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Senators Absent: John Brown, Frank French, Steve Hale, Alison Morrison-Shetlar, Sandra Peacock, Deborah Thomas, Matthew Williamson

Administrative Members in Attendance: Linda Bleicken, Kathleen Burke, Jeff McLellan, Bede Mitchell, Richard Rogers, Lane Van Tassell, Vaughn Vandegrift,


The February 11 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Dr. Vaughn Vandegrift (acting for Dr. Bruce Grube) at 4:00 p.m. Dr. Vandegrift opened the meeting and presented the gavel to Dr. Candy Schille (CLASS), Faculty Senate Moderator. Dr. Schille presided over the business of the Senate for the rest of the meeting.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the February 11, 2002, meeting

Motion: Dr. Candy Schille (CLASS) moved the acceptance of the agenda. The motion was approved.

2. Approval of the November 28, 2001, Minutes:

Motion: Ms. Laura Davidson (LIB) moved the acceptance of the November 28, 2001 minutes. The motion was seconded and approved.

3. Librarian’s Report of February 4, 2002: Librarian Dr. Jean-Paul Carton

Motion: Dr. Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) reported the omission of an attachment for the Graduate Committee minutes. With that exception, he moved the approval of the Librarian’s Report.
Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if Senators could get copies of the survey being conducted by the Undergraduate Committee. Dr. Schille suggested distributing the survey to Senators via e-mail.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked about the pilot projects for students failing History and Math classes reported in the Academic Affairs Council minutes. Dr. Linda Bleicken (VP/Enrollment Management and Student Affairs) responded that there are two classes in Math and two in History that are working with the Academic Success Center. In one class in each pair, instructors identified students who were not doing well. Those students were provided with assistance by the Academic Success Center. The other class in each pair served as a control group. In the Fall, some moderate improvement was seen in the Math class, but not much in the History class. The experiment continues with four different classes this Spring. MATH1111 and HIST1112 were selected for this trial because they have the highest failure rates in the institution.

The motion was seconded and approved.

a. Undergraduate Committee Minutes of November 14, 2001, and December 4, 2001

Motion: Dr. Kathleen Koon (CHPS) moved the approval of the November 14, 2001 and December 4, 2001 meetings of the Undergraduate Committee. The motion was seconded and approved.

b. Graduate Committee Minutes of November 15, 2001:

Motion: Dr. Ming Li (CHPS) moved the approval of the November 15, 2001 meeting of the Graduate Committee. The motion was seconded and approved.

c. Faculty Welfare Committee: Policy on Centers and Institutes:

Motion: Dr. David Dudley (CLASS) moved the approval of the Policy on Centers and Institutes.

Dr. Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked how faculty personnel issues (hiring, tenure and promotion) would be handled for faculty attached to Institutes. Dr. Vandegrift responded that we would follow Board of Regents criteria, placing them in an administrative unit with a line officer like a department chair, with other faculty in position to make recommendations on tenure and promotion.

The motion was seconded and approved.

d. Task Force on the Role of Faculty in Shared Governance:
Dr. Jill Lockwood (COBA) gave a progress report on the Task Force on the Role of Faculty in Shared Governance. The committee has been developing an inventory of departmental and college policies such as promotion and tenure, post-tenure review, governance documents, committee assignments, and involvement in curriculum. They are investigating if there is a written policy in a given department or college, if it is readily available to the faculty, and if there is a copy in the Provost’s Office. They are also trying to determine the role of the faculty, if any, in those policies. The committee has plans to meet with Dr. Vandegrift to discuss their research.

4. President’s Report: Dr. Bruce Grube (Dr. Vandegrift in the absence of Dr. Grube):

Dr. Vaughn Vandegrift (Provost): Dr. Grube invited everyone to attend the March 7th General Faculty Meeting at the Nessmith-Lane Continuing Education Complex. A groundbreaking ceremony for the new School of Information Technology Building is planned for later this Spring. The building is expected to be completed at about the same time as the Science/Nursing Building. He continued, saying that the President and Provost would be attending budget hearings for the University System on February 13th in Savannah. In spite of the mandated 5% budget cut from the Governor, the new Chancellor felt it appropriate to learn the interests of the institutions in the budgeting process.

5. Report from Senate Executive Committee Chair:

Dr. Candy Schille (Chair, SEC) reported on SEC activities.

The SEC referred three proposals from the Enrollment Management Council to the Academic Standards Committee for consideration. The proposals are the following: first, that there would be a mathematics placement examination for all entering freshmen, second, that midterm grades would be submitted for all students classified as freshmen, and that the grades would be used for intervention purposes, and third, that a plan be developed that would require the successful completion of English and mathematics core courses during the freshman year. Jill Lockwood is chair of that committee.

Dr. Jim LoBue (COST) asked the SEC for elaboration on the criteria used in the decision to set the status of a unit or program of the University to enhanced, reduced, reorganized, monitored, or eliminated. The SEC has asked Martha Abell to discuss this during her report from the EPC/SPC during this meeting.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked that the whole faculty be kept informed of Senate matters. Dr. Schille outlined the steps that have been taken to ensure that this is done.

The SEC was asked to have the Elections Committee oversee Faculty Grievance Committee elections. The SEC has asked the Elections Committee to ensure that those elections are carried out in each college and the library.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked the SEC to address the question of physical harassment or threat(s) to faculty. Dr. Krug listed three specific questions: 1) What should a faculty member do
if this occurs? 2) What response should a faculty member expect the administrative unit and/or university to make? 3) What should a faculty member do if he/she is dissatisfied with the response? Dr. Schille distributed to Senators copies of correspondence with Dr. Jeff McLellan on the subject, and read Dr. McLellan’s response to Senators. In his response, Dr. McLellan observed that the University has several avenues available to address harassment problems. He recommended that faculty, staff, and students faced with threats of physical harassment should contact Public Safety for immediate assistance. Threats that do not warrant police intervention should be referred to the appropriate administrative office on campus, such as the supervisor of the alleged harasser, the office of Judicial Affairs, and/or the Office of Affirmative Action. He affirmed that such complaints are taken seriously and will be investigated. He concluded that it is necessary for an alleged victim of harassment to make a complaint to someone in authority in order for the problem to be investigated.

Dr. Clara Krug asked if a faculty member must wait to contact Public Safety until after they have been harmed. Dr. McLellan responded that, if one feels one’s physical safety is threatened, one should call the police and let them determine what action is necessary.

Dr. Krug then asked what response should a faculty member expect the administrative units and/or University to make. Dr. McLellan responded that the range of possible responses depended largely upon the circumstances surrounding the case.

Dr. Schille suggested that beyond the strictly legal response to harassment, perhaps the University needs an administrative statement that harassment of faculty by faculty or students will not be tolerated.

Dr. Vandegrift suggested that the Office of Affirmative Action has the power to investigate these types of complaints. He went on to assert that as an academic institution we not tolerate an intimidating or threatening environment at the University.

Dr. Krug suggested that a policy statement on harassment be placed in the Faculty Handbook. Dr. Jill Lockwood (COBA) commented that the Federal Title VII requires that policies on harassment be publically posted and recommended the University web as a good place for such a posting. Dr. Vandegrift supported the idea of a general statement on harassment being developed, approved by the Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook. Dr. Saba Jallow (CLASS) suggested that AAUP might be a source for sample policies.

Dr. Schille concluded the discussion by asking that the Faculty Welfare Committee investigate developing a statement on harassment that clearly states that the University recognizes that harassment can be a problem and that victims of harassment will have the University’s backing.
6. **Georgia Southern Environmental Network (handout):**

Dr. Ray Chandler introduced Senators to a new faculty group on campus. It is a network of faculty from all colleges who are interested in campus environmental issues. These issues include environmentally sound growth on campus in addition to the traditional environmental interests of resources and habitat. Further information about the group is available on their web page:  http://www.bio.gasou.edu/GSEN/GSEN.html.

7. **Report from EPC/SPC Representative**

Dr. Martha Abell (COST) reported that the SPC is looking for nominations for the elected faculty position on the committee. She also reported that three of the eight Level II Strategic Plans have been posted on the campus web and input is being sought on those plans from the entire campus community. Non-academic units have already begun writing level three plans.

Dr. Abell then addressed Dr. LoBue’s request for further elaboration on the criteria used to set the status of a unit or program of the University to enhanced, reduced, reorganized, monitored, or eliminated in the program review process. Dr. Abell referred Senators to the original Strategic Planning document, *Navigating a Course Through the Strategic Planning Process*, which came out in March 2001. She then briefly described how the Academic Program Review Committee applied those definitions.

Dr. Jim LoBue (COST) asked if written rationales were available for why programs received assignments other than “maintain.” Dr. Abell responded that in most circumstances, written comments were made by the Deans and included in the program review document before it reached the Academic Program Review Committee. That committee made recommendations to the SPC which made recommendations to the Provost who made recommendations to the President.

Dr. Schille asked if any Dean’s recommendations were overturned by the review committees. Dr. Abell responded in the affirmative and added that those types of changes occurred most between department and Dean, not later in the review process.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked for a further clarification of the definitions of “enhance,” “maintain,” and “reduce.” Dr. Trey Denton (Chair, SPC) responded that programs recommended for enhanced have demonstrated potential to advance the strategic plan in profound and unusual ways. Programs recommended for maintain will have a proven track record of consistent contributions to the institution’s strategic themes and mission. Programs in this category may request additional resources to maintain their current level of support in relation to the strategic plan. Programs recommended for reduce or eliminate exhibit a limited ability to advance the strategic plan and/or are judged to be outside the bounds of a more focused university. He added that these definitions can be
found in the Board of Regents’ Policy Manual, section 205.

Mr. Nick Pearson (SGA) asked if ranking 90% of programs as “maintain” was a requirement of the process. Dr. Denton responded that at the Presidential level of the review process, only 75% of the programs received a “maintain” status.

