

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

1999

Faculty Senate Minutes-1999

Georgia Southern University

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



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

Recommended Citation

"Faculty Senate Minutes-1999" (1999). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 6.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/6>

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

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

DATE: March 1, 1999

Members Present: *absent #substitute

College of Business Administration: Dr. John Brown (1), Dr. Trey Denton (1), Dr. John Hatem (1), Dr. Lowell Mooney (1), Dr. Jake Simons (1, 2), Dr. Jack White (1, 2)

College of Education: Dr. Randy Carlson *, Dr. Elizabeth Downs*, Dr. Mary Jackson (R. Carroll 1, 2), Dr. Stephanie Kenney (2) (L. Plevyak, 1), Dr. Kent Rittschof (1, 2), Dr. Robert Warkentin (2)

College of Health and Professional Studies: Dr. June Alberto* (B. Joyner, 2), Dr. Kent Guion (1, 2), Dr. Diane Hamilton (B. Joyner,1), Dr. Jerri Kropp (1, 2), Dr. Larry Mutter (1)

College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences: Ms. Kathy Albertson (1, 2), Dr. Charles Crouch (2), Dr. Marc Cyr (1, 2), Dr. Hal Fulmer (1), Dr. Chris Geyerman (1), Dr. Barbara Hendry (1, 2), Dr. Clara Krug (1, 2), Mr. Mike Mills (Alt) (1, 2), Dr. Sue Moore (1, 2), Dr. Curtis Ricker (1, 2), Dr. George Shriver (1, 2), Dr. Steven Weiss (1), Dr. Janie Wilson (1, 2)

College of Science and Technology: Dr. Martha Abell (1), Dr. J. B. Claiborne (1, 2), Dr. Gerald Jones (1), Dr. Bruce McLean (1, 2), Dr. Anne Pierce (1, 2), Dr. David Stone (1), Dr. John Wallace (1), Ms. Pamela Watkins (1, 2)

Library: Ms. Iris Durden (1, 2), Mr. David Lowder (1, 2)

Administrators: Acting President Harry Carter (1, 2), Acting Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Linda Bleicken (1, 2), Vice President James Britt (1), Vice President Ron Core (1, 2), Vice President Jack Nolen (1, 2), Ms. Laura Davidson (1, 2), Dean Charlene Black (1, 2), Dean Arnie Cooper (1, 2), Dean Carl Gooding*, Dean Roosevelt Newson (1, 2), Dean Jimmy Solomon*, Dean Lane Van Tassell (1, 2), Dean Fred Whitt*

Representatives: SGA President: Russell Keen (1, 2), SGA Vice President for Academic Affairs Jennifer Washburn (1, 2), Senate Secretary: Dr. Kent Rittschof (1, 2), Senate Librarian: Dr. Janie Wilson (1, 2), Parliamentarian: Dr. Jeff McLellan (1, 2), EPC/SPC Representative: Dr. Trey Denton (1, 2), EPC/SPC One-year Apprentice: Dr. Sue Moore (1, 2), NCAA Representative: Dr. Richard Rogers (1, 2), Lias.: Ms. Ruth Ann Rogers (1,2)

Alternates: 1st Pat Walker, CLASS, Susan Williams, COBA, Linda Plevyak, COE, Barry Joyner, CHPS, Sonya Gaither, LIB, Quentin Fang, COST

2nd Richard Tichich, CLASS, Cindy Randall, COBA (1), Alice Hosticka, COE, Bernita Hamilton, CHPS (1), Marvin Goss, LIB, Norman Schmidt, COST (2)

3rd Jorge Suazo, CLASS, Ken Johnston, COBA (2), Dan Rea, COE, Amy McCrory, LIB, Kelly McLain, COST

4th Ellen Hendrix, CLASS, Jim Stephens, COE, Jocelyn Poole, LIB, Sharon Barrs, COST

5th Marie Franklin, CLASS, Ruth Carroll, COE, Charles Skewis, LIB, Mark Welford, COST

6th Tim Giles, CLASS, Fred Smith, LIB, Mohammad Davoud, COST

7th Vicki Zwald, COE, Lynn Walshak, LIB, Carol Nessmith, COST

VISITORS: March 1st: Virginia Samiratedu, Office of the Provost; Kevin Larson, George-Anne; Howard Kaplan, Research Services; a large group of students and faculty who remained through item 3 on the agenda.

Acting President Harry Carter called meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 4:30 p.m.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the March 1, 1999 meeting:

Russell Keen (SGA President) motioned that item 7, the Discontinued Athletic Programs, be moved up to item 3. Motion and revised agenda for the March 1, 1999 meeting were approved.

2. Approval of the December 2, 1998 Minutes: Dr. Kent Rittschof, Senate Secretary:

Minutes were approved with a clarification of the motion on the summer 2000 Calendar.

3. Discontinued Athletic Programs: SGA President Russell Keen and President Carter:

A lengthy discussion took place regarding the addition of women's track and the discontinued athletic programs. Faculty members, students, alumni, and senators spoke on the decision to cut men's swimming, diving, and cross-country teams. A key issue was the exclusion of students in the decision making process. Documents on the issue were distributed. A sample of the discussion follows.

Mr. Tim Willis (Alumni Guest) said, "As the Senate proceeds and as this administration hopefully proceeds on reconsideration of dropping these two very important sports, these sports that consist of 40 to 50 athletes, male athletes, total. Remember what these programs have meant to this university. Remember the commitment that this university has made to these programs in the past two decades. Remember that many hundreds of athletes have come through these programs, achieved success, and have gone on to do good things with their lives. That was a commitment that this university made to establish those programs in the first place. A commitment now that this administration sees fit to abandon. Also remember every step of the way with these student athletes in the past, now, and potentially in the future a faculty member was involved. High-paying coaches weren't brought in to coach these teams. Usually a faculty member in another department, in a the various departments around campus came out at 6:00 in the morning, ran with their teams, swam with their teams, and were with them every step of the way, gave thousands upon thousands of hours to these student athletes in the past,

the present, and potential future athletes. And now the commitment that the faculty of this university has given to these programs is being abandoned. That commitment is now being set aside in saying your commitment does not matter. Finally, let's remember these programs have meant something to this university for a very small fee--a fee in which most of these athletes pay to the university themselves because these are not athletes that are on full scholarships. These are athletes that come here primarily to compete but in turn pay their full tuition to be students on this campus. Also as one of the original cross-country team members wrote me last week, and I will quote, his name is Christian Jentrud. He was an international exchange student in the early 80s, and was on the original cross-country team. He said we didn't have much as a team; we didn't have much money; we didn't have much support, but the one thing that we did have was the knowledge and the appreciation that those that followed would at least have the opportunity to compete in something they loved--to be a part of something. From a personal standpoint, Georgia Southern cross-country and as a student athlete here, has meant the world to me, and has enabled me to achieve great things in my own career, not only in athletics, but also in life. And finally, if these are a financial concern, never once has the alumni of this university, ever received any kind of documentation soliciting any kind of fund-raising to help keep these programs alive or to establish new programs. So I submit to you let's move with caution because this can serve as a blemish on the record of Georgia Southern University's athletic career, athletic programs, that are positive in nature and positive to all communities around Georgia and all communities in which these student athletes come from. And I'd like to take this last little opportunity to thank the current student athletes that are here today, to thank you for what you have done for this university. Regardless of whether this administration appreciates the work you've done, all alumni who have ran before you or swam before you."

Mr. Derek Chaput (CHPS Guest) said, "My name is Derek Chaput and I am currently the head men's swimming coach at Georgia Southern and an instructor for the Department of Health and Kinesiology. The reason I am here today goes back to a time when my parents taught me to fight for things that you believe in. Instructors at Georgia Southern, many of you that are here in this room, continued to instill that same philosophy in me until I graduated with my masters degree in 1996. Georgia Southern University athletic department strives to be broad-based in serving the needs of the students in the state of Georgia. The matter in which this decision was made is a far cry from that statement. Many of the students affected by this decision chose Georgia Southern because they wanted an education and an opportunity to use their HOPE scholarships. Many of these students also chose the university in order to participate in athletics. Many of the students that are involved receive athletic aid in amounts of a few hundred dollars or just textbooks. They're not here to receive money, but they are here to receive an education. Many of these students have been swimming or competing in cross-country since they were six and understand that competitive swimming or cross-country will end once they finish college. Swimming is an excellent tool for the university because it extends the teaching that the students receive in the classroom. Students who participate in athletics or organizations have an advantage before they enter the outside world. Athletics teaches leadership, time management, people skills, and the list can go on and on. The university is going to lose a portion of its students who excel in those areas if this decision is carried out. I understand the consequences that the university can face if we do not comply with Title IX. The intent of Title IX is to increase opportunities for women, not decrease opportunities for men. The excuse that other universities are not doing it, are doing this is not acceptable. Georgia

Southern can't settle for this type of solution. I'm not upset with the creation of women's track, again I'm disappointed that there was no opportunity for faculty, students, and the community to help our athletic department and the university create this new team. The addition of women's track was discussed in 1993, and scheduled to be added in 1996. Here we are in 1999 and we still don't have a track team until this Fall. Only a few individuals knew this was going to happen. No one was aware of the consequences or a solution that would result if we didn't receive extra funding or an alternative solution to our Title IX problems. There was no plea to the students, faculty, community, and local corporations to help us with this issue. A very small group made this decision and I understand how difficult it must have been for them. However, the thoughts and the ideas of many outweigh the few. Again, I am here because I think this decision is wrong and I have been instilling the same principles taught to me over the years to my team and I will continue to lead them until this issue is finished. I am asking for your help and support to correct a wrong. This is only a brief synopsis of a very serious issue and I appreciate the time that you have given me. Thank you."

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) motioned that the Long-Range Athletic Planning Committee reconvene with student representation and more faculty input to re-examine the question of whether to discontinue athletic programs, so that a more informed decision can be made.

Dr. Harry Carter discussed many issues regarding NCAA Title IX (gender equity) compliance, including the possible loss of Federal Funds, court involvement, the 17 swimmers/10 runners involved, the commitments GSU has made to those athletes, the decision process, and the budget considerations.

Dr. Lane Van Tassell (Academic Affairs) stated, "Having served on the Athletic Committee for, I don't know how many years over the last 25 years, but a good many, student participation on that committee has been erratic, at best. And I can tell you, I have not done a content analysis of those minutes, as Janie suggested we might want to do, but I would suggest to you that if you did them you would find first of all, many many occasions when the student representatives were not there but you would also find many many occasions where these issues were discussed."

Mr. Russell Keen (SGA President) stated, "The issue at hand here is giving the students a voice. Giving the students a voice in a program that they contribute a lot of their funds to. Faculty's Operating Principles, 'We acknowledge that we set the example for others within the University.' This body right here can set the example and send a clear message that the students at this University have a voice in what goes on. It's beyond my comprehension to why at some point someone just didn't say "Well hey, we've got an issue that involves students." In this memo from Sam Baker to Dr. Core it says they knew that this was going to be a tough pill to swallow for the students. But no one bothered to ask students to be there in the discussion. I encourage each of you to vote for this motion on the floor to clear your conscience and to allow students their voice."

Dr. Richard Rogers (NCAA Representative) stated, "You don't find out whether you are in compliance with Title IX or not until someone takes you to court. I don't think there are any federal programs for deciding whether an institution is in compliance or not. An institution at its own expense can hire a

consultant to come in and advise them to study their situation."

The Senate approved the motion that the Long-Range Athletic Committee reconvene with student representation and more faculty input to re-examine at the question and make a more informed decision about cutting the athletic programs. There were 26 votes in favor, and 5 votes in opposition. The large crowd of visitors applauded and most of them left the meeting.

4. Approval of the Librarian's Report: Dr. Janie Wilson, Senate Librarian.

Dr. Barbara Hendry (CLASS) requested a clarification of dates on the Undergraduate Council minutes. Dr. Janie Wilson was checking into these dates.

Dr. Charlene Black indicated that notifications for Honors Committee members were reportedly distributed to departments. Honors Committee members should be contacted for further information.

Dr. Carter said that the marketing plan feedback was available on the web through the Presidents' Office web page.

Dr. Charlene Black indicated that the policy proposal to administratively withdraw students from classes was still on the table at the Undergraduate Council.

The Librarian's Report was approved.

5. Update on the Summer 2000 Calendar:

Dr. Linda Bleicken (Acting Provost) reported that the rationale for the Summer 2000 calendar had been distributed and that the Student Services Council had made a recommendation that had been accepted by Dr. Carter and was passed at a Calendar Committee meeting on February 23. The recommendation suggested that to design a calendar for Summer 2000 without some background as to how this summer (1999) works might be unproductive.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked how faculty feedback would be solicited, on what date the decision was going to be made, and whether the Senate would be convening before that date.

Dr. Carter said that no date had been set because Calendar Committee meeting dates had not been set yet, but that calendar issues are routinely brought to the senate before implementation. He also said that as long as we deal with it in the Fall semester, timing would not be a problem and that this one time we will not have a detailed summer calendar in the Catalog.

Dr. Black indicated that feedback will be solicited from every faculty, staff, and student in the Fall, and information would be gathered on sister institution plans for Summer.

Dr. Clara Krug asked whether a nine-month student and a nine-month faculty member could be added to

the Student Services Council because there are currently only "twelve-monthers" on it.

Dr. Black suggested that any faculty member or student could come to the meetings that are held on the first and third Thursdays at 8:30am to 10:00am.

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) asked about the survey of students on the Summer issues.

Dr. Black responded that those surveys had been compiled and that it confirmed that the students do plan to attend and what they plan to take. She said that the survey was used to make sure we were on track in 1999 and to help us schedule classes.

6. Action: University Judicial Board: Revision to Article III-Membership: Dr. Nolen

Dr. Nolen reported that an email was sent out that described recommended changes in the Judicial Board constitution that were approved by the Judicial Board and by the Student Government Association. The primary change is to streamline the process by which students are selected for the Judicial Board.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked for a clarification on the appointment of student members.

Dr. Jack Nolen replied that three faculty, four students and five representatives from SGA, would make the appointments for the incoming Judicial Board and that those individuals would make the appointments of the incoming board. He motioned that the recommended change be approved. The motion was seconded and the revision to Article III was approved.

7. Election of Faculty Representative on Parking/Transportation Committee:

Dr. Curtis Ricker (Chair, SEC) brought for approval the appointment of Diana Sanders (LIB) as the faculty representative on the Parking and Transportation Committee to serve a two-year term. Diana Sanders was elected as the faculty representative on the Parking and Transportation Committee.

8. Student Fees: SGA President Keen and Vice President Core

Dr. Core discussed fees and fee increases requested. Increases included \$4 per year for Health Services, \$4 for Athletics, under 3% for Housing and Food, and \$1 for parking and transportation. In general, mandatory fees were increased by 2.2% for next year.

Mr. Keen opposed the Athletics fee increase, given the elimination of two sports, as well as the parking fee increase, considering the uncollected outstanding fines (reportedly close to \$200, 000). He opposed the Housing and Food services fee increase and suggested the need for more competition for such services at GSU.

Dr. Carter spoke about having small increases each year rather than fewer large increases in order to be positively received at the "Central Office level."

Ms. Kathy Albertson (CLASS) asked whether the food fee increases would have the effect of punishing students with meal plans, given the number of faculty without meal plans who eat at Lakeside, for example. Dr. Carter and Dr. Core did not think it would, but Dr. Core agreed to examine ala carte prices.

Mr. Keen motioned that the committees that are usually consulted regarding fee increases be consulted on fee increases again, then to send it through the process again to get more student, faculty, and staff input on the fee increases proposed. The motion was seconded, but did not pass. A roll call vote was requested yielding 7 yes votes and 21 no votes.

The Senate adjourned at 7:30pm.

The Senate reconvened on March 2, 1999 at 4:00, in Business Administration Building, Room 1124. This session was not tape-recorded.

9. Information Item: Adapted Scholarly Misconduct Policies and Procedures and Response to Federal Agencies: See http://georgiasouthern.edu/Presidents_Office/scholarly_misconduct

Dr. Carter mentioned that GSU added some provisions to the policy to do research with Public Health. Copies of the policy were distributed. He said that this could be considered to be the official policy in the future, but that it is not official yet. The information was received by the Senate and will be placed in the Faculty Handbook.

10. Report from Dr. Curtis Ricker, Chair, Senate Executive Committee:

Kathy Albertson (CLASS) was recommended by the SEC and approved by the Senate to serve on the Facilities Master Plan Steering Committee.

11. Report from EPC/SPC Representative Trey Denton: (Sue Moore)

Dr. Moore (CLASS) reported that the EPC/SPC had started the series of forums and that they had already met with SGA.

12. Report from NCAA Representative Richard Rogers:

Dr. Rogers reported that the GSU women's soccer team had won a Team Academic Award from NSCAA. Also the GPA average for all female student athletes was 2.82, with four out of seven women's teams having GPA averages at or above 2.90 during Fall Semester. For men, the average GPA was 2.32, with four out of eight teams having GPA averages at or above 2.50 for Fall Semester.

13. Old Business:

Update on Presidential and Provost Searches: Dr. Denton and Dr. Van Tassell

Dr. Van Tassell reported on the campus visits of finalists for the provost searches in the days and week to come.

It was reported that the new president would be announced on March 9th.

Dr. Bleicken reported no movement at the System level on consideration of plus/minus being added to grades.

Dr. Carter added that GSU supported the implementation of the plus/minus system in the past, but that only about one-third of the 34 institutions were in favor of it.

Dr. Carter reported that copies of the child care survey outcome were available in Human Resources through Tony Phillips or at http://www.georgiasouthern.edu/President_Office/childcare

He said that the Chancellor appointed a system-wide task force to look into the issue of childcare. Dr. Jerri Kropp was appointed as the GSU representative.

Dr. Barbara Hendry (CLASS) asked whether we have heard from the Regents about a Spring 2000 starting date.

