Armstrong Campus, Georgia Southern University  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Agenda for February 19, 2018  
Student Union, Ballroom A, 3:00 p.m.

I. Pre-Senate Working Session (3:00–3:30 p.m.)

II. Call to Order

III. Senate Action
   A. Approval of Minutes from November 27, 2017 and January 22, 2018 Faculty Senate Meetings
   B. Brief Remarks from Dr. Chris Curtis, Interim Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs (Armstrong Campus)
   C. Brief Remarks from Dr. Diana Cone, Interim Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs (Statesboro Campus)
   D. Brief Remarks from Mr. Ron Stalnaker, IT Services
   E. Brief Remarks from Mr. Robert Whitaker, Vice-President of Business and Finance
   F. Old Business
      1. Faculty SWOT Results (Appendix A)
      2. Consolidation Updates
         i. Tenure and Promotion
         ii. Salary Study
         iii. Advising
         iv. Website Migration
         v. New Faculty Senate
            a. Recommendations for Allotment of Senate Seats (Appendix B)
               i. Proposal from LLP: Consolidating two healthy universities into one new university that will meet the needs of students on all campuses is a gradual process. The USG set the template for parity in the consolidation process by mandating equal representation from both universities on the Consolidation Implementation Committee (CIC). To extend that equitable model as implementation proceeds and nonresolved critical issues are definitively addressed, I propose that for the new university's first two years of operation, CY 2018-19, representation from both campuses on the new Faculty Senate should be equal.
               ii. Proposal from Nursing: senate apportionment and membership be determined by the number of students in each college instead of the number of faculty
               iii. Correction of Armstrong Faculty in Library (modification of chart entry)
            b. Full Faculty Vote on Bylaws: Timeframe
c. New Senate Membership: Nominations and Timeframe
   vi. Other Consolidation Updates
3. Administrative Position Updates
4. Old Business from the Floor
G. New Business
   1. Proposed Bill on Class Scheduling to meet Unique Campus Needs (Appendix C)
   2. Committee Membership and Reports
      i. University Curriculum Committee
      ii. Governance Committee
      iii. Academic Standards
      iv. Education Technology
      v. Faculty Welfare
      vi. Planning, Budget, and Facilities
      vii. Student Success
   3. New Business from the Floor
H. Senate Information and Announcements
   1. Send Committee Meeting Dates and Minutes to faculty.senate@armstrong.edu
   2. Send Changes in Committee Membership, Chairs and Senate Liaisons to governance.senate@armstrong.edu and faculty.senate@armstrong.edu
   3. Announcements (from the floor)
IV. Adjournment
SWOT Faculty Analysis
Armstrong Campus
Method

• Collaborative effort of faculty senate and institutional research
• Qualtrics survey link emailed to all full-time and part-time faculty of Armstrong campus
• Respondents given one week to complete survey, with reminder email sent out
• 130 respondents
• Survey responses examined for common themes
• See supplemental handout for all themes and specific examples
Strengths

• More financial and academic resources \((n = 76)\)
  – E.g., combined library resources, increased salary, increased access to software
• Opportunities for students \((n = 55)\)
  – E.g., more degree and course offerings, wider variety of extracurricular activities, increased diversity of student body, professional advisor access
• Opportunities for collaboration and growth within and across campuses \((n = 30)\)
  – E.g., new colleagues, new expertise, opportunities to collaborate with more diverse faculty body
• Name recognition \((n = 13)\)
• Statement given that no strengths can be identified with the consolidation \((n = 13)\)
Weaknesses

• Negative faculty impact ($n = 74$)
  – E.g., workload inequity, take over in some departments, merged senate will have less representation from Armstrong, uncertainty of T&P requirements, committee burden
  – Salary inequity specifically mentioned by 30 respondents

• Morale ($n = 53$)
  – E.g., failure to integrate the traditions and pride of all three campuses, lack of consideration for the Armstrong campus (we are not valued), lack of clarity about the identity of each campus

• Logistics ($n = 50$)
  – E.g., no clear plan to share faculty, staff, meetings, and resources; poor communication between administration and faculty/staff; uncertainty about who to contact with questions

• Leadership ($n = 43$)
  – E.g., lack of on-site leadership for departments at Armstrong campus, lack of autonomy in decision-making, top-down governance model inherited from Statesboro campus

• Negative student impact ($n = 33$)
  – E.g., decreased course offerings at Armstrong campus, higher tuition, pressure to increase class size, loss of academic rigor, loss of athletics
Opportunities

- Academic growth ($n = 61$)
  - E.g., program development/new programs for Armstrong campus, expanded degree programs, student opportunities for research and practice
- Professional growth ($n = 37$)
  - E.g., higher profile university name, more opportunities for collaboration, decreased workload
- Bigger budget/better resources ($n = 25$)
  - E.g., increased student services at Armstrong campus, new buildings/infrastructure in Savannah, more available grants
- Opportunities have not been apparent or made clear ($n = 17$)
- Strength of name ($n = 10$)
  - E.g., recruitment
Threats

• Morale \( (n = 44) \)
  – E.g., loss of current faculty, staff, and administration; marginalization; animosity between Armstrong and Statesboro faculty; infighting between political leaders over resources at each campus will likely be a future problem to manage

• Salary/workload inequities \( (n = 31) \)

• Inability to create/work toward positive change \( (n = 24) \)
  – E.g., unwillingness to collaborate across campuses, possessiveness about programs and courses, resistance to change

• Community impact \( (n = 20) \)
  – E.g., lack of information/wrong in community about consolidation, drop in enrollment

• Logistics/communication \( (n = 16) \)
  – E.g., departments spread across three campuses in different locations with different cultures
## Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Faculty GSU</th>
<th>Senators – Statesboro</th>
<th>Faculty Armstrong</th>
<th>Senators Armstrong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering and Computing</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science and Mathematics</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don and Cindy Waters College of Health Professions</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>853</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
<td><strong>314</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(last revised 10-31-2017)*
Appendix C

Class Scheduling to meet Unique Campus Needs

Whereas the three campuses of Georgia Southern University serve different student populations, with more residential and traditionally aged college students on the Statesboro campus and more commuter and non-traditionally aged college students on the Savannah and Hinesville campuses;

Whereas students on the Savannah and Hinesville campuses more often need to balance their classes with work and family obligations;

Whereas students on the Savannah campus are more often employed in service-industry jobs associated with Savannah tourism that require full day Friday through Sunday hours;

Whereas the Savannah and Hinesville campuses utilize part-time faculty to a much higher degree than the Statesboro campus (For Fall, 2015: 182PT vs. 286FT in Armstrong Factbook and 97PT vs. 841FT in GSU Factbook);

Whereas part-time faculty benefit from a class schedule that requires fewer days on campus;

Whereas Savannah State University offers a variety of once and twice weekly classes to meet the needs of the local Savannah student and part-time instructor population;

Whereas the FAQ section of the consolidation website for student questions articulates an objective of “trying to limit the need for commuting” and therefore little impact of divergent class schedules across the three campuses;

The Armstrong Faculty Senate requests that the class scheduling needs of the Savannah and Hinesville campuses and local community be placed above the goal of unified scheduling with the Statesboro campus.

Specifically, the Savannah and Hinesville campuses have integrated many MW, TR, and once weekly classes into the class schedule because these best serve our campus and community needs. The Armstrong Faculty Senate requests to continue using a class schedule that works best for the Savannah and Hinesville campuses.