Dr. LoBue asked if programs with the status of “reduce” or “eliminate” received a detailed discussion of why they were given that status. Dr. Denton responded that no such statement had been given. Dr. Charlie Hardy (Chair, Academic Program Review Committee) discussed the communication process, emphasizing the openness of the decision process and the fact that the Academic Program Review Committee communicated with the Deans, rather than the authors of individual program reviews. Dr. Marc Cyr (CLASS) strongly encouraged that specific explanations be supplied to the programs with the status of “reduce” or “eliminate” or to the department where these programs are housed. Dr. Denton and Dr. Hardy agreed that this would be done.

Dr. Vandegrift pointed out that a complete set of the Academic Program Reviews are on reserve in the Library. He added that the Level II Academic Strategic Plan is now available on the web and that academic departments should now be developing Level III plans that make recommendations for how the Academic Program Review changes should be carried out. He also said that the University’s vision of Academic Distinction was what drew him to Georgia Southern and that he thought the whole Strategic Planning process has been exceptionally well done.

8. **Report from NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:**

Dr. Richard Rogers reported on the academic performance of student athletes for the fall. The detailed information is a part of the Athletic Committee’s minutes, which have been posted to the Senate’s web site. Last fall the overall GPA for all women student athletes was 2.91; for all women students it was 2.73; for all men student athletes, 2.53; and for all men students, 2.51. The teams with the highest team GPAs were men’s and women’s tennis. For all student athletes GPA was 2.69, and all students GPA was 2.58. He commented that as a group our student athletes are doing as well in the classroom as they are in the field of competition.

9. **Old Business**

Dr. Clara Krug asked how faculty could appeal negative tenure and promotion decisions if they are notified of the decision on February 6 and recommendations are forwarded to the Board of Regents on February 8. Dr. Vandegrift responded that only positive recommendations were sent forward on February 8 and that appeal processes were currently underway. He further commented that next year, the time frame for appeals would be more clearly spelled out. Dr.
Krug asked if the Board of Regents had a final deadline beyond which recommendations would not be accepted. Dr. Vandegrift replied that he did not know exactly what that date was and encouraged those with questions to contact the Provost’s office.

Dr. Clara Krug asked if the Faculty Development Committee had decided whether or not to fund proposals that were strictly scholarly presentations. Dr. David Allen responded that the matter is still under consideration by the committee.

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

None.

11. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Dr. Linda Bleicken announced that George Lewis had been appointed the new Director of the Center for Multicultural Affairs.

Dr. Vaughn Vandegrift announced that the recommendation of the Freshman Year Experience committee that GSU1211 become optional had been forwarded to the Undergraduate Committee for action. He also outlined the Academic Affairs response to the mandate for a 5% budget cut for next year. Fourteen searches were stopped and seven other vacant faculty lines were eliminated as well as five staff positions. When money begins coming back in, those eliminated positions will be considered first as part of a plan of restoration. The President’s Cabinet has an understanding that if any money is returned to offset the budget cuts, the faculty teaching area will be the highest priority for the University. He then commented that he is committed to enhancing faculty productivity. He has discovered that there is great interest across the University in assessing faculty roles, workloads, etc. Denise Battles has agreed to chair a task force on faculty workloads and enhancing faculty productivity. A couple of open forums are planned before members of the task force are appointed. He encouraged Senators to contact either Denise or him with recommendations for members for the task force and issues for the task force should consider.

12. Announcements from the Floor

Dr. Karen McCurdy (CLASS) announced a one week extension of the Faculty Excellence in Research Awards (to February 18) because no nominations were received by the deadline.

Dr. Martha Abell announced the upcoming visit of a Nobel Prize winning physicist. He will be on campus March 1 and there will be a public presentation at 7pm in the Performing Arts Center.

Dr. Candy Schille announced that the Georgia Sea Island Singers are performing on campus in the Performing Arts Center at 7pm tonight.
14. Adjournment

A motion was made to adjourn at 5:23pm. It was passed.
The March 26 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Dr. Bruce Grube at 4:00 p.m. Dr. Grube opened the meeting and presented the gavel to Dr. Candy Schille (CLASS), Faculty Senate Moderator. Dr. Schille presided over the business of the Senate for the rest of the meeting.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the March 26, 2002, Meeting

Motion: Dr. Candy Schille (CLASS) moved the acceptance of the agenda. The motion was approved.

2. Approval of the February 11, 2002, Minutes

Motion: Ms. Laura Davidson (LIB) moved the acceptance of the February 11, 2002 minutes. The motion was seconded and approved.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) pointed out an omission in the minutes. She referred to the discussion of the campus policy on physical harassment or threats to faculty in which Dr. Krug, Dr. Schille, and Dr. McLellan discussed the potential repercussions of harassment and making threats. She pointed out that the minutes did not mention the consideration that these acts reflect a lack of collegiality, and as such, might be addressed during the annual review process.
3. Librarian’s Report of March 8, 2002

Motion: Dr. Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) moved the approval of the Librarian’s Report. The motion was seconded and approved.

a. Undergraduate Committee Minutes of January 30, 2002 and February 19, 2002

Dr. Kathleen Koon (CHPS) moved the approval of the January 30, 2002 and February 19, 2002 meetings of the Undergraduate Committee. The motion was seconded and approved.

b. Graduate Committee Minutes of February 21, 2002

Dr. Ming Li (CHPS) moved the approval of the February 21, 2002 meeting of the Graduate Committee. The motion was seconded and approved.

c. Faculty Welfare Committee, Policy on Faculty Absence from Professional Responsibilities

Dr. David Dudley (CLASS) moved the adoption of the policy, Faculty Absence from Professional Responsibilities.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked for clarification of the third bullet of the policy, regarding remuneration for assignments of more than one week. Dr. Dudley responded that coverage of one week of classes would be done as a professional courtesy, but that if coverage was required for more than one week, the faculty member covering the class would be paid for all the classes covered (including that first week).

The motion was seconded and approved.

4. President’s Report

Dr. Bruce Grube (President) focused his remarks on the budget items in front of the Georgia Legislature for the year. The amended budget for this fiscal year has passed both the House and Senate, but has not yet been signed by the Governor. It includes an additional $30,000,000 for the University System to make up for enrollment shortfalls caused by semester conversion, an additional $19,000,000 for health insurance premiums. This is good news since the campus would have had to find a way to cover our share, if the legislature had not provided the additional funds. It also includes $975,000 in planning money for the library addition, but no monies for construction. Not receiving money for construction will slow this project by three to four months. Finally, the amended budget includes matching funds for two more endowed chairs—one for Nursing and one for the College of Education. Spring enrollment is up over 3% from last
spring. Much of this increase reflects our higher admissions standards and the retention efforts we have made. The budget for next fiscal year (2003) has only been approved by the House. This includes 3.25% salary increase, $600,000 in ICAPP money for Georgia Southern that was not recommended by the Governor, $70,200,000 in funding formula for the University System, and nearly $30,000,000 for health insurance premiums. The early numbers for our Fall enrollment look very strong and we have some expectation of seeing SAT averages rise again. He concluded by reminding everyone that we are only five weeks from commencement and everyone is starting to feel pretty worn out. We need to remain calm, reminding ourselves that it is just that time of year.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if summer salaries would be based on the number of students per class on campus. Dr. Vaughn Vandegrift (Provost) responded that last year we began new approach to how the summer sessions will function. If there is a demand for a class and there is a faculty member willing to teach it, provided the class section fills to its normal capacity, we will offer that section. This is as opposed to previous practice where each College offered classes based on a fixed budget that could not be exceeded. How summer assignments are made is ultimately the responsibility of the dean of the college.

5. Report from Senate Executive Committee

Dr. Candy Schille (Chair, SEC) reported that most SEC activities are represented in agenda items for this meeting. In addition, the Faculty Welfare Committee asked for a clarification of their charge regarding the harassment issue. Their charge is, first, to find out if indeed we have any kind of campus harassment policy besides the sexual harassment policy, second, to discover what other universities have such policies and to consider whether one or more might be adapted for use at Georgia Southern.

6. University System Policy on Sexual Orientation, Discrimination

Dr. Candy Schille suggested that the second motion on the agenda (motion 6b) be acted upon first. That motion is as follows:

That the Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate asks the President of the University to review all campus policies and benefit programs that include provisions for the spouses of faculty, staff, and students, and to take the necessary steps to amend such policies to provide equal treatment for the domestic partners of faculty, staff, and students.

The motion was moved, seconded, and approved with no discussion. [Note: The motion was later rescinded. See following discussion.]
partners of employees and students the same benefits and privileges that are provided to
the spouses of employees and students.
This motion was moved and seconded.

Dr. Shawn Forbes (COBA) objected to the wording of the rationale provided to the
Senate in support of this motion. Dr. Schille suggested that since the rationale is not part
of the motion, Dr. Forbes could assist in helping to make the rationale more acceptable.

Dr. Forbes then asked if Dr. Grube or Dr. Vandegrift had a position on the motion. Dr.
Grube responded that he was concerned that the Senate was approving motions that had
not been referred to a committee for study. He pointed out that, for example, Georgia
Southern does not have any local benefits programs that could be addressed by the first
motion and that the ramifications of the second motion reach beyond the Board of
Regents to the General Assembly.

Dr. Forbes then asked why the motions had not been referred to the Faculty Welfare
Committee. Dr. Schille responded that the SEC had determined that it was appropriate to
bring these motions directly to the floor of the Senate. Dr. Forbes suggested that the
motion be referred to the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Dr. John Brown (COBA) moved that the motion on the floor be amended to refer it to the
Faculty Welfare Committee. This motion was seconded, and after some discussion about
Roberts Rules of Order, approved.

After a further discussion of Roberts Rules of Order, Dr. Forbes moved that we rescind the
previous vote (on motion 6b) and refer it to the Faculty Welfare Committee as well. This motion
as seconded and after a show of hands, approved (21 to 6).

Dr. Clara Krug asked if it were important that the motion coming from the Faculty
Welfare Committee be something that the Board of Regents be able to act upon or if it
were important to make a statement similar to that of the other large universities in the
state, as an indication of how these large institutions feel.

