

February Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting: February 13th, 2017. 12:30 - 1:45 pm. KH 4427.

Full Senate Meeting: February 20th, 2017. 12:30 - 1:45 pm. Kennesaw Campus – University Rooms C-E (Carmichael Student Center).

Old Business

1. Non-voting OIE representation on the UPCC – Jorge Perez

New Business

1. Approval of January [meeting minutes](#).
2. Comments from President Olens
3. Parking concerns – Aaron Fowler
4. Teaching effectiveness taskforce – Maureen McCarthy
5. CIP codes – Ron Matson
6. Handbook change process – Val Whittlesey
7. Campus Carry – Jim Davis
 - a. See related communication
8. History of the Holocaust Resolution – Ken White and Federica Santini
9. Any other business?
10. Motion to adjourn.

Information

1. Dissatisfaction with Faculty Senate: Membership resolution – Marianne Holdzkom
 - a. Reminder: Will vote on March 20th.
2. University Council meeting: April 25th – 2 – 3:15 PM in KH 4427. [Agenda and minutes can be found here](#).
3. Senate elections: President Elect, Secretary, Kennesaw/Marietta campus reps, and all liaisons.
 - a. Elections in April meeting. Nominations due 03/31.

**Report on Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness
Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness
Spring, 2017**

Beginning in the Fall semester of 2008 an ad hoc committee was formed to develop recommendations concerning institutional policies and criteria for appraising teaching effectiveness for formative assessment (e.g., faculty professional development) and summative assessment (e.g., annual review, tenure and promotion decisions). The final report from the ad hoc committee was approved by the faculty senate and elements of the report were used to appraise teaching effectiveness. However, the specific recommendations were not formally incorporated into the faculty handbook.

During the Spring semester of 2017 a new ad hoc committee was formed to review and update the initial recommendations. Upon meeting, the committee determined that a revised version of the report would need to move through the shared governance process for final approval. The recommendations will be incorporated into the faculty handbook after approval by the governance bodies. This report contains recommendations for using Student Ratings of Teaching (SRTs) and additional measures to evaluate teaching effectiveness. We also recommend making resources and training for faculty, chairs, and deans available through the office of Academic Affairs.

Student Ratings of Teaching (SRT)

The Georgia Board of Regents Policy manual (Appendix A) requires that all faculty within the Georgia system be evaluated annually. More specifically, students must be provided with the opportunity to provide written feedback on faculty effectiveness. **Kennesaw State University collects student feedback using an electronic, online system that ensures anonymity of the students.** The feedback is then provided to faculty for use in improving instruction.

Consistent with BOR policy, five standard SRT items were developed by the ad hoc committee (2008) and approved by the faculty senate for use at the university level. The items currently used by the university are listed in Appendix B. Individual colleges and departments may include additional items.

Guidelines for using SRTs

Individual faculty members may use SRT data to improve their own classes. The data may also be used during the annual review process or for purposes of promotion and tenure. When data are used for evaluating teaching performance, several important guidelines should be followed. First, it is important to note that SRTs constitute only one measure of teaching effectiveness, so SRTs should never be used as the sole criterion for evaluation.

Data from objectively scored items (Likert items) should be compiled in the form of frequency tables that include both counts and percentages for each Likert category (i.e., strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, no response). Response rates should also be provided for each course section. **Data should not be reported as an average (mean) because it is not**

appropriate to interpret mean values for Likert scale data. It is also not appropriate to compare means between faculty for purposes of evaluation.

Additional Measures of Teaching Effectiveness

The KSU Faculty Handbook (Appendix C) provides criteria for appraising teaching effectiveness. These criteria include pedagogical skills, professionalism, assessment of student learning, professional development, and reflective practice. Moreover, the faculty handbook requires faculty to provide Student Ratings of Teaching (SRT) in the annual review and promotion and tenure process (p. 66), along with at least one additional measure of teaching effectiveness.

Examples of additional measures of teaching effectiveness were developed across each of the five criteria. Faculty may wish to include an additional measure of teaching effectiveness from among the following examples.

