

Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, May 1, 2017
Schuster 130

Members Present: Alison Cook, Rajeev Dabke, Michael Dentzau, Sherika Derico, Lisa Frander, Vanessa Hicks, Patrick Jackson, Michelle Jones, Krystal Kennel, Tesa Leonce, Paul Luft, Laurence Marsh, Ellen Martin, Chris McCollough, Clay Nicks, Yesem Peker, Carolina Paleaz-Morales, Andrew Puckett, Amanda Rees, Diana Riser, Brian Schwartz, Kim Shaw, Richard Stephens, Joy Thomas, Neal Thomson, Alan Tidwell, Kevin Whalen

Guests Present: Chris Markwood, Tina Butcher, Samuel Abegaz, Richard Baxter, Benjamin Blair, John Finley, Mark Flynn, Abraham George, Linda Hadley, Tim Howard, Mary Levan, John Lester, Kimberly McElveen, Pat McHenry, Jennifer Newbrey, Rodrigo Obando, Dennis Rome, Brandt Smith, Glenn Stokes, Amy Thornton, Cindy Ticknor, Brian Tyo, Dustin Worsley

- I. Call to order at 3:00 PM
- II. President's comments and announcements (TIME STAMP 0:18)
 - a. The BOR has approved our institutional budget
 - i. We've had a very decent year with the tuition increase. The legislature has fully funded the formula. This will allow us the opportunity to invest in the first phase of the faculty salary study.
 - b. There will be an update to the campus soon about new faculty positions, new advisors, and new recruiters.
 - c. The Governor signed the budget today:
 - i. There is no evidence that anything for CSU has been taken out of the signed budget.
 - d. Still no word on campus carry:
 - i. NRA is getting ready to meet in Atlanta.
 - ii. Governor has made no indication if he will sign or veto that legislation.
 - e. On the Federal Level, with the budget deal just reached by Congressional Republicans:
 - i. This includes the restoration of summer PELL, which will be very good for our students.
 - ii. We have expressed support of this measure to our delegation.

- f. Internally, we have a work group on policies and procedures which is going well
 - i. This summer we will advertise and hire faculty fellows to work with the general council to fill in some of the gaps that we already know exist in policies and procedures.
 - ii. We've had several questions raised regarding reimbursement for travel between campuses. A new policy will be issued on that in the very near future. That effective July 1, because we operate a shuttle service, we will not be issuing reimbursement for travel between campuses.
- g. We will be going to a summer hours model which means we will close to the public Friday afternoons – Staff still required to get 40 hours of work done for a full week's pay.
- h. Provost search:
 - i. The president has received feedback from some from the search committee.
 - ii. He will be meeting with the Deans tomorrow to get their feedback.
 - iii. There were significantly more concerns and weaknesses raised than strengths articulated.
 - iv. Afraid we are heading into a difficult direction.
 - v. However, a greater number of people are developing a real clarity on the type of person that we want in this position.
- i. Tomorrow, we will be holding the CSU Faculty and Staff Recognition Awards.
 - i. Recognize years of service
 - ii. Faculty awards
 - iii. Staff awards
 - iv. There will be food
- j. Questions
 - i. **Brian Schwartz:** Will we be able to publicize the summer PELL approval for recruitment? **Markwood:** As soon as it is approved, we would move with all deliberate speed to make sure that our students are aware of that change.