7. Revision of Faculty Senate Bylaws (for Discussion)

Dr. Schille described the bulk of the revisions presented to the Senate today as clerical and
encoding current Senate practice. She called the Senate’s attention to three particular changes.
First, Article III, Section 5, parts N (“review and revise as appropriate the apportionment of
Senators from the colleges and the library according to the Statutes”) and O (“adjust term limits
of committee members and Senators as necessary to ensure appropriate continuity and
apportionment.”) allows the Senate Executive Committee to correct Senate Committee structures
when they get out of balance, such as next year when only one member of the Senate Executive Committee will continue. Second, Article III, Section 9 (“Any action taken by the Senate Executive Committee may be overturned by a two-thirds vote of the Faculty Senate”) ensures that the Senate is not ceding decision making power to the SEC. Third, Article III, Section 5 part E affects the term of the NCAA representative. She reminded the Senate that besides this discussion, amendments and questions could be posted to the Senate listserv.

Mr. Bryan Saxton (SGA) pointed out some inconsistencies regarding the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Organization.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked that the Faculty Grievance Committee be mentioned specifically in Article IV, Section 17, part E.

Dr. Martha Abell (COST) pointed out that there is no EPC and asked if consideration had been given to having the SPC representative serve as a non-voting member of the SEC.

8. Report from SPC Representative Martha Abell

Dr. Martha Abell (COST) reported that the SPC has been discussing Level II plans and will be meeting with each of the vice presidents to discuss those plans during the rest of this semester. She also pointed out that the Senate needs to elect the next SPC representative, so that they can serve their internship next year before beginning a two year term.

9. Report from NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative Richard Rogers

Dr. Richard Rogers announced the Scholar/Athletes of the Year for Georgia Southern. Danna Simpson is the all-time career leader in assists on the Women’s Basketball team and a senior Exercise Science major. Justin Kolumber is an all-conference golfer and a senior Finance major. They will be honored at a banquet on April 23rd.

10. Old Business

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked how we are going about developing a plan that would require the successful completion of English and Mathematics core courses during the Freshman year. Dr. Schille replied that the question had been referred to the Academic Standards Committee. Dr. Marc Cyr (CLASS) referred to the committee’s minutes, included in the Librarian’s report and said that the committee is gathering information on the topic and discussing the topic right now.

Dr. Krug then asked if specific explanations had been supplied to programs that were recommended for reduction or elimination by the program review process, as recommended at
the last Senate meeting. Dr. Schille said that the Senate Executive Committee would investigate that.

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

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked what happens to student appeals that the Academic Standards Committee denies and whether they can still appeal to the Provost or President. Dr. Grube responded that the academic appeals process ends with the Provost and the admissions appeals process ends with the Vice-President for Student Affairs. He then emphasized that academic decisions should remain in the hands of the faculty.

12. **Announcements: Vice Presidents**

Dr. Linda Bleicken (VPSA) asked the Senate to take a moment to acknowledge the good work of the outgoing Student Government Association President and his cabinet.

Dr. Vaughn Vandegrift announced the upcoming open forum on April 2. He said he would open the forum with a few opening remarks and spend the remainder of the time in an open question and answer period. He announced that Dr. Charles Hardy would become the Acting Graduate Dean on July 1, serve in this capacity for one year. A new search for Graduate Dean will be begun at the end of that year at which point Dr. Vandegrift and Dr. Hardy will decide if he should continue in the position for another year. Dr. Vandegrift also announced the appointment of Dr. Alison Ridley of Hollins College as Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. She will begin this position some time in June. Finally, he announced the appointment of Edna Levernier from the College of Business as the Business Manager in the Provost’s Office. She begins her position April 1.

13. **Announcements from the Floor**

Dr. David Dudley (CLASS) invited Senators to attend the eleventh annual Averitt Lecture Series, April 9-10. The lectures this year will be presented by Dr. Russ McDonald of the University of North Carolina-Greensboro, an internationally known Shakespeare scholar.

Dr. Saba Jallow (CLASS) announced that the Center for Africana Studies is conducting a book drive to benefit institutions in the Democratic Republic of Congo and Gabon. He emphasized that no textbook is too old for this book drive. For further information or book pick-ups, call the Center at 681-5387.

Dr. John Brown (COBA) announced an upcoming meeting of the AAUP, April 16 at 4:30. Dr. Vandegrift will be the speaker.
Mr. Bryan Saxton (SGA President) thanked the Senate for their recognition and asked Senators
to encourage their students to vote in the SGA elections.

Dr. Karen McCurdy (CLASS) announced that Earth Day events would be held in the Union on
April 23. Events will include a speaker and workshops.

Dr. Alison Morrison-Shetlar (COST) announced that the final speaker in the Colloquium on
Teaching Series will be Dr. Randy Bass of Vanderbilt University. He will be speaking in the
Continuing Education Ballroom on April 15 at 4pm.

14. Adjournment

A motion was made to adjourn at 5:03pm. It was passed.
The April 25 meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Dr. Vaughn Vandegrift at 4:00 p.m. Dr. Vandegrift opened the meeting and presented the gavel to Dr. Candy Schille (CLASS), Faculty Senate Moderator. Dr. Schille presided over the business of the Senate for the rest of the meeting.

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the April 25, 2002, Meeting**

Motion: Dr. Candy Schille (CLASS) announced that agenda item 8 “Report from Lisa Spence” regarding the Computer Use Policy should be deleted from the agenda. She then moved the acceptance of the agenda as amended. The motion was approved.

2. **Approval of the March 26, 2002, Minutes**

Motion: Ms. JoEllen Broome (LIB) (for Laura Davidson, LIB) moved the acceptance of the March 26, 2002 minutes. The motion was seconded and approved.

3. **Librarian’s Report of April 27, 2002**

Dr. Candy Schille reminded Senators that approval of the Librarian’s report meant approval of all
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action items included in the minutes of the various committees. For example, the Academic
Standards Committee in the March 26, 2002 Librarian’s Report included the approval of a Math
Placement Exam. Senate approval of that Librarian’s Report meant the Senate has also approved
the actions of the academic standards committee regarding that exam.

Motion: Dr. Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) moved the approval of the Librarian’s Report. The
motion was seconded and approved.

a. Undergraduate Committee Minutes

In the absence of Kathleen Koon, approval of the Undergraduate Committee Minutes were
postponed until the next meeting of the Senate.

b. Graduate Committee Minutes

Dr. Ming Li (CHPS) moved the approval of the March 21, 2002 meeting of the Graduate
Committee. The motion was seconded and approved.

c. Faculty Welfare Committee

Dr. David Dudley (CLASS) reported that the committee has established a subcommittee to
address the issues on harassment. Pat Walker will chair this committee and members
include Steve Sexton, Nigel Davies, Cordelia Douzenis, and Mark Welford. He also announced
that a subcommittee has been formed to investigate issues relating to domestic partners. Shawn
Forbes will chair this subcommittee and members include Susan Trimble, Ann Hamilton, Jack
White, and Bill Irby. As chair, Dr. Dudley will work with both groups. Both subcommittees
welcome input from the faculty.

d. Faculty Development Committee

Dr. David Allen (CLASS) reported that the application forms for proposals are being revised to
reflect a broader scope of activities related to faculty development, whether it be in the area of
public speaking, research presentations at conferences, broader community work, or teaching in
the classroom.

4. President’s Report

Dr. Vaughn Vandegrift (Provost) reported for Dr. Grube. He announced that ground had been
broken for the new Information Technology building. The University plans to petition the Board
of Regents to establish the College of Information Technology effective July 1, 2003. There are
currently 175 majors in the School of Information Technology. It is projected that there will be
between 350 and 400 majors by the end of next year. The goal is to have 1,200 majors in two years. He reported that Level III strategic plans are being completed. He announced that the commencement speaker for this year is Norman S. Fletcher the Chief Justice of the Georgia Supreme Court. Finally he announced that a 4% tuition increase had been approved. The impact on Georgia Southern’s budget has not yet been determined.

5. Report from Dr. Candy Schille, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

Dr. Schille (Chair, SEC) reported that the SEC has been focused on Senate elections and will soon begin appointing Senators to standing committees. Those with interests in particular committees should contact a member of the SEC.

6. Approval of Faculty Senate Bylaws

Dr. Candy Schille noted three amendments to the document presented at the last Senate meeting. The first is to refer to the graduate student group as the Graduate Student Organization. Second, a statement has been added that all Senate officers must be Senators. Third, in Article IV, Section 7, E, specific reference has been made to the Faculty Grievance Committee.

Motion: With these amendments, Dr. Schille moved the approval of the Bylaws revision.

Dr. Martha Abell (COST) asked that references to EPC be removed from the document.

With that further change, the bylaws revision was approved.

7. Election of Senate Officers: Moderator, Secretary, and Librarian

Dr. Candy Schille called for nominations for Moderator.

Dr. Marc Cyr (CLASS) nominated Dr. David Allen (CLASS).
Mr. Mike Mills (CLASS) nominated Dr. Chris Geyerman (CLASS)

Ballots were distributed. Dr. David Allen was elected.

Dr. Candy Schille called for nominations for Librarian.

Dr. Schille announced that Dr. Ming Li was nominated. By a voice vote, he was elected.

Dr. Candy Schille called for nominations for Secretary.

Dr. Marc Cyr (CLASS) volunteered. By a voice vote, he was elected.
9. Report from SPC Representative Martha Abell

Dr. Martha Abell (COST) reported that the Level II plans which have been posted on the Web are being consolidated and put in a more uniform format. The SPC spent the past month meeting with each of the Vice Presidents. The SPC will be adding two appointed members in the near future. Finally, she reminded the Senate that it needed to elect the next SPC representative, to begin serving in the fall. Each Senate representative serves one year as an apprentice before serving a two year term as the Senate representative to the SPC. Dr. Mike Mills (CLASS) recommended that the election for this position be held at the next meeting of the Senate.

10. Report from NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative Richard Rogers

No report.

8. Old Business

Dr. Shawn Forbes (COBA) asked about the status of the University policy on students repeating classes.