Pedagogical Skills

- Samples of Course Materials: Syllabi, daily/weekly schedule outlining content, course readings, resources, materials, standards, learning outcomes, activities, exams, project guidelines, etc.
- Peer evaluation of classroom performance and/or course materials.
- Explanation of situational context and impact on pedagogy (e.g., special courses such as large lecture courses, lab, and/or studio courses).
- Self-report on pedagogies and technologies used in the classroom (can discuss diversity of techniques and innovation).
- Explanation of quality and significance of administration and/or coordination activities, along with materials developed and commentary from faculty and/or students involved.
- Reports on students mentored and/or supervised (and in what contexts: e.g., undergraduate, graduate, research, studio, lab, teaching, clinical work).
- Written comments on teaching, mentoring, and/or supervising from students, community partners, clients—solicited or otherwise.
- Examples of student work completed under teacher's supervision, along with descriptions of venues for presentation and any recognition (with student permission granted or with identifying information removed).
- Letters from students commenting on mentoring/supervising that indicate how the mentoring has influenced student learning.
- Letters attesting to impact of guest presentations in classes (at KSU and/or elsewhere).
- Excerpts of books, websites, or other teaching materials generated, and any letters attesting to quality/impact of those materials.

Professionalism

- Peer evaluation of classroom performance.
- Examples of work with other KSU entities (e.g., Writing Center, Library, Learning Community Program, Career Center/Experiential Learning) to support teaching and student learning.
- Written comments/letters on the professionalism of teaching, mentoring, and/or supervising from students, community partners, clients—solicited or otherwise.
- Responses to student feedback (e.g., from student ratings of teaching, consultations with peers or chairs about student concerns).

Assessment of Student Learning

- Samples of assessments (exams, project guidelines and rubrics).
- Samples of feedback provided to students to promote learning.
- Trend data showing the impact of the teacher on student learning (e.g., includes pre- and posttests).
- Samples of student work demonstrating student learning.
- Examples of work with other KSU entities (e.g., Writing Center, Library, Learning Community Program, Career Center/Experiential Learning) to support teaching and student learning.
- Examples of any local, regional, and/or critical review and recognition of student work.

Professional Development

- Seminars attended or conducted on teaching, including description of new approaches learned from workshops or descriptions of how ideas have been incorporated into teaching.
- Examples of collaboration with faculty at KSU or elsewhere to support teaching.
- Examples/explanations of faculty colleagues mentored on teaching, including comments from colleagues about shared work.
- Evidence/explanation of participation in learning communities, book clubs, and listservs.
- Conference programs/descriptions for presentations, letters, or other evaluations of quality of presentations; samples of presentations or published proceedings.
- Explanation of quality and significance of department, school, college, and/or university teaching committees or presentations at KSU.
- Educational contributions to professional organizations.

Reflective Practice

- A narrative that articulates how supporting evidence demonstrates the faculty member's level of achievement in one or more of the specific criteria for effective teaching
- A narrative that addresses plans for future adjustments and course development.
- Describes how evidence or artifacts demonstrate adjustments of teaching.
- Adjusts teaching practices based on relevant evaluations (e.g., students, peers, chair).
- Demonstrates evidence of change in student, peer or supervisor evaluations.
- Shows evidence of engagement in the scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Uses the results of assessments to improve the quality of instruction.

Resources and training

Although SRTs offer useful quantitative data that is important in the overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness, the data should not be oversimplified. Qualitative data offer equally useful data about teaching effectiveness that demonstrate trends across semesters. Thus it is important to provide guidance to faculty and administrators to ensure effective use of the data.

Training will be provided to Promotion and Tenure committee chairs during the annual workshop provide by the office of Academic Affairs. Training will be provided to Chairs and Deans during training sessions provided by the office of Academic Affairs. Guidance for evaluating teaching effectiveness will be available on the Academic Affairs website.

Members of Task Force: Ron Matson, Maureen McCarthy, Alice Pate, Tom Pusateri, Pat Pierce, Humayun Zafar

Appendix A Georgia Board of Regents Policy

8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel

(Last Modified on December 2, 2009)

8.3.5.1 Faculty

Each institution shall establish definite and stated criteria, consistent with Regents' policies and the statutes of the institution, against which the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated. The evaluation shall occur at least annually and shall follow stated procedures as prescribed by each institution. Each institution, as part of its evaluative procedures, will utilize a ***written system of faculty evaluations by students***, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness as the main focus of these student evaluations.