Dr. Bleiken responded that they had moved the starting date to January 6-13 (from January 4-10) and the ending date to April 27-May 4.

Dr Carter handed out a Summer schedule rationale document to direct attention to that rationale on the web ([President's Office site](#)) and in hardcopy.

Dr. Carter handed out a document describing the new composition of the Long-Range Athletic Planning Committee that includes students.

14. New Business: Discussion Forum and Questions from the Floor

Frequency of Faculty Senate meetings: Dr. Curtis Ricker

Dr. Ricker motioned that the Senate request consideration be given by the new President for more than two Senate meetings per session during Fall and Spring Semesters. The motion was seconded and approved.

15. Announcements: Presidents and Vice Presidents

President Carter briefed the Senate on his thinking regarding the Long Range Athletic Planning committee's review of Title IX and men's sports.

Dr. Carter announced that a question and answer mechanism via email would be implemented. Questions will be restated, answered, and posted to the faculty at senate@georgiasouthern.edu.

Dr. Charles Crouch (CLASS) expressed hope that this mechanism would not foreclose debate on the floor.

16. Announcements from the Floor:

President Carter briefed the Senate on honorary degrees to Emma Kelly and Bill Freeman and the moving of the Marvin Pittman name from the former lab school to the new Administration building.

17. Adjournment:

Senate adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Kent A. Rittschof,

Senate Secretary

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES 1999

DATE: APRIL 15,

Members Present: *absent #substitute

College of Business Administration Dr. John Brown; Dr. Trey Denton; Dr. John Hatem; Dr. Lowell Mooney; Dr. Jake Simons

Dr. Jack White*

College of Education Dr. Randy Carlson; Dr. Elizabeth Downs; Dr. Mary Jackson (Alice Hosticka); Dr. Stephanie Kenney;

Dr. Kent Rittschof; Dr. Robert Warkentin

College of Health and Professional Studies Dr. June Alberto; Dr. Kent Guion; Dr. Diane Hamilton; Dr. Jerri Kropp* ; Dr. Larry Mutter

College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences Ms. Kathy Albertson; Dr. Charles Crouch; Dr. Marc Cyr (Pat Walker); Dr. Hal Fulmer;

Dr. Chris Geyerman; Dr. Barbara Hendry; Dr. Clara Krug; Mr. Mike Mills (Alt); Dr. Sue Moore (Ellen Hendrix); Dr. Curtis Ricker;

Dr. George Shriver; Dr. Steven Weiss (Richard Tichich); Dr. Janie Wilson

College of Science and Technology Dr. Martha Abell (D. K. McLain); Dr. J. B. Claiborne; Dr. Gerald Jones*; Dr. Bruce McLean; Dr. Anne Pierce

Dr. David Stone; Dr. John Wallace; Ms. Pamela Watkins (Sharon Barrs);

Library Ms. Iris Durden; Mr. David Lowder

Administrators Acting President Harry Carter; Acting Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Linda Bleicken; Vice President James Britt;

Vice President Ron Core; Vice President Jack Nolen; Ms. Laura Davidson (Fred Smith); Dean Charlene Black; Dean Arnie Cooper; Dean Carl Gooding*

Dean Roosevelt Newson; Dean Jimmy Solomon; Dean Lane Van Tassell; Dean Fred Whitt

Representatives SGA President: Aaron Nicely; SGA Vice President for Academic Affairs: Casey Jackson; Senate Secretary: Dr. Kent Rittschof;

Senate Librarian: Dr. Janie Wilson; Parliamentarian: Dr. Jeff McLellan; EPC/SPC Representative: Dr. Trey Denton; EPC/SPC One-year Apprentice:

Dr. Sue Moore; NCAA Representative: Dr. Richard Rogers; Liaison: Ms. Ruth Ann Rogers

Alternates: 1st Pat Walker, CLASS; Susan Williams, COBA; Linda Plevyak, COE; Barry Joyner, CHPS; Sonya Gaither, LIB; Quentin Fang, COST

2nd Richard Tichich, CLASS; Cindy Randall, COBA; Alice Hosticka, COE; Bernita Hamilton, CHPS; Marvin Goss, LIB; Norman Schmidt, COST

3rd Jorge Suazo, CLASS; Ken Johnston, COBA; Dan Rea, COE; Amy McCrory, LIB; Kelly McLain, COST

4th Ellen Hendrix, CLASS; Jim Stephens, COE; Jocelyn Poole, LIB; Sharon Barrs, COST

5th Marie Franklin, CLASS; Ruth Carroll, COE; Charles Skewis, LIB; Mark Welford, COST

6th Tim Giles, CLASS; Fred Smith, LIB; Mohammad Davoud, COST

7th Vicki Zwald, COE; Lynn Walshak, LIB; Carol Nessmith, COST

VISITORS: Bob Haney, VPAA.

Recording equipment was available at this meeting but much of the meeting was not actually recorded, possibly due to the locations of those microphones.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the April 15, 1999, meeting

The minutes of March 1, 1999 meeting were approved without revision.

2. Approval of the March 1, 1999, Minutes: Dr. Kent Rittschof

Dr. Kent Rittschof (COE) provided six corrections to the minutes.

Correction 1 submitted by Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS): Dr. Clara Krug asked why student members of the Athletic Committee had not been invited to meet with the Long Range Athletic Planning Committee. Dr. Ron Core responded that he did not realize what the composition of the committee was.

Correction 2 submitted by Dr. Clara Krug: Dr. Clara Krug asked for a description of the mission and composition of the Long Range Athletic Planning Committee appearing in writing. Dr. Carter responded that it did not appear in writing.

Correction 3 submitted by Dr. Clara Krug: In response to a question on the Librarian's report regarding how faculty might get a copy of the marketing plan that had been mentioned by candidates for the presidency during their forum with faculty, Dr. Carter mentioned the document is available on the web site.

Correction 4 submitted by Dr. Clara Krug: Regarding the discussion of the two men's sports programs, Dr. Carter distributed (prior to the March 1st meeting) pages from Title IX Compliance Bulletin. Page 11 was not distributed at the March 1st meeting. Clara Krug requested that all senators receive page 11 of the Compliance bulletin.

Correction 5 submitted by Dr. June Alberto (CHPS): Bernita Hamilton (CHPS) substituted for June Alberto.

Correction 6 submitted by Dr. Charles Crouch (CLASS). Dr. Charles Crouch was present for the first meeting.

The minutes from the March 1, 1999 meeting were approved with these corrections.

3. Librarian's Report: Dr. Janie Wilson

Dr. Janie Wilson submitted one correction: On page 7, the date November 3, 1999, should read 1998.

Dr. Clara Krug asked about page 6, the Athletics Committee meeting on January 20, paragraph 2, penultimate sentence, where Dr. Rogers informed the committee that legislation to increase the limits on scholarships in women's sports is being considered. The final sentence indicates Georgia Southern is opposed to the legislation. She asked why Georgia Southern is opposed to the legislation?

Dr. Richard Rogers responded, ³That was NCAA legislation that was proposed to allow schools that could afford it to give more scholarships to women. The NCAA limits how many scholarships you can give in each sport, and proposed to increase them. We saw that as a way for the rich to get richer and the poor to get poorer. Those schools that could afford more scholarships for women would stockpile the athletes.²

Dr. Clara Krug asked about paragraph 3, final sentence, where Dr. Richard Rogers announced that the Board of Regents has approved construction of the football office building. She asked where the dollars are coming from for this office building.

Dr. Harry Carter said that the money has been donated from private funds.

Dr. Clara Krug asked about the final paragraph on regarding the February 24, 1999, meeting, where John Mulherin reported that the renewal campaign will begin next week. She asked what the renewal campaign was?

Dr. Harry Carter responded that it is the annual Booster membership drive.

Dr. Clara Krug asked about the construction of the Cowart Building. She asked what the Cowart Building is.

Dr. Harry Carter reported that it is the ticket office that will be constructed near the stadium and was funded through contributions from Mr. Cowart.

Dr. Clara Krug asked about the Graduate Council meeting on page 1, November 19. She asked why a candidate for full graduate faculty status might not be approved.

Dr. Harry Carter reported that the criteria are in writing.

The Librarian's report was approved with a correction.

4. For Nomination and Election: Faculty Senator Representative to the SGA

Dr. Curtis Ricker announced that the Senate Executive Committee would like to nominate Dr. Hal Fulmer (CLASS) to continue another year as the Faculty Senator Representative to the SGA, and he has agreed to that.

Dr. Hal Fulmer was re-elected as the Faculty Senator Representative to the SGA.

5. For Nomination and Election: One Faculty Representative to the Calendar Committee.

Dr. Curtis Ricker announced that the SEC would like to nominate Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) as the Faculty Representative to the Calendar Committee.

Phyllis Dallas and Ellen Hendrix were also nominated as Faculty Representatives to the Calendar Committee.

Clara Krug was elected by ballot as the Faculty Representative to the Calendar Committee.

6. Discussion and Possible Action: Revisions to Faculty Grievance Procedures: Dr. Clara Krug.

Dr. Clara Krug referred to a copy of a memo of April 9 to Members of the Faculty Senate from the Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee (Dr. Clara Krug) about proposed revisions to the Faculty Grievance Procedures.

Beginning in the 96-97 academic year The Faculty Grievance Committee has been working on the proposed revisions for those reasons included in the memo. A reason not listed in the memo was some basic corrections necessary because of semester system and changing dates.

There are three typographical errors that need to be corrected.

Correction 1: On page 2, the College of Business should read "Business Administration," in paragraph 2 of the underlined sections.

Correction 2: On page 7, number 6, if a committee member brings a grievance he or she shall resign from the committee for the remainder of his or her term, instead of "of her term."

Correction 3: On page 9, there is a suggestion that came from Jake Simons in the College of Business Administration involving paragraph 14. It was unclear to him what it meant for the Faculty Grievance Committee to agree to consider the report of the investigative panel. The correction was distributed to senators. The correction would change the third and fourth sentences to read: ³Upon hearing the panel's report, The Faculty Grievance Committee may vote to accept the panel's recommendation, reject it in

favor of a different recommendation, or request additional information. Any of these actions requires a majority vote of the full committee.²

Dr. Clara Krug mentioned that the proposed revisions do not change the philosophy or the rationale of the Grievance Procedures but help make them ³foolproof² in that once a grievance procedure begins the committee would not have to invent procedure on the spot to cover a particular situation. She addressed several proposed revisions:

1. She reported that during one quarter the committee had three or four investigations and were literally running out of members and alternates. The number of alternates was increased in the proposed revision in order to have a large pool from which to draw in case there are conflicts of interest.
2. In the past, conflicts of interest have never been specified or defined.
3. It would be good to have two year terms because they need to become oriented to the committee in order to understand all procedures.

Dr. Krug also reported that there is a concern that this Grievance Procedure, in general, does not address grievances at the Provost/Vice Presidential level. That would mean if a faculty member or group of members had a grievance against the Provost, he/she would not necessarily start with the chair or with the dean to resolve the grievance, which one must presently do. Dr. Krug recommended that this issue be considered at a future time

Motion: Clara Krug motioned for adoption of these corrected revisions of the Faculty Grievance Procedures. The motion was seconded.

There was much discussion and debate involving the proposed revisions:

1. Possible changes, such as using the word "recommendation" instead of "report" in correction #3.
2. Clarification about the number of members constituting a quorum at the initial meeting and at the meeting during which the investigative panel presents its report
3. Clarification about the number of votes needed to accept/reject the investigative panel's report.
4. Whether proxy votes are accepted at either meeting.

Motion: Aaron Nicely (SGA President) motioned to table the issue until the June 30th meeting. The motion was seconded (motions to table are not debatable). The motion to table the proposal to revise the Faculty Grievance Procedures passed.

Dr. Krug specified that suggested revisions and/or corrections be submitted to her in writing.

Dr. Kent Rittschof (COE) reminded meeting participants to please step up to the microphone and identify themselves in order to maximize the probability of being recorded.

7. Report from Dr. Curtis Ricker, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

Dr. Curtis Ricker reported that The Senate Executive Committee has several items of business to report on.

First they welcomed the new SGA reps Aaron Nicely and Casey Jackson.

Secondly, the Senate Executive Committee had the opportunity to meet with Dr. Grube. He has the intention of having an informal meeting this summer with the senate just to get together and to get to know the senators. He is very interested in working very closely with the senate. He believes that a strong faculty voice is a necessity to shared governance at the institution, The level of involvement and discussion at senate meetings was discussed and will be discussed in the future after Dr. Grube arrives.

Motion: Dr. John Brown (COBA) motioned to establish a list-serve for senate related discussions. The motion was seconded and passed.

8. Report from EPC/SPC Representative Trey Denton

Dr. Trey Denton indicated that there was nothing new to report from the EPC at this particular senate meeting. The SPC is going to hold a listening forum for faculty who are going to retire this academic year and this listening forum was scheduled for Tuesday, April 27, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m., in the Russell Union. At this meeting the committee hopes to gather the impressions of these individuals regarding where we have been, where we are, and where we are going as an institution. The Strategic Planning Council is also preparing a list of campus issues of strategic importance to send to Dr. Grube as part of his preparation for taking office in July. The committee hopes to organize this list as a SWOT analysis (institutional strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats). The committee will be working on this list again on Wednesday, April 28, and would welcome input from all on campus on this matter.

9. Report from NCAA Representative Richard Rogers

Dr. Richard Rogers discussed the three student athletes selected by the Faculty Athletic Committee as Scholar Athletes of the Year. They were Tim Blom, a senior soccer player, Vonnellies Allen, a senior member of the football team, and Lindsay Grossman a Psychology major.

Dr. Rogers reported that about a month ago a federal judge said that the NCAA's requirement that an applicant have an 820 minimum on the SAT to receive an athletic scholarship was discriminatory and illegal, so for about a week or two the NCAA did not have any initial eligibility standards. The NCAA

appealed the ruling and got a stay, so those initial eligibility standards are in effect now.

Three of GSU's teams are at Southern Conference Tournaments: the men's and women's tennis team, and the golf team.

10. Old Business

Dr. Carter discussed the issue of raises. He reported that the legislature approved a 4 percent salary increase, but that there was not enough funding to pay for the salary increases due to sick leave funding that was needed as well as the fact that 75% of pay raises come from the state, while 25% of pay raises come from tuition. What has been done at Georgia Southern so far is to hold back or not allocate salary increase funds for the following categories: vacant positions, graduate assistantships, student assistants, temporary faculty positions, temporary staff positions, and casual labor. There will be the proper amount of funds appropriated to each college for all of the permanent continuing positions in that college.

Dr. Janie Wilson asked whether there any danger that we will have our raises postponed by another month this time.

Dr. Carter and Dr. Ron Core both responded that the chance of a postponement was possible, but remote at this point.

Dr. Ron Core discussed per diem rates that have increased. The per meal rates are \$6.00 for breakfast, \$7.00 for lunch, and \$15.00 for dinner. The question has come up if you don't eat breakfast can you, in a sense, bank breakfast for a larger dinner? The answer to that is yes. If you are eligible for three meals a day you are eligible for \$28 maximum reimbursement. These changes are on the Controller's Web Site. The changes themselves will be going out in a memo from Kim Thompson to deans, directors, and department heads next week.

Dr. Anne Pierce (COST) asked about the kind of documentation is needed for meals, particularly in high cost cities where one may not have much choice about where to eat.

Dr. Core responded that under the new regulations there are no longer any ³high cost cities² in Georgia and that we follow federal guidelines for other out of state cities.

11. New Business: Discussion Forum and Questions from the Floor

Dr. John Brown (COBA) asked about the status of the new Engineering Program.

Dr. Carter reported that it is under way and that we are working closely with Georgia Tech. They have an interim director, David Frost, and we are moving forward with two programs, one is computer engineering, and the other is civil engineering with an emphasis in environmental. There will be faculty hired between now and Fall, probably for two locations: one here in Statesboro and the other location is

in Savannah. Courses will be taught at both locations. There was money appropriated in the amended FY 99 budget for this initiative and there is money in the big budget for FY 2000. There is a new announcement that we are sending out to students who are potentially interested in these two programs, and it is on the web site of the College of Science and Technology.

Ms. Kathy Albertson (CLASS) observed that many people could not hear the tornado warnings and that this was a source of concern.

Dr. Carter said that it had been discussed and that we need to update our emergency action procedures. He also indicated that we need to move toward either some kind of telephone tree or e-mail or something like that, because many people are in buildings where a horn is not heard. He said ³we will take a look at that.²

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) asked whether alternates from the senate are to be listed on the Librarian's report.

Dr. Curtis Ricker responded that the senator who is listed is the senator who is responsible for making connection to the Librarian, not the alternates.

Dr. Charlene Black provided an update on the University Librarian search. The Search Committee is ready now to bring to campus four finalists for this position and they will begin to visit campus on April 21st. Campus/community forums will be held in the Russell Union the 22nd, the 26th, the 28th of April, and May 3rd. There are three gentlemen and one lady being invited to campus who each have very strong credentials. Their credentials will be on file at the reference desk in the University library.

Dr. Hal Fulmer asked about the recent attempt to set off a bomb over at the RAC and the email that had been read. He asked at what level was that email interception approved, given the Freedom of Privacy issue involved.

Dr. Carter responded that short answer is that the interception of the electronic messages that led to the arrest was conducted pursuant to a court order. The longer answer has to do with the some of the open records issues and the storage of email communications on the campus.

Dr. Clara Krug established a deadline for receiving suggested revisions and/or corrections to the proposed revisions in the Grievance Procedures as April 30 at 5:00 p.m. Dr. Krug can be reached in Forest 1339, at Ext. 5695, or at ckrug@gsaix2.cc.gasou.edu.

Dr. J. B. Claiborne (COST): asked about the email question. He asked how open the email records are or whether anyone going through the proper channels can request all emails of anyone else, and how long they are stored on the mainframe tapes.