Dr. Vaughn Vandegrift responded that the Dean’s Council was collecting data with the assistance of Institutional Research and the Registrar before formulating a policy in the Fall. That policy would then be referred to the Academic Standards Committee.

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked about the specific explanations being supplied to programs in the Level II program review.

Dr. Vandegrift responded that Trey Denton, the chair of the Strategic Planning Council, and Charlie Hardy, chair of the Academic Program Review Committee, would respond to specific questions directed at them. He did not know if either Dr. Denton or Dr. Hardy had received any questions.

Dr. Candy Schille suggested that questions could be forwarded to the SEC and they could ensure that written responses were provided.

Dr. Jim LoBue (COST) asked that information about how to get such responses be widely disseminated.

Mr. Mike Mills suggested that such inquiries should go first to the department chair, then to the Dean before coming to the SPC.

Dr. LoBue responded that information from the Department Chair and Dean were already available on reserve in the library.

Dr. Martha Abell (COST) said that Dr. Hardy had talked with each Dean about the program review results for their programs and it was expected that the Deans would talk with their department chairs and that department chairs would talk with faculty in their departments.

Dr. Krug pointed out that as a member of a program marked for reduction or
reorganization, she has not received an explanation for the decision, although this was the
third consecutive Senate meeting at which the issue had been raised.
Dr. Schille suggested that faculty or programs needing further information about the
rationale behind the program review decisions make a written request to the SEC. The
SEC would obtain written responses to those requests.
Dr. Vandegrift warned the Senate that a possible outcome of requiring such rationales
could be revisiting the entire program review process.
Dr. Schille clarified that the information requested by Dr. LoBue and Dr. Krug was for
explanation, not for reconsideration of the decisions.
Dr. Shawn Forbes (COBA) asked who was responsible for the rationales being requested.
Dr. LoBue pointed out that the data in the library do not include the rationale that is being
sought.
Dr. Sandra Peacock (CLASS) pointed out that it was reasonable to expect that an
explanation of the decisions made could be produced, even if the basis of that decision
was an oral discussion.
Dr. LoBue pointed out that information about the rationales for the
reduce/reorganize/eliminate decisions have value to faculty beyond the affected programs,
since it gives a more complete picture of our strategic plan.

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

Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS) asked, for a colleague, if the award for excellence in research,
scholarly, and/or creative activity should not be reserved for faculty with full teaching loads, as
opposed to being available to faculty who have received release time for research.
Dr. Charles Gossett (CLASS) responded that it would be quite complex to determine who
was eligible or what research would be eligible, given the ever-changing mix of
assignments (for example would a one course release one semester two years before the
award make a faculty member ineligible?) and release time available to individual faculty
members and the length of time devoted to various research projects (would research
initiated before coming to Georgia Southern count, for instance?).

Dr. John Brown (COBA) asked if the University had conducted research on the impact of
students’ outside work schedules on their classroom performance.
Dr. Vandegrift responded that the questions about outside work commitments were asked
of students in the AACT Student Opinion Survey administered last Fall. When survey
results are available, Institutional Research will be able to examine the question.

Dr. Brown then asked if University Administration could have any influence on balancing the
amount of law enforcement present in Statesboro for Players’ Ball weekend.
Dr. Vandegrift responded that since Players’ Ball is not a University sponsored or
sanctioned event, we have limited influence, although the University Administration
Dr. Krug asked what the time frame for the appeal of raise decisions would be.

Dr. Vandegrift responded that the University feels that it is unable to publicize raise decisions before they have been approved by the Board of Regents. However, a reasonable amount of time will be allowed for appeals, including an allowance for faculty who have not been here over the summer.

13. **Announcements: Vice Presidents**

Dr. Vaughn Vandegrift (Provost) congratulated the newly elected Senate leaders and added that he looks forward to working with them. He also congratulated Mike Mills on his election to the Strategic Planning Council. He plans to appoint two other members to the council soon. Dr. Vandegrift announced the date and time of a reception to honor Lane Van Tassel and his contributions as Dean of the Graduate School. He also announced that the Task Force for Faculty Roles and Rewards should be appointed within the next week. Finally, he announced that Dr. Robert Haney has been designated Associate Provost and he thanked Bob for the profound role he plays in Academic Affairs.

14. **Announcements from the Floor**

None.

15. **Adjournment**

A motion was made to adjourn at 5:00 pm. It was passed.
The June 24, 2002, Faculty Senate meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by President Bruce Grube, who turned the gavel over to Faculty Moderator Candy Schille (CLASS).

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the June 24, 2002, meeting**

The motion was moved, seconded, and approved.

2. **Approval of the April 25, 2002, Minutes**

In the absence of Senate Secretary Laura Davidson (LIB), Marc Cyr (CLASS) moved approval; the motion was seconded and approved.

3. **Librarian’s Report of June 24, 2002:**

In the absence of Librarian Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS), Gary Dartt (CLASS) moved approval; the motion was seconded and approved.

   a. **Undergraduate Committee Minutes**

Kathleen Koon (CHPS) moved approval of the minutes of the Undergraduate Committee meetings from March 20, 2002, April 16, 2002, and May 22, 2002; the motion was seconded.
Clara Krug (CLASS) queried re: the April 16 minutes, page 17, whether the New Course Proposal Guidelines could be seen by faculty by checking with their department chairs. Koon said that this was correct. The motion was then approved.

Koon then called attention to the recently completed Undergraduate Committee survey of faculty views on the extent to which core courses assist students in obtaining the University General Education Outcomes (General Education Outcomes). The report is contained in the Librarian’s Report, and Koon passed out copies to the Senate. The report evaluated 76 course offerings via 273 surveys (only one survey was returned concerning IDS 2210, Turning Points and Connections, so the Undergraduate Committee recommends further evaluation of that course). The Undergraduate Committee believes the survey confirms the strengths of the core curriculum: With the exception of Foreign Languages, faculty felt overall that outcomes were attained through their courses. However, Outcome 5 (aesthetic appreciation) and Outcome 7-D (familiarity with major issues) rated low attainment. Koon noted that the report concludes with a summary of recommendations, and pointed particularly at the recommendation that we look at how we address Modern Technology and Writing Across the Core Curriculum.

Krug asked how faculty would know to go the Web site; Koon said she would email all faculty. Krug then asked how the General Outcomes had been generated in the first place. Koon replied that they were developed by an ad-hoc task force while the new core curriculum was being constructed during semester conversion. Schille noted that, while she did not know if this was true of all departments, her own department (Literature and Philosophy) had developed its outcomes via full department discussions, which Krug found interesting.

b. Graduate Committee Minutes

Krug noted that some faculty and Senators had been unable to access the approved curriculum amendments, and moved that approval be tabled until the Fall Faculty Senate meeting; the motion was seconded and approved.

c. Task Force on Faculty Role in Shared Governance

In the absence of Jill Lockwood (COBA), Krug reported that the Task Force requested and received copies of all written policies and procedures at the departmental levels, when they existed, and at the college level, as they relate to hiring, annual review of faculty, third year review of faculty, applications for tenure, applications for promotion, post-tenure review, committee structure, and determination of the composition of the committees in departments and colleges. The Task Force then developed a matrix of questions or statements to determine whether a department or college had written procedures and policies in all of these areas. The Task Force is now preparing a questionnaire to be distributed to all faculty at Georgia Southern University during the fall semester to determine the level of faculty awareness of and access to
these written policies and procedures, and the role of faculty in developing and approving these procedures at the departmental and college levels, and the degree to which the procedures that are written actually are followed and the policies that are written are actually honored.

4. President’s Report

President Bruce Grube announced that his summer’s enrollment is up over 17 percent and that we are currently about 5.3 percent ahead of last year for Fall enrollment; various projection models predict somewhere between 14,700 and 15,100 students in Fall, a historic high. He also noted the expectation that average SAT scores will have risen again and attributed the quality and number of students to a lot of folks doing a lot of good, hard work.

President Grube noted that foundation work for the Information Technology School is underway and, despite how much later it was begun, the building is due to be completed and in use at the same time as the Science/Nursing Building. Hence, Georgia Southern may pioneer a new fast-track process for building.

President Grube praised Gary Dartt for his production of Twelfth Night and noted how wonderful it was to see the play performed in a real facility.

Regarding academic programs, President Grube congratulated the Nursing Program for being recognized by the University System of Georgia as one of the preeminent programs, and for receiving a ten-year accreditation, the best possible. He also noted that in a speech broadcast on Georgia Public Television, Chancellor Meredith singled out Georgia Southern a couple of times.

5. Report from Dr. Candy Schille, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

Schille thanked all of the outgoing Senators for splendid work and welcomed all the incoming Senators. She then asked Mike Mills (CLASS) to report on the policy whereby an individual faculty member could go through the Senate Executive Committee to find out about program review. Mills reported that, in accordance with the procedure set up in Spring, Dr. Charles Gossett formally requested from the Senate Executive Committee in writing a program review statement about the Masters of Arts degree in Political Science. This request was forwarded to the Strategic Planning Council and acted upon and a rationale was produced. This procedure seemed to work really pretty well, and all future requests for these written rationales about program review will be cheerfully addressed in this manner in the future.

Schille then called forward Ginger Malphrus, the Senate Administrative Assistant, and presented her with an honorarium from the Senators in thanks for her invaluable service to the faculty and noted that one of her great pleasures as Moderator has been working with her.
6. Elections of SPC Representative and Senate Librarian

The Senate Executive Committee nominated Mike Mills for SPC representative; the nomination was seconded and approved. Because Ming Li has taken a job elsewhere, the SEC nominated Richard Flynn (CLASS) for Senate Librarian; the nomination was seconded and approved.

7. Report from SPC Representative

Martha Abell (COST) noted that the SPC has not met since the previous meeting of the Faculty Senate. She then offered clarification of Mills’ report on program review: Gossett’s request was forwarded to her and she forwarded it to Charlie Hardy, who was the chair of the Academic Program Review Committee; the response to Gossett’s request came in about 3 days.