The evaluation procedures may also utilize a written system of peer evaluations, with emphasis placed on the faculty member's professional development. In those cases in which a faculty member's primary responsibilities do not include teaching, the evaluation should focus on excellence in those areas (e.g., research, administration) where the individual's major responsibilities lie. Institutional policies and procedures shall ensure that each faculty member will receive a written report of each evaluation and that the results of the evaluation will be reflected in the faculty member's annual salary recommendations. Institutions will ensure that the individuals responsible for conducting performance evaluations are appropriately trained to carry out such evaluations (BoR Minutes, 1979-80, p. 50; 1983-84, p. 36; May, 1996, p. 52).

Each institution shall conduct in-depth pre-tenure reviews of all faculty in their third year of progress toward tenure. The criteria established for promotion and tenure, emphasizing excellence in teaching, shall be used as the focus for these reviews. The institution shall develop pre-tenure review policies, as well as any subsequent revisions (BoR Minutes, April 1996, p. 39-47; May 1996, p. 52; February 2007).

<http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/C245/>

Appendix B
Student Ratings of Teaching
Standard Questions for the University

Two items rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

1. Instructor was effective in helping me learn.
2. Overall the content of this course contributed to my knowledge and intellectual skills.

Three open-ended response items.

1. Please comment on the strengths of the instructor.
2. Please comment on ways the instructor might improve.
3. Please comment on the course content.

Appendix C
KSU Faculty Handbook Criteria for Appraising Teaching Effectiveness

**BROAD AND SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR APPRAISING TEACHING
EFFECTIVENESS**

Chapter 5 Section IV.B. of the Faculty Handbook identifies five broad criteria for evaluating the quality and significance of scholarly work “that apply equally to all areas of faculty performance” including Teaching Effectiveness: Clarity and Relevance of Goals, Mastery of Existing Knowledge, Effectiveness of Communication, Significance of Results and Consistently Ethical Behavior. In the context of teaching, the University adopts the following five specific criteria for use in appraising teaching effectiveness¹, each of which exemplifies one or more of the broad criteria in the Faculty Handbook:

1. **Pedagogical Skills** that exemplify Mastery of Existing Knowledge, Effectiveness of Communication, and Significance of Results (e.g., Demonstrates skill, experience and creativity with a range of appropriate pedagogies and technologies; Designs courses to meet student needs at their developmental level in the subject/profession; Communicates effectively; Manages class time well; Provides effective mentoring and/or supervision of students).
2. **Professionalism** that exemplifies Consistently Ethical behavior (e.g., Demonstrates concern and respect for student welfare, learning and development; Demonstrates fairness and consistency; Is approachable and accessible to students; Upholds academic integrity).
3. **Assessment of Student Learning** that exemplifies Mastery of Existing Knowledge and Significance of Results (e.g., Gives timely feedback designed to help students improve; Conducts examinations and assignments that are fair and appropriate for the desired learning outcomes; Uses a variety of strategies to assess student learning; Documents the extent to which students achieve the learning outcomes and shares this information as appropriate for the assessment of the course or program).
4. **Professional Development** that exemplifies Clarity and Relevance of Goals and Mastery of Existing Knowledge (e.g., Pursues appropriate professional development opportunities and integrates into instruction; Stays current with practice, trends and issues related to the courses taught; Contributes to professional dialogue on teaching; Conducts research, presents, and publishes Scholarship of Teaching and Learning).
5. **Reflective Practice** that exemplifies Clarity and Relevance of Goals and Effective Communication (e.g., Uses the results of assessments to improve the quality of instruction; Examines and improves the methods of student assessment; Adjusts teaching practices based on relevant evaluations from students, peers, and/or Chair).



Office of Academic Affairs

This document provides an overview of a commonly used term in higher education – CIP. The document describes what a CIP is and more importantly how it is used. The document will outline the use of CIP codes within KSU’s reporting data warehouse, and in federal and state reporting.

What are Classification of Instructional Programs Codes (CIP Codes)?

The Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) is the taxonomic coding scheme used in higher education. CIP was originally developed in 1980 by the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). Revisions to the CIP taxonomy occurred in 1985, 1990, 2000, and 2010. The most recent version contains 37 two-digit groupings. CIP is the accepted federal standard for identifying instructional/academic programs. With a standard identification system, institutions can make comparisons to other institutions, such as information from national survey results (IPEDS – Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems; CUPAHR - College and University Professional Association for Human Resources), wages that graduates typically earn, enrollment by discipline, and degree completions. CIP codes can also be used to identify courses and for faculty credentialing.

