

9-1-2017

Consolidation Review Committee

Bob Jackson
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jackson, Bob, "Consolidation Review Committee" (2017). *Faculty Senate Index*. 620.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/620>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Approved by the Senate: 10-16-2017

Not Approved by the Senate:

Approved by the President: 10/20/2017

Not Approved by the President

Consolidation Review Committee

Submitted by: Bob Jackson

9/1//2017

Motion(s):

To form a Consolidation Review Committee to review potential problems related to consolidation that require immediate action and make recommendations to the President.

Rationale:

Some problems concerning consolidation will require immediate attention. For example, the College of Business Administration is going to be housed in Statesboro but continue to offer some courses on the Armstrong campus. The Department of Biology will be housed in Statesboro, but the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry will be housed in Savannah. This could severely impact the synergy between these two departments, including the reduction of applications to extramural funding agencies. It may turn out that the split of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences will similarly have negative effects. The presence of three colleges on the Armstrong campus could result in further consolidation of programs during this transition process. A faculty-driven committee with representation from all Georgia Southern University campuses is needed to identify problems as they arise and make appropriate policy recommendations. Although some operational working groups are working on these matters, a small task force could focus on more specific problems and advise the President on problems that require immediate action.

Response:

Minutes: 10-16-2017

Motion: Consolidation Review Committee Bob Jackson (COBA): "To form a Consolidation Review Committee to review potential problems related to consolidation

that require immediate action and make recommendations to the President.” The motion was seconded.

President Hebert said this motion was brought to his attention by “someone not in here [who] said maybe you're concerned about this.” And he was, thinking the mission was not broad enough, looking only at potential problems. He wanted this committee, should the motion pass, to do a SWOT analysis, looking at strengths, weaknesses, and opportunities as well. He said if the senate didn't approve this committee, he'd appoint one to act as a “kind of set of faculty eyes on the entire landscape of what's going on here.” So he fully supported the motion if the committee had this expanded mission.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) appreciated the President's position, but preferred to keep the committee's focus on problems undiluted. He thought of their work as “troubleshooting.” President Hebert agreed that the threats would be the primary thing they would look at, but wanted opportunities included in their charge. This would be part of the SWOT analyses he wanted from everyone in mid-Spring. He thought this committee a good one to do that for the Senate.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) wanted clarification re: how this committee's charge would differ from that of the Core revision committee.

Moderator Pirro said he'd raised that question with the SEC, and that he didn't want just a bunch of committees getting nothing done. He had wanted to combine the committees, but we were already committed by the motion to the core review committee being just that, and he didn't want to give up the idea of a broader look.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) agreed with Cyr because she thought the kind of issues that will come before this committee would be ones without easy solutions, otherwise they wouldn't come to them in the first place. She saw the committee as a contact point if something is going wrong or someone sees a potential problem coming. She asked, though, if this would be one big committee, or if there would be separate ones for the different campuses. Bob Jackson (COBA) said since it will be a post-consolidation committee, his idea was that it would be one committee with representation from all campuses.

Moderator Pirro noted that the Senates will not consolidate until Fall 2018, and given that Armstrong has been asked by President Hebert to form a senate SWOT committee and the motion doesn't specify membership, it might be that we won't have Armstrong members until Fall.

Cyr didn't think we should be getting caught up in petty process details. If Armstrong knows about this committee, he thought they'd want to be on it, and he didn't think "that we are going to have the GS police force at the campus edge stopping them from getting to a meeting. And if they wanted to just come and kibitz, I think they would be invited anyway. So I think that if we're going to get into that kind of pettifogging detail I think we've got a problem." (Secretary's Note: Your secretary was gratified to have the opportunity to use the word "pettifogging" during Senate discussion. He was even more deeply gratified when he got home, looked it up, and found that he had used it correctly.)

Moderator Pirro wanted to offer an amendment to the motion, but Parliamentarian Karen McCurdy pointed out that as Moderator he could not do so. She suggested getting someone from the floor to move his amendment. Before that could happen, someone unidentified called the question.

The vote Approved calling the question.