Dr. Carter said that we'll have to do some research on that and that everyone should understand that the privacy of email correspondence is not guaranteed.

12. Announcements: President and Vice Presidents

Dr. Jack Nolen introduced more formally the two new student representatives. Casey Jackson is a sophomore Political Science major, and the newly elected Vice President for Academic Affairs on the Student Government. Aaron Nicely is a junior Political Science major and the newly elected President of the student body association. They have both been in office officially for two days.

Dr. Carter discussed the process of reconsideration of the Sports Sponsorship question. There was a panel of experts set up for students, Faculty Senators, administrators, members of the Long Range Athletic Planning Committee to meet with and get some questions answered. Following that, Dr. Carter asked the Long Range Athletic Planning Committee to reconsider the question of doing away with two men's sports, both the men's swimming program and the men's cross country program. Dr. Core convened a meeting on April 14 and then wrote Dr. Carter the results of that meeting. The next step is for Dr. Carter to communicate to senators the reconsideration from the Long Range Athletic Planning Committee. There are six sessions set up in the afternoon for Dr. Carter to receive input from senators in small groups. After finals, an announcement of the decision will be made.

13. Announcements from the Floor

There were no announcements from the floor.

14. Adjournment

The senate adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dr. Kent A. Rittschof
Senate Secretary

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

DATE: June 30, 1999

Members Present: *absent #substitute

College of Business Administration: Dr. John Brown*, Dr. Trey Denton, Dr. John Hatem, Dr. Lowell Mooney, Dr. Jake Simons# (Susan Williams), Dr. Jack White*

College of Education: Dr. Randy Carlson*, Dr. Elizabeth Downs, Dr. Mary Jackson*, Dr. Stephanie Kenney, Dr. Kent Rittschof # (Alice Hosticka), Dr. Robert Warkentin*

College of Health and Professional Studies: Dr. June Alberto, Dr. Kent Guion*, Dr. Diane Hamilton*, Dr. Jerri Kropp*, Dr. Larry Mutter*

College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences: Ms. Kathy Albertson, Dr. Charles Crouch, Dr. Marc Cyr*, Dr. Hal Fulmer, Dr. Chris Geyerman, Dr. Barbara Hendry*

Dr. Clara Krug, Mr. Mike Mills (Alt), Dr. Sue Moore*, Dr. Curtis Ricker, Dr. George Shriver*, Dr. Steven Weiss*, Dr. Janie Wilson

College of Science and Technology: Dr. Martha Abell, Dr. J. B. Claiborne*, Dr. Gerald Jones, Dr. Bruce McLean, Dr. Anne Pierce*, Dr. David Stone # (Sharon Barrs),

Dr. John Wallace, Ms. Pamela Watkins

Library: Ms. Iris Durden, Mr. David Lowder

Administrators: Acting President Harry Carter, Acting Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Linda Bleicken, Vice President James Britt*, Vice President Ron Core

Vice President Jack Nolen, Ms. Laura Davidson, Dean Charlene Black*, Dean Arnie Cooper, Dean Carl Gooding*, Dean Roosevelt Newson# (Jeff Buller), Dean Jimmy Solomon

Dean Lane Van Tassell, Dean Fred Whitt*

Representatives: SGA President: Aaron Nicely, SGA Vice President for Academic Affairs: Casey Jackson, Senate Secretary: Dr. Kent Rittschof # (Alice Hosticka)

Senate Librarian: Dr. Janie Wilson, Parliamentarian: Dr. Jeff McLellan, EPC/SPC Representative: Dr. Trey Denton, EPC/SPC One-year Apprentice: Dr. Sue Moore,

NCAA Representative: Dr. Richard Rogers, Liaison: Ms. Ruth Ann Rogers

Alternates: 1st Pat Walker, CLASS; Susan Williams, COBA; Linda Plevyak, COE; Barry Joyner, CHPS; Sonya Gaither, LIB; Quentin Fang, COST

2nd Richard Tichich, CLASS; Cindy Randall, COBA; Alice Hosticka, COE; Bernita Hamilton, CHPS; Marvin Goss, LIB; Norman Schmidt, COST

3rd Jorge Suazo, CLASS; Ken Johnston, COBA; Dan Rea, COE; Amy McCrory, LIB; Kelly McLain, COST;

4th Ellen Hendrix, CLASS; Jim Stephens, COE; Jocelyn Poole, LIB; Sharon Barrs, COST

5th Marie Franklin, CLASS; Ruth Carroll, COE; Charles Skewis, LIB; Mark Welford, COST

6th Tim Giles, CLASS; Fred Smith, LIB; Mohammad Davoud, COST

7th Vicki Zwald, COE; Lynn Walshak, LIB; Carol Nessmith, COST

VISITORS: Major R. K. West, LTC B. K. Knox, Todd Deal, Jim Darrell, Frank French, Gale Bishop, Lynn Wolfe, CHPS; Charles Skewis, Lib; Jill Martin, COBA; Leo Parrish, COBA; Kathleen Koon, COBA; Nancy Wright, Judy Schomber, Melanie McClellan, Student Affairs; Bob Haney, Acad. Aff; Fred Richter, Acad. Aff; Mike Deal, Registrar.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the June 30, 1999, meeting

The agenda for the June 30, 1999 meeting was approved.

2. Approval of the April 15, 1999, Minutes: Dr. Kent Rittschof

Motion: Dr. Alice Hosticka (COE) motioned to approve the minutes from the April 15, 1999 meeting. The motion was seconded and approved.

3. Librarian's Report: Dr. Janie Wilson

Motion: Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) motioned to approve the Librarian's Report.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if the motion approved by a unanimous vote at the March 24 meeting of the Athletics Committee included a written statement of the composition and charge of the Long Range Planning Committee in the Athletics Policy Manual.

Dr. Harry Carter replied that at the conclusion of the paragraph in question, it says the proposal was unanimously approved and that he assumed that the proposal included the charge and composition. He then asked Dr. Richard Rogers for confirmation.

Dr. Richard Rogers (NCAA Rep.) indicated that the committee did approve those items for inclusion.

Dr. Carter suggested that Richard Rogers to refer this question to the chair of the Athletics Committee and bring back an answer from them.

Dr. Krug referred to page 3 and asked whether the Senate was approving not only the March 24, 1999 minutes of the Undergraduate Council, but also the April 27 and May 27 minutes, which Senators had received.

Dr. Janie Wilson responded that they had arrived too late to be considered at the June 30 Senate meeting.

The librarian's report was approved.

4. Report from Dr. Curtis Ricker, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

Status of list serve: Dr. Lowell Mooney

Dr. Lowell Mooney (COBA) distributed a memo on the creation of a Senate Listserve. All senators are subscribed and they may unsubscribe if they prefer not to participate. The name of the list is SENATE and its email address is Senate@gsaix2.cc.gasou.edu. Any questions about the list should be directed to Dr. Lowell Mooney at 681-0347 or lmooney@gasou.edu.

Dr. Curtis Ricker thanked those who have served on the senate this year who are leaving and those who are continuing.

Dr. Hal Fulmer (CLASS) presented a senate resolution regarding Acting President Harry Carter's tenure at Georgia Southern. The resolution reads as follows: "Whereas The true measure of a person is best determined by the respect of his peers; and Whereas There is no greater tribute than to be known as a person who made a positive difference in the world through which he passed; and Whereas The true good of an individual, like starlight, shines on brightly long after that person has found new challenges in other places and moved from our midst; and Whereas Harrison Sharpe Carter has given of his time, his talent, and his treasure for almost a full quarter of the years our University has existed; and Whereas Harrison Sharpe Carter has served our University as professor, department chair, Vice President, Provost, and [twice] as Acting President; and Whereas His tenure at Georgia Southern was marked by days of great challenge and years of greater excitement; and Whereas His skills as an educator and an administrator were instrumental and essential as our institution grew from small college to significant university; and Whereas Under his direction and guidance Georgia Southern has become a recognized and respected institution of higher learning throughout this state, region, and nation; and Whereas He will be remembered as a leader of great energy and intelligence, as a colleague committed to both faculty and students, and as an alumnus who gave unceasingly to his

alma mater; and Whereas You do take your leave from us on this day, June 30, 1999, A.D., We Do Here Commonly Resolve As members of the Faculty Senate, representing the Corps of Instruction of Georgia Southern University, to Thank You, Harry, for all of your efforts on our behalf. We are enriched as a university and as a community because of your leadership. We will surely miss you. Good luck and Godspeed in all of your future endeavors.”

5. Agenda Item:

Take from the Table: Dr. Janie Wilson

Faculty Grievance Procedures Revision: Attached

Motion: Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) motioned that the Senate remove from the table the Faculty Grievance Procedures revision. The motion was seconded and approved.

Dr. Clara Krug (Chair, Faculty Grievance Committee) reminded the Senate that, at the April 15 meeting, two items in the proposed revisions had concerned Senators: (a) the number of members necessary to constitute a quorum and (b) the number of votes necessary for approval of the investigative panel's report.

Motion: Dr. Clara Krug motioned for adoption of the proposed revisions to the Faculty Grievance Procedures as specified in the draft document which follows her memorandum dated June 9, 1999 to members of the Faculty Senate. She reiterated the following revisions and clarifications highlighted in that memo and appearing in the proposed revisions.

1. The quorum necessary to hear a complaint was 9.
2. The number of votes necessary to determine whether or not a complaint should be investigated was still 5.
3. The quorum necessary to hear an investigative panel's report and vote to accept or reject it was 7.
4. The number of votes necessary to reject the report, accept the report, or request additional information was 5.

The motion was seconded.

Ms. Pam Watkins (COST): suggested a friendly amendment (page 10 under D-14) to modify the statement right after C where it says “any of these actions requires” to say “actions A or B require.” The effect of the friendly amendment is that actions A or B require a minimum of five affirmative votes. The default is C if the committee can not get five affirmative votes. The friendly amendment was accepted and the motion was approved.

6. Report from EPC/SPC Representative Trey Denton

Dr. Trey Denton did not have anything to report from the Executive Planning Council (EPC) until President Grube arrives. He reported that the Strategic Planning Council (SPC) is currently working on the preparation of its annual report to be completed within a month. It will be posted on the SPC's web page and also will be available in hard copy to anyone.

Dr. Denton announced that this is his last EPC/SPC report and thanked the other members of the EPC for the way that they treated their faculty representative of the last three-years and for the way they operate and govern the University.

7. Report from NCAA Representative Richard Rogers

Dr. Richard Rogers reported that of the three post-graduate scholarships given by the Southern Conference this spring, Georgia Southern, again had a recipient of one of those. The recipient was Lindsay Grossman, a soccer player and psychology major. She received the Dorothy Hicks Scholarship.

The average GPA for all undergraduate students at GSU this spring was 2.49; for all males it was 2.41; and for all

females it was 2.60. The average GPA for all student athletes was 2.48; for all male athletes it was 2.44; and all female athletes it was 2.96.

At the spring meeting of the Southern Conference in May, a new constitution and bylaws were adopted which gave the CEOs some more authority in the governance of the Conference. CEOs will now evaluate the Southern Conference Commissioner. Also there should be better communication and more participation by all the constituencies such as the CEOs, the Athletic Directors, Faculty Athletic Directors, and the Senior Women's Administrators in the governance of the Conference.

8. Old Business

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked when the faculty were going to get their contracts.

Dr. Bleicken (VPAA & Acting Provost) responded that as soon as the budget issues are taken care of, Virginia Samiratedu will have a better idea of when contracts will be generated.

Dr. Carter added that the Board of Regents did approve the budget at the June meeting, and therefore the salary recommendations that went forward for faculty and staff have been approved.

Dr. Krug asked whether there going to be a return deadline for those contracts after which a faculty member will not have a job if the contract is not signed.

Dr. Carter responded no, and that the University is not going to pull the plug on somebody because they didn't get their contract back on time.

9. New Business: Discussion Forum and Questions from the Floor

Royalties from self-authored instructional materials

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) reported that there were concerns that people are publishing textbooks and having their students purchase these texts while they keep the profit, and that there are many other issues that may surround this. She asked whether there is a policy on this issue.

Dr. Carter did not know of a written policy. He stated, "I think there is a practice on this campus, and the practice, my understanding of it, is that textbook selection has to be approved at the departmental level. And so if I am the author of a textbook, and a committee selects my textbook, I don't but a committee does for a class, and that in the past has been appropriate for the faculty member to receive royalties. Another approach is I create materials, I take them to the bookstore or to the University Printing Services and I have those materials packaged and the students purchase them at the cost that has been deemed acceptable in the past. Now, if I as a faculty member make the sole determination about the textbook in my class and I require my own book I think the position in the past has been that I should not benefit from that. And I believe, in fact, there are faculty members who have put the proceeds of that into agency accounts or foundation accounts and used those proceeds to enrich the course itself." He then asked department chairs and Deans for input.

Dr. Richard Rogers (NCAA Rep.) reported that a continuing significant example is that in his department is Dr. Lloyd who takes the royalties from her book in one of her classes and gives those royalties to the student organizations in Psychology.

Dr. Carter stated, "I think in general as a faculty community we have tried to stay away from the real conflict of interest that it puts an individual faculty member in if that faculty member makes the decision by himself/herself, requires the book, and profits from it."

Dr. Janie Wilson asked whether it would it not be a good idea to have some kind of written policy.

Dr. Carter replied that he thought it would be appropriate if the Faculty Senate developed that policy and brought it forward rather than having administrators develop the policy. He suggested a subcommittee of the Senate be appointed through the Senate Executive Committee.

Motion: Dr. Charles Crouch (CLASS) motioned that an ad hoc committee be established to recommend a policy that deals with royalties from self-authored instructional materials. The motion was seconded and approved. The Senate Executive Committee will establish the committee.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) expressed concern over the decision making process regarding the decision to make faculty pack up and move furniture from offices and files from filing cabinets for new carpeting to be put down. She suggested that the unloading and loading of file cabinets can be difficult work and questioned whether it was actually necessary.

Dr. Ron Core (VPBF) indicated that the project manager made a recommendation to Physical Plant director who reportedly discussed it with department heads. Reportedly, the general feeling was that the department heads were in favor of replacing all the carpet and that it would be less disruptive and made more sense to do it all at once, rather than do the public areas now and the faculty offices later. He said that filing cabinets are a little different than stoves and refrigerators in that they tend to be a little flexible and when they are very heavily weighted they tend to warp and that they were trying to insure that file cabinets would be in good shape once they were done. Dr. Core indicated that he will check on when the project will begin.

Dr. Clara Krug asked whether it is possible to establish a "faculty grade drop-off" parking spot near the Registrar's office during final exams week.

The Senate Executive Committee was assigned to take this suggestion to the person on the Parking and Transportation Committee to present it to that committee.

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) added that service vehicles are often in faculty parking spots making it more difficult for faculty to park and get to classes, and that this should be brought to the Parking and Transportation Committee's attention as well.

10. Announcements: Presidents and Vice Presidents

Dr. Linda Bleicken (VPAA & Acting Provost) discussed noise problems at graduation ceremonies. As a result Dr. Carter appointed a task force that is jointly chaired by Melanie McClellan and Dr. Bleicken and also includes Mike Deal, the Registrar; Ken Brown, Director of Public Safety; Dick Mellett, Director of Physical Plant; and Leon Spencer. Several suggestions have been discussed to improve the situation including the elimination of seating behind the podium, reiteration just before the diplomas are distributed to "please hold your applause, please restrict celebratory remarks until all graduate have been recognized" and limited admission to graduation with a possible ticket system. Additional ushers might also be used and Deans might be asked to actually meet prior to graduation with that group of graduates.

Dr. Jack Nolen (VP) announced that there will likely be an increase in the number of freshman students and transfer students this year.

Dr. Jack Nolen expressed his appreciation to the Senate upon his retirement and encouraged faculty members to get involved with educational opportunities with students outside of the classroom.

Dr. Carter expressed his appreciation for Dr. Nolen's contributions to Georgia Southern since arriving in 1970.

11. Announcements from the Floor

Dr. Hal Fulmer (CLASS) gave a reminder of the final performance of the summer production of "Arcadia" in Fine Arts 1001 at 8:00 p.m.

Ms. Pam Watkins (COST) announced a Welcome Back Open House at the Center for Excellence in Teaching. The focus is on the use of multimedia. It will on August 16th from 1:00 to 4:00.

Dr. Carter introduced Dr. Melanie McClellan as the Acting Vice President for Student Affairs next year, and announced that Jeff Buller will be Acting Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences for next year,

Dr. Carter made some final comments regarding his departure from Georgia Southern. He said, "...this is not a farewell, because we are aren't selling our house. But I do want to say, most of you know this, that I transferred here as a sophomore in 1964, and Georgia Southern has been a part of my life for 35 years and came back here in 1975 and have had 24 years here with you on the faculty, and as a faculty member and an administrator. And most important to me for those 24 years has been the relationships that we have had and the fact that many of you have played a large part in my life during those 24 years, and I really want to thank you for your friendship, for your support, and most of all for your commitment to Georgia Southern. I'm really sort of delighted that my last official act is to chair and adjourn the Faculty Senate. I thank you Hal and Curtis and all of you so much for the Resolution that means a lot to me and I'll hang it on the wall in my office and hope that it will buy me a little credibility with the faculty members at The Citadel."