Academic Program CIPs

All of KSU’s academic programs (degree/major programs, certificates, and minors) are assigned a CIP code using the most recent edition of the Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) table.

The CIP code is a six-digit number (xx.xxxx) that identifies academic programs. The first two digits represent the most general grouping of related programs. When the next two digits are added onto the initial two digits, the resulting four digit code represents a more specific program within the general grouping. Finally, adding on the last two digits to give a full six digit code represents a very specific instructional field of study.

Table 1 is an example of how engineering programs are coded using the CIP taxonomy. In this example Engineering is the two-digit family, Computer Engineering is a four-digit program within Engineering, and Software Engineering is a six-digit code representing a discipline within Computer Engineering. It is important to identify the most appropriate CIP code so that reporting data based on CIP codes are represented correctly, internally and externally.

Table 1: Example of a CIP Code

2 digit grouping	14	Engineering
4 digit specialty	14.09	Computer Engineering
6 digit most granular	14.0903	Computer Software Engineering
8 digits- 2 digits are added by the USG System Office for USG Degree/Major Programs	14.090301 (as listed on the BOR- Degrees and Majors Authorized [DMA] list)	Computer Software Engineering

The 2010 edition lists 47 broad first two-digit CIP codes, and 37 of them are meant to encompass all

instructional programs offered by all institutions of higher education across the country and correspond to academic and occupational instructional programs offered for credit at the postsecondary level (see table 2).

Table 2: Two-Digit CIP Code Groupings

01 Agriculture, Agriculture Operations and Related Sciences	30 Multi/Interdisciplinary Studies
03 Natural Resources and Conservation	31 Parks, Recreation, Leisure and Fitness Studies
04 Architecture and Related Services	38 Philosophy and Religious Studies
05 Area, Ethnic, Cultural, Gender, and Group Studies	39 Theology and Religious Vocations
09 Communication, Journalism, and Related Programs	40 Physical Sciences
10 Communications Technologies/Technicians and Support Services	41 Science Technologies/Technicians
11 Computer and Information Sciences and Support Services	42 Psychology
12 Personal and Culinary Services	43 Homeland Security, Law Enforcement, Firefighting, and Related Protective Service
13 Education	44 Public Administration and Social Service Professions
14 Engineering	45 Social Sciences
15 Engineering Technologies and Engineering-related Fields	46 Construction Trades
16 Foreign Languages, Literatures, and Linguistics	47 Mechanic and Repair Technologies/Technicians
19 Family and Consumer Sciences/Human Sciences	48 Precision Production
22 Legal Professions and Studies	49 Transportation and Materials Moving
24 English Language and Literature/Letters	50 Visual and Performing Arts
25 Library Science	51 Health Professions and Related Programs
26 Biological and Biomedical Sciences	52 Business, Management, Marketing, and Related Support Services
27 Mathematics and Statistics	54 History
29 Military Technologies and Applied Sciences	

There are additional CIP codes (beyond the 37) that correspond to residency programs in various dental, medical, podiatric, and veterinary specialties that may lead to advanced professional certification; personal improvement and leisure programs; and instructional programs that lead to diplomas and certificates at the secondary level only. For example, CIP code 53 is for High School/Secondary Diplomas and Certificates.

The best resource for the full list of six-digit CIP codes is found on the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) website: <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55>
You can either browse a full listing of CIP codes (a numerical listing) or search CIP codes (type in search terms). Choose the option in the right menu of the NCES website.

CIP Codes for Degree/Major Reporting

All higher education institutions are required to report the number of degrees conferred each year to the U.S. Department of Higher Education. These data are reported by degree level (associate, baccalaureate, masters, doctorate, and doctor-professional practice). The data displayed in Table 3 shows the number of baccalaureate degrees conferred in 2015-16 for KSU and KSU's peer institutions for CIP code 14.0903. San Jose State University conferred 28 degrees, University of Texas at Arlington conferred 27, and KSU conferred 19.

Table 3: Baccalaureate Degrees Confirmed 2015-16 for CIP Code 14.0903 (Computer Software Engineering)

KSU	19
San Jose State University	28
University of Texas at Arlington	27

Course CIPs

Courses are assigned a 6 digit CIP code based on course content. In general, course CIPs should closely relate to the applicable program(s).

