

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

2004

Faculty Senate Minutes-2004

Georgia Southern University

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



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

Recommended Citation

"Faculty Senate Minutes-2004" (2004). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 12.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/12>

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

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
February 9, 2004
4:00 - 6:00 p.m.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Kathy Albertson, David Alley, Sharon Barrs, John Brown, Randy Carlson, Jean-Paul Carton, Robert Cook, Phyllis Dallas, Gary Dartt, Elizabeth Downs, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Bob Fernekes, Chris Geyerman, Mary Hadley, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Clara Krug, Gautam Kundu, Annette Laing, Bill Levernier, Jim LoBue, Michael Moore, Patrick Novotny, Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Debra Skinner, Cordelia Douzenis Zinskie

Voting Members Absent: Reggie Brown, Ken Clark, Carol Cornwell, Susie Lanier, Karl Manrodt, Charisse Perkins, David Stone, Stuart Tedders, Deborah Thomas, Kathy Thornton

Senate Officers in Attendance: Marc Cyr, Richard Flynn, Jeff McLellan, Jeanette Rice

Administrative Members in Attendance: Linda Bleicken, James Bradford, Kathleen Burke, Ron Core, Billy Griffis, Charlie Hardy, Anny Morrobel-Sosa, (Bob Haney for Vaughn Vandegrift)

NCAA Faculty Athletic Rep: Richard Rogers

SPC Rep: Mike Mills

Visitors: Denise Battles, Marcia Jones, Lisa Spence, Susan Trimble

1. Approval of the Agenda for the February 9, 2004, Meeting

Marc D. Cyr (CLASS, Senate Moderator) noted that both President Grube and Provost Vandegrift were out of town. Vice President Linda Bleicken and Associate Provost Bob Haney would be delivering their respective reports. He moved for approval; the motion was seconded and approved.

2. Approval of the November 17, 2003, Minutes

Jeanette K. Rice (COST, Senate Secretary) amended the November 17, 2003 minutes as follows: on page two, second to the last paragraph, line six, the period should be moved to outside the parenthesis; on page three, third paragraph, last sentence, affect should be changed to effect; on that same page, fifth paragraph, add a period to the last sentence; on page four, first paragraph, first sentence, it should read the Global Access Project is cosponsored *by* the American Association, etc.; on page ten, last paragraph, line nine, equitable should be changed to equity; and all appearances of the name Vernon Eggers should be replaced with Vernon Egger. She moved for approval with those changes; the motion was seconded and approved.

3. Librarian's Report of February 2, 2004

Richard Flynn (CLASS, Senate Librarian) reminded the Senate that passing the Librarian's Report simply affirms the accuracy of the minutes of the various meetings. Having received no corrections, he moved for approval and was seconded.

Clara Krug (CLASS) requested confirmation that the Senate was not voting to accept the recommendations to the Faculty Senate from the Faculty Research Committee, which Cyr (CLASS) provided. The Librarian's Report was approved.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair

Sharon Barrs (COST, Undergraduate Committee Chair) moved for approval of the minutes of the October 22, 2003 meeting of the Undergraduate Committee, including the curricular items. The motion was seconded.

Krug (CLASS) wanted to know if there had been any additional information regarding amendment of the General Education Outcomes on foreign language requirements. Barrs (COST) noted that this issue came up in committee several times, particularly with respect to the SACS Reaffirmation Study. She deferred to Associate Provost Bob Haney, who provided that this concerns the General Education Outcomes which state that every student will be able to communicate in at least one foreign language. Currently, not all students take a foreign language for their degree program and the thought was that the College of Liberal Arts and Social Science, in particular, should review that outcome to see whether it should continue to be listed. Krug (CLASS) expressed her hope that faculty in CLASS would be consulted on the wording before it goes forward, and that it be consistent with the Strategic Plan which indicates "...the promotion of foreign language study."