12. Adjournment

The Senate was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Kent A. Rittschof,

Senate Secretary

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**DATE: October 4, 1999**

Members Present: *absent #substitute

College of Business Administration

Dr. John Hatem
 Dr. Jill Martin
 Dr. Lowell Mooney
 Dr. Leo Parrish
 Dr. Jake Simons
 Dr. Jack White

College of Education

Dr. Randy Carlson
 Dr. Mary Jackson# (Linda Plevyak)
 Dr. Stephanie Kenney
 Dr. Mark Kostin
 Dr. Kent Rittschof
 Dr. Robert Warkentin

College of Health and Professional Studies

Dr. Kent Guion
 Dr. Diane Hamilton
 Dr. Kathleen Koon
 Dr. Larry Mutter
 Dr. Joelle Romanchik

College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences

Ms. Kathy Albertson
 Dr. Jean-Paul Carton
 Dr. Charles Crouch
 Dr. Hal Fulmer
 Dr. Chris Geyerman
 Dr. Saba Jallow
 Dr. Clara Krug
 Mr. Mike Mills
 Dr. Sue Moore
 Dr. Patrick Novotny
 Dr. Candy Schille
 Dr. Steven Weiss
 Dr. Janie Wilson

College of Science and Technology

Dr. John Averett# (John Rafter)
 Dr. J.B. Claiborne
 Dr. Frank French*
 Dr. Gerald Jones
 Dr. Bruce McLean
 Dr. Allison Morrison-Shetlar
 Mr. John Wallace
 Ms. Pamela Watkins

Library

Ms. Iris Durden
 Mr. Charles Skewis

Administrators

President Bruce Grube
 Acting Provost and VPAA
 Linda Bleicken
 Vice President Jim Britt
 Vice President Ron Core
 Acting Vice President
 Melanie McClellan
 University Librarian Bede
 Mitchell
 Dean Charlene Black
 Dean Arnold Cooper
 Dean Carl Gooding
 Acting Dean Jeff Buller
 Dean Jimmy Solomon
 Dean Lane Van Tassell
 Dean Fred Whitt*

Representatives

SGA President Aaron Nicely
 SGA Vice President for Academic
 Affairs Casey Jackson
 Senate Secretary Dr. Larry Mutter
 Senate Librarian Dr. Hal Fulmer
 Senate Parliamentarian Dr. Jeff
 McLellan
 EPC/SPC Representative Dr. Sue
 Moore
 NCAA Representative Dr. Richard
 Rogers
 Liaison Ms. Ruth Ann Rogers

Alternates

1st
 Gisele Gaudet, CHPS
 Richard Tichich, CLASS
 Susan Williams, COBA
 Ruth Carroll, COE
 Wil Grant, COST
 Sonya Gaither, LIB

2nd
 Jim Bigley, CHPS
 Donnie Richards, CLASS
 Steve Rutner, COBA
 Susan Franks, COE

Alternates (cont.)

John Rafter, COST
 Wanda Grandberry, LIB

3rd
 Pat Walker, CLASS
 Jerry Wilson, COBA
 Delores Liston, COE
 Janet O'Brien, COST
 Ann Hamilton, LIB

4th
 Tim Whelan, CLASS
 Ed Walker, COBA
 Deborah Thomas, COE
 Sharon Barrs, COST
 David Lowder, LIB

5th
 Rose-Marie Stallworth
 Clark, CLASS
 Linda Plevyak, COE
 Norman Schmidt, COST
 Diana Sanders, LIB

6th
 Sharon Tracy, CLASS
 Diana Hammitte, COE
 David Williams, COST
 Fred Smith, LIB

7th
 Karen McCurdy, CLASS
 Amy Heaston, COE
 Lynn Fine, COST
 Laura Davidson, LIB

VISITORS: Denise Battles, COST; Virginia Samiratedu, Office of the Provost; Lynn Wolfe, CHPS; Georgina Hickey, History; Mike Deal, Registrar; Dale Wasson, Admissions; Nancy Wright, CLASS; Kim Thompson, Controller; Fred Richter, Academic Affairs; Trey Denton, COBA; Bob Haney, Office of VPAA, John Brown, COBA; Elizabeth Downs, COE.

The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Grube at 4 p.m.

Dr. Grube opened the meeting with remarks about the role of the Senate in helping the University reach its next level of excellence. He spoke about the need for an active and vigorous Senate, and then passed the gavel to Senate Executive Committee Chair Robert Warkentin to conduct the remainder of the Senate's business. Dr. Grube's remarks included the following:

"Now, I must say that one of the eye opening things for me was when I found out that I was Chair of the Faculty Senate. I have never been on a campus where the President has been Chair of the Senate. But what I was to discover was actually there's a statutory section that declares that I serve as Chair of the Faculty Senate and that I preside at all of its meetings."

"I think as everybody in this room knows, you can go to other universities and campuses within this System and find different models. So, frankly, I think it would be very easy for me to call the meeting to order, thereby presiding, and simply pass the gavel, which is what I intend to do today."

"As I started thinking through the piece on academic distinction, one thing became very clear to me, and that was in order for Georgia Southern to go up another level, we need a Senate that is very vigorous and a Senate in which all kinds of substantive debate is going on. We need a Senate that to my mind really is much more in the hands of the faculty than it has been to this point."

"I really do believe that a vigorous advisory group made up of faculty senators on the campus is absolutely critical to the whole notion that we can move forward to the next level of excellence. So, what I am proposing is this: I propose that the Faculty Senate put together a small task force to report back to all of us on how the Senate might be restructured to operate in a much more independent way while, at the same time, honoring the statutory requirement that has been thrust upon me to serve as Chair and to preside at all of the meetings."

"As you consider what this Senate might look like, you might also consider whether or not we have certain committee structures on the campus that currently run outside of the Senate that we might, for the purposes of discussion, want to consider as committees that might run inside the Senate, or some hybrid thereof....but these are essentially committees established by the Senate that are faculty committees with administrative help but not dominated by administrators."

"I would ultimately imagine a Faculty Senate with its own office, with its own clerical support, with the ability to form agendas."

"You are the major advisory group to the President on this campus."

"I declare this meeting in order and I pass the gavel. Congratulations."

President Grube passed the gavel to Dr. Robert Warkentin, Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, who presided over the business of the Senate for the remainder of the meeting.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the October 4, 1999, meeting

The agenda for the October 4, 1999 meeting was approved.

2. Approval of the June 30, 1999, Minutes: Dr. Kent Rittschoff

Motion: Dr. Kent Rittschof (COE) motioned to approve the minutes of the June 30, 1999 meeting. The motion was seconded and approved.

3. President's Report

Dr. Grube recommended that the Senate meet more frequently and indicated that there will be three Senate meetings in the Spring semester.

Dr. Grube indicated his desire to reappoint Dr. Nancy Shumaker as coordinator of the Consolidated Greivance Procedures. He requested feedback from senators about this appointment.

Dr. Grube discussed the importance of strategic planning and its relationship to the development of Georgia Southern as a "pre-eminent comprehensive university."

Dr. Grube discussed the need for enrollment management planning. He said we need to put an emphasis on raising our standards, attracting "an even better quality of student," and starting a dialogue over the amount of growth the University will sustain. He indicated his desire that the Senate be involved in addressing enrollment management issues.

4. Librarian's Report

Motion: Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) motioned to approve the Librarian's Report. The motion was seconded and approved.

5. Nominations and Election of Faculty Senate Secretary and Faculty Senate Librarian

Motion was made to elect Dr. Larry Mutter (CHPS) as Faculty Senate Secretary. The motion was seconded and approved.

Motion was made to elect Dr. Hal Fulmer (CLASS) as Faculty Senate Librarian. Motion was seconded and approved.

6. Calendar Committee: Nomination and Election of Faculty Member to Complete the Second Year of the Term of Milan Degyansky

Motion was made to elect Ms. Pamela Watkins (COST) to complete the second year of a two-year term on the Calendar Committee left vacant due to the death of Milan Degyansky. Motion was seconded and approved.

7. Report from Dr. Robert Warkentin, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

Dr. Warkentin reported that an ad-hoc committee of the Senate had been formed to consider the issue of royalties from self-authored instructional materials. Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) will chair the committee. Members of the committee are Dr. Allison Morrison-Shetlar (COST), Dr. Anne Pierce (COST), Dr. Cliff Ragsdale (COBA), and Dr. Mike McKenna (COE).

Dr. Warkentin announced the appointment of faculty member Dr. David Robinson (CLASS) to the Non-Student Organization Advisory Board; faculty members Dr. Martha Abell (COST), Dr. Jack Beasley (CHPS), and Ms. Mildred Pate (CLASS) to the Honors Committee; and faculty member Ms. Jackie Erney (CLASS) to the Campus Life Enrichment Committee (CLEC).

Dr. Warkentin announced the appointment of Senators to standing committees: Undergraduate Council - Dr. Kathleen Koon (CHPS); Graduate Council – Dr. Frank French (COST); CLEC – Dr. Diane Hamilton (CHPS); Development Subcommittee of the Faculty Development, Research, and Service Committee – Mr. John Wallace (COST); Research Subcommittee of the Faculty Development, Research, and Service Committee – Dr. Jake Simons (COBA); Honors Committee – Dr. Joelle Romanchik (CHPS); and Library Committee – Dr. Mark Kostin (COE).

Dr. Warkentin announced the appointment of Dr. Jeff McLellan (Academic Affairs) as Parliamentarian.

Dr. Warkentin mentioned the work of Dr. Lowell Mooney (COBA) in setting up the Faculty Senate Listserv.

8. Report from EPC/SPC Representative Sue Moore

Dr. Sue Moore (CLASS) reported on Executive Planning Committee (EPC)/Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) activities. There has been no EPC meeting since the last Senate meeting.

As mentioned by President Grube, the SPC has been charged with revisiting the Strategic Plan for the University. Moore said that senators would be getting a communication about that process in the near future. The Senate Executive Committee is already involved and this involvement will eventually reach to all areas of the campus. She stated that this is an exciting opportunity and hoped that everyone will take part in it.

As part of her duties as EPC/SPC representative, Moore is involved in communicating items of strategic importance from the SPC to the EPC. If senators have things that they think should be discussed by SPC and/or EPC, they should feel free to pass them on to her.

9. Report from NCAA Representative Richard Rogers

Dr. Richard Rogers (CLASS) discussed the official NCAA graduation rates report for student athletes who entered Georgia Southern University as freshmen in 1992-93. The graduation rate for male student athletes at Georgia Southern University who entered as freshmen in 1992-93 and graduated within six years was 45%; for female student athletes the rate was 59%; the rate for

genders combined was 48%. The graduation rates for all students who entered Georgia Southern University as freshmen in 1992-93 and graduated within six years was 32% for males, 39% for females, and 35% combined.

10. Old Business

Sub-item: Childcare Facility

Senator Steven Weiss (CLASS) presented a statement on the need for childcare facilities at Georgia Southern University. The statement, read by Dr. Charles Gossett, Department of Political Science, was as follows:

“Georgia Southern University professes a commitment to providing the best quality teaching and learning environment for its students and employees. We believe that one way in which Georgia Southern can put that commitment into action is through the provision of on-site facilities for assisting students, staff, and faculty with their responsibilities to provide care for dependent children and adults in their households. A childcare facility designed to meet our community’s needs would include high quality care in a drop-in child care center for children of all ages, part-time and full-time child care for younger children, and after-school care for school-aged children, provided at affordable rates for all members of the Georgia Southern community—students, staff, and faculty.”

“The practical effects of offering such services would include increased productivity on the part of faculty and staff, fuller participation of student parents in campus life, and enhanced recruitment opportunities for the University as a whole. The less tangible (but no less important) effects would be improved morale in both the work force and student body and a deserved reputation as a progressive and socially responsible place to work and study. By offering child care at Georgia Southern University, the administration sends the message that our community is concerned for the welfare of all its members, including its children.”

Following discussion on the subject, the Senate requested an update from Dr. Grube on the University System Task Force’s activities on the child care issue; that details of proposals to develop a child care facility at the University be posted on the University’s web page; that an informational public forum be held on the subject to allow stakeholders and interested publics to ask questions and make recommendations on child care proposals; and that the item appear on the December Senate agenda.

Sub-item: Last Day of Attendance Reporting

Senator Patrick Novotny (CLASS) expressed concern regarding the Registrar’s request for the “last day of attendance” notice used in U.S Department of Education reports. Discussion followed concerning possible options to gain the needed information. Controller Thompson noted that faculty response on this report is not a personal liability.

Sub-item: Calendar

Dr. Charlene Black (Academic Affairs) discussed the process for constructing the summer 2000 calendar and distributed a handout describing the process. In reference to the development of the 2000-2001 academic year calendar, Dr. Linda Bleicken (VPAA and Acting Provost) stated that at least seven days in advance of Calendar Committee meetings each committee member will receive a draft of the proposed calendar.

Sub-item: Enrollment Management

Senator Kathy Albertson (CLASS) raised numerous concerns about enrollment management. Framing her remarks as “Faculty Concerns about Largest Ever Freshmen Class,” Albertson stated:

“We’ve had trouble with retention in the past, so how can we improve if we have more students yet fewer teachers to build a better relationship.”

“Instructional strategies have been affected: many teachers can’t walk between rows let alone move desks into groups or circles for discussion. Many teachers have to borrow chairs from other rooms...”

“Learning Support classes have 24 students in them; scholarship has proven that 15 is the recommended cap for positive results with this population.”

“If we let students—hundreds of them—wait to test for placement in regular or Learning Support classes until the week that classes start, what message are we sending? That coming to one of the ten orientations during the summer isn’t important? That deadlines aren’t necessary? That they can be guaranteed a full load if they wait until the last possible minute? These students were notified of their acceptance much earlier in the year. Why shouldn’t students who won’t come (a few have legitimate reasons, but hundreds do not) by orientation deadlines have to wait until Spring term to register?”

“Several faculty are concerned with the two-year college image we’re creating by admitting large numbers of freshmen.”

“Many faculty are confused about the administration’s message to increase numbers at upper end and graduate levels when these very courses are often canceled to meet the freshmen need. How does this current practice help the University develop academic distinction, if the very teachers who need to be developing and teaching upper level courses are needed to teach the additional freshmen?”

“If the administration allows these massive numbers of freshmen, why isn’t the budget for supplies in these core departments being increased at the same percent of increase of students? Writing and Linguistics faculty have been told to be careful with copies since the budget is the same while the number of students and classes offered is greater than last year. How can faculty perform at the same standards with less?”

“How can departments be expected to hire the best faculty when Chairs are having to find these people two weeks before classes begin? This has happened literally two days before classes began this fall.”

“Some faculty feel pressured to teach overloads when asked by Chairs to do so. Is it fair to ask untenured faculty who can’t risk saying “no?” Isn’t it next to impossible for a Chair not to remember “who helped” and “who didn’t” when evaluation time comes?”

“Budgeting is the key issue; we realize that two years from now our budget will be affected by this fall’s numbers. But we also feel it’s crucial to set standards and stick by them: deadlines are deadlines. If we know the number of classrooms we have, and know the number of teachers we have, we don’t understand why the administration can’t cap freshmen enrollment to maintain teaching standards...”

“A special concern to Writing and Linguistics faculty is the large number of freshmen. Two years ago, the administration guaranteed every freshmen should be able to complete Composition 1 and 2 in the first year. However, the semester system has created an impossibility for this demand. On the quarter system, students who could be in Learning Support English in the fall could logically get through English 99, 1101, and 1102 in those three quarters. With only two terms in the first year, the Department can’t meet that promise...The question that Writing and Linguistics is putting before the administration is this: can we revoke the guarantee that both 1101 and 1102 can be fulfilled in the freshmen year? BOR policy only states that to be a sophomore, students must earn 30 hours. Nowhere is it written that they have to have both writing courses finished by that time. If this mandate were rescinded, much of Writing and Linguistics’ bottleneck would be taken care of. There would be enough faculty to teach the first writing course, many of the second, and still be able to “grow” this new department at the upper level end that administration has asked to be done. Many writing faculty have also noticed that, more often than not, sophomores who have waited to take their second writing courses are more successful and more productive in the second composition course, partly because they have more experience as a student to meet the demands of the course.”

Discussion followed concerning issues associated with enrollment management, including questions about faculty representation on committees or groups that consider enrollment management and about the timetable for developing an enrollment management plan. There appeared to be no designated spokesperson to directly respond to questions about enrollment and enrollment management. Dr. Grube then made it clear that enrollment management is at the top of his agenda. He stated “I would anticipate that we would have a proposal with regard to enrollment management well before this academic year is out.” Dr. Grube indicated that the enrollment management proposal would need to mesh with the University’s new strategic plan, which is targeted for completion by May of 2000. He pointed out that the Strategic Planning Council would not do enrollment management planning. Dr. Grube called on Dr. Trey Denton (COBA) to briefly discuss strategic planning. Dr. Denton described the tentative timetable for producing a strategic plan and said that faculty would be receiving communication from the President’s office within a couple of weeks regarding dates and anticipated course of action.

11. Discussion Forum and Questions from the Floor

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) asked Senators if they had any questions or concerns about distributing the Librarian's Report on the web. She said it would allow more updated information to be included in the report because the lengthy process of copying the report and sending it by mail would be bypassed. There were no questions or concerns voiced.

Dr. Janie Wilson requested that future Senate agendas specify the sub-items that will be discussed under "Old Business" and "New Business." Senators can come to meetings better prepared if the agenda is more descriptive of what will be discussed under "Old Business" and "New Business."

12. Announcements: Vice Presidents

The Provost search announcement was distributed.

Acting Provost Bleicken reported on several positive developments on campus, including the Board of Regents' approval of the Ed.D. in Educational Administration and the admission of 75 freshmen into the University Honors Program

13. Announcements from the Floor

Senator Larry Mutter (CHPS) announced that the campus master planning process will start in November and that if senators are concerned about environmental issues they may want to voice them at the scheduled campus master plan forums.

Senator Mutter followed his announcement with questions about the role of the Faculty Senate at Georgia Southern University. He said, "What is our agenda? Are we an activist Senate? What is our role?"

Senator Hal Fulmer (CLASS) announced the dates of the fall production of the Goblin Market at the Black Box Theater and encouraged all to attend.