Faculty Credentials and CIP Codes

Faculty credentialing is also tied to CIP codes. Each KSU faculty member is assigned a six-digit teaching CIP code consistent with the faculty member's teaching discipline. The faculty member's teaching CIP code is matched with course CIP codes and the faculty member's earned graduate degree(s) CIP code(s) as evidence that the faculty member is qualified to teach the course(s) that he/she is teaching. Additional qualifications are required when the faculty member's teaching CIP code and/or earned graduate degree(s) CIP code(s) are not consistent with the course code.

Student Loans and CIP Codes

Academic program CIP codes must be assigned to ensure that the US Department of Education can track the following information for students who receive federal loans: grades each term, program length, and program completion by students.

Who Assigns CIP Codes

Academic Programs and Courses

Academic program and course CIP codes are assigned by a team with representatives from the Curriculum Office, Registrar's Office, and the Financial Aid Office, and this team is chaired by the Assistant Manager of Curriculum Systems in the Office of the Provost.

When a KSU college/department wishes to create a new academic program or course in Curriculog, the Assistant Manager of Curriculum Systems assigns the correct six-digit CIP code to the proposal before it is launched. When a new degree/major program proposal is sent to the BOR for review and approval, the BOR adds two additional digits for an eight-digit CIP code and all eight-digit codes can be found on the BOR DMA List for KSU.

https://apps.usg.edu/ords/f?p=118:9:11567816013739::NO::P9_INSTITUTION_LKP,P9_INSTITUTION_NAME:001577,Kennesaw%20State%20University

The Registrar's office ensures that each degree and/or major on a student's record has the correct associated CIP code.

Faculty Credentialing

When an academic department has completed a search, Faculty Affairs receives new faculty hiring documentation which includes a position advertisement, a candidate application, hiring proposal, and, at a minimum, a curriculum vitae and unofficial transcripts for all graduate degrees conferred. Official transcripts for all graduate degrees conferred are due upon hire, including an official translation and/or evaluation for international degrees. Faculty Affairs will review the job description and discipline for which the person is being assigned. This is assessed in relation to the degree major(s) and coursework completed on the faculty member's transcripts. If there is no discrepancy the hiring moves forward. When additional description is required to identify why the individual is believed to be qualified to teach in the prescribed discipline/courses, the hiring unit sends the information to Faculty Affairs in writing for review by the Provost. Faculty titles (e.g., Professor of Electrical Engineering, Assistant Professor of Music) will be based on the CIP code of the faculty member's academic home department/program.

Storing of CIP Codes

Academic program, course, and faculty credentialing CIP codes are stored in KSU's information systems: Banner, Curriculog, and FIS.

Help with CIP Codes

If you need help with a CIP code, contact:

Academic Programs or Courses: Amy Jones, Assistant Manager of Curriculum Systems (470-578-4951; ajone545@kennesaw.edu)

Faculty Credentials: Lynn Lamanac, Director of Faculty and Academic Services (470-578-4416; llamanac@kennesaw.edu)

06Feb17

Old Version:

Currently on last page of section:

Section 3 (Shared Governance and Committees)

Changes to this section of the University Handbook will be routed as outlined here:

Senate Approval → University Council → Associate VPAA → Provost/VPAA → President → President notifies Provost/VPAA of decision → Provost/VPAA notifies Associate VPAA of decision → Associate VPAA forwards change to Publication Coordinator for inclusion in next publication.

New Version:

Section 3.8- Process for Changes to University and Faculty Handbooks and Catalogs

Changes to the University Handbook (Shared Governance section), Faculty Handbook, and Catalogs (Academic Policies section) will be routed as outlined here:

* Faculty Senate Approval → * Chairs and Directors Assembly → * Deans Council → Associate VPAA (Associate VP for Faculty for Handbooks and Associate VP for Curriculum for Catalogs) → Provost/VPAA → President → President notifies Provost/VPAA of decision → Provost/VPAA notifies Associate VPAA of decision → Associate VPAA forwards change to Publication Coordinator for inclusion in next publication.

(*) denotes that the ordering of routing is not sequential.