The Undergraduate Committee Report, including curricular changes, was approved.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair

Flynn (CLASS, Graduate Committee Chair) moved for acceptance of the curricular changes contained within the November 20, 2003 minutes in the Librarian's Report beginning on page 8; the motion was seconded and approved.

4. President's Report

Vice President Linda Bleicken (for President Grube) noted the resignations of Vice President for Business and Finance Ron Core, effective April 1, 2004, and Vice President for University Advancement Jim Britt, effective January 30, 2004. The search to replace Vice President Core is underway, with Athletic Director Sam Baker, Dean Kate Conway-Turner, Rebecca Davis (Political Science), Joe Franklin (Director of Auxiliary Services), Billy Griffis (Interim VP for University Advancement), Marcia Jones (COBA), Georj Lewis (Interim Dean of Students), Sheryl Lewis (Materials Management, and a member of the President's Advisory Council), Monique McKinsey (student), Scott Pierce (Director of Audit and Advisement Services), Greg

Russell (Finance and Quantitative Analysis Department) and Kim Thompson (Controller) comprising the search committee. Resume review will begin on February 16, 2004, with the aim of having a decision by April

Regarding the resignation of Vice President Britt, Vice President Bleicken noted that the on-going capital campaign makes it more logical not to seek his immediate replacement. Billy Griffis will serve as Interim Vice President.

January 27, 2004 marked the Annual Wild Game Supper in Atlanta, which provided the opportunity to thank our legislators and other supporters and allowed us to make our case for continued support. The Georgia Southern University Foundation members were briefed prior to the event on significant University activities and their importance to both Georgia Southern and the University System of Georgia. Senators were provided with a copy of the handout that our legislative liaison, Bill Golden, gave to Foundation Board members, which stressed the impact of budget reductions institutionally as well as to the University System as a whole, and the impact of imposing further cuts. Vice President Bleicken deferred to Vice President Core for further discussion on the budget.

Vice President Core informed the Senate that the legislative session has begun and the Governor has given his recommended budget to the legislature for both the '04 and '05 fiscal years. For the remainder of '04, the anticipated 2.5% reduction has been recommended, however, the 60-day hiring slow down and the additional enrollment tuition revenue will allow us to weather it. For '05, the Governor has recommended a 5% reduction for most state agencies, but it will likely be closer to a 4% reduction for the University System. Of particular significance is the Governor's request for full-formula funding of enrollment earnings, which, if approved, would help to offset the 4% reduction.

Vice President Core noted that he had received numerous requests concerning the outcome of the budget forums held in the fall. Several good ideas resulted from those sessions and will likely be implemented regardless of the magnitude of the '05 budget reductions. Those ideas centered around four primary initiatives: energy conservation, technology (i.e., the use of technology to decrease costs), printing and paper usage, and administrative processes. Those discussions have been taken up by the President's Cabinet and information will be forthcoming.

Vice President Bleicken referred the Senate back to the handout, stressing that President Grube wanted everyone to know not only what the Governor's recommendations were, but what Georgia Southern and the University Foundation supported and emphasized at the Wild Game Supper. There are no major or minor projects that the Governor recommended for Georgia Southern, however, attendees were encouraged to stress Fine Arts Phase III. She noted the recommendation for a 2% salary increase.

5. Report from Marc D. Cyr, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

Cyr (CLASS) addressed an information request regarding the Teacher of the Year Award. The faculty member filing the information request was concerned that faculty who teach large numbers of students, especially in core classes, have won the award with greater frequency than

those whose assignments are weighted to smaller upper division and graduate classes.

Gamma Beta Phi conducts the nomination and selection process. Faculty must have completed 3 years at Georgia Southern to be eligible. Voting is conducted on WINGS. The department heads for the top five candidates are contacted for letters of support, and Gamma Beta Phi meets to pick the winner. The University is involved only via WINGS being used for the nomination process, and through the Honors Committee providing time during the Honors Day Convocation for the presentation of the award. Ed Walker, chair of the Honors Committee, thinks that the award came about when Georgia Southern was of such a size that all technically eligible faculty would have been more truly eligible. The Senate has no real jurisdiction in this matter, but Cyr (CLASS) encouraged discussion of the topic between interested faculty and Gamma Beta Phi.