Senator Wil Grant (COST) encouraged professors to fill out grade/academic reporting sheets that student-athletes bring to them. He suggested that the sheets are a good way to monitor the progress of student-athletes and facilitate their development as students.

14. Adjournment

The Senate was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Larry Mutter
Senate Secretary

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES**DATE: November 30, 1999**

Members Present: *absent #substitute

College of Business Administration

Dr. John Hatem
 Dr. Jill Martin# (Steve Rutner)
 Dr. Lowell Mooney
 Dr. Leo Parrish
 Dr. Jake Simons
 Dr. Jack White

College of Education

Dr. Randy Carlson# (Ruth Carroll)
 Dr. Mary Jackson*
 Dr. Stephanie Kenney
 Dr. Mark Kostin
 Dr. Kent Rittschof*
 Dr. Robert Warkentin

College of Health and Professional Studies

Dr. Kent Guion
 Dr. Diane Hamilton*
 Dr. Kathleen Koon
 Dr. Larry Mutter
 Dr. Joelle Romanchik# (Jim Bigley)

College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences

Ms. Kathy Albertson
 Dr. Jean-Paul Carton
 Dr. Charles Crouch
 Dr. Hal Fulmer
 Dr. Chris Geyerman
 Dr. Saba Jallow
 Dr. Clara Krug
 Mr. Mike Mills
 Dr. Sue Moore
 Dr. Patrick Novotny
 Dr. Candy Schille
 Dr. Steven Weiss
 Dr. Janie Wilson

College of Science and Technology

Dr. John Averett
 Dr. J.B. Claiborne
 Dr. Frank French
 Dr. Gerald Jones*
 Dr. Bruce McLean
 Dr. Allison Morrison-Shetlar
 Mr. John Wallace
 Ms. Pamela Watkins

Library

Ms. Iris Durden
 Mr. Charles Skewis

Administrators

President Bruce Grube
 Acting Provost and VPAA
 Linda Bleicken
 Vice President Jim Britt*
 Vice President Ron Core
 Acting Vice President
 Melanie McClellan
 University Librarian Bede
 Mitchell
 Dean Charlene Black
 Dean Arnold Cooper
 Dean Carl Gooding*
 Acting Dean Jeff Buller
 Dean Jimmy Solomon
 Dean Lane Van Tassell
 Dean Fred Whitt

Representatives

SGA President Aaron Nicely*
 SGA Vice President for Academic
 Affairs Casey Jackson
 Senate Secretary Dr. Larry Mutter
 Senate Librarian Dr. Hal Fulmer
 Senate Parliamentarian Dr. Jeff
 McLellan
 EPC/SPC Representative Dr. Sue
 Moore
 NCAA Representative Dr. Richard
 Rogers
 Liaison Ms. Ruth Ann Rogers

Alternates

1st
 Gisele Gaudet, CHPS
 Richard Tichich, CLASS
 Susan Williams, COBA
 Ruth Carroll, COE
 Wil Grant, COST
 Sonya Gaither, LIB

2nd
 Jim Bigley, CHPS
 Donnie Richards, CLASS
 Steve Rutner, COBA
 Susan Franks, COE

Alternates (cont.)

John Rafter, COST
 Wanda Grandberry, LIB

3rd
 Pat Walker, CLASS
 Jerry Wilson, COBA
 Delores Liston, COE
 Janet O'Brien, COST
 Ann Hamilton, LIB

4th
 Tim Whelan, CLASS
 Ed Walker, COBA
 Deborah Thomas, COE
 Sharon Barrs, COST
 David Lowder, LIB

5th
 Rose-Marie Stallworth
 Clark, CLASS
 Linda Plevyak, COE
 Norman Schmidt, COST
 Diana Sanders, LIB

6th
 Sharon Tracy, CLASS
 Diana Hammitte, COE
 David Williams, COST
 Fred Smith, LIB

7th
 Karen McCurdy, CLASS
 Amy Heaston, COE
 Lynn Fine, COST
 Laura Davidson, LIB

VISITORS: Virginia Samiratedu, Office of the Provost; Mike Deal, Registrar; Kim Thompson, Controller; Bob Haney, Office of VPAA; Howard Kaplan, Research Services.

The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by President Grube at 4 p.m.

Dr. Grube opened the meeting and passed the gavel to Dr. Robert Warkentin (COE), Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, who presided over the business of the Senate for the remainder of the meeting.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 30, 1999, meeting

The agenda for the November 30, 1999, meeting was approved with the following amendments:

Motion: Dr. Warkentin motioned to amend the agenda under Old Business (Item 14) to allow the Senate to vote on the appointment by the Senate Executive Committee of Jeff McLellan to the position of Senate Parliamentarian. Motioned was seconded and approved.

Motion: Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) motioned to amend the agenda under Senate Executive Committee Update on Activities (Item 11) to include a sub-item (11 d.) titled "Restructuring the Composition of the Faculty Senate" to be presented by Dr. Larry Mutter (CHPS). Motion was seconded and approved.

2. Approval of the October 4, 1999, Minutes: Dr. Larry Mutter

Dr. Mutter (CHPS) reminded senators and visitors to speak clearly into the microphone during the meeting, to identify themselves and their College, and to read motions slowly.

The following corrections are submitted to the October 4 Senate meeting:

Senator Frank French (COST) was represented at the October 4 meeting by Alternate Wil Grant.

The last paragraph of page seven of the October 4 minutes should include the statement "Senator Kathy Albertson (CLASS) specifically asked that the administration include faculty and students in future enrollment management decisions."

The last sentence of the last paragraph of page 5, regarding last day of attendance reporting, should be modified to add "and the signature was just to identify the faculty member. Signature is not required."

Motion: With the corrections noted above, Dr. Mutter motioned to approve the minutes of the October 4, 1999 meeting. The motion was seconded and approved.

3. Librarian's Report: Dr. Hal Fulmer

Motion: Dr. Hal Fulmer (CLASS) motioned to approve the Librarian's Report. The motion was seconded.

There was discussion of the motion. Referring to page 8 of the Librarian's Report, Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if the Faculty Development and Welfare Committee had met and distributed funds. Dr. Allison Morrison-Shetlar (COST) replied affirmatively to the question. Dr. Krug asked that the business of the Faculty Development and Welfare Committee be reflected in future Librarian's reports. Referring to page 9 of the Librarian's Report, Dr. Krug also asked if the Library Committee had met and requested that their business be reflected in future Librarian reports. Dr. Mark Kostin (COE) replied that the Library Committee would hold its first meeting of the academic year on the upcoming Friday and that the minutes of the Committee meeting would appear in the next Librarian's report.

The motion was approved.

4. President's Report: Dr. Grube

Dr. Grube spoke of the meetings he had with academic departments and that they "are going very well."

Dr. Grube spoke about the work of the Strategic Planning Council to develop the University's strategic plan. He encouraged senators to review the draft plan, due to be circulated in mid-December, and to comment on it during the month of January.

Dr. Grube announced that Dr. Allison Morrison-Shetlar (COST), senator and Director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching, would be the speaker at the Fall Commencement.

Dr. Grube urged senators to move with "a little patience" in their deliberations and let proposals be "thoroughly examined, debated, and discussed" relative to the issues of a campus child care center and restructuring of the membership of the Faculty Senate.

5. Calendar for Summer 2000, Fall 2000, and Spring 2001: Dr. Bleicken

Dr. Linda Bleicken (Acting Provost) reported that the Calendar Committee met on November 9 and approved each of the calendars. She stated that calendars would be presented separately to the senators for their approval. Dr. Charlene Black (AVPAA; Dean of Undergraduate Studies), then described in detail the process followed to develop the summer 2000 calendar, as well as Board of Regents and institutional factors that influenced its development. After Dr. Black's presentation, Dr. Bleicken moved the approval of the Summer 2000 calendar.

Summer 2000 Calendar

Motion: Dr. Bleicken motioned for the approval of the Summer 2000 calendar as described in the attachment to the Faculty Senate meeting agenda. The motion was seconded.

There was considerable debate about the proposed summer calendar, including the following comments:

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS), a member of the Calendar Committee, stated that she voted against the calendar "because there is not even a full week between graduation and the typical day of the University-wide faculty meeting that normally precedes Fall Semester."

Ms. Pam Watkins (COST) expressed a concern about the starting date of the summer calendar. She stated: "Bulloch County Schools don't get out until June 6, I think, and our calendar starts a full week ahead of that. So we are basically excluding Bulloch County students from Georgia Southern by starting on May 29. And...most of the core classes that students would take coming right out of high school are not offered in the short term session; they are offered only in the long term session. So we are, in effect, closing out Bulloch County students who want to go to Georgia Southern."

Dr. Jeff Buller (CLASS) stated: "I don't think there has been a decision yet as to whether core classes are going to be offered only in long terms or in the short terms. In fact, it's my understanding that for the coming summer we will be able to offer classes in any format that we like, and so I expect that a large number of core classes will be offered in either short term I or short term II."

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) stated: "This is, I guess, less connected to this particular calendar on which we are voting than it is to long-range planning. I think faculty in the long term would like to see the calendar reflect more of student-faculty wishes for breaks between semesters. Fred Whitt, at the Calendar Committee, volunteered, if I remember correctly, to work with the sub-committee to try to plan a template of a summer calendar that would be a possible alternate in the future. Am I reflecting what you said correctly, Fred? I just wondered about the progress on that."

Dr. Fred Whitt (CHPS) stated: "I think the key was...what the decision was going to be on where revenue would be placed in the future. If revenue is placed in the later term--the upcoming fiscal year rather than the one we would currently be in--then it's a moot point."

Dr. Kent Guion (CHPS) posed the question: "Is our obligation to have instruction occur after July 1 a long term obligation or is it one that is just going...out this summer?"

Dr. Ron Core (Vice President for Business and Finance) replied: "Yes, it presents a number of problems from a budgetary standpoint of where you record the revenue and also student credit hours. In discussions I had at the Board office just two weeks ago they are also looking at this as an issue and they strongly feel that all institutions should move their revenue and consequently expenditures forward into the next fiscal year. They are reluctant to make that as a mandate, but they are continuing to look at that. As far as whether it's a long term or a short term, it's an ongoing discussion at this point."

Ms. Pam Watkins (COST) stated: "I don't think it can be stressed enough that this 51 percent rule really does drive the summer calendar, and that we can do nothing to change the fact, basically, unless we change the length of class time. If we operate in this manner and the Board of Regents continues to set the August start date as early in August as it's being set, then we are going to be held to about one week from summer graduation to the start of school in the Fall. I understand that there are fiscal reasons to leave it the way it is. I understand that, but nonetheless it still is a real hardship on faculty members."

Dr. Ron Core (VPBF) responded: "In the discussion I had at the Board office two weeks ago, the issue of mandatory beginning and ending dates was brought up as a factor in what dictates how summer school and the rest of the calendar is going to be scheduled. There was a lot of discussion among the Chief Business Officers that this was really a vestige of the quarter system and didn't really have a lot of merit once we moved to semesters. The Assistant Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs indicated that he would take it up...at the Board office as an issue that they needed to address it as part of addressing the summer school issue. So they are aware of those problems; now what will be done about it I don't know."

Dr. Lowell Mooney (COBA) stated: "If you have school age kids and you start May 29, they're still in school, and if you graduate on Sunday and the General Faculty meeting is the following Friday, there's not even a weekend between Summer Semester and Fall Semester. So there's absolutely no time for family activities. Another issue is that...most of the student off-campus housing lease agreements end July 31st. That's going to put an additional hardship on students as they scramble to find someplace to live that last week or so while they are trying to finish up school projects, prepare for final exams, etc. I talked with one realtor and she said she tries to work with students if they need to stay on a few extra days, but a lot of companies in town do not. So I think that's another issue that would suggest we need to look at this rule again and see if we can make a change."

Dr. Jack White (COBA) asked Dr. Core: "Isn't summer school self-supporting? I remember when we were talking about the summer compensation at 2 percent per credit hour...in the past summer school made money. So if it's self-supporting, why does it matter whether we push it forward or do it in the current fiscal year?"

Dr. Ron Core (VPBF) responded: "Well, there again, it depends on how you account for it. If you look at strictly the tuition revenue that comes in and the expenditures that are associated with that, summer school is not self-supporting. Actually, expenditures exceed revenue and have for some time. I know they have for the two years I have been here."

In response to Dr. Mooney's point earlier, Dr. Krug (CLASS) stated: "Linda...was there not overwhelming sentiment among the 18 people at the Calendar Committee meeting that there be a request, if at all possible, to move the University faculty meeting from the Friday after graduation to the following Monday? So that there would be at least seven full days, so that it would occur rather than on Friday the 11th, on Monday the 14th of August?" Dr. Linda Bleicken (Acting Provost) responded: "Yes, that is true."

The motion to approve the Summer 2000 calendar was defeated by a vote of 17-15.

Fall 2000 Calendar

Dr. Bleicken (Acting Provost) described the factors involved in developing the Fall 2000 calendar and then moved its adoption by the Senate.

Motion: Dr. Bleicken motioned for the approval of the Fall 2000 calendar as described in the attachment to the Faculty Senate meeting agenda. The motion was seconded.

An amendment to the motion was immediately offered by Ms. Pam Watkins (COST).

Motion: Ms. Pam Watkins motioned to amend the proposed Fall 2000 calendar to include a Fall break on Monday and Tuesday, October 23rd and 24th, to eliminate the reading day on Friday, December 8th, to move the last day of classes to Monday, December 11th, and to hold final exams from December 12th through 16th. The motion was seconded.

Ms. Pam Watkins (COST) explained the rationale for the amendment by stating: "The reason that we're proposing a Monday and a Tuesday for Fall break, instead of a Thursday-Friday, is because it cuts out a lot of Thursdays and Fridays during the Fall. If we put it on a Monday-Tuesday, and couple that with the Wednesday-Thursday-Friday Thanksgiving break, that takes us out a whole week. Moving the last day of class until Monday compensates for the Labor Day holiday. So we don't come up short any days by doing it that way. Regarding the elimination of the reading day, if we put a reading day on a Friday basically we are giving the students a long weekend right before final exams, and I don't think that's necessarily an educationally sound thing to do. I realize that one trade-off is having a Saturday final, but as we discussed in the Calendar Committee meeting, finals could be scheduled in such a way that Saturday finals would impact the fewest number of students and faculty members."

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) followed up on Watkins point by stating: "If this two-day Fall break is added and if the scenario plays out the way Pam has described it, graduation would not occur any later, we would still finish on the same day, and yet we would have a two-day Fall break."

Dr. Jack White (COBA) asked: "How do you give a Saturday afternoon exam, get it graded, get it over to the Registrar, and know whether those people graduate? I mean, I am all for them working 24 hours a day, but I think that is almost what it would take and I might direct that to Mike Deal."

Mr. Mike Deal, Registrar, responded: "We have changed our procedures so that we are not issuing diplomas at graduation so that's really not an issue any longer. We would not have to have grades before graduation."

Dr. Kathleen Koon (CHPS) stated: "I would just like to support the amended calendar that Pam Watkins has proposed, primarily for the reason that it does have a full complement of 15 Fridays, and elimination of a Friday for our students is elimination of an 8-hour clinical day so it has a considerable impact on them."

Dr. Leo Parrish (COBA) asked: "The folks that analyzed this in terms of how many Monday night graduate classes meet and Tuesday night, and so forth, have you had a chance to determine the impact of this change on whether we're going to be making up night classes on a weekend because of this? I am just wondering if this amended schedule has been analyzed to be sure that it doesn't end up coming up short on labs..."

Dr. Frank French (COST) stated: "There's an impact every time you have a holiday break...I just think that we are chopping up the schedule so much that it's breaking up the rhythm of school."

Mr. Michael Mills (CLASS) stated: "As I understand it, Fall break was initially a student-initiated motion, and I am wondering if there are any student representatives here today? How do students feel about this and was polling done about whether they wanted the Fall break?"

Ms. Casey Jackson (SGA) responded: "We did a survey for the Calendar Committee, a very informal survey, but overall by a wide majority the students wanted a Fall break."

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) reported on a faculty survey conducted by herself and Ms. Watkins regarding the Fall calendar. On the issue of Fall break, she reported that: "105 of our colleagues wanted a Fall break out of the 143 responding in CLASS. In the College of Education, of the 38 respondents, 31 wanted a Fall break. Of the faculty in College of Science and Technology, 62 out of 99 wanted a Fall break. In COBA the total number who wanted a Fall break was 14 out of 31. So there were somewhat less than half. So more than half of the faculty wanted a Fall break."

Dr. Grube stated: "You're about to vote to recommend something to me and I'm missing a huge piece of information. I've heard almost no substantive pedagogical reasoning given to support the two-day break. I need to hear your thinking on this point. Simply a popularity poll about whether you are going to take a couple of days off isn't quite enough for me."

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) responded to Dr. Grube's concern: "I think it's unfair to the students and the faculty to suggest that it's just a break. Some discussion here today has been that students will blow off classes. I would prefer to think that's not true. I believe my students spend time perfecting papers when they have days off...they come back with better papers after a break, so I tend to think they do a better job when they have extra time for those things."

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) followed up by quoting a comment from a faculty member who replied to a survey about the Fall calendar: "I'm not as concerned with faculty in relation to the Fall break as I am with students. The break offers them a time to get caught up and rejuvenate. Going from the 3rd week in August to Thanksgiving with only one three-day holiday is too long, they need the Fall break."

The motion to amend the proposed Fall 2000 calendar to include a Fall break on Monday and Tuesday, October 23rd and 24th, to eliminate the reading day on Friday, December 8th, to move the last day of classes to Monday, December 11th, and to hold final exams from December 12th through 16th was defeated by a vote of 19-14.

The original motion to approve the Fall 2000 calendar as described in the attachment to the Faculty Senate meeting agenda was approved by a vote of 23-9.