From: Amanda D. Seals amanda.seals@kennesaw.edu

Subject: Fwd: Campus Carry Update

Date: February 16, 2017 at 9:21 PM

To: Humayun Zafar hzafar@kennesaw.edu, Victoria Brock presidentbrock@ksusga.com, Kathy Rechsteiner krex@kennesaw.edu

AS

FYI - I imagine we'll have a full committee meeting by Wednesday of next week.
Amanda

From: "amanda seals" <amanda.seals@kennesaw.edu>

To: "Charles Amlaner" <camlaner@kennesaw.edu>, "Charles Ross" <cross39@kennesaw.edu>, "kwhite" <kwhite@kennesaw.edu>, "Ron Koger" <rkoger@spsu.edu>, "Erik Malewski" <emalewsk@kennesaw.edu>, "Vaughn Williams" <vwilliam@kennesaw.edu>, "W. Ken Harmon" <wharmon3@kennesaw.edu>, "Arlethia Perry-Johnson" <aperryjo@kennesaw.edu>, "Julie Peterson" <jpeterso@kennesaw.edu>, "Tammy DeMel" <tdemel@kennesaw.edu>, "Lectra Lawhorne" <llawhorn@kennesaw.edu>, "Stopher, Brenda" <bstopher@kennesaw.edu>, "Melisa Baldwin" <mbaldw19@kennesaw.edu>, "James Cooper" <jcooper@kennesaw.edu>, "Sam Olens" <solens@kennesaw.edu>, "Jeff Milsteen" <jmilstee@kennesaw.edu>, "Erika Gravett" <egravett@kennesaw.edu>

Cc: "Fatimot Ladipo" <fladipo1@kennesaw.edu>, "Lynda Johnson" <ljohnson@kennesaw.edu>

Sent: Thursday, February 16, 2017 8:54:17 PM

Subject: Campus Carry Update

Good evening,

Yesterday, an hour prior to the committee meeting, a subcommittee of the House Public Safety Committee added the Campus Carry legislation to its hearing schedule. Today, that same subcommittee met and voted the legislation out, moving it on to the full House Public Safety committee. The following information was sent to all USG Presidents and Government Relations points of contact. In addition, I have added the AP story from this evening.

Next week, the legislature is in session, Tuesday - Friday. I will continue to keep you posted.

Best,
Amanda

From: Rollin Downs <Rollin.Downs@usg.edu>

Date: Thursday, February 16, 2017 at 6:14 PM

Subject: Campus carry update

Dear Presidents,

The campus carry bill – House Bill 280 – passed out of a House public safety subcommittee this afternoon by a vote of 3-1. We spoke with the chairman of the committee this morning and agreed that the chancellor would give his formal

testimony in the full House public safety committee, likely next week.

Our public statement to all media remains: “we support current state law,” which speaks on behalf of the university system and the institutions. We will keep you updated as this bill continues to move.

Thank you.

Georgia House Panel Approves Bill Allowing Guns On Campus

By ASSOCIATED PRESS

SETH WENIG / ASSOCIATED PRESS

Licensed gun owners could carry concealed handguns on public college campuses under legislation advancing in the Georgia House.

A panel approved the bill on Thursday after about an hour of testimony, sending it to the House's full Public Safety Committee. The measure would allow anyone age 21 and up to carry a concealed handgun on campus with a state-issued permit.

Georgia's Republican Gov. Nathan Deal last year vetoed similar legislation. The University System of Georgia also has opposed past efforts.

This year's bill from Republican Rep. Mandi Ballinger of Canton adds an exemption for on-campus preschools, one of Deal's concerns. She says people on campuses have a right to protect themselves.

Opponents fear the change would endanger students and staff.

Georgia is among 17 states banning concealed weapons on campus.

Amanda D. Seals, MEd.

Associate Vice President - Government Relations

Kennesaw State University

KH5405

Office: 470.578.3880

Cell: 404.895.2933

amanda.seals@kennesaw.edu

<http://gr.kennesaw.edu/>

The statement by the White House on International Holocaust Remembrance Day on January 27, 2017, omitted any specific reference to anti-Semitism and the attempted genocide of the Jewish people by the Nazi regime. This presents our campus with a unique opportunity to open discussions among staff, students, faculty, and the community about the Holocaust, twentieth century genocide, and its continuing relevance.