An information request pertaining to GroupWise was referred to David Robinson (CLASS) to investigate and report on. Robinson (CLASS) noted that David Stone (COST) submitted the information request and wondered if IT services would continue to make GroupWise accounts compatible with e-mail standards such as POP and IMAP? Robinson (CLASS) reported that with GroupWise 6.5, any POP or IMAP compliant mail client can be used to retrieve mail from a GroupWise 6.5 server. Typical mail clients that GroupWise supports are Eudora, Netscape, Mozilla mail, Outlook, etc., so faculty can continue to get their mail in the manner they are currently receiving it.

Stone's (COST) second question concerned potential penalties for those faculty who choose to use another e-mail software package. Robinson (CLASS) opined that the only technical penalty for continuing to use POP with GroupWise 6.5 would be a loss of centralized automated storage and backup, which GroupWise provides. Users of mail clients supporting IMAP would suffer no disadvantage at all in this respect. Other technical penalties would include the loss of GroupWise's address book integration, calendaring, and so forth. As far as administrative penalties, and these are hypothetical, in a previous memo concerning GroupWise the Provost stated that, "administrative staff will be required in the near future to use GroupWise and its use by faculty will be strongly encouraged/recommended. Although existing faculty may continue to use other messaging means...we hope eventually as new users are added the use of GroupWise will become more widespread." This policy is reiterated on the [GroupWise Migration Web Site](#), which states that all "all faculty members are encouraged to use GroupWise," while noting that "campus technical support personnel will not support the use of other types of e-mail accounts or e-mail software." So even though all faculty, administrative, and staff e-mail will be consolidated on the GroupWise server, faculty may request that IT Services merely reconfigure their existing mail clients to access their mail on the new mail server. The Provost's stated policy of voluntary adoption would seem to preclude initiatives by academic unit heads to compel faculty to participate in Group calendaring, or other supplementary features of GroupWise.

Robinson (CLASS) further noted that the decision for a centralized system came from the Level I Strategic Plan. A Task Force, led by IT Services Director Lisa Spence, selected GroupWise from among several competing packages. The license was acquired as part of the campus Novell license. The GroupWise Migration Web Site contains an FAQ section on the GroupWise Migration, as well as tutorials on how to use the new software.

Cyr (CLASS) addressed information requests pertaining to the status and contract conditions of temporaries. He is preparing a list of questions to submit to the Provost for clarification. An agenda item request submitted in tandem with these queries regarding temporaries has been deferred until answers to the information requests can provide more clarity.

Two agenda item requests did not make the agenda. The first was from the Academic Standards Committee recommending eliminating the adjusted GPA. Among other things, this proposal might impact recruitment and retention of students, and therefore the Enrollment Management Council needs to be consulted. The other agenda item request has been deferred until our March meeting so that faculty can review and comment on the Research Committee proposal for revising its procedures. Cyr asked Senators to draw their constituents' attention to the proposal which is posted on the Senate web page and to use the Senate listserv to disseminate and discuss comments and concerns.

Two agenda requests have been placed on today's agenda: one involves adding a representative from Enrollment Management to the Academic Standards Committee and the other is a revised shared governance document to be included in the *Handbook*. An issue concerning membership on the Faculty Grievance Committee will be addressed under Old Business. Faculty Grievance is not a Senate committee, but its composition is Senate business as provided by Article IV, Section 4 of the University *Statutes*. This related issue was overlooked when the *Bylaws* were changed to accommodate the University's new structure.

Cyr (CLASS) provided handouts concerning the shared governance motion and deferred to Mark Edwards (COST) to introduce it.

6. Motion re: [Shared Governance: Mark Edwards per the SEC](#)

Edwards (COST) moved that this motion be approved by the Senate.