- III. Provost's comment and announcements – Tina Butcher (TIME STAMP 7:24)
 - a. Final Exam schedule for summer 2017 has been posted. Questions or concerns should be addressed to Suzy in the Provost's office.
 - b. ROAR: Student Orientation
 - i. June 8 – Orientation for new students for this summer
 - ii. Please check academic calendar for the remaining dates of the orientation for new students in the fall.
 - c. A Professor Emeritus will be awarded tomorrow (May 2) at the Faculty & Staff Excellence Awards.
 - d. Final grades are due by noon on Wednesday, May 10.
 - e. Spring Graduation
 - i. Friday, May 12 @ 5pm - COEHP
 - ii. Saturday, May 13 @ 10am – COLS
 - iii. Saturday, May 13 @ 3pm – TCOBCS/COA
 - iv. All will take place in the Lumpkin Center
 - f. No questions or comments for the Provost
- IV. Executive Officer's comments and announcements – Kim Shaw (TIME STAMP 00:10:41)
 - a. Note of deep gratitude from Officer Kim Shaw to all senators for the hard work they have done this year, particularly the Executive Council.
- V. Old Business
 - a. Workload Policy – Tina Butcher and Glenn Stokes (TIME STAMP 00:11:25)
 - i. Changes to the Workload Policy have been sent out to faculty
 - ii. Changes include:
 - 1. Rewording of the evaluation standards to read as follows:
 - a. *In accordance with the University System of Georgia's policies, faculty members are evaluated based on their performance in teaching, their productivity in research, creative activities and/or academic achievement, their professional growth and development, and their contributions in professional service.*
 - 2. In section 5.3, a section about teaching loads was clarified to read:
 - a. *Faculty whose teaching loads have been reduced as described in Section 1.1 are not eligible to teach an additional course for overload pay. Exceptions will only be considered in extraordinary circumstances*

with recommendation of the chair with approval of the Dean and Provost.

3. In 5.4, a section was reworded to acknowledge the fact that E-Core no longer exists by itself; there is also an E-major component. The amended dialogue reads as follows:

- a. *eCore and eMajor courses may only be taught as an overload through the same approval process as outlined above. Compensation for teaching an eCampus course is determined by eCampus policy and provided through eCampus.*

iii. Questions

1. **Richard Stephens:** Was the issue of Associate Chair dealt with at all? **Glenn Stokes:** Not at this level. There is too much variety in assignments across the departments and colleges. **Brian Tyo:** Any discussion on Universal variables things like class sizes, new preps, number of different preps, etc. **Stokes:** All of those things have been pushed down to college level.
2. **MOTION** (Neal Thomson): Move to approve the workload policy. Second (Chris McCollough)

Motion Passes: 18-1-3

- b. Promotion and Tenure policy – Ellen Roberts joined by Tim Howard and Brian Tyo (TIME STAMP 00:17:19)

- i. First amended change to the Promotion and Tenure Procedures refers to the post tenure review. There were concerns that it wasn't fair for administrators to opt into Post Tenure Review when our policy has been that they don't have to do it, but by not doing it, they also wouldn't get an increase in pay. We reverted back to the language that was there to begin with that says: *Administrators with tenure who have some teaching responsibilities will not be subject to post-tenure review as long as the majority of their duties are administrative (typically department chair level or higher). Administrators who return full-time to the faculty will be placed in the post-tenure review cycle and evaluated under those guidelines in the fifth year following their return and at subsequent five-year intervals.*

- ii. Questions:

1. **Neal Thomson:** A possible reason to seek post tenure review is that it is at this point, according to policy, that faculty are supposed to be evaluated for equity adjustments. **E. Roberts:** I think we are trying to make equity adjustments anyway. **Amanda Rees:** Are you being reviewed at that point then as a faculty member or chair? **Roberts:** We're talking about administrators. **Thomson:** It's still in writing in our by-laws, that at post tenure review, you get an equity review. **Rees:** We still plan on focusing on equity? **Roberts:** It should be possible in the future to give people going up for Post Tenure Review some sort of pay bump although that is not policy yet. **Thomson:** Somewhere else in one of our policies it says if anyone has an unsuccessful post tenure review they are ineligible for merit pay increase. **Roberts:** Yes.

iii. Second amended change refers to voting procedures regarding abstentions. The most frequent and problematic abstentions were caused by two kinds of issues: A lack of understanding of procedures and a conflict of interest. The following wording was added as a result:

1. *Deans or their designees shall ensure that the chairs of committees at each level are aware of the timeline as well as the policies and processes that guide the review, vote, and reporting of results. In the case of dual appointments, the dean and provost will determine at the time of hire which department will be considered the home department for purposes of promotion and tenure review.*
2. No questions or comments on this change

Second half of this issue is in regard to unusual circumstances. The following wording was submitted:

3. *At times, unusual circumstances may arise (for example, when an administrator [typically someone at the department chair level or higher] stands for promotion or tenure) that call for a modification to these processes by the Office of the Provost. For example, in colleges in which the dean appoints additional members to the college personnel committee and a dean, associate dean, or assistant dean stands for promotion or tenure, it will be the responsibility of the Provost or designee from the Office of the Provost, to appoint the additional members.
An administrator up for review who believes a conflict of interest exists because of the membership of one of the personnel committees may appeal (prior to the review by that committee) to the Office of the Provost. The Provost or designee from the Office of the Provost will determine whether or not the conflict warrants the replacement of a faculty member, and if so, identify a substitute member of the committee for that review. It will be the responsibility of the*

Office of the Provost to ensure fairness in the process and the avoidance of conflicts of interest.

The review of administrators that takes place within the college will be as follows:

- *A department chair will be reviewed by the department personnel committee (if one exists), college personnel committee, and dean;*
- *An assistant or associate dean will be reviewed by the department personnel committee (if one exists), department chair, college personnel committee, and dean;*
- *A dean will be reviewed by the department personnel committee (if one exists), department chair, and college personnel committee.*

4. Questions:

Brian Schwartz: Is “identifying a substitute member of the committee” in reference to all the candidates or just the one?

Roberts: That candidate or that administrator. **Schwartz:** This is a really difficult situation. I don’t really know how to do this. Do other universities have procedures for this issue? **Roberts:** I don’t

believe we looked at that this time. **Clayton Nicks:** I think there was some mention of this process being the same across, but what matters is that there is a process in place. **Roberts:** Would this

group be agreeable to not having a Dean reviewed by a department chair? **Linda Hadley:** The process would be the same for

administrators as well as faculty. So, why did it change? **Roberts:**

We thought of a couple situations that seemed to warrant putting something back in. **Hadley:** The reason for the change is that the

administration should not go through the same process as the faculty? It seems to me that you are opening yourself up to a whole

bunch of lawsuits, if the process is not the same. I think it is a big mistake for individualized processes. In situations where you said,

the dean would overturn the faculty, it is not a matter of the dean or the provost overturning the faculty, it’s a matter that they make

an independent decision, but it doesn’t overturn the faculty vote. **Roberts:** A new administrator may not know enough or they may

be confused about the policies. It’s very difficult for a new person coming in to go against the faculty recommendation. **Hadley:** I

know a special process was created for a specific faculty member. Other people went through the process and had problems. We are leaving ourselves open to a lawsuit. **Ellen Martin:** We spent a lot of time last month with the idea of having an axe to grind or there was some other element involved with the decision-making, we never really talked about the circumstances if the materials presented did not reflect their need for promotion. **Roberts:** This isn't meant to address those whose materials aren't up to par. But, we do have situations where there is an obvious conflict of interest. **Martin:** This doesn't include a bias situation, which occurs in any personnel committee. **Roberts:** Administrators, by the nature of their work, have to make decisions that adversely affect faculty and then those faculty, end up on the committee evaluating the administrator. Those are the situations we're talking about. **Schwartz:** A department chair is not free to evaluate the Dean, frankly. That could extend to the committee, even though there can be some anonymity there. There might be a fear of retaliation. This is a really difficult problem to solve and it should be avoided in the future. It is a good QEP problem to solve. **Howard:** The P& T candidate does not make the final decision on who sits on their review committee. The candidate cannot control the make up of their committee. This should be evaluated at the Provost's office. **Thomson:** Why limit it to administrators? Why not give all faculty the ability to appeal to the Provost and ask to have someone with bias removed from their committee. **Roberts:** It doesn't happen nearly as much with faculty, as it does with administrators. **Thomson:** It would solve the problem. **Schwartz:** It doesn't solve all the problems, but it does solve some. **Kim Shaw:** We've just said that administrators can't do post tenure review, but we're still allowing administrators to go up for promotion and possibly tenure – that seems to be inconsistent. **Roberts:** I don't know how we fill

