or field experience, compared to 59% of white seniors
NSSE

Academic Probation
16%
Of students of color were on academic probation or suspended, while only 7.2% of white students were
Small Regional Public University

Referrals to Honor Committee
33%
Of the cases brought before Honor Committee were against African American students even though they only make up about 7% of the student population
Elite Public University

Policies and Procedures
Message from the President

People…Purpose…Action – Growing ourselves to Grow Others!

This is an exciting time to be part of Georgia Southern University, as we envision the future of this institution and the many opportunities that lie ahead with optimism, passion, energy and determination. This new Strategic Plan offers a bold, comprehensive roadmap to unite students, faculty, staff, and the region as one Eagle Nation working together to obtain and discover knowledge, develop talent, and serve a region.

I believe Georgia Southern University’s Strategic Plan articulates our mission and vision, defines our core values, and offers clear goals and objectives, all aligning our efforts to be recognized as a national leader in higher education and the premier educational partner of choice to learn, work, and engage.

We will be dedicated to growing ourselves to grow others—investing in our people and clearly defining our goals, objectives and actions, all to have the greatest impact on our students and the communities we serve. Lest we never forget, we are in the business of transforming lives. You will notice that student success is more than just the first “strategic pillar” in the plan—it is the very foundation of our institution and it is through this lens that we will define and measure our success.

We must work together to create a world-class environment where faculty, staff, and students are in a continuous state of growth, discovery, and development. This plan provides a strategic pathway to empower our dedicated faculty and align our academic programs to develop global citizens, impact and inform economic development, expand mutually beneficial community partnerships, and enhance high-quality instruction and research that infuses Georgia Southern University with academic purpose and inspired innovation. Together, we will create an even more inclusive community, deepen our impact across the region, and embrace a culture of operational efficiency and performance excellence that will ensure our long-term sustainability.

The real power of a Strategic Plan lies in its successful implementation, so it is critical that we measure success through key performance indicators, monitoring and continually assessing our progress with a culture of continuous improvement and high performance. The Plan is designed to be a “living document.” Accordingly, we will assess and evaluate our effectiveness at strategic intervals to ensure that we are on track, relevant, and working at the speed of business.

By any measure, we are already fortunate to have vibrant, distinctive campuses and communities, nationally recognized faculty, staff, alumni, and programs, and storied histories and traditions serving our diverse University communities. It is important for us to honor the past as we look to the future. While enhancing, elevating and leveraging our distinctives, we will be unified as one Georgia Southern, one
Eagle Nation inspired and directed by our Strategic Plan - obtaining and discovering knowledge, developing talent, and serving a region unified as one Georgia Southern, one Eagle Nation,

People…Purpose…Action – Growing ourselves to grow others!

Please join me as we envision the future of Georgia Southern University.

Sincerely,

Dr. Kyle Marrero, President
Georgia Southern University

Georgia Southern University Strategic Plan
2019-2024

A New Vision for Eagle Nation

In October 2018, a working team of Georgia Southern University faculty, staff, and students was charged to develop a University strategic plan and to update the University’s mission and mission statements. The new plan would not only serve as a five-year road map for the University, it would also outline an exciting new vision for Eagle Nation.

Throughout the 2018-2019 academic year, the University Strategic Planning Committee engaged hundreds of University stakeholders in this planning process. The committee and subcommittee members worked together to make the strategic planning process inclusive, transparent, and collaborative.

Over the course of the year, the committee hosted more than 65 events at all campuses, attracting more than 1,400 attendees. In addition, 328 stakeholders provided feedback online.

The collective input and feedback helped to redefine goals, identify missing elements, clarify priorities, and provide a broad-based consensus for the final plan. Members of the University Strategic Planning Committee worked together to draft a vibrant new strategic plan centered on five main pillars:

1. Student Success;
2. Teaching and Research;
3. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion;
4. Operational Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Sustainability;
5. Community Engagement.

Like a well-constructed building, these pillars combine to support a larger structure.

During the 2019-2020 academic year, the University Strategic Planning Committee will reconvene for a second year of work, monitoring and modifying plan elements while tracking progress in achieving the goals outlined in the plan. Under the direction of President Kyle Marrero and the University leadership team, the committee will continue to evaluate and adjust the plan to ensure that all goals are being met.