Spring 2001

Dr. Bleicken (Acting Provost) described the factors involved in developing the Spring 2001 calendar. One important issue concerned the "earliest start date" for Spring 2001 semester as mandated by the Chancellor's office. Dr. Bleicken reported that the Chancellor's office would not approve GSU's request to move the earliest start date from January 5 to January 8, as requested by the Calendar Committee.

Motion: Dr. Bleicken motioned for the approval of the Spring 2001 calendar as described in the attachment to the Faculty Senate meeting agenda. The motion was seconded.

The motion to approve the Spring 2001 calendar passed.

6. Calendar Committee: Issues and Composition of the Committee: Dr. Clara Krug

Motion: Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) motioned that the Faculty Senate recommend to Dr. Grube the following changes to the Calendar Committee:

- 1) that he change the composition of the Calendar Committee to include more than the current 19 members.
- 2) that he change its composition to increase the total number of faculty members and the total number of student members, specifically, a total of 5 faculty members, one from each College to be elected by the Faculty Senate, a total of 3 undergraduate students to be designated or elected by the Student Government Association: one sophomore, one junior and one senior, one graduate student to be designated or elected by the Graduate Student Association or if there is no such association at an election conducted among graduate students.
- 3) that President Grube initiate whatever actions are necessary including having *Statutes* and/or *Bylaws* revised and/or having unwritten traditions codified in writing to effect this change in composition.

The motion was seconded.

Dr. Krug, a member of the Calendar Committee, provided the following justification for the motion: "The Calendar Committee is not a standing committee of the Faculty Senate. If it were, I would recommend that the Senate change the composition. However, we cannot change the composition. We must recommend to President Grube that he change the composition. So that is why item number 1 reads as it does."

"In item number 2, I'm requesting an additional number of faculty members and students so that the total number of faculty members would be increased by three; currently we have two. The Senate elects those two. They do not need to be members of the Senate, so this is providing for additional members, but is not asking for a change in the way in which they are elected. It is providing representation from all Colleges as is currently the situation on those committees which are Senate standing committees. A total of 3 undergraduate students to increase the number of students from 1 to 3 to increase that by 2 and to have one from each class of students who have already spent at least one year at Georgia Southern, so they are somewhat familiar with Georgia Southern and the calendar. The graduate student because at our Calendar Committee meetings the graduate students were discussed, and today we heard about graduate students from Kathy Albertson and we heard about graduate students from faculty in other Colleges."

"Regarding item number 3, I do not know where there exists anywhere in writing that the Calendar Committee is composed of the people in the offices that are currently on it. I have never seen anything that gives a description of the Calendar Committee, how it is constituted, its rationale and mission. That is what we can find in other written documents on this campus."

"Once we got into the meetings and to trying to prepare for the meetings I found out that the Calendar Committee works differently than other committees that I am associated with. It meets once a year and in that one meeting everything is decided in two hours."

"...there would be additional voices at the Calendar Committee meeting who speak from the perspective of those who actually follow the nine-month calendar. The vast majority of the 19 Calendar Committee members--16 of the 19--are what I refer to as twelve-monthers and 3 of us are nine-monthers. And that perspective makes a difference in the votes and in the discussion and in the sense of who is represented."

Dr. Lane Van Tassell (Associate VPAA; Dean of Graduate Studies) suggested that item 2 be revised to reflect that a Graduate Student Association, in fact, exists at Georgia Southern University.

Dr. Jim Solomon (COST) asked Dr. Krug: "If you are making these changes, Clara, why would you not let each College elect their own faculty representatives as opposed to the Faculty Senate?"

Dr. Krug (CLASS) responded: "That would be fine with me. I was just trying to follow the procedures that are currently in place. And currently we do have an election for the Faculty Senate of a member of the Calendar Committee."

Ms. Iris Durden (Library) asked: "Is there a reason that the Library was excluded from the total of five faculty members, one from each College? We are considered the Corps of Instruction also."

Dr. Krug (CLASS) responded: "Yes, I apologize for that, Iris, because I realized our error after we had already done that, and I should especially apologize to Iris because she served on the Calendar Committee. Thank you for calling that to my attention."

Two motions were offered to revise Dr. Krug's original motion.

Motion: Motion was made to remove the following language from item 2 of the original motion: "or if there is no such association at an election conducted among graduate students." Motion was seconded and approved.

Motion: Motion was made to remove the following language from item 2: "specifically, a total of 5 faculty members, one from each College to be elected by the Faculty Senate" and replace with: "specifically, a total of 6 faculty members, one from each College and the Library, to be elected by the Faculty Senate." The motion was seconded and approved.

Discussion continued on the original motion.

Dr. Jim Bigley (CHPS) asked: "What are we trying to fix here? The process by which the Committee works, or the representation on the Committee? How many people does this Committee have now?"

Dr. Krug (CLASS) responded: "It has 19 now."

Dr. Bigley (CHPS) replied: "And we are going to add 8, so that will be 27. I don't understand how a committee can work effectively or efficiently with 27 people."

Dr. Krug (CLASS) responded: "You have to have more than three people who have a nine-month perspective."

Dr. Bigley (CHPS) replied: "Why don't we eliminate some twelve-monthers then?"

Dr. Krug (CLASS) responded: "You are asking the wrong person. I'm just trying to go from the nine-month perspective. I think there might be some value in what you are saying. However, I think if we suggest that to Dr. Grube he might not act on it. I think maybe its one of those long range things. This is the first time to my knowledge anybody has ever proposed that anything about the Calendar Committee be changed. Until last year I don't think anybody but the Calendar Committee members knew who was on it."

Dr. Fred Whitt (CHPS) stated: "Obviously, the whole calendar issue is very sensitive...I've been here 8 years and the Committee some years has met three times. I remember a year where we didn't meet at all. I think on the quarter system, those meetings didn't last 15 minutes. We would approve almost two or three academic years in a 15 minute meeting because we had a model in place. And it was helpful to have some of the 12 monthers because you could check when Homecoming was, or you knew when there was an away football game, or you knew when there was a certain religious holiday...we had a model. Going into semester conversion we don't have a model. I would suggest that maybe an ad hoc committee look at the 51- percent rule, the start date, the extra time in Spring, when we have graduation, and bring to the Senate a model. It's a model that we are lacking here."

Dr. Leo Parrish (COBA) asked: "Who knows the answer to the question of how did we determine the composition of the Committee?"

Dr. Krug (CLASS) responded: "That's why I asked for an explanation in writing, in item number 3. I'd like to know."

No recorded response was given to Dr. Parrish's question.

Debate was closed on the motion. The motion passed 22-6.

At 5:55 p.m. a motion was made to extend the Senate meeting one-half hour as allowed under the Senate under Article II of the *Bylaws* of the Faculty Senate.

Motion: Motion was made, seconded, and approved to extend the Senate meeting to 6:30 p.m.

Motion: Dr. Candy Schille (CLASS) motioned that item 11 d. "Restructuring the Composition of the Faculty Senate" be considered next on the agenda. Motion was seconded and approved resulting in discussion of item 11 d. immediately.

11d. Restructuring the Composition of the Faculty Senate: Dr. Larry Mutter

Dr. Larry Mutter (CHPS) read the following statement:

"The *Statutes* of Georgia Southern University, approved by the Board of Regents on April 10, 1996, state in Article V, Section 8:

"The Faculty Senate shall be composed of the following:

- A. Voting members. Voting members of the Faculty Senate shall include forty regular full-time members of the Corps of Instruction holding the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor who have been members of the faculty of the University for at least one year at the beginning of their terms; the President of the Student Government Association; and the Student Government Association Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- B. Administrative members. The following administrative officers shall have the authority to participate in all deliberations of the Faculty Senate: the President; Vice Presidents of the University; the Academic Deans; and the University Librarian.”

The *Statutes* make it clear that administrators and students are members of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate, though administrators may not vote on the business of the Senate.

However, the Board of Regents Policy Manual does not specify this particular composition. It leaves the issue of what constitutes an institution’s Senate membership up to the institution. The Board of Regents’ Policy Manual addresses the subjects of faculty meetings and faculty rules and regulations in the following sections:

“302.05 Faculty Meetings

Each faculty shall meet at least once each academic term and at such other times as may be necessary or desirable, except at those institutions which have a council, senate, assembly, or other such body, in which case the faculty shall meet at least twice per year...”

and

“302.06 Faculty Rules and Regulations

The faculty, or the council, senate, assembly, or other comparable body, shall make, subject to the approval of the President of the institution, the Chancellor and the Board, statutes, rules, and regulations for its governance and for that of the students; provide such committees as may be required; prescribe regulations regarding admission, suspension, expulsion, classes, course of study, and requirements for graduation; and make such regulations as may be necessary or proper for the maintenance of high educational standards. A copy of the statutes, rules, and regulations made by the faculty shall be filed with the Chancellor. The faculty shall prescribe rules for the regulation of student publications, athletics, intercollegiate games, musical, dramatic, and literary clubs, fraternities and sororities, and all other student activities and affairs, subject to the approval of the President of the institution, the Chancellor and the Board.”

The first part of the first sentence of Section 302.06 makes it clear that an institution’s faculty senate may enact statutes, rules, and regulations for its governance, subject to the approval of the institution’s President, the Chancellor, and the Board.

Keeping in mind that the composition of the Senate’s membership is an institutional prerogative, not a Board of Regents policy, I will make a motion in a moment to alter the composition of the GSU Faculty Senate.

The motion is offered simply to get a sense of whether the voting members of the Faculty Senate desire to amend the *Statutes* of Georgia Southern University regarding the composition of the Faculty Senate. The amendment I offer would have the effect of restricting membership of the Senate to elected faculty senators or their alternates.

It is important to note that amendments to *Statutes* are governed by Article XII of the *Statutes* of Georgia Southern University, which states that amendments are to be handled through a specific process that involves the President appointing a "Committee on Revision of the *Statutes*."

If it is the Senate's desire to amend the *Statutes* per the motion below, the proposed amendment then would be reviewed by the Committee on Revision of the *Statutes*. The Committee's job would be to review the proposed amendment, make changes to it if necessary, and offer it for adoption by the Faculty Senate. If approved by a majority of the Senate's voting members, it would become *Statute*.

Motion: Dr. Larry Mutter motioned that Article V, Section 8, of the Georgia Southern University *Statutes* be repealed and replaced with the statement:

"The Faculty Senate shall be composed of forty regular full-time members of the Corps of Instruction holding the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor who have been members of the faculty of the University for at least one year at the beginning of their terms."

The motion was seconded and the floor was opened for debate.

Dr. Larry Mutter (CHPS) asked if the vote on the motion could be conducted by ballot per Robert's Rules of Order. By general consent of the faculty, it was agreed that the vote would be conducted by ballot.

Dr. Linda Bleicken (Acting Provost) stated: "The Senate might be interested to know that last year the Deans' Council met with the Senate Executive Committee and a proposal that was somewhat similar to this was forwarded to the members of the Senate Executive Committee by the Deans' Council. The Deans' Council had heard at some point that there were members of the Senate who may feel intimidated about speaking out on issues given that there were a number of administrators sitting around the table. So the proposal that was suggested to the Senate Executive Committee at the time was that one Dean be elected as a member of the Senate and the other Deans not sit around the table. At the time, this was greeted by the Senate Executive Committee with some consternation. And the general response was that this would signal that administrators did not have an interest in what was going on in Faculty Senate if this occurred. So I put that to you so that you know that there has been discussion of this. This is a slightly different motion than the proposal that was made by Deans' Council last year."

Dr. Patrick Novotny (CLASS) asked Dr. Mutter: "I just have a question to follow up on Dr. Bleicken's comments. I'm honing in on two words, and that is "restricting membership." It seems to me that by our votes membership is restricted. We are all mature. I think we can infer what the words "restricting membership" mean, but it seems to me in a technical sense, respectfully, that membership is restricted already in the context of votes. And so what we're talking about perhaps is something different. Would you care to respond to that?"

Dr. Mutter (CHPS) replied: "I'd like to address your issue, Patrick, by reading something I sent to Robert Warkentin on October 18th in response to his request that I explain what I meant by the term "activist Senate," which I used at the October 4th Senate meeting. This is what I wrote to Robert: "First, I must tell you that I have not enjoyed my term as a senator. I see the Faculty Senate as a reactive body, with no developed agenda of its own, no or little resources with which to advance an agenda, and weak access to decision making. These observations have dampened my interest in being an active senator. Worse still is the tense, intimidating environment of Faculty Senate meetings. I am intimidated by the presence of some administrators who in the past have shown thinly veiled contempt in their tone of voice, facial expressions, and body language for our most vocal senators. As a junior faculty member, I never would have thought of opening my mouth in such a setting."

"I am not alone in thinking this way. When I made this same statement at a recent College of Health and Professional Studies' faculty meeting, several faculty members also said they felt this way. In my many interactions with faculty all over this campus I hear it time after time "Why do we have administrators at our Senate meetings?" I think it's a shame that the 600 or so faculty members on this campus who are principally teachers and researchers don't have a forum that is under their control and independent from administrators. The instructor/assistant professor/associate professor/professor job series is probably the largest class of employees on campus and we have no independent forum in which to think, dream, and debate our unique vision of this University. I think that's a shame."

Dr. John Averett (COST): "I'd like to raise a different point. Not so much about the merits of the issue, but the way we would go about this. In particular, we considered this in the Senate Executive Committee. And the principle point that we raised is that we will be considering all of these things at a future date anyway and do we really want to write legislation in a group like this? I would urge you to defeat this motion simply for that reason. There are other words that need clarification, such as, what a Corps of Instruction is, who is a person responsible for teaching, and I think there are a number of things that need definition. It's the sort of thing that you need to really work out in committee."

Dr. Mutter (CHPS) replied: "My response to your issue, Dr. Averett, is that it's sensible to address the issue of Senate composition before we deliberate any other structural reforms. It is important to address who we are before we even begin to think about where we are going, and how we hope to get there. The issue of Senate composition is fundamental and should be addressed alone and before all other issues.

Dr. Charlie Crouch (CLASS) stated: " I would like to speak to one thing Patrick said earlier, and that is that politics is not only about voting, it's about symbols, and I think Larry has addressed a very important symbol. I know when I was an untenured member of this Senate I was very intimidated. Secondly, as to why not roll it into broader reform, I think Larry makes the point beautifully. We need to define ourselves before we get redefined again by another body. I think Larry's motion puts that process in step."

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) stated: "And for whatever reason tonight we actually saw at least three senators explain their vote based on a question from a Dean. I don't think the Dean asked for that,

but it was obviously interpreted that way. And as long as we are explaining the way we voted something is definitely wrong in this room."

Dr. Lowell Mooney (COBA) stated: " I'd like to speak against the motion. Not on the merits, although I don't agree with the motion, but I think we would be throwing away a valuable resource of information if we were to exclude administrators. I don't want us to do a piecemeal approach to this restructuring issue. The President has been meeting with us, on the SEC, monthly since he came here and he has convinced us that we really do need to address the structure of the Senate. It may be that we will recommend that the President create this committee which Larry talks about, but let's bring all that together in a complete package. Let's don't try to do this piecemeal where we do something today and then when we look at the big picture later on. Can't we give the processes that are in place now time to function? It may very well be that Larry's motion is a part of that recommendation, that overall recommendation that we bring."

Dr. Jim Bigley (CHPS) stated: "In response to that and a couple of other observations, this is not about losing resources for these meetings. These other people--the administrators and students-- could sit in the gallery, they could be addressed, we want their input, we need their input, but this is our Senate and as long as it has other people as members, and administrators are members, it's not a Faculty Senate. And the rush, if it is perceived to be a rush, is that at the first meeting the President gave us the keys to a hotrod, and he said "here, go with it." We need to do that. This is the time to strike on this thing. We don't want to fold it into a bunch of other efforts. At the beginning of this meeting, he put some kind of governor on the hotrod, with his process thing, which I think is what you are referring to, but we still need to go with this. This is like throwing the kings tea in the harbor kind of thing. Or firing on Fort Sumter, if you're a Southerner."

Dr. Hal Fulmer (CLASS) stated: "I want to speak against this on a couple of points. I want to make the observation that I have been on the Senate now going on a third term. I was an untenured member on this Senate, and maybe I was fortunate because of who I had as a Dean or a Chair, I never felt intimidated and I spoke freely as an untenured member. And I want to call your attention to the fact that you can't move administrators away from the table, and leave them in the room if intimidation is part of what's driving this document. You will have to excuse them from the room. Now the other thing that worries me a little bit about this is we're taking students off of it. Georgia Southern has a very long and proud history of students involved in the governance of the University, and I am proud to sit as your representative on SGA. My point is is that when you do that you drive another wedge between groups on this campus that I think historically have operated quite well. And what concerns me is that what we are saying is there ought to be this significant difference between faculty and administrators. A lot of our administrators came up through the ranks. A lot of them continue to teach. And I am concerned that somehow we think that they don't have some kind of interest in what we are doing. And so, I speak against it, and hope you will, too."

Dr. Alison Morrison-Shetlar (COST) stated: "I agree with that. One of the reasons I was interested in getting on to the Senate was a fact that it was a balanced community. And that we can get input from all sorts of aspects of the University, and I would also be very sad to see that go. I think everybody has a valuable contribution to give and I would like to be able to hear that contribution."

Dr. Lane Van Tassell (AVPAA; Dean of Graduate Studies): "I want to echo the comments that Hal ended on. But let me say as a preface, I applaud Larry Mutter and others who contributed to this initiative. I think this is probably a conversation this body needs to have from time to time

regardless of where it goes. But I do want to make a couple of observations, and I probably come at this from several hats. Quite frankly, I have been at this institution for a pretty long time. That brings a lot of pro and cons, perhaps, even to this discussion. But I came up through the ranks. I served six terms on this Senate. I've seen this body evolve. I've seen this body change. Not always for the better; quite frankly, one of the detriments to this body over the years has been a rather shabby record that all of us have had about coming to these meetings prepared to discuss the items on the agenda. Now, if indeed a different composition of the Corps of Instruction would change that I would be all for it, in some ways. I think there would be some very big losses, however. Secondly, I just want to make the observation that, and maybe this is the other hat, I am very troubled by what I heard tonight about the we-and-them mentality that has run through four or five major issues. And I am concerned about excluding the students. They have made this body a bit of an exception throughout the System. And so I think those are serious moves but I do think this is a conversation we need to have."