all the positions without offering promotion. **Shaw:** The solution is to only have people in those positions that don't need promotion.

Roberts: Ideally, yes, but there are small departments or emergency situations that do not allow us that luxury. We are limiting the pool if we don't allow administrators to go forward for promotion. **Thomson:** Promotion is not a forced process. If we

froze it, then they couldn't go up for promotion. **Hadley:** It is not inconsistent. Post tenure is for faculty members who are spending 50% of their time or more as administrators. If you are trying to get promoted, it is for things you've done in the past. **Schwartz:** It

would be easier if people in those positions were not allowed to go up for promotion while in the office. **Roberts:** It would be problematic in many departments. **Schwartz:** Maybe while they are chair, they will not go up for promotion?

Thomson: Key thing is, it's voluntary, you don't have to do it. **Schwartz:** What if you're chair and the departmental committee is afraid to evaluate you

honestly for fear of retribution. **Rees:** It is good to have the policy at some point. **Martin:** Is the process the same? – We can continue to move forward in the process even with an unfavorable vote.

Thomson: If you're trying to convince someone to be a chair: the idea that you will not be able to go up for promotion, will not make it easier to find people to chair. **Martin:** My own personal opinion

is they go through the process. If they don't like the result, then they can appeal it. I don't think the department chairs sometimes do faculty justice when they just say everybody's a five and they don't truly review their performance. It provides faculty with some false sense that they're doing fine. The chairs have not done their due diligence and that causes issues. We are interjecting issues that

don't need to be present. **Roberts:** I think we need to do a better job explaining the job to the committee. I recommend to the Deans

that we do a better job explaining the role of the personnel committees at the beginning of the academic year.

- iv. Ellen Roberts: On page 10, cut out the paragraph that begins: *An administrator up for review who believes a conflict of interest exists...*
From the bullet points at the bottom of page 10, we will take out “Department Chair”. There was some conversation about including assistant or associate deans. **Rees:** Do we have to get this done by August?
Roberts: Yes, so the whole process is improved for the new people coming in. There was more discussion about clarifying the role of the assistant or associate Dean.
- v. **MOTION** (Ellen Martin): Move to strike the paragraph that begins: *An administrator up for review who believes a conflict of interest exists...*
Second (Michael Dentzau)
Motion Passes: 17-0-2
- vi. **MOTION** (Ellen Martin) Move to strike department chair from third bullet point on page 10
Second (Alan Tidwell)
Motion Passes: 17-1-3
- vii. Third amended change is in regards to departmental and college voting procedures and the handling of abstentions and conflicts of interest. The added wording is as follows:
 1. *If during the meeting information is presented that seems to committee members or the chair to be a conflict of interest or if there are questions of procedure in voting, the meeting will be temporarily halted and the department chair or designee (which may be an assistant chair or member of the dean’s office) asked to join the meeting to determine how to proceed. If it is determined that a conflict of interest exists with a faculty member, that member should be excused from further participation/discussion and the vote for that candidate. The affirmative vote from a majority of those remaining at the committee meeting is required for the vote to be a positive recommendation.*
 2. Questions: **Brian Schwartz:** Who would determine that it is necessary to stop the meeting and call in the chair or the dean?
Roberts: Any committee member. **Schwartz:** Can that be clarified?
Who determines in the end that the person can be excused from the