8. Report from NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative Richard Rogers

Richard Rogers (CLASS) distributed a report on the academic performance of our student athletes for spring semester and for the academic year; in all cases, student-athletes as a group performed better academically that corresponding groups of all Georgia Southern undergraduates. He then noted that our baseball team won the Southern Conference Championship Tournament, and advanced to the regionals; our golf team got an at-large bid to the NCAA Regional Tournament, where they finished sixth, which allowed them to qualify as one of thirty Division I teams in the country to play in the NCAA championships for the second year in a row; and that in The Chronicle of Higher Education report on Title IX, Georgia Southern was one of only 45 institutions in the country whose proportion of scholarship dollars to female athletes is within 1 percent of the proportion of the number of student-athletes who are female.

9. Old Business

Krug noted that a couple of faculty members had told her that they had not yet received a memo indicating their raises for the coming academic year, and asked if there is a deadline by which they are supposed to receive that memo that indicates a dollar amount. Provost Vaughn Vandegrift replied that there is no deadline, but he had thought they had all been sent out. He expressed interest in knowing which departments had not yet sent out the letters and said he would check to make sure they did get out. Krug asked if a faculty member should call his office to let him know they had not received notification, and Provost Vandegrift said yes.

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

Krug asked whether Georgia Southern would be represented at a workshop, Understanding Islam and Muslim Students, to be conducted at Georgia Southern on July 25 - July 27 by NAFSA and
if funding were available for faculty to attend. Lane Van Tassell (CLASS) said he would be going; President Grube noted that no money was available.

11. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Provost Vandegrift announced that Dr. Alison Ridley has joined us as Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs; she will have oversight of the Bell Honors Program, the University Honors Program, Advisement and Retention, the First Year Experience, and International Studies. Essentially, she will therefore serve as a liaison between Academic Affairs and all things student that pertain to Academic Affairs. He further announced that Ms. Bobbie Williams will now be the Student Program Manager in the College of Business Administration, and Ms. Charlotte Parrish-Woody will join Continuing Education and Public Service as the Director of Marketing. He then noted that a number of faculty were retiring or going to other jobs, thanked them for their work at Georgia Southern, and wished them Godspeed.

President Grube then asked Candy Schille to remain with him at the podium. He recognized and introduced her mother and uncle, who were attending as guests. He thanked and applauded the Senate at large for their hard work over the past three years, working with him to transform itself into a more autonomous body. He particularly thanked all the members of the SEC and noted the good fortune to have had Schille as Moderator for the last two years; he presented her a plaque reading, “In Recognition of Dr. Candy Schille For her Dedicated Service to Georgia Southern University – Moderator of the Faculty Senate 2000-2001 – 2001-2002,” and called for the Senators to join him in applause. Schille thanked President Grube and the Senate.

12. Announcements from the Floor.

As there were no announcements from the floor, Schille called for a motion to adjourn, which was moved, seconded, and approved.

***If necessary, Senate will reconvene on June 25, 2002, site TBA
Dr. Grube formally presented the gavel to incoming Moderator David Allen.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the September 17, 2002, meeting

Moved, seconded, and approved.

2. Approval of the June 24, 2002, Minutes: Marc Cyr, Senate Secretary

Moved, seconded, and approved.

3. Librarian’s Report of September 12, 2002: Richard Flynn, Senate Librarian

Moved, seconded, and approved.
a. Undergraduate Committee Minutes: No report. (No meetings held since last Senate meeting.)

b. Graduate Committee Minutes: (April 18, 2002, minutes - tabled from the June 24, 2002, Faculty Senate Meeting): Dr. Jerry Wilson

Jerry Wilson (COBA) noted that the Graduate Committee has not yet met this term, but that the June 24 Librarian’s Report had been tabled until all attachments to the Graduate Committee minutes of that date were accessible to all faculty. Clara Krug (CLASS) moved that the Librarian’s Report of June 24 now be approved; the motion was seconded and approved.

4. President’s Report: Dr. Bruce Grube

Our “Day for Southern” brought in $1.1 million, thus exceeding our goal; the campus participation rate was up this year to 70%, which President Grube noted is great for community relations.

Enrollment is up about 900 students to about 15,200; average SAT scores are also up, about 23 points to about 1050. President Grube specifically applauded our admissions office and SOAR team.

Because parents often desire University housing for freshmen and sophomores, and because retention rates and average grades tend to rise for such students in University housing, Student Affairs, the people who run student housing, and the President have set a goal of being able to house 40% of our students in University controlled housing in the next 8-10 years (currently, we can house about 19%); President Grube had three community meetings in December 2001, and the Physical Master Plan and the housing plan were positively reviewed by the Regents. Part of the housing plan was to buy Campus Club apartments, but community concerns and objections that arose in early 2002 mean that purchase will not go forward. However, the long vacant Pines complex and Oxford Hall will be demolished and the sites rebuilt on; this has Regents, Development Authority, and Court approval, and goes before the County Commission on October 3, and President Grube expects it to pass. This will add about 1,100 beds; President Grube believes that community fears can be allayed by getting out the information that the large majority of juniors and seniors will still live in non-University owned apartments, and so our housing plans will have no negative impact on private owners.

David Stone (COST) asked if there is a current oversupply of apartments in Statesboro. The short answer was “no,” but ten or twelve years ago, when the state was not funding more housing, local people were encouraged to build it privately; now they are being competed with by outside developers offering more amenities, and the University is perceived by some to be one of these outside competitors, even though the now defunct proposal would have had small impact on the market. President Grube stressed that, to the contrary, Georgia Southern is very much a part of the local community in every way, and that in future development discussions this will be greatly clarified.
Regarding the Chancellor, he was in hospital but doing well; whether he would be able to visit campus on September 23 was unknown. Mark Edwards (COST) asked if the Chancellor’s illness would prevent him from visiting our campus anytime soon. President Grube did not know, but noted that the Chancellor is scheduled for a visit in February, and stressed that the Chancellor is not slighting us; he has a lot of knowledge and appreciation of institutions like Georgia Southern.

President Grube thanked the Senators for coming to his reception and causing minimal damage. Krug asked if he had checked what was missing yet; he promised to do so.

5. Report from David Allen, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

The SEC replaced some of the vacated chairs on the standing committees: Mary Marwitz (CLASS) will chair the Faculty Development Committee, and Alice Hall (CHPS) will chair the Faculty Service Committee.

6. Report from David Allen, Senate Moderator

Allen felt compelled as the moderator in surveying the situation today to try to read the climate and consider what challenges we have ahead for the coming year; he invited later responses or objections to his remarks.

Allen believes the shared governance situation has improved dramatically in the last two years, and the Faculty Handbook has become a more reliable guide than in the past. However, overall faculty morale remains low and there is continued cynicism, fear, and trepidation regarding an unacknowledged ratcheting up of standards regarding tenure and promotion, and the existence of hidden administration agendas. He believes that we now have a more accessible and transparent process and that the administration is not trying to do anything sneaky and underhanded. But we have a self-perpetuating problem: Faculty who are not involved in the governance system perceive little to have changed, and because of that perception they remain uninvolved. Allan wants the Senate to find more creative ways to involve faculty in the process and suggested the Strategic Planning Council hold open faculty forums; he also asked the Faculty Welfare Committee to consider ways to raise morale. Further, the standing committees, which are wholly composed of faculty, should move quickly to address their charges actively. He further mentioned that with the College of Information Technology coming into being, the Senate will be expanding and we need to consider proportional representation. A final point was that he wants faculty more actively included in physical and environmental planning for the campus.

Krug, noting that she had been asked by colleagues to bring two questions to the Senate concerning lack of transparency and contradictory messages in the Handbook, asked when rebuttals of Allen’s remarks might be appropriately made, and specifically disagreed with his remarks about transparency, that while sometimes administrators think decisions they make are being communicated to those at lower levels, they are not. She also questioned how the SEC could speak of transparency without having recently surveyed faculty.
Allen clarified that his remarks were his own, not the SEC’s; the SEC only approved as an appropriate agenda item the new moderator offering his ideas. Much discussion ensued regarding the appropriate way for making responses to Allen’s remarks; John Brown (COBA) and Jeff McLellan (Parliamentarian) suggested bringing the issue up under “New Business.”

7. **Report from Mike Mills, SPC Representative**

Mike Mills (CLASS, intern SPC Representative) reported that on September 11, 2002, the Strategic Planning Council met and welcomed new members Bryant Smalley, Leon Spencer, and Jean Bartels. Of note for the Faculty Senate were the following items:

- Seven of eight of the Level II plans of the University’s Strategic Plan have been completed, and each one can be found on the Strategic Planning Council web site. The one Level II plan not implemented is that of the proposed University Organization Plan, but a committee is to be named by the administration to address that issue this semester.
- The SPC web site is being updated to represent the latest information about membership, minutes of meetings, and implementation of the Strategic Plan. Questions about the SPC and its actions can be directed to the chair at that site.
- A recommendation: In line with the action taken by the Faculty Senate last spring to eliminate verbiage in the Senate documents pertaining to any mention of the Executive Planning Council, the SPC respectfully recommends that the Senate Executive Committee in cooperation with the President and the SPC move to redefine the role of the EPC/SPC Representative to better suit the needs of the administration, the SPC, and the Faculty Senate. The Executive Planning Council has not played any significant role on campus for at least four years.

Martha Abell (COST, SPC Representative) moved that the language involving EPC be removed from University documents.

Parliamentarian McLellan pointed out that if the language appears in the *Statutes* of the University or the Senate *Bylaws*, certain procedures need to be followed, so the motion needed to be targeted to specifically where EPC appears. Jim LoBue (COST) asked that the specific language in question be identified, and John Brown (COBA) motioned to table Abell’s motion and ask the SPC to come back with the passages identified; seconded and approved.

8. **Report from Richard Rogers, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative**

Richard Rogers (NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative) had nothing to report.