Dr. Mutter (CHPS) replied: "I think it is important for senators, voting senators, to remember whom we represent. We are elected by the Corps of Instruction of our respective Colleges to represent their concerns. The Corps of Instruction is defined in *Statute* as full time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, lecturers, and teaching personnel, full time research and extension personnel and duly certified librarians. I think it is important to have an SGA liaison to the Senate but, as with administrators, why should they sit as members of the Faculty Senate when they are not elected faculty members? Simply put, the Senate should be the official domain of elected senators. All others are welcome guests, and their issues should be addressed with the endorsement of elected senators. Maybe it's all semantics anyway. Perhaps we should simply rename ourselves the University Senate. This characterization would then fit our present composition. Or is there a perspective unique to the Corps of Instruction that warrants a true Faculty Senate made up of elected faculty who convene their own meetings?"

Dr. Leo Parrish (COBA) stated: "Department chairs around the table are elected. They are part of the Corps of Instruction. Is that correct?"

Dr. Mutter (CHPS) replied: "Very important point. This motion excludes all administrators from the table. If there is a weak point in this motion, it is in interpreting the term "Corps of Instruction." That is a very important issue that needs to be looked at. The way I interpret it, I don't think Chairs are considered "full-time professors, associate professors, etc." as suggested by the *Statutes*. I read the Corps of Instruction to preclude chairs that sit on our Senate right now. That's my reading of it, but it's an open issue."

Dr. Parrish (COBA) followed up: "You know if what we are saying is we can no longer elect chairs to the Faculty Senate, and I understand that is the response you just gave, I'm very much opposed to it. Second question: as I read this I am confused, Larry, that the motion is offered simply to get a "sense." I'm confused as to what I would be voting on."

Dr. Mutter (CHPS) replied: "I would like to clarify that. Article XII of the *Statutes* lays this out. We don't make any decisions here. We are simply getting a sense of the Faculty Senate's view on this issue. It then moves to the President, who must appoint a committee to review and consider this change to the *Statutes*. The President has the power to appoint anyone he or she wants to this committee. This committee then reviews and revises the proposal--this motion that I made--and then gives it back to the Senate for consideration. If the Senate approves it, it's still advisory to the

President. If the President buys into it, it then goes to the Chancellor. If the Chancellors buys into it, it goes to the Board of Regents. This is a very lengthy process. We are just getting a sense today of whether the Senate wants this issue forwarded in the first place."

Dr. Jake Simons (COBA) stated: "I speak against the motion because as I see it the crux of the issue is that since the administrative members are non-voting members, and since at the same time the meeting is open and we say that we encourage them to come, the question is really one of whether or not we are explicitly inviting them to come and participate. I believe that that's important for two reasons: 1) for availability to us as senators to be able to get information that we need in our deliberations, and 2) while I do acknowledge that certainly there are going to be instances where people are intimidated by the presence of someone, if there are contentious issues, I think it is equally important for the administrators to be aware of that, which they won't necessarily be unless we ask them to come and hear."

Debate was closed on the motion. The motion was defeated 19-9 with 3 abstentions.

The meeting closed for the evening at 6:30 p.m. and was scheduled to reconvene at 4:00 p.m. on December 1.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

DATE: December 1, 1999

Members Present: *absent #substitute

College of Business Administration

Dr. John Hatem
Dr. Jill Martin
Dr. Lowell Mooney
Dr. Leo Parrish
Dr. Jake Simons
Dr. Jack White

College of Education

Dr. Randy Carlson*
Dr. Mary Jackson
Dr. Stephanie Kenney# (Ruth Carroll)
Dr. Mark Kostin
Dr. Kent Rittschof
Dr. Robert Warkentin

College of Health and Professional Studies

Dr. Kent Guion
Dr. Diane Hamilton
Dr. Kathleen Koon
Dr. Larry Mutter
Dr. Joelle Romanchik# (Jim Bigley)

College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences

Ms. Kathy Albertson*
Dr. Jean-Paul Carton
Dr. Charles Crouch
Dr. Hal Fulmer
Dr. Chris Geyerman*
Dr. Saba Jallow
Dr. Clara Krug
Mr. Mike Mills
Dr. Sue Moore*
Dr. Patrick Novotny
Dr. Candy Schille
Dr. Steven Weiss
Dr. Janie Wilson

College of Science and Technology

Library

Ms. Iris Durden
Mr. Charles Skewis

Administrators

President Bruce Grube
Acting Provost and VPAA
Linda Bleicken*
Vice President Jim Britt*
Vice President Ron Core*
Acting Vice President
Melanie McClellan
University Librarian Bede
Mitchell
Dean Charlene Black
Dean Arnold Cooper
Dean Carl Gooding*
Acting Dean Jeff Buller
Dean Jimmy Solomon*
Dean Lane Van Tassell*
Dean Fred Whitt*

Representatives

SGA President Aaron Nicely*
SGA Vice President for Academic
Affairs Casey Jackson*
Senate Secretary Dr. Larry Mutter
Senate Librarian Dr. Hal Fulmer
Senate Parliamentarian Dr. Jeff
McLellan
EPC/SPC Representative Dr. Sue
Moore
NCAA Representative Dr. Richard
Rogers
Liaison Ms. Ruth Ann Rogers

Alternates

1st
Gisele Gaudet, CHPS
Richard Tichich, CLASS
Susan Williams, COBA
Ruth Carroll, COE

Alternates (cont.)

John Rafter, COST
Wanda Grandberry, LIB

3rd
Pat Walker, CLASS
Jerry Wilson, COBA
Delores Liston, COE
Janet O'Brien, COST
Ann Hamilton, LIB

4th
Tim Whelan, CLASS
Ed Walker, COBA
Deborah Thomas, COE
Sharon Barrs, COST
David Lowder, LIB

5th
Rose-Marie Stallworth
Clark, CLASS
Linda Plevyak, COE
Norman Schmidt, COST
Diana Sanders, LIB

6th
Sharon Tracy, CLASS
Diana Hammitte, COE
David Williams, COST
Fred Smith, LIB

7th
Karen McCurdy, CLASS
Amy Heaston, COE
Lynn Fine, COST
Laura Davidson, LIB

Dr. John Averett	Wil Grant, COST
Dr. J.B. Claiborne	Sonya Gaither, LIB
Dr. Frank French *	
Dr. Gerald Jones*	2 nd
Dr. Bruce McLean	Jim Bigley, CHPS
Dr. Allison Morrison-Shetlar	Donnie Richards, CLASS
Mr. John Wallace	Steve Rutner, COBA
Ms. Pamela Watkins# (John Rafter)	Susan Franks, COE

VISITORS: Simon Attle, CHPS; Bob Haney, Office of VPAA.

The continuation meeting of the November 30, 1999, Faculty Senate was called to order by President Grube at 4 p.m.

Dr. Grube opened the meeting and passed the gavel to Dr. Robert Warkentin, Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, who presided over the business of the Senate for the remainder of the meeting.

**11. Report from Robert Warkentin, Chair, Senate Executive Committee
Senate Executive Committee Update on Activities**

a. Minutes

Dr. Warkentin announced that the minutes of Senate Executive Committee meetings would be available on the web after each SEC meeting.

b. Request for Agenda Item Submission Form (see attachment 5)

Dr. Lowell Mooney (COBA), SEC member, distributed the agenda item submission form to senators and described its rationale:

"Back during the summer at one of our SEC meetings, there was some concern expressed that folks were not sure exactly where to submit requests to the SEC: The President's Office, Chair of the SEC, or to any SEC member. So we decided that we probably did need some central collection point and mechanism to collect information and the President had already indicated a willingness to create an office for the Faculty Senate. So we thought it was a good timing to create a PO Box for the Senate, as well as an e-mail account. What you have in front of you is a form that you can use to submit your requests to the SEC and when your request comes in to PO Box 8150, it will be automatically forwarded to each member of the SEC committee. So that way there reduces the possibility that some of your requests might not get responded to. We looked in the *Bylaws* and it states that our responsibilities are approving agenda items and establishing ad hoc committees, so the first two forms in the package are for those two purposes. I think the forms are very self-explanatory. They are brand new, so if you think that we have left off some important piece of information, please let us know we will be happy to revise the form. The last one is simply a request for information. It seems traditionally that many times when folks make an inquiry to the SEC they are not necessarily wanting to establish or create an agenda item; they just want information. You'll see on all three of the forms there's a place for us to record the action that we take in response to your request. So it's a good way to document that 1) you have submitted a request, and 2) we have, in fact, responded to your request."

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked a question about the timing of agenda item submissions and about how to handle attachments to agenda item submissions.

Dr. Mooney (COBA) responded: "Probably it would be an improvement in the form to have some language at the bottom that says in order to be considered for the next Senate meeting it has to be submitted to the SEC by a certain deadline. So I think that would help. Notice in the first section, there is a place for you to indicate whether or not you have attachments. So I think it would just be helpful to the SEC that if you have additional information that supports your request it would be good to go ahead and include it. Just mark that box "yes," with attachments, and staple them to it."

Dr. Warkentin followed up by explaining that ten days before the date of the Senate meeting was the "bare minimum" time limit needed to make copies of attachments to agenda items so they could be distributed to senators.

c. Debate on Agenda Items (see attachment 6)

Dr. Warkentin asked Dr. Hal Fulmer (CLASS) to discuss a draft proposal by the SEC regarding a time limit for debate on motions on the Senate floor. The proposal (attachment 6) reads:

"In order to assure that all members of the Senate have an opportunity to comment on motions on the floor of the Senate, the Senate Executive Committee states that the floor will be open for debate following the motion and a second (if a second is required). Each member of the Senate will be given an opportunity to speak for or against the motion that is on the floor. The Chair will grant each speaker two minutes for this purpose."

Dr. Fulmer (CLASS) explained that the intent of the proposal was to promote and encourage discussion and he invited feedback on it. He stated:

"What we'd like to see is a very active and energized Senate. As you know, a lot of deliberative bodies have a policy where there is some type of limitation of the amount of time that a person can speak at any one time so that you get more voices on the floor."

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) pointed out that Valdosta State's Senate Executive Committee places a limit of five minutes on speakers. She also questioned the idea that limiting the number of minutes a person speaks is the same as getting additional people to speak.

Related to the activities of the SEC, Dr. Saba Jallow (CLASS) inquired about how the SEC "arrived at appointing the task force to look at restructuring the Senate without involving the senators in the debate."

Dr. Fulmer (CLASS) suggested that that issue would be more appropriate under new business. Dr. Jallow (CLASS) disagreed and pressed the inquiry.

Dr. Warkentin stated that the composition of the task force had not been finalized.

Dr. Grube stated: "Let me try at this one for just a moment if my voice will hold out. My apologies perhaps for not being as clear yesterday as I might have been on this issue. I charged the Provost and the SEC with working with me on the organization of the Senate along the lines that I have

discussed publicly with many of you. The only piece of that that I left open was I said that if the SEC wants to exercise some flexibility by bringing others to bear upon the issue that that was fine. But what I wanted to avoid was trying to sit down with forty-some plus people. My charge to look at the Senate organization was charged directly to the SEC. The reason I did that was the SEC are your elected representatives, so I just assume that they represent you. But I still gave them some wiggle room there if there needed to be a person or two added."

The discussion resumed on the issue of the SEC proposal regarding a time limit on debate on motions on the Senate floor.

Jill Martin (COBA) supported the idea of a time limit as a mechanism to compel senators to be clear and concise in arguments on the Senate floor.

Steve Weiss (CLASS) asked Dr. Fulmer (CLASS) for clarification on the proposal: "Are you suggesting that each member will be given an opportunity to speak up to two minutes, or could a member speak three times for an aggregate of two minutes, or could a member speak once for one minute, and then could they only speak again if everybody has spoken? I mean, there's a lot of ambiguity here that needs clarification."

Dr. Fulmer (CLASS) responded: "I think that's the kind of feedback that we need. I think that the intent is to try to get folks to make the point and then someone else make a point and then as the motion evolves and as that changes then clearly people should be able to come back and comment further. So it's not a case of saying you've got your two minutes and that's all you are ever going to get. So yes, as the motion unfolds and as it becomes a more complex motion, then certainly people can speak again."

Mr. Mike Mills (CLASS) asked: "I was just wondering is there not a parliamentary procedure whereby members could cede their time to someone else who's maybe a little verbose."

Dr. Warkentin believed there was but that it needed to be checked into.

Clara Krug (CLASS) distributed a memo suggesting ways to improve the Senate's deliberations. These included recommendations to the SEC to 1) focus on orientation of new senators vis-a-vis their responsibilities, Senate protocol, and procedures and deadlines for submitting agenda items; 2) focus on ways to get senators to meetings; and 3) establish a uniform election process across all colleges that includes nominations, election by mail ballot, submission of written platforms, etc.

Dr. Candy Schille (CLASS) followed up on Dr. Krug's (CLASS) recommendations by suggesting a recall procedure for both senators and SEC members.

In response to these comments, Dr. Warkentin stated: "Okay, Clara can we take this as advice on the orientation of new senators? This is a good list of things that we need to cover with them in the future."

The discussion resumed on the issue of the SEC proposal regarding a time limit on debate on motions on the Senate floor.

Dr. Charlie Crouch (CLASS) stated: "I'm a little bit disturbed by the limit, although I can understand your reasoning and I think it might indeed promote debate, but it also might lead to a stifling of discussion amongst the senators. I'd also like to add that it seems incongruous to me that on the one hand President Grube told us he wanted us to take a proactive stance and be a proactive Senate, but now we are presented with a polite "sit down and shut up" and we'll decide how best to do this restructuring for you."

Dr. Kathleen Koon (CHPS) stated: "I'd just like to say that a limitation on debate is a common procedure in organizational meetings. I'm not sure about the length. I did have one question for the maker of attachment 6: would there be some sort of exception for the maker of a motion?"

Dr. Warkentin responded: "Yes, so that the person presenting the motion may take longer. Yes, this is a reasonable approach."

Dr. Warkentin then raised the issue of the confirmation of the appointment by the SEC of Jeff McLellan as Senate Parliamentarian.

Motion: Motion was made, seconded and approved to appoint Jeff McLellan as Senate Parliamentarian.

Dr. Warkentin invited McLellan to make a few announcements about his role. McLellan stated:

"I'm not a member of the Senate and I'm not an active participant in any of the deliberations. The *Bylaws* say that the Parliamentarian serves as a counsel to the presiding officer regarding matters of parliamentary procedure. And I view that as that I speak when I am spoken to. So I don't jump in and make objections even though I see something really going away from the rules. I am a neutral here and I really don't have an opinion; all I am is the rule keeper. I am also not the sergeant in arms, so I don't enforce the rules. If I see someone clearly tampering with *Robert's Rules of Order* it's your responsibility to make a motion to stop that from happening. I would encourage you to read the *Robert's Rules* if you are proceeding or going to entertain actions and you are going to be making motions."

"I think it is important that speakers identify themselves before speaking and it makes it easier for the Secretary to keep the records of what motions are on the floor, and what's been said. You need to identify yourself, and speak your motions clearly, so that Larry Mutter can get those down in order to come back to that when it's time to vote. And the last is that you need to have the consent of the Chair--this is just a parliamentary reminder because everyone violates this--before you speak. If you're not recognized by the Chair, you shouldn't be speaking. I think that formality would move the meeting along, and make for a cleaner, crisper meeting, which I hear a lot of people expressing to me."

Dr. Steve Weiss (CLASS) commented that he secured a copy of "*Robert's Rules of Order Made Simple*" from Amazon.com for \$5. Dr. Warkentin reminded faculty that the Rules are on the President's Office web page.

7. Freshmen Admission Requirements for Academic Year 2000-2001: Dr. Black

Dr. Charlene Black (AVPAA), representing Dr. Bleicken (Acting Provost) in the presentation of the

proposed admission criteria for Fall of 2000, stated:

"Many of you may be aware that in 1996, the Board of Regents announced that there would be new admission criteria for the Fall 2001, which affected various institutions in the University System in different ways. The goal for the regional universities was two-fold, 1) to reduce the number of students to zero who had college preparatory curriculum deficiencies, so the elimination of CPC deficiencies for regularly admitted students, and 2) to eliminate students at the University who would be required by System requirements to be in Learning Support courses. Georgia Southern, in preparation for the 2001 admission criteria, developed a five-year phase-in plan so that by the year 2001 we will be at the admission standards which are appropriate for us as a regional institution."

"Our phase-in plan calls for us to eliminate one of the CPC deficiencies requirements each year. So in 1996 we allowed students with 5 to attend, then we went to 4, to 3, to 2. We had about 750 students who had System required Learning Support requirements at that point in time and to eliminate them to zero by the year 2001 we were basically looking at reducing them by 150 each year as we progressed toward 2001. We are proposing for Fall of 2000 a set of admission standards that would allow us to do exactly that."

Dr. Black distributed a handout that explained the proposed admission criteria. She then described the handout:

"To be regularly admitted to the University you must have a 480 verbal and a 440 math and a 2.0 or higher high school GPA based on academic subjects and no more than one CPC deficiency. That would be the criteria for regular admission. Provisional admission is granted to students who do not meet the regular admission criteria, but who do meet Georgia Southern's minimum. In achieving our goal toward moving toward 2001 criteria we have been raising the minimum each year for the past three years and we are proposing an additional raising of that minimum for the Fall of 2000. You see stated there that the index we use is a verbal score plus the math score plus the high school GPA times 100. In the Fall of 1999, the floor was set at 1085. We are proposing that for the Fall of 2000, we set the minimum at 1095, a 10 point increase. In addition, so that we may be a bit more aggressive in eliminating the number of students with System required Learning Support that any student who has an index of 1095 to 1135 and who has a System Learning Support requirement, not be admitted to the University. So in another words, if you are in that range of 1095 to 1135, you must not have any System requirements to be admitted to the University."