committee? **Roberts:** If the committee member is willing to say they have a conflict of interest, that person can be excused from the meeting. **Schwartz:** Please clarify this. **Amanda Rees:** These are big things – I don't feel comfortable making a decision in the time available. **Yesem Peker:** Does the person need to explain the reason they are recusing themselves or have a conflict of interest. **Roberts:** I think they should before the meeting. **Laurence Marsh:** What if the person is not willing to take themselves off the committee, but there is a conflict of interest. **Roberts:** That's when we bring in the department chair and anyone can bring in the department chair that feels the procedures aren't being followed. **Tesa Leonce:** Point of clarification: The person recused – will not be replaced. Some people choose to abstain. **Roberts:** It doesn't count negatively on the candidate. **Larry Dooley:** It changes the number you need for your majority. **Rees:** Is it really the role of the chairperson to adjudicate the claim being presented? Perhaps the Dean should be coming in.

There was discussion on certain supposed situations where one might wish to abstain from the vote.

- viii. Point of Order: After discussing this topic for one hour, should the conversation keep going or should we table it for a future time.
 1. **Ellen Martin:** Were there other things that the Senate wants to bring up? **Richard Stephens:** The issue of mandatory peer review for teaching. Many people in his department have expressed concern about this. **Roberts:** Mandatory peer reviews were in the previous document. They were not explained very well. We cleared it up a bit. **Shaw:** Those of you who still have concerns, please get them to Dr. Roberts ASAP. **Dr. Butcher:** We need four

or five senators to be added to the committee who can continue to work on this document.

2. Call for volunteers:

- a. Ellen Martin – COEHP
- b. Diana Riser – COLS
- c. Alan Dahl – TCOBCS (already on the committee)
- d. Paul Luft – Library
- e. Chris McCollough - COA

c. Report on fees– Frank Hardyman (TIMESTAMP 1:25:30)

i. Budget information from BOR:

1. We submitted \$242,000 in requests for fees:
2. \$31,000 approved
3. \$210,000 not approved for FY 2018

ii. We've lost about \$301,000 in fees.

iii. \$1.2 million in fees have stayed in the system.

iv. Questions: **Clayton Nicks:** Any plans on how to fund programs that have lost fee revenue? **Markwood:** Direct conversations with Dean to use other funds. Must be extremely cautious, fee money must be used as intended. Asked Frank to do an internal audit. We will not be surprised to see an audit from the BOR. Looking at a lot of options including state money.

d. Glenn Stokes: Recommendation as a friend to the Senate to change sequence of the agenda and do elections first. No objections.

VI. New Business: Senate election of officers (TIME STAMP 1:30:33)

i. Need to elect: Executive Officer, Executive Secretary, Executive Council (2 members), Committee on Committees (3 members), Committee on Elections (3 members), Senate Budget Advisory Committee (2 members)

1. Executive Officer

- a. Ellen Martin nominated Brian Schwartz; Nomination declined
- b. Amanda Rees nominated Ellen Martin; Nomination happily accepted

2. Executive Secretary
 - a. Diana Riser nominated Krystal Kennel; Nomination accepted
 3. Executive Council
 - a. Clayton Nicks nominated Michael Dentzau; Nomination accepted
 - b. Brian Schwartz self nominated
 4. Committee on Committees
 - a. Laurence Marsh self nominated
 - b. Diana Riser self nominated
 - c. Sherika Derico self nominated
 5. Committee on Elections
 - a. Patrick Jackson self nominated
 - b. Rajeev Dabke self nominated
 - c. Alison Cook self nominated
 6. Senate Budget Advisory Committee
 - a. Neal Thomson self nominated
 - b. Michelle Jones self nominated
- ii. Neal Thomson moves to close nominations. Congratulations to all.
 - iii. Kim Shaw: All those in favor of this slate of nominees:

Motion Passes: 21-0-0

VII. Standing Committees

- a. Distance Learning – Lisa Frander and Amy Thornton (TIME STAMP 1:39:56)
 - i. Worked very closely with the Center of Online Learning
 - ii. Still Quality Matters grants in process. Approximately 30 courses that are QM certified.
 - iii. Hosted town hall meetings, where faculty were invited to give feedback about technology needs. These will be continued in the fall.
 - iv. 5 members of COOL took a trip to Jacksonville to visit their technology center.