9. **Old Business**

Krug noted that a colleague requested that she ask what a faculty member applying for tenure can do if a Dean does not apply department criteria. This question arose from the Faculty Senate minutes of November 28, 2001, in which she noted President Grube as saying that the
departmental criteria on is hired under, not University criteria, should remain in effect until the first personnel action, and therefore he doubted the tenure and promotion guidelines document or the *Handbook* of which it is part needed a grandfather clause; Krug noted that then-Senate Librarian Laura Davidson listened to the tapes and had confirmed these statements were made by President Grube. The colleague who prompted Krug’s question has been told by his/her Dean that instead of the department criteria in place when this individual came to Georgia Southern, there will be different criteria applicable.

Provost Vandegrift believed that President Grube’s November 28, 2001, remarks mean that the promotion and tenure criteria being considered at the time were only clarifications of existing University criteria; departments and colleges would not need to rewrite their criteria as long as those were not inconsistent with University criteria. Vandegrift suggested the issue was not the criteria, but how the criteria in the University *Faculty Handbook* are applied in each case.

Krug suggested the Provost’s interpretation did not address what the President had said about department criteria at hiring time trumping University criteria. Provost Vandegrift said department criteria had to be interpreted in the context of the University criteria and be consistent with them. If the Dean in question is doing this, there is no problem.

President Grube added this: “On a different, but a very related point, since this is a deliberative body, you know, I will express a point of view, from time to time in here, and that does not mean that what I say is policy. I wish I could have my own way all the time, but that’s pretty unlikely, but I will express a view, but unless this body adopts it and recommends it, and you know, we make it a University policy that is all that it is. And so, Clara, I don’t know if maybe that was what was going on in the spirit of the conversation. We were talking about an issue and I was expressing a particular point of view, too, which is now informing the conversation. But there are ways things get into policy and they are not by me saying something in public which is only intended, you know, as a singular kind of contribution to the conversation.”

Ann Pratt (COST) suggested that much of the problem may be that Deans are taking what are called in the *Handbook* “typical” times for faculty members to go for tenure or promotion and applying them as minimum times, when those times may not be the times stated in departmental guidelines or be typical for a particular department. Provost Vandegrift noted that intense Senate discussion had led to the use of the term “typical,” and that this means there can be exceptions under exceptional circumstances, though Deans sticking strictly to the “typical years” guidelines may believe they are expressing the will of the Senate. The Provost added that President Grube’s comments in no way conflicted with the criteria of the *Handbook* or were somehow at odds with the relationship of those criteria to departmental criteria. The Provost further added: “Literally, no department has a prescription on how to get tenure, you know, two of these, four of those, one of these, so many of that, that’s not what we seek at Georgia Southern and that’s not what we have endorsed, either as a University in the Senate [Faculty] *Handbook* or at the department levels. Ultimately, there is a quality decision made about the application of the criteria, and that quality decision I think is very much influenced by the department and the faculty as they make recommendations to the Dean. And I think that’s where we are with respect to the *Handbook*
Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked whether, if a hiring-time document listed a lesser number of years as “minimum” time for a personnel action than is now listed as a “typical” time, would that not be an exception that the new “typical” language cannot make void? Provost Vandegrift did not quite understand the question; Cyr clarified that neither he nor, he thought, anyone else had suggested bad faith on the part of Deans, but only that Deans may not understand that they have some leeway regarding promotion and tenure timelines. Provost Vandegrift answered: “Where language is subject to a reasonable interpretation then people can make a reasonable case, and that’s with respect to the promotion time. With respect, again, to the criteria for tenure, if that’s an issue, I just don’t think that anything at a department level, either that was written before or is written now, should contradict the University-wide policy. There may be interpretations. The one thing we are all guaranteed which we pride and value is academic judgment, and academic judgment of a faculty member, a department chair, and a Dean may all be the same, and that’s the best situation. When an academic judgment differs, I think there needs to be a good rationale for it, but I also recognize that it could differ at any one of those levels.”

Phyllis Dallas (CLASS) noted that Krug was not asking about new faculty coming in but about a faculty member who is going up for tenure now, who wants to know if the criteria that that person was brought in on still apply or if new guidelines that have been instituted in the last year or two can be applied to this person, and this was a question that was asked last year and she had understood President Grube to be saying that it was certainly his intent that faculty not be held to new standards that they did not have an adequate amount of time to meet, and since that was clear we did not need a grandfather clause; that for the system to be fair, whatever standards faculty came in under would apply for the first personnel action, and only after that could they be held to new standards from the department, new understandings from the University.

Provost Vandegrift stated that he wanted to reemphasize that there are no new standards; he stated that what the Senate voted upon and accepted was a clarification only. So, he stated, whether they are coming up for tenure now or just starting at Georgia Southern, faculty are subject to evaluations based on how they have met expectations placed on them by criteria that have not changed.

David Robinson (CLASS) expressed concern that Deans were now, with interpretive leeway, given cover to align themselves with higher administration policy and thereby treat departmental requirements as moot, and that this had not been the Senate’s intent; the Senate’s concern had been to protect faculty and departmental prerogatives. Provost Vandegrift replied that there is no higher policy than that endorsed by the Faculty Senate and there is no intention to force anything else on the faculty. President Grube added that Deans can arrive at different academic judgments than departments, and that perfect and perpetual congruence of opinions at all levels of a university is something that has never existed; there is no intent or attempt to give cover to improper administrative actions.

Dallas noted that she had heard from faculty who were going up for tenure this fall that there
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were many questions, and hence the process is not as transparent as the Senate and as Provost Vandegrift and President Grube have hoped it would be. One faculty member got no guidelines from her Chair about the new procedures for tenure; another was not sure about the timetable and had problems getting that type of information. It becomes a morale issue when faculty feel as though they are not being given all of the information they can be given about this process and that people are not interested in clarifying the process for them.

Provost Vandegrift agreed and noted that the Provost’s web page (http://www2.gasu.edu/acadaff/forms/promotion/promoteninfo.html) has all of the dates and instructions for the processes and all of the forms. He will talk to the Deans about being sure that Department Chairs communicate this. David Dudley (CLASS) stated his sense that regarding tenure and promotion and making the process transparent and fair, the Senate, faculty as a whole, and the administration are all on the same side.

Cyr noted that the Senate has a sub-committee on Faculty Governance working on such issues, and stated that we need to make sure departments have written policies and these policies do not conflict with any college or University or Regents’ policies, and make sure that everybody knows these policies.

10. New Business

Krug stated that a colleague had told her that applications for graduate faculty travel funds were now on a competitive basis, and, on behalf of this colleague, asked when the faculty as a whole would be told of this change, and when the change had been made, by whom, and why. Chris Geyerman (CLASS) noted that the SEC had referred the whole question to the Senate Graduate Committee, no new procedures were in place, and changes (if any) likely would not come until next fall. Jim Stephens (COE) noted that the issue came to the SEC via Provost Vandegrift, who was working from a recommendation by Dean Hardy that that money come under the purview of faculty rather than the administration.

11. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Provost Vandegrift: He echoed Allan’s call to action for shared governance and offered to share an open faculty forum with the Senate. He then noted that the College of Information Technology will be effective July 1, 2003, and 24 current Georgia Southern faculty have agreed to join the new college, along with new faculty and a new Dean for whom we are now advertising. We are also searching for a new Dean of COST, a Director for the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Faculty Development, and about seventy faculty positions. The Provost further noted that faculty-governed distribution of support funds is highly valued by the administration, and that they have been able to increase that funding by about 8 percent: The Faculty Development Committee will have $105,000 this year, the Faculty Research Committee $125,000, and the Faculty Service Committee $55,000.

He then introduced Dr. Denise Battles, chair of the task force on faculty roles and rewards. Dr.
Battles noted the task force has met twice and is meeting on a twice monthly basis. They are reviewing current documents that govern workload and will be developing a survey to identify and characterize faculty roles as they currently exist.

Provost Vandegrift noted that last year, when the promotion and tenure criteria were approved by the Senate, referenced in that document were two works regarding faculty roles and rewards: *Scholarship Reconsidered* by Ernest Boyer, and *Scholarship Assessed* by Glassick. Each of the persons on the task force has been given those two monographs to read, and each Dean; additional copies of those monographs will be put on reserve in the library.

Vice President Linda Bleicken (Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) thanked all involved in student attendance verification this fall; it saved us a lot of money we would have had to repay under Title IV. There were some glitches, and a cross-departmental committee will meet to try to iron them out.

Vice President Ron Core: (Business and Finance) noted that last spring or early summer, in four buildings -- Communication Arts, the Health Center, Williams Center, and Anderson – mold was discovered. Georgia Southern has done a number of things to eradicate it, and has retained two consultants: an environmental consultant, to look at the issue generally; and an air quality firm that does nothing but test air quality. They have been working throughout the summer. The testing of the air quality in those buildings reports that there were only two rooms in those four buildings in which the mold level exceeded that of the outside air, and in those two rooms the level of air quality was not at a level that was detrimental to the health of anyone that was going to be in those rooms. Georgia Southern will continue to monitor air quality and address it aggressively when a problem is

12. **Announcements from the Floor**

John Brown (COBA), as President of the Georgia Southern Chapter of the AAUP, invited all to the fall meeting, at which Hugh Hudson, who is on the staff of the AAUP, would talk about state issues, including the budget situation.

No other announcements being forthcoming, Allen moved for adjournment; seconded and approved.

13. **Adjournment**

Submitted by Senate Secretary Marc Cyr
President Bruce Grube called the Faculty Senate meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and turned proceedings over to Senate Moderator David Allen (CLASS).

1. **Approval of the Agenda for October 24, 2002:** moved, seconded, approved.

2. **Approval of the September 17, 2002, Minutes: Senate Secretary Marc Cyr (CLASS):** moved, seconded, approved.