KSU has a deep commitment to engaging in dialogue about these issues, reflected by:

- (1) the work of faculty members teaching in this area in numerous departments, including history, music, theater and performance studies, and interdisciplinary studies;
- (2) the Museum of History and Holocaust Education that serves more than 140,000 people a year through exhibitions, programs, and outreach;

Faculty Senate of Kennesaw State University hereby declares the following resolution:

1. We note that the Jewish people were specifically targeted by the Nazi regime during the Holocaust in an attempted genocide that resulted in the murder of one third of the Jewish people in Europe.
2. The Nazi regime targeted additional groups who were deemed dangerous or inferior, including, but not limited to, political prisoners, the Roma and Sinti, Afro Germans, Slavs, clergy, those with mental and physical disabilities, Freemasons, artists and intellectuals, homosexuals, and Jehovah's Witnesses.
3. Through educational dialogue about World War II, the Holocaust, and other genocides, we invite the campus to consider:
 - Multiple and complex human experiences
 - Ethical and political consequences
 - Respect for difference and diversity of life
 - Acceptance of civic and personal responsibility

We invite the KSU Community to reflect on the history, meaning, and continued relevance of the Holocaust in 2017-2018 by engaging in the following activities.

1. Visiting the following museums:

Museum of History and Holocaust Education at KSU Center
3333 Busbee Drive
Kennesaw, Georgia 30144
<http://historymuseum.kennesaw.edu/>

The Breman Jewish Heritage Museum
<http://www.thebreman.org/>
1440 Spring Street, NW
Atlanta, GA 30309

2. Reading and/or integrating the following books, films, and digital resources into courses, programs, and other campus activities:

Books

Primo Levi, *If This is a Man* and *The Truce* (2003)
Edith Bruck, *Letter to My Mother* (2006)
Anne Frank, *Diary of a Young Girl* (1993)
Irene Awret, *They'll Have to Catch Me First* (2004)
Simon Wiesenthal, *The Sunflower* (1998)
Alexandra Zapruder, *Salvaged Pages* (2004)
Danny Cohen, *Train* (2015)
Elie Wiesel, *Night* (1982)
Primo Levi, *Survival in Auschwitz* (1986)
Doris Bergen, *War and Genocide* (2016)
Maus I and II, *Art Spiegelmann* (1993)
Markus Zusak, *The Book Thief* (2007)
Christopher Browning, *Ordinary Men* (1998)
Deborah Lipstadt, *Denial: Holocaust History on Trial* (2016)
Jerry Spinelli, *Milkweed* (2010)
William Styron, *Sophie's Choice* (1979)
Eleanor Ayer and Helen Waterford, *Parallel Journeys* (2000)
Eric Larson, *In the Garden of the Beasts* (2012)

Literary Collections

Hana Volavkova and Vaclav Havel, *I Never Saw Another Butterfly* (1994)
Lawrence Langer, *Art from the Ashes: A Holocaust Anthology* (1995)
Jean Brown and Janet Rubin, *Images from the Holocaust: A Literature Anthology* (1996)
Linda Raphael and Marc Raphael, *When Night Fell* (1999)
Milton Teichman and Sharon Leder, *Truth and Lamentation* (1993)

Films

Hitler's Children (2011)
The Round Up/Le Rafle (2010)
The Pianist (2002)
Europa, Europa (1990)
Sophie's Choice (1982)
Defiance (2008)
Schindler's List (1993)
Life is Beautiful (1997)
Denial (2016)
Night and Fog (1955)

Digital Resources

- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum
<https://www.ushmm.org/>
 - University of Southern California Shoah Foundation, The Institute for Visual History and Education
<https://sfi.usc.edu/>
 - IWitness, USC Shoah Foundation, One Voice at a Time
<http://iWitness.usc.edu/SFI/default.aspx>
 - Yad Vashem, The World Holocaust Remembrance Center
<http://www.yadvashem.org/>
 - Echoes and Reflections, Leaders in Holocaust Education
<http://echoesandreflections.org/>
 - Museum of History and Holocaust Education at KSU, Legacy Series
http://historymuseum.kennesaw.edu/educators/legacy_series.php
 - The Breman Museum
<http://www.thebreman.org/>
 - The Breman Museum, New Lives: Coming to America exhibition
<http://www.newlives.thebreman.org/>
3. Participating in public programming, including a fall and spring Dinner, Movie and a Tour at the Museum of History and Holocaust Education (for dates and times visit: <http://historymuseum.kennesaw.edu/>) and other events sponsored by other centers and departments.
 4. Organizing an interdisciplinary symposium on the “Holocaust and Public Life” in the 2017-2018 academic year, with support from Academic Affairs, that might include a partnership with area museums and universities, the Southeast Regional Office of the Anti-Defamation League, and the National Center for Civil and Human Rights.