Motion: Dr. Black (AVPAA) motioned the adoption of these admission criteria. The motion was seconded. Discussion of the motion ensued.

Dr. Hal Fulmer (CLASS) asked: "Charlene, I just want to clarify something; if a person that met the indices or exceeded it had 1135 plus, would that person then be able to have some System required Learning Support and still be admitted?"

Dr. Black (AVPAA) responded: "Yes, they would. We currently have 11.5 percent of the freshman class who have System required Learning Support. We need to be, by Fall of 2000, down to 5 percent to be on target. And we do have at Georgia Southern quite a number of very well qualified students who have imbalances in their indices. With a very high math score, it is not unusual for that person to have a verbal score which places them below 430, places them in System required Learning Support. Likewise the other imbalance of the very high verbal and the low math. But the

student would have to have a very high score in one of these to be in that category. We would probably have about 150 students in Fall of 2000 who might be in that category."

Dr. Saba Jallow (CLASS) asked if the grading scale is uniform across all the schools from which students apply and, if not, does GSU weight grade point averages according to schools?

Dr. Black (AVPAA) replied: "There is no weighting. We take what the high school sends us as the average of the students who graduate from those high schools. There is typically a uniform grading now. We do not rank high schools."

Dr. Richard Tichich (CLASS) stated: "I would be remiss if I didn't point out the State problem with not counting Fine Arts courses in the high school grade point average. It impacts us in the Music and Theatre departments. If you are a Fine Arts major seeking entrance to Georgia Southern the courses that you have taken in preparation for the Fine Arts academic program do not count in your admission requirements. It's not one that we have control over; it's a State issue. Florida has adopted a system where if you are in the Fine Arts you can challenge that and then it has to be recalculated with the Fine Arts courses when you are seeking admission to the University. Georgia has yet to get that system, so we're still at a disadvantage."

Discussion of the motion ended. The motion to approve the proposed freshmen admission requirements for 2000-2001 was passed.

8. Extra Compensation Policy: Dr. Bleicken

Dr. Charlene Black (AVPAA), representing Dr. Bleicken (Acting Provost), referred to materials attached to the agenda that explained the extra compensation policy. She stated that the development of the policy was a result of a recommendation from the Internal Auditor who concluded that there was no consistent method across campus for handling extra compensation. A committee chaired by Dr. Bob Haney developed the proposed policy. It was brought to the Senate for review. However, since the extra compensation policy was an administrative policy, there would be no vote on it. The floor was opened for questions of Dr. Haney, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) asked Dr. Haney a question on behalf of Ms. Pam Watkins (COST) who had to leave the meeting: "Section 1, item c says that additional duties must not be so heavy as to interfere with the performances of regular duties, in order for us to teach overloads. But since we all have to do scholarship on our free time, and of course, service, I guess the case could be made that we would always have something interfere with those if we tried to do an overload. Even more important than that, in section 2, the first long sentence says that the overload would have to occur outside of normal working hours, and actually it goes on to define those normal working hours as pretty much any time at all for nine-month people. So is there a way that you get actually get paid to teach an overload?"

Dr. Haney (AVPAA) responded: "Janie, you'll find that the overload policy already existed and it was one of the few things that we could import into this policy without having to write a policy. Because of the way we must schedule classes, if you choose to accept to teach an overload, you would teach that overload when it is scheduled and when the students have signed up. So it certainly would be an exception to this wording on page one."

Dr. Wilson (CLASS) asked: "Is there anything in here that indicates something like what's a full teaching load or how would we know that it was an overload?"

Dr. Haney (AVPAA) replied: "No, because each College has a separate workload policy or guideline."

Dr. Wilson (CLASS) asked: "One last item, I just noticed, second page, A2, in bold it says that the Chancellor's approval is required in advance for extra compensation in teaching. And oftentimes we have whole bunch of people enrolling at the last minute and have to add classes. Is there time to actually get Chancellor's approval for that?"

Dr. Haney (AVPAA) replied: "In practice, the Chancellor's office allows us to submit overloads for approval through the second week of classes. So we do that at the beginning of the semester, and have that approval in place and as you know those payments are made only at the end of the term."

In response to a question from Dr. Warkentin, Dr. Haney pointed out that several universities in Georgia have extra compensation policies, including the University of Georgia, Georgia State University, Georgia Tech, and the Medical College of Georgia. Georgia Southern University's policy was modeled on these, which have been in place for years and survived various audits.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) stated: "Jake Simons forwarded to the senators a couple of concerns of Russell Kent. He has an example about annual leave; he gave an example: if Ralph Byington teaches an accounting update for continuing education on a Thursday from 9 to 5, can he be paid if he takes annual leave on that day? That has been an issue but it is still unclear in the current policy."

Dr. Haney (AVPAA) responded: "That was a comment that came to us in the early stages of the policymaking. And we addressed it on the first page under the bullets in Roman Numeral II. Originally, the draft said when on sick leave or annual leave. At one time we had a controller who would not make payments to people for work they did while on annual leave, but we felt that if you are on annual leave you should be able to do what you want to and we were able to take that out of there, so yes someone who takes annual leave could earn extra compensation while on annual leave."

Dr. Krug (CLASS) followed up: "Another question that Russell had was about the rate of pay; he had concerns about the rate of pay being in line with the rate of compensation pay for the performance of the individual's normal duties. He mentioned varying salaries across Colleges."

Dr. Haney (AVPAA) responded: "That was brought up to us in the early comment period. That is one of the principles that we were more or less handed by Board of Regents' Policy; there is a statement in Regents' Policy that pretty much says exactly what we said under Roman Numeral III, amount of extra compensation. So those variations from unit to unit would be preserved. But Regents' Policy does not allow us to say you can pay a wildly higher rate for extra comp, as compared to your normal compensation."

Dr. Krug (CLASS) stated: "So it would be conceivable that there would, let's say, be a collaborative project with somebody from the Humanities and somebody from Accountancy, where they were co-directors and yet the salaries would be quite different."

Dr. Haney (AVPAA) responded: "That's conceivable. Generally my observation in processing extra compensation has been that in a case like that, where people are co-directors of something, they're paid on an equal basis."

Dr. Kathleen Koon (CHPS) asked: "One of our faculty members wondered if an individual would be able to earn extra compensation and be paid in the summer?"

Dr. Haney (AVPAA) replied: "You're speaking of a nine-month faculty member? Yes, that's theoretically possible under this policy. If someone is not teaching a full load in the summer, it's likely that whatever payments they earn would be made as summer compensation. Extra compensation would come into play only if they had maxed out in terms of a full load for summer."

Dr. Wilson (CLASS) stated: "Let me just clarify this one last thing: extra compensation shall be available to all employees as defined above, but only for services rendered other than the individual employee's normal employment duties and that occur outside normal working hours. For purposes of this policy, normal working hours for nine-month faculty is defined as all times required including evening class assignments, student contact hours, committee assignments, and to perform regular instructional, research, and service duties for each academic term from the date of course registration through the examination schedule."

Dr. Haney (AVPAA) responded: "Well, remember it is quite legitimate if you are teaching an evening class to have some time off when you are not teaching that class, and I assume that that would be during the daytime. So you could earn extra compensation during that time. Many people who have night classes out of town have certain hours in the morning when they don't come in and I think that's legitimate and those would be times you could perform extra compensation and be paid for them. The difficulty in defining the faculty workday is one that we did not want to do by defining clock hours, because that would be ludicrous."

**9. Modification to *Bylaws*, Faculty Senate Standing Council: Undergraduate Council:
Dr. Black
Change from the Director of the First Year Experience and Director of Advisement
and Retention to the Director of Advisement and Retention.**

Dr. Charlene Black (AVPAA) explained the rationale behind the proposal to modify the *Bylaws*: "When the current *Bylaws* were revised we wanted to add to the Undergraduate Council the position of Director of Advisement. At that point in time, the individual who served as Director of Advisement also served as Director of the First Year Experience, so they were indeed one and the same individual. Last year, we divided those two positions and there is a Director of Advisement and Retention, Dr. Judy Schomber, and there is a Director of the First Year Experience and the University Honor's Programs, Dr. Fred Richter. The intent is for the person serving in the capacity of Director of Advisement to be a part of Undergraduate Council because we are dealing with curriculum and programs of study and how they effect individuals across the campus. So we are asking for a clarification because the intent is for the person in charge of Advisement to be on that council."

Motion: Dr. Charlene Black motioned to change the Senate *Bylaws* from "the Director of the First Year Experience and Director of Advisement and Retention" to "the Director of Advisement and Retention."

There was no discussion of the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Nomination and Election of Faculty Representative on the Parking and Transportation Committee: Chair Warkentin

Dr. Lowell Mooney (COBA) nominated Ms. Kitty Willaims (COBA) to serve as the faculty representative on the Parking and Transportation Committee. There were no other nominations. The Senate confirmed the nomination of Ms. Williams and unanimously elected her.

12. Report from EPC/SPC Representative Sue Moore

Ms. Iris Durden (Library) presented the report for Dr. Sue Moore (CLASS) who was attending an SPC meeting. Ms. Durden stated: "The SPC has been meeting frequently, working on the first draft of the Strategic Plan. We have met with a variety of groups including Senate Executive Committee, Deans' Council, Personnel Advisory Council, Undergraduate and Graduate Student Groups, Jekyll Island Administrative Group, and the African American Caucus. The first draft is planned to be distributed during exam week. Please give this draft your serious attention. They do want feedback. There have been no EPC meetings so nothing needs to be reported at this time."

13. Report from NCAA Representative Richard Rogers

Dr. Richard Rogers (CLASS) reported on several issues related to collegiate athletics. Dr. Rogers' report began with the subject of men's basketball: "Some time ago I mentioned to this group that there was a working group appointed to study the sad state of men's basketball nationally. That group has brought some proposed legislation to the NCAA membership. I'll briefly mention three of the more radical items. Item one encourages all entering basketball student athletes to attend summer school before their first Fall term by allowing institutions to pay them financial aid, athletically-related financial aid, if they are enrolled for a minimum of 6 hours that count towards their degree. Item two: scholarships will be permitted based on graduation rate. Institutions that have a graduation rate for men's basketball only of above 75 percent would get 14 scholarships; graduation rates from 33 to 74 percent would get 13 scholarships, which is the current, and less than 32 percent could only get 12 scholarships. A third item is basketball student athletes must successfully complete at least 12 hours towards their degree by the end of the first term of their freshman year with a 2.0 in such hours. These have been rushed on to the table because the working group of largely institutional CEOs saw them as so important. They have gotten there so quickly that they probably haven't received a legal review. We're still waiting for that legal review but these are some of the things that are being considered right now as proposed legislation."

Dr. Rogers also reported on several changes within the Athletic Department, notably the replacement of Senior Women's Administrator in Athletics Brenda Carter by Cathy Beene, and updated the Senate on the status of several of the University's teams. He finished by welcoming the input of senators regarding the content, format, and method of delivery of his future reports.

14. Old Business: Child Care Update: Chair Warkentin

Dr. Warkentin recognized Dr. Georgina Hickey, a representative of the Women's Network Child Care Committee, and invited her to update the Senate regarding campus child care issues.

Dr. Hickey stated: "Most recently my Committee has gotten together to facilitate discussions on what we feel is a very important instructional and workplace issue. We are particularly interested in the less than adequate supply of child care available in Statesboro; the lack of part time care, which is important for our students; the lack of after school care, which is important for many of our staff, and the lack of infant care, which is important for those of us with infants. We would really like to encourage the Senate, the administration, the SGA, Women's Network, and everyone to be involved in a larger dialogue of a campus child care center as well as making Georgia Southern a more family friendly campus all the way around."

"As most of you probably know, there was a survey of faculty and staff done in the Spring of 1998, and 80 percent of the respondents supported a campus child care center. If you haven't seen the results of that it is on the President's web page. Over the past month or so there's been articles in the *George-Anne* on the issue, and we are starting to see a lot of students asking what they can do, how they can get involved, where their input might be gathered as the survey did not include a survey of students' needs or feelings on a campus child care center. There's been a fairly lively ListServe discussion, I understand, among you folks, but also among Women's Networkers."

"I guess President Grube referenced this yesterday that there were cost reports done at his urging. One on the building that came in before the last Senate meeting, and one that was turned in yesterday afternoon just before the Senate meeting on program cost. The Senate had asked at its last meeting to have those and President Grube was agreeable to have those posted on the President's web site so that we all can see them. And of course Women's Network is interested in seeing those. I was not involved in the program cost report at all, but I have talked with Jerri Kropp about it. It's essentially going to be an extension of the Family Life Center on campus, and include some of the real strengths of that program. The Family Life Center is one of only about 2 percent of child care centers in Georgia that is not only licensed, but is also accredited. It's a real mark of distinction for us and certainly the Family Life Center, and any sort of expansion of that would serve our Early Childhood Education majors and our childhood development majors."

"The last bit I wanted to mention is that there was a call from this body for a public forum. Women's Network tried to organize one, ran into scheduling problems, but found an enormous amount of support, particularly from staff and students that they really would like to have a place to put in their two cents, to learn about what kinds of programs we could look at. We'd like to talk about it."

Dr. Steve Weiss (CLASS) asked: "When will the report be posted on the web and when can we move ahead with a forum for discussion?"

Dr. Grube replied: "First of all, having just received Jerri's report yesterday--unless somebody agreed for me--I hadn't agreed to put it on the web. Although that is not a bad idea and we'll do it. I think I mentioned to the group yesterday that I am in a discussion with the PAC--where this came

up long before it came up in the Senate--and Virginia Samiratedu, who is a member of that group and has been working with Jerri Kropp. Ron Core completed a set of cost estimates for a facility. So I think we are getting very close to the point where we can put all of that together and know what kind of costs we are actually looking at. I feel an obligation to kick off my initial discussion, however, with the group that I started it with, but no reason that immediately following that we can't get information out and we will put it on the web."

"I don't detect that debate on the normative question is what's at stake here. With most folks that I have talked to it is not an issue of should we or should we not; it's going to come down to an issue probably of what we can and can't afford, and that's when we are going to have to think about how innovative we can be. Jerri has given us some cost but I can't say that I have it memorized and that I understand it totally yet. But on the surface, it looks like with certain kinds of weekly and monthly charges on the operational costs of personnel, benefits, the operating costs, that we might be able to come close to breaking even on that part of the budget; maybe some deficits, depending on the number of children the center might have and the type of program that might be there. You can imagine a baby sitting service would cost you one thing, but something that's going to require Ph.D.s in Jerri's area to be involved is going to be quite another matter. The physical facility estimates, and I am doing this off the top of my head, range as high, as I recall, about \$1.4 million. And so to put it in the vernacular this is not "chump change," we are going to have to sit down and figure this out. And if we decide we are going to do this then something is going to have to give somewhere else, and we'll just have to figure out what that is. But I'll have the information out and we'll get it back into this body very, very quickly."

15. New Business: Discussion Forum and Questions from the Floor

Dr. Larry Mutter (CHPS) asked for clarification of the process and rationale for selecting non SEC members to the Senate Restructuring Task Force, particularly the appointment of Dr. Leo Parrish.

Dr. Warkentin responded: "We need to put this in context. Over the past several months, we have had a whirlwind of changes that have been very positive. Dr. Grube met with us and gave us the freedom to begin thinking about what we want this meeting to be. And in that context also was mentioned the idea of the task force to be given the assignment of rejuvenating discussion and perhaps even dealing with larger issues of committees and so on. And in that discussion it was our perception that the Senate Executive Committee was looked upon to represent this task force. And we thought we should add others to it. Leo's name came up as one who has served in a variety of positions on campus. But there was no exclusion of anyone. The way I envision the task force is that we are still in the process of negotiating who are the people that will be on it. We may add others. There wasn't anything magical about Leo."

Dr. Mutter (CHPS) had an additional comment about the future work of the Senate Restructuring Task Force as it relates to changing the GSU *Statutes*. He stated: "I want to remind the SEC they can tinker all they want with *Bylaws*, but when you move into the *Statutes*, the President, by statute, is required to set up what is called the Committee on Revision of the *Statutes*, which he appoints."

There was further discussion about the importance of following the *Bylaws* and *Statutes* in future restructuring of the Senate. Several members indicated their desire to offer nominations from the floor for persons to be considered for appointment to the Senate Restructuring Task Force.

Dr. Warkentin: "I don't think that we're in a position right now to take nominations and do elections because we haven't moved in our conception of what this is yet and we have not drawn closure to that committee."

Several senators, notably Drs. Crouch (CLASS) and Wilson (CLASS), stated their desire to allow senators to have input in the selection of members to the Senate Restructuring Task Force.

Motion: Dr. Charles Crouch moved that the Senate Executive Committee seek input from the Senate regarding enlargement of and appointment to the Senate Restructuring Task Force. The motion was seconded.

There was discussion about the merits of having the larger Senate body become involved in the selection of task force members.

The motion passed.

16. Announcements: Vice Presidents

There were no announcements from Vice Presidents.

17. Announcements from the Floor

Dr. Hal Fulmer (CLASS) reminded the Senate that the main stage theatre production *Last Night of Ballyhoo* is December 8-11 in McRoan Auditorium.

Dr. Richard Tichich (CLASS) stated: "I have been on the Senate for about 10 years, and the last two days have been the most vital that I have seen the Faculty Senate go through. So I would like to congratulate all the existing senators and the SEC and all the committees."

18. Adjournment

The Senate was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Larry Mutter
Senate Secretary