3. **Librarian’s Report of October 15, 2002: Senate Librarian Richard Flynn (CLASS):**

   Approval was moved and seconded. David Stone (COST) asked about the proper channels to follow for having a very early drop date for lab classes considered. He was directed by Allen to make a request to the SEC (Senate Executive Committee), which would pass it to the Academic Standards Committee for consideration. The Librarian’s report was then approved.

   a. **Undergraduate Committee Minutes: Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair**

   Co-Chair Phyllis Dallas (CLASS) reported they did not meet so there is no report for September; at their October meeting Dallas and Constance Campbell (COBA) were elected co-chairs.
b. Graduate Committee Minutes: Report from Graduate Committee Chair, Dr. Jerry Wilson

Wilson (COBA) reported they met in September, but the minutes were not approved for the September meeting until the October meeting, so they did not make the Librarian’s Report. In that meeting in September, curriculum proposals brought forward from four colleges were discussed and passed. Also discussed was the Graduate Faculty Development Fund and possibly changing the way that those funds are allocated or disbursed in future, though not for the current academic year. That discussion is continuing and members of the committee are to bring as much information from their colleagues as they can to the November 21 meeting. He encouraged everyone to talk to the representatives on the Graduate Committee and share views on the subject. There are three proposals being examined currently:

- Continuing the present policy: full-graduate faculty that teach a graduate course in the current academic year are eligible for a maximum of $300 for activities that are classified as Faculty Development. There is a very simple form to fill out. Associate graduate faculty are eligible for up to $150 in an academic year.

- Possibly disburse those funds to existing committees at the University level: Research, Service, and Teaching. And allocate a portion of that fund to each one of those committees that would go only to graduate faculty.

- Create a competitive process where graduate faculty would present a proposal, and a panel of graduate faculty would meet and allocate those funds.

Mark Edwards (COST) asked if there had been discussion about dropping the requirement that one have taught a graduate course within the year: some departments have no graduate courses and so some qualified graduate faculty never have access to this money. Wilson said that was an excellent point and would be discussed. He hopes the committee will develop a recommendation at their next meeting, on November 21.

Wilson then noted that the Graduate Committee had requested that the SEC clarify the alternate structure for the committee, and that the SEC’s reply that the committee itself deal with the alternate issue, or that lack of a quorum should lead to the meeting being rescheduled, had not helped. Flynn pointed out that no Senate committees have alternates; Wilson suggested setting up a structure for committee alternates, or having Senate alternates be on-call. Cyr pointed out that Senate alternates already serve on committees and could wind up over-burdened. President Grube pointed out that the recent restructuring of the Senate had given greater responsibility to Senators, and that this issue had been extensively discussed: faculty asked to be “in charge” and that means faculty being “responsible enough to be there.” Wilson noted that achieving a
quorum has not been a problem, but the lack of all colleges being represented every meeting has been. Allen asked Wilson to submit a more specific request that the SEC consider an alternate structure for all committees, which he will do.

4. President’s Report:

President Bruce Grube reported that we have 15,075 students this Fall, that our retention rate went from just under 70 percent three years ago to slightly over 77 percent this Fall, and while the SAT scores are still being calculated, he is confident that they will come in somewhere between 1048 to 1052, a considerable rise over last year and a considerable rise over the past three years. Our two housing projects – the Pines and Oxfors – are moving forward. We had a CAC ABET team in regarding Computer Science accreditation, and that has gone very well, although there will be no formal statement and decision from that group until sometime next Spring.

5. Report from David Allen, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

Allen noted that the Graduate Committee information request had already been discussed. There was also a denied motion from the SPC (Strategic Planning Council) to seek out and delete all references in University documents to the now-defunct EPC, but that motion was presented and tabled at the September Senate meeting. A motion from Dr. Krug to revise language on promotion and tenure in the Handbook was put on the agenda. The SEC had to replace the CLASS Senate representative on the Graduate Committee and did so with Richard Flynn. The SEC also decided that the Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards, which will be giving regular reports to the Faculty Senate, should not be a separate agenda item but be in the Provost’s report since he initiated the task force.

6. Motion from Clara Krug to amend Faculty Handbook on Faculty Evaluations

Krug (CLASS) moved that the Faculty Welfare Committee add to the 2002-2003 Handbook the following statement: “Departmental criteria (as opposed to University criteria) under which one is hired will remain in effect, at least until the first personnel action (tenure or promotion).” She supported the motion with four rationales:

Rationale 1. There is precedent for allowing individuals at Georgia Southern University to adhere to a specific set of requirements even when new requirements are approved, printed in various media, and displayed on the internet. The individuals are Georgia Southern University students. The precedent is the option to adhere to requirements in effect when they enter our University, regardless of changes.
Rationale 2. If the current draft of promotion and tenure policies and procedures at the University level is a necessary clarification, that is acknowledgment that, in the past, those procedures and policies were not clear. Faculty members have had departmental policies and procedures to guide them. If these policies and procedures were not clear faculty should not be held accountable. In following departmental guidelines they were acting in good faith and therefore should have no professional harm inflicted upon them.

Rationale 3. The concept stated in this motion has received support – orally, if not in writing -- from the Senate at the following meetings: October 25, 2001; November 2001; and September 2002.

This concept guided approval of the current policies and procedures in this body. However, we have learned that since it is not recorded in an approved, written document, it does not constitute policy.

Rationale 4. Georgia Southern University’s requirements and procedures evolve. Therefore, adding this statement should remove a potential penalty inherent to such evolution. We need to recognize the fact that not all faculty enter our institution at the same point in our particular evolutionary process.

Jerry Wilson (COBA) noted that the wording of her motion was problematic, that it could actually work against a faculty member. Krug replied that she was just trying to get discussion started on the principle and wording of the motion. Cyr said that he found Krug’s rationales #2 and #3 particularly compelling, and that unless the departmental guidelines that were a faculty member’s sole guide were in conflict with a hard and fast Regents’ rule, the departmental guidelines should prevail. He suggested the motion be referred to the Faculty Welfare Committee to work on the wording (a reference Allen had wanted to make before the motion actually came to the Senate floor). Cyr also noted that Krug’s motion and rationales point out the need for departmental handbooks that are clear, that are in line with college handbooks that are clear, that are in line with the now pretty clear University policies, so that everybody knows what’s going on.

Mark Edwards (COST) and Ann Pratt (COST) pointed out that department guidelines often referred (and still refer) faculty to the University Faculty Handbook regarding some issues and criteria, and that there are conflicts between the current Handbook and past editions. Mary Marwitz (CLASS) clarified later that this creates a compound issue: conflicts between departmental and University guidelines at time of hiring, and between guidelines at time of hiring and time of personnel action.
Much discussion ensued, with President Grube noting that the necessary procedure is for the Faculty Welfare Committee to bring suggested policy re-wording to the Senate, for the Senate to recommend (or not) that policy re-wording to the President, and for the President to approve (or not) that policy re-wording. Krug pointed out that she was more than willing that revisions to her motion be made. Much more discussion ensued, composed largely of learned disputation regarding parliamentary procedures and of multifarious suggestions for amending the motion so that the proper procedure outlined by President Grube (see above) could be followed. Parliamentarian Jeff McLellan narrowly led the Senate out of the path of what Jim Stephens (COE) characterized as a potential “Rules of Order train wreck” and up to the amended motion, presented by Krug:

“The Faculty Senate requests the Faculty Welfare Committee [to] review the Faculty Evaluation Guidelines submitted to the Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate in October and November 2001, specifically to look into clarifying promotion and tenure guidelines for the purpose of including a ‘grandfather clause.’”

The amended motion was passed by a substantial majority.

7. **Report from Mike Mills, SPC Representative**

Mills (CLASS) has initiated a series of listening forums tentatively scheduled for the week of November 18th through the 22nd, to see how the “University stakeholders” perceive the implementation, understanding, and success of the strategic plan. There will be separate forums for faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduates. For each of these groups multiple times and dates will be offered for the forums. The SPC faculty forum should not be confused with the scheduled November 12th Academic Affairs open forum, which will be happening the week before.

8. **Report from Richard Rogers, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative**

Rogers reported that the NCAA Management Council gave their final approval for new initial eligibility requirements for student athletes to compete. One change was that the number of academic core courses they have to submit a grade for was increased from 13 to 14. Also, the minimum SAT or ACT score was dropped in favor of a compensatory model involving an equation between test score and GPA: With the model, for example, an 820 SAT would require a 2.5 GPA. The other major change is to continuing eligibility requirements. These have been increased for student-athletes: Now, at the end of the second year they will have to have
completed 40 percent of their degree requirements. At the end of the third year, 60 percent, and the end of the fourth, 80 percent. They will have to have passed six hours the preceding regular term to be eligible in any given term. There are a few other smaller changes, but these are the main ones and will go into effect this Fall.

Rogers’ next item was the official graduation rates report (copies distributed to Senators): For students entering in the 95-96 year, all men students at Georgia Southern graduated at a rate of 33 percent — male student-athletes, 47 percent. The all women rate for GSU was 42 percent — for female student athletes, it was 73 percent. For that cohort, the overall graduation rate for all GSU students that entered that year was 38 percent, for all scholarship student-athletes it was 57 percent. That 57 percent is up 4 percent over last year’s report. So in general the numbers are pretty positive, but the graduation rate in this cohort for black, male basketball players is zero, as it was last year. The University Athletic Committee has this topic on their agenda to try to change that number in the future.

Cyr asked whether the overall numbers – 38% graduation rate for all students, versus 57% for student athletes – might be “deceptively rosy” given that athletic scholarship monies likely mean more student athletes stay at our University until they graduate, whereas students without that incentive transfer at a higher rate and may well be graduating elsewhere. Rogers noted that such transfers do count against the graduation rates. President Grube suggested that Rogers comment on the comparative grade point averages between student athletes and the overall student body. Rogers did not have those numbers with him; he had distributed those at the Summer Senate meeting, but noted the number comparisons were similar. President Grube noted that many factors no doubt contribute to the overall better performance of student athletes, and highlighted the discipline they need to keep up their studies while also dealing with their hectic schedule of practices, games, and roadtrips. Rogers also noted that student athletes enrolled since 1986, even with exhausted eligibility, have graduated at an 85% rate.