- v. We have deployed a student success survey – in process of compiling the data.
 - vi. Amy Thornton – Online courses must be accessible from the point of creation regardless of any student disability. This is required by federal law. **Tina Butcher:** There are people who are actively looking to file lawsuits in this area and if we are not in compliance, we will be very vulnerable. **President Markwood:** If we are found non-compliant, we lose the ability for our students to have financial aid.
- b. National Scholarship – Sarah Bowman (TIME STAMP 1:46:03)
- i. Working on creating a website for students/faculty with information about scholarships.
 - ii. Investigated best practices at other universities.
 - iii. Developed an internal scholarly awards database.
 - iv. Distributed star cards to faculty members to give out to high achieving students
 - v. Worked with registrar to look for students who might be looking for scholarly awards
 - vi. Met with various faculty and departments
 - vii. Next year the committee will continue to develop a social media presence
- c. Shared Governance – Wade Holley (TIME STAMP 1:49:58)
- i. Since 2012, there has been some sort of Shared Governance Committee – and they have been considering the creation of a university council. Still considering personnel for the committee to consist of two administrators, two faculty reps, two students, and two staff.
 - ii. Purpose is to examine issues that affect more than one constituency of the University.
 - iii. There will be an opinion questionnaire passed out electronically in the near future.
 - iv. The committee will be getting the senate opinion first, then open up questionnaire to all faculty.
 - v. Kim Shaw: Please send comments to Dr. Holley.

- d. Academic Advising– Stephanie Lahnala (TIME STAMP 1:54:07)
 - i. Met in April – Stephanie Lahnala was nominated as chair, Kristen Hansen is the secretary
 - ii. In the fall, the committee plans to focus on FERPA and discussing the role of advising in tenure and promotion.
- e. Faculty Grievance (TIME STAMP 1:55:03) – Larry Dooley
 - i. The committee has been discussing two things - scope: what can we, the committee, change or delete; and procedures: a common complaint is that it feels as though they are reinventing the wheel at the beginning of the process.
 - ii. The committee is continuing to work on clarifying the process and hope to have a report to the Senate by fall.
- f. Ad hoc Faculty Communications (1:57:15) – Mary Levan
 - i. Recommendation to make a do-not-reply-email, and a facebook/twitter account available to the faculty by the technology of their choice. The committee will set up a Google chat discussion board where the discussion can continue.
- g. Honors Education (1:59:17) – Andrea Frazier
 - i. Report on a major change that is happening in the Honors College.
 - ii. Please see handouts attached at the end of this document.

VIII. Standing Committees – written reports

- a. Diversity Programs and Services Advisory – James Coleman (TIME STAMP 2:03:00)
 - i. Unable to be here because of a bicycle accident.
- b. Retention, Progression and Graduation – Jennifer Brown (TIME STAMP 2:03:18)
 - i. Here is the written report submitted to the faculty: *In February, the Committee examined the academic standing after probation 1 of two fall cohorts. The Committee found the majority of those students were placed on academic exclusion or left the university. To improve the students' academic standing (i.e., probation and academic exclusion), the committee proposed a peer mentorship program, which will be piloted in*

fall 2017 through the ACE Office. Targeted participants will be undergraduate students from the College of Letters and Science who have been granted an override for academic exclusion (approximately 15). After the student is granted an override for academic exclusion, he or she will meet with the peer mentor and staff coordinator to develop a contract based on their needs. The peer mentor will serve as a resource for academic integration into the CSU community. A grant through the Department of Education, which was submitted this month, could expand the program participants if funded.