Learn more: georgiasouthern.edu/StrategicPlanning.
Mission Statement
At Georgia Southern University, our learner-centered culture prepares us to think, lead, teach, and serve. We value collaboration, academic excellence, discovery and innovation, integrity, openness and inclusion, and sustainability. We promote talent and economic development to enhance quality of life through scholarly pursuits, cultural enrichment, student life, and community engagement across distinctive campuses. Our success is measured by the global impact of our students, faculty, staff, and alumni.

Vision Statement
TBA

Values

Collaboration: Georgia Southern University embraces shared governance, teamwork, and a cooperative spirit that shapes our engagement with students, faculty, staff and communities.

Academic Excellence: Georgia Southern University academically challenges students, providing them with the knowledge, experiences, and support they need to develop into productive and responsible citizens.

Discovery and Innovation: Georgia Southern University promotes environments and technologies that encourage and facilitate creative, problem-solving collaborations among students, faculty, staff, and community partners.

Integrity: Georgia Southern University creates a caring, respectful environment that is deeply committed to ethical decision-making in the spirit of collegiality.

Openness and Inclusion: Georgia Southern University values the diversity of all people, communities, and disciplines with an unwavering commitment to equity and inclusion.

Sustainability: Georgia Southern University is a conscientious steward of resources and supports the well-being of students, faculty, staff, and communities.
Strategic Pillar #1
Student Success

Goal: Support students in achieving their individual, unique goals and provide a wide range of opportunities for engagement in academic, personal, and professional development activities.

Georgia Southern University is dedicated to helping students reach their full potential. Through engagement with the institution and exposure to a student-centered approach, students are able to thrive, reach their goals, and complete their degrees. By providing access to resources for support, as well as strong curricular and co-curricular opportunities, the University promotes the intellectual, personal, and professional development of students. Each student is challenged to define what success means to them and to follow customized, well-supported pathways to success.

Strategic Pillar #2
Teaching and Research

Goal: Advance knowledge and innovation through a culture of integrated teaching, research, and creative scholarly activity.

Teaching and research are the keystones to advance knowledge, foster creativity, inspire innovation, and improve quality of life. Georgia Southern University will increase investment in research programs, faculty development, and current technologies that enhance the faculty as teacher-scholars and support their ability to model best practices for students. As a result, faculty can improve student learning, prepare students to compete in the global marketplace, and enhance student success by providing access to a complete experiential learning environment that develops students into holistic critical thinkers who contribute as productive citizens to societal enrichment.

Strategic Pillar #3
Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion

Goal: Promote an equitable, diverse, and inclusive institutional culture to eliminate institutional barriers for underrepresented groups and to unify the Georgia Southern University community as one Eagle Nation.

Georgia Southern University celebrates diversity in all its forms. All populations will feel valued and respected, regardless of race, gender, ethnicity, religion, national origin, age, sexual orientation or identity, education, or disability. In addition, the University will capitalize on distinctive, unique campus cultures while encouraging strong institutional unity.

Strategic Pillar #4
Operational Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Sustainability

Goal: Increase operational efficiency and effectiveness while maximizing financial capital and human resources to ensure the University’s long-term sustainability.

Georgia Southern University will implement robust policies, procedures, and practices to ensure current and future sustainability, highlighting financial management, risk management, and employee
satisfaction. The “One Georgia Southern” theme will reinforce the University’s focus on equity, diversity, and inclusive excellence.

**Strategic Pillar # 5**  
**Community Engagement**

**Goal:** Build and nurture sustained, mutually beneficial, collaborative partnerships to increase quality of life in surrounding communities and to share knowledge and resources that foster civic and social responsibilities among students, citizens, faculty, and staff.

Community engagement is critical to ensure that Georgia Southern University’s impact extends far beyond the geographic boundaries of its multiple campuses. The University is committed to being a strong partner with community members, area organizations, U.S. military, and local companies. By deepening strategic relationships, expanding cultural opportunities, and encouraging community members to engage, the University will distinguish itself as a valued partner and community resource.