The original motion was put to a vote and Approved

Minutes 9-6-2017:

Moderator Pirro turned to SEC discussion of the motion passed at the last meeting for an ad-hoc committee to review and revise the disliked but nevertheless passed (because of a consolidation deadline) new core curriculum. The motion called for the committee to be formed from members of both the Undergraduate and GECC Committees in Statesboro and the Curriculum Committee at Armstrong and charged this fall. Pirro had suggested to the SEC that the committee's role be expanded to take on all consolidation issues, but the SEC believed the motion committed us to limiting that committee's purview to the core. Pirro had reached out to the Chair of the GECC for interested faculty and four members of the GECC volunteered, including two who also sit on the Undergraduate Committee; a UGC member from COBA also volunteered. So far, we had two members from COSM, and one each from COBA, the Library, and COE. The Chair of the Curriculum Committee at Armstrong was on board with this plan, but thought Spring would be a better time to begin because his committee was focused on the program matters that have to be completed by December 1st. One member of the GECC wondered why we need an ad hoc committee if the GECC has the expertise to take on this responsibility. Unless the SEC gets other direction from the

Senate, he hoped to complete membership of the ad hoc committee and charge it sometime this Fall.

Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) noted one reason for the ad-hoc committee was concern that not all stakeholder departments had been involved in constructing the new core.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) was concerned that we were planning to deal with consolidation issues when it will be too late because everything will be settled. She thought the time to deal with these issues was during, not after the consolidation process.

Moderator Pirro pointed out that, in the case of the splitting of CLASS into two colleges, we had tried to do such work during the process, but had failed.

Dustin Anderson (CLASS) asked Pirro to reiterate the ad-hoc committee membership so far. Pirro did so and added that the GECC chair had suggested expanding the membership to include faculty so far not “implicated” with the core to gain objectivity.

Anderson noted that there was no CLASS member and asked how large the committee would be. Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) said that to this point, there had been only a few people in a room making these plans and suggested a committee representing every discipline teaching in the core, even though this might impede efficiency.

Moderator Pirro next noted two other items discussed by the SEC: He had suggested that the Senate discuss how to consolidate our Senate with Armstrong’s, but an SEC member who is also on that OWG suggested we wait until the OWG brings concrete proposals, and the SEC agreed. Pirro then reported on an aspect of the Provost Search: Jim Lobue had been appointed as Senate representative, but he had rotated off the Senate, so the SEC was asked to choose someone else. Pirro pointed out to the Provost and President that Lobue had been appointed without consulting the Senate, and that this should not have happened. The SEC selected Robert Costomiris because of his experience on the Senate, including a term as Moderator.

Minutes 8-23-2017

Undergraduate Committee Report: Ron MacKinnon (COBA), Chair Ron MacKinnon (COBA) noted they “were given two urgent meetings on the 11th and the 17th, and the discussion you heard around this room, we heard it two or three times ourselves.” On August 11 they received from the CIC the recommendation that 126 hours go to 124 and this was approved by the UGC. The second CIC recommendation was for approval of all programs [not courses] they’d looked at at Armstrong and Georgia Southern; the UGC approved these recommendations.

MacKinnon moved approval of those two items. Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked where the two hour reduction was being made. MacKinnon said that was a hard question to answer: “We just received a report, we look at it, we vote on it, we pass it on. Who did the thing in the first place? I’m not exactly sure; some of the guilty people might be in this room, but . . . my understanding is they had a sensitive discussion on it [and] their best judgment [was] that we should agree with the Board of Regents – when they say it is 124 hours, it’s going to be 124 hours.”

Provost Cone said two hours of the four [above 120] will be in the freshman experience orientation class, while the other two will be from Health and Physical Activity. Moderator Pirro called for a voice vote. All but one vote was Yes, so the motions re: programs and hours were Approved.

Regarding the core, MacKinnon said that on August 11th, the UGC had had the same discussion as had just taken place in the senate. They didn’t like it either, so they sent some members to attend a GECC meeting to see if they could come back with a recommendation, and that was what they were presenting as their motion in the report:

“We move to approve the Core Curriculum Work Group Recommendations as a starting place until a critical look can be taken with more faculty input. This motion is made with the understanding that an ad-hoc committee consisting of faculty members from both GECC, UGCC and all campuses to take a close and critical look at the core post-consolidation.”