Cyr (CLASS) clarified that the shared governance proposal that was passed in November was developed by the Faculty Welfare Committee, posted on the web and passed by the Senate at the November 17, 2003 meeting. The next day the Provost and President communicated that they had concerns with it, and available members of the SEC met with the President and the Provost on December 15, 2003. During that meeting, objections were raised to several passages as well as concerns that people would have conflicting readings of the sections and problems with their practical application. The President wanted to rewrite the proposal himself, approve it, and make it policy.

As background and for clarification, Cyr (CLASS) noted that, also at the November 17, 2003 Senate meeting, a new Graduate Faculty Model was passed. Unfortunately, it lacked a necessary signature line. The President modified it, adding that signature line, and approved it. Since this action brought the model in line with the *Statutes*, the SEC did not object. However, at the meeting on the shared governance model, the issue was eliminating approximately half of the text and rewriting the other half. Cyr (CLASS) felt that such a substantial change needed to come back to the Senate and requested that the President disapprove with SEC support. The SEC would then revise that document and bring it forward. There was a time consideration,

since failure to pass it at the February meeting meant it would not be included in the next printing of the *Faculty Handbook*. On December 16, 2004, Cyr (CLASS) wrote a revision, which was sent to the Provost and to all members of the SEC. E-mail exchanges produced the new motion presented today. This explains the chain of events, and the logic for the motion not going back to the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Annette Laing (CLASS) expressed grave concerns about the President not being present to defend his reasoning, and wondered what his specific objections were. Cyr (CLASS) noted that the nature of the objections were highlighted in the handout.

Laing (CLASS) added concern over the idea of the SEC getting together with the President and the Provost to overturn a faculty decision, noting that it seemed to be deeply ironic to be talking about faculty governance at the same time that the President rejected a faculty-approved document about faculty governance and re-wrote it himself. Cyr (CLASS) interjected that the President, in fact, did *not* do that and referred Laing (CLASS) back to his original comments.

Laing (CLASS) continued by noting her opposition to feeling pressure to get ‘something’ into the *Faculty Handbook*, adding that ‘nothing’ in this case would be better than ‘something.’ On the question of language, she noted that we are using shared governance these days, not faculty governance, and that it is very hard to share when there is such an imbalance of power. She requested clarification on what the faculty’s share of shared governance is. The passage that she found particularly troubling is, “Faculty therefore have a role in developing policies including, at the appropriate levels,...” and queried, “What role? What is an appropriate level?” She felt it critical to define these terms, because, in her opinion, what is playing out in real life at the University is not particularly encouraging. She cited an e-mail today from a concerned faculty member of the CLASS Faculty Governance Task Force, which stated that the faculty has very little confidence in any committee structure which is consistently reminded of its advisory capacity by administrators who blindly make their decisions without reference to faculty. Discussions at their last meeting included the virtues of changing the name from the Faculty Governance Committee to the Faculty Advisory Committee. She further noted that her colleagues are embittered by the ease with which decisions on important things are either taken away from faculty or never brought to them in the first place, from the ability to rank candidates in searches, something the CLASS faculty are prohibited from doing, to the ability of departments to give scholarships to deserving students. She noted cases of tenure being overruled after faculty at the department and at the college level have overwhelmingly approved them. With respect to these very real issues, Laing (CLASS) offered that if this document goes into the *Faculty Handbook*, she can not help but to note, as a historian, that there are many examples in the past of people discovering that the real key to power is not to assert it and squash your enemies openly; it is to say we are giving you a share in the power and then do precisely the opposite, which she fears is what is happening here.

Cyr (CLASS) clarified that the Senate functions as an advisory body to the President, and that is set out in the *Statutes*. He noted that he and the President had a tete-a-tete about who makes policy. While there is no use of the word “make” in the Georgia Southern *Statutes*, the word is used in the *Board of Regents Policy Manual*, Section 302.06, in which it states, “the Faculty Senate is the body that makes policy.” However, it only becomes policy when it is approved by

the President, who has the responsibility to either approve or