David Stone (COST) noted that graduation rates for this cohort’s football players (a small number) was 100% for whites, 50% for blacks. Moderator David Allen asked whether finding a coach committed to improving retention and graduation rates had formed part of the selection process for our most recent basketball coach hiring. Rogers replied that it was a criterion, but noted that coaches do not have complete control of the situation, which President Grube analogized to teachers not being completely accountable for whether students pass or fail their classes: “In fact, we probably get some better passing rates among the athletes and athletic matters than we do in some of the academic departments here in core courses, but probably [we] don’t want to go down that road at the moment.” He noted how Athletic Director Sam Baker is committed to and emphatic about the concept that “student” comes before “athlete.”

9. Old Business

None.
10. **New Business**

None.

11. **Announcements: Vice Presidents**

President Grube announced Provost Vandegrift was off campus at some academic meetings and had asked the President to convey a couple of pieces of information: The Board of Regents approved a reorganization for the College of Health and Professional Studies; that college’s internal structure has changed, as has the name of the college, to the College of Health and Human Sciences. He added that many people in the college would prefer the college now be called CHHS, not “Cheese.” Diana Cone (CHHS, not “Cheese”) commented, “We had one faculty member say we were CHiPS before and now we are Cheese, so I don’t know what we are, CHiPS or Cheese.”

President Grube introduced an update on the Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards, reported by Cone (CHHS, not “Cheese”): The Task Force is meeting bimonthly to take a look at the current structure used to determine faculty workloads. A website is being set up for faculty input and the Task Force will have the first thirty minutes of the Provost’s open forum on November 12th at 2:00. Task Force members are also coming to the faculty at college or department meetings. A survey is being prepared to send out to the faculty in the Spring to help come up with a model or recommendation to give to the Provost.

12. **Announcements from the Floor**

Mark Edwards (COST) asked President Grube what would be the approved acronym for the College of Information Technology. The President replied, “I would recommend we follow Senate process on that, and that issue be conveyed to the SEC for assignment to the appropriate committee, which would then consult with the resource people established to define the issue as to, again, establish what the facts are, analyze that, come up with a recommendation based on that, get it back to the SEC in order to get it back on the floor with the proper documentation and materials for the Senate to thoroughly undertake that discussion.” Although this was not a motion, it was nonetheless seconded, but the President withdrew his non-motion.

13. **Adjournment:** moved, seconded, approved.

Minutes submitted November 1, 2002, by Marc Cyr, Senate Secretary
In the absence of President Grube, Provost Vaughn Vandegrift called the Faculty Senate meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and turned the gavel over to Senate Moderator David Allen (CLASS).

1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 25, 2002, Meeting.

Moved, seconded, and approved.

2. Approval of the October 24, 2002, Minutes: Senate Secretary Marc Cyr (CLASS)

Cyr noted one typo in the October 24, 2002, Minutes, on Page 3: “Oxfore” should be “Oxford.” He then moved approval; seconded and approved.

3. Librarian’s Report of November 19, 2002: Senate Librarian Richard Flynn (CLASS)

Flynn moved for approval and received a second. Clara Krug (CLASS) queried re: the Elections Committee report, #5, “We discussed the situation in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, but were unable yet to formulate an agenda for the college.” She wondered what that meant. Jim Lobue (CLASS) noted that the CLASS representative missed the last meeting, so the situation re: CLASS election procedures was not clear at the meeting reported in the minutes; the situation has been clarified by phone since then. Flynn’s motion was then approved.
a. Undergraduate Committee Minutes: Report from Undergraduate Committee Co-Chair Phyllis Dallas (CLASS)

Dallas noted these were included in the Librarian’s Report; no comments or questions arose re: the Undergraduate Committee minutes.

b. Graduate Committee Minutes: Report from Graduate Committee Chair Jerry Wilson (COBA)

Wilson noted that the Librarian’s Report contains the approved minutes of the Graduate Committee for September 19, 2002. The October minutes were approved at the November committee meeting.

Mark Edwards (COST) asked if they had taken up the matter of disbursement of graduate faculty funds. Wilson said they had, that at their January meeting they will finalize discussion of the three already formulated proposals, and a fourth “hybrid” which is currently being written into a coherent form for consideration. Those proposals are:

**Plan 1:** Continue to distribute the funds as they have been in the past: An associate member of the graduate faculty who is teaching a graduate class in this academic year can submit a request for $150 in faculty development funds. A full-graduate faculty member scheduled to teach a graduate class this academic year can submit a request for up to $300.

**Plan 2:** Take the money that is currently available and split it up among research, service, and faculty development committees, and make that money available for those standing committees to allocate to graduate faculty only through the process they currently have.

**Plan 3:** Form a new committee of graduate faculty that would evaluate competitive applications for money beyond current limits, meaning that a faculty member could qualify for a larger amount of money.

The still-being-formulated “Hybrid Plan 4 from the Graduate Committee” would establish two separate pools of money, one pool to be disbursed as in Plan 1, the other pool as in Plan 3. Michael Nielsen (CLASS) asked if the current policy (Plan 1) has led to year-end funding deficiencies, and Wilson replied in the affirmative.

Provost Vandegrift recommended avoiding any additional work for committee members; Wilson noted that the extra work and level of bureaucracy in some of the plans is a big part of their discussions. Edwards asked re: the provision requiring one to have taught a graduate class in the current year; Flynn noted strong sentiment to remove it from all proposals. Flynn also noted that
$500 would be the likely cap for the competitive applications under “Hybrid Plan 4 from the Graduate Committee,” and that the application process would not be onerous.

David Stone (COST) noted that despite their entreaties, the Graduate Committee had received no input from other faculty on these proposals. Krug suggested they send a reminder; Cyr suggested that everybody so trusts and admires the members of the Graduate Committee that they simply trust they will be presented with fine proposals and rationales for consideration.

4. President’s Report: Provost Vandegrift

Provost Vandegrift reported in the absence of President Grube: Governor Barnes announced that he would request withholding of 2 percent additional during this fiscal year on top of the 3 percent which was originally recommended for a budget cut. Some of that original 3 percent was protected for instruction. At Georgia Southern, the President’s Cabinet decided that rather than that 2 percent additional cut, we would hold 3 percent to be prudent and to hope that would buffer us against additional cuts if they are forthcoming after the year. A variety of plans are being discussed. However, there has been some discussion about managing it similarly to the way we did last year during the year by using monies available from unfilled lines and perhaps a delay in hiring when a position opens for a period of time. None of the things that are on the table would impact on instruction, though deans must be prudent in evaluating overload and part-time teaching. All this applies to ‘03; any budget effects for ‘04 and beyond are currently unknown.

Mike Nielsen (CLASS) asked about potentially changing current searches. Provost Vandegrift noted such action would be contemplated only if the ‘04 budget is cut.

5. Report from David Allen, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

Allen noted there were two information requests that the SEC responded to: one was from the College of re: election proceedings having to do with College of Education, but it missed the deadline for consideration this year. COE has been directed consult with the Elections Committee. Another information request came from Jerry Wilson, which asked the Senate Executive Committee to appoint alternates in the Senate position from all the colleges on all the standing committees. The SEC decided this was simply too cumbersome and that we would be better off trying to deal with the questions on the individual standing committees in terms of scheduling responsibilities and making sure that everybody who can attend, does attend.

6. Report from SPC Representative

Martha Abell (COST) reported in the absence of Mike Mills (CLASS): There has been a series of open forums: three undergraduate forums, one graduate student forum, three staff forums, and Mills and Abell went to two of the Turning Points and Connections classes. The idea was to find
out if the goals of the Strategic Plan being accomplished. Also, the SPC will begin again the writing of an annual report, which hasn’t happened over the last three years, and they are updating their web site.

7. Report from NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative Richard Rogers

- Women’s cross country team competed in the Southern Conference Championship Meet and finished seventh.

- Women’s soccer had a very successful season: 13-6-2 — entered the Southern Conference Tournament as a number three seed — but lost the in the first round.

- Volleyball had a very successful season: 26-9 Regular Season Champions of the Southern Conference. Coach Kerry Messersmith was Coach of the Year in the Conference and Martina Veiglova was Player of the Year in the Southern Conference. They entered the Conference Tournament as the #1 seed, but lost in the finals to College of Charleston.

- Men’s soccer suffered 8-1 point losses during their season, giving them a record of 2-16-2, and went into the Conference Tournament as #6 seed, where they lost in the first round.

- Football finished 9-2 overall, 7-1 in the Conference to make them Conference Champions, which gave them an automatic bid into the National 1-AA playoffs. They were seeded #3.

8. Old Business

None.

9. New Business

None.

10. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Provost Vandegrift: The faculty committee screening the applicants for the College of Science and Technology Dean has recommended three finalists, and will begin their campus interviews on December 2nd, Monday, another on the 5th and 6th, and the third likely on the 9th of December. The College of Information Technology Dean’s search expects that we may be able to have persons interviewing right after the first of the year.
The Dean’s Council has been discussing the possibility of introducing special course fees when the faculty in a department agree that such a course fee would enhance the student learning through some value added as a result of the fee.

The faculty open forum on November 12th was attended by 90 to 100 people, and several issues were raised, including the fact that the class schedules are not published any longer; a discussion of the value of grants for service versus those for research; a discussion of enrollment limits for online classes; how we will continue to absorb enrollment growth if we have it; the funding level for the University; some questions about promotion and tenure; and the need to emphasize the love of learning and what we do as our primary focus, and an evaluation of teaching by department colleagues. There was also a presentation by Denise Battles about the Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force, and some questions were brought up and there was discussion. Provost Vandegrift asked Diana Cone (CHHS) to make a report about the Roles and Rewards Task Force. Cone noted that the Task Force has met twice since the last Senate meeting and are finalizing a compilation of workload policies; they hope to have it available on their web site prior to the Christmas holidays. In addition, they have drafted surveys for the Deans and Department Chairs to complete and are getting ready to pilot test those instruments in early December. They remind all faculty to review the web site and send suggestions, comments, and any questions for the committee.

11. Announcements from the Floor

None.

12. Adjournment

Moved, seconded, and approved.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Marc D. Cyr, Senate Secretary