IX. New Business, cont.

- a. Salary Equity report from Senate Budget Advisory Committee – Clay Nicks (TIME STAMP 2:04:22)
 - i. Senate Budget Advisory Committee has met three times since the last senate meeting.
 - ii. Frank Hardymon has come up with a standard to determine Lecturer pay.
 - iii. Regarding the Equity adjustments, the goal being to get everyone to 90% of the median.
 - iv. The committee recommends to apply the standardized method to determine lecturer comparative salaries.
 - v. **MOTION** from Committee
Motion Passes: 18 - 0 - 0
 - vi. Second recommendation: Annual contracts for 2017 – ‘18 will include specifically: 1) amount of merit pay (if applicable); 2) amount of equity pay (if applicable); 3) amount increased for new parking fee (\$45); 4) amount for promotion (if applicable); 5) CUPA salary CIP code (with web link to CUPA for information); 6) and any salary adjustment amounts if applicable (e.g. retention).
 - vii. Some discussion and clarification
 - viii. **MOTION** from Committee
Motion Passes: 17-1-0
 - ix. Third recommendation: Recommend the following steps for the process:

1. Deans will apply merit pool first (*note – timeline on this TBA*)
2. After merit funds are applied, funds will be added to get individual to 90% of the median (provided meritorious performance as assessed by Dean)
 - x. Some discussion and clarification
 - xi. MOTION from Committee

Motion Passes: 17-0-1

- X. End of Meeting: (TIME STAMP 2:19:27)

The Honors Program has transitioned to a point system to determine eligibility for graduating with honors.

These elements remain the same:

Students must earn a GPA of 3.4

Students must complete a thesis or alternative to thesis project

Students must complete the intro seminar and Great conversations – common areas where students are encouraged to thinking in an interdisciplinary way

In addition to these criteria, students must earn 30 points in activities aimed at personal enrichment, academic enhancement, and research and inquiry.

Personal enrichment- this component of the program encourages and recognizes current student activity showing engagement in their communities, including career development

Academic enhancement – this component of the program encourages and recognizes student participation in academic activities that broadens them as scholars. This component also encourages problem solving and multiplicity or multiculturalism

Research and inquiry - this component of the program encourages and recognizes a student's deep engagement in their discipline

Students have to complete at least 3 areas in each bin to earn the full 10 points for each component, with the individual components having its own weight.

For example, a student can earn a total of 4 points for career readiness activity (personal enrichment)

The Honors College has also revised several honors courses to either narrow the scope, support the learning goals clarified by this new point system or align with the numbering convention currently employed by the university.

For example, under the academic enrichment bin, students must be involved in international education. So, in addition to students having the option to study abroad, students can complete Hons 3010 Global Perspectives, wherein students can participate in learning activities that grow their understanding of global perspectives. A new course Hons 3015 is the course used for students to record their experiences with study abroad or service learning. So, students can stay at home or go abroad in the pursuit of an international education.



Requirements to Earn the Honors College Seal

1. Honors Introductory Seminar: ITDS 1779H Scholarship Across the Disciplines
2. Earn at least 10 points in each of the following categories:

BETTER:
Personal Enrichment
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Leadership• Community Service• Career Preparation• Enrichment Seminars• National Recognitions

BROADER:
Academic Enhancement
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Honors Courses• International Education• Minors & Certificates• Academic Seminars• Honors Study Trips

DEEPER:
Research & Inquiry
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Honors Contracts• Independent Studies• Field Based Problem-Solving• Publications• Presentations & Performances• Service Learning

3. HONS 3555: Great Conversations (3 credit hours; A course that encourages interdisciplinary conversations)
4. Honors Senior Capstones & Thesis Sequence (3 credit hours)
5. Achieve at least Cum Laude Honors (3.4 GPA or greater)