He thought it would be quite appropriate to put a time frame in there via an amendment. Mark Edwards (COSM) asked what this committee would do after they took this close and critical look at the core. MacKinnon hoped that they would make positive recommendations that would improve the situation. Edwards asked how those recommendations would be implemented.

MacKinnon guessed they’d be handled in the ordinary way, via the UGC and Senate. Edwards asked what the time frame for that would be. MacKinnon noted the motion did not mention a time frame; the UGC was open to amendments on that point. He thought that would perhaps satisfy a lot of faculty.

Jake Simons (COBA) called a timeline “a bit of a sticky wicket.” Everybody wanted this done expeditiously, but on the other hand everybody wanted to make sure it is done right, and the subject of much of our earlier discussion had been that we were operating

under a time constraint. He did not object to a timeline, but said this would boil down to what we do as faculty, and he hoped that an imposed timeline would not preclude continued refinement of proposals if they for some reason did not get in to the committee before a deadline.

Heidi Altman (CLASS) wanted at least to see a certain date for beginning the process, and set dates for parts of the process, such as calls for proposals, so that we know we are actually moving on this and not just letting it stay like it is.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said the motion calls for inter-campus and inter-committee cooperation, and thought the Senate Executive Committee would be responsible for giving them a charge that would include a start date.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) wondered if we couldn't just put such a date in the motion. Moderator Pirro noted we were not yet combined with Armstrong and the motion would require action on both campuses; he did not think we could commit them to action, so we needed a proviso that we have to get cooperation from Armstrong.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) agreed, saying that if we don't like this core, likely they don't either. He added that since we have a 2018 Fall deadline, we should propose meetings in this Fall before we "get things into cement for the catalog that comes out in the Fall [2018]," which he said is usually before the end of Fall semester, or early January. He hoped the group could come up with something better this term. Simons asked whether, if such a group were to begin meeting and discussing this term, it would duplicate or complicate or perhaps dovetail in a synergistic way with the implementation part of the plan.

President Hebert thought it would not complicate, but dovetail.

Moderator Pirro called for a motion to amend.

Jake Simons (COBA) moved we append the words "beginning in Fall Semester 2017." This was seconded.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) thought we needed to add something about this process continuing through post-consolidation. Simons was okay with that. Pirro thought December 1 was the deadline for submitting courses for the following year. That would be a tight deadline and once again create a situation in which people on the committee would be acting under pressure. He suggested people keep that in mind if asked to serve on the committee.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) thought if they began this term we'd be lucky if by the end of Spring there would be something actionable. He thought if we approved the core proposal then before the Senate, that would be in the next catalog as is. He thought if we started working on revising the core this term, we would have something better by 2019 "if we're lucky."

Costomiris thought it imperative that the process get started, and while it could take two years or more, or never be resolved, we might resolve at least some of the problems by this December. Cyr agreed but doubted "the timeline partly because we've basically been complaining about what somebody in one set of minutes called an 'aggressive deadline' and I think that right now we are now setting aggressive deadlines on ourselves, doing exactly the same sort of thing that we've been complaining about having done to us. . . . But I agree, let's get it started now, but if we don't have something in two or three weeks . . . let us realize that that's just the way it is." Moderator Pirro had Mackinnon read the motion again. On Altman's suggestion, "postconsolidation" was removed and "beginning Fall 2017" added. Haberland suggested we include language that would have the committee report to the Senate in November so we would not lose track of the issue, and Moderator Pirro modified that to "reporting on a regular basis to the Faculty Senate." The amended language was Approved by voice vote.

Provost Cone asked if the SEC will appoint the committee. Cyr said so far as he could tell, yes, because it would be a Senate committee, but we would consult with Armstrong.

Moderator Pirro called for a vote on the amended motion. All who voted said Yes, except for one No. The amended motion to approve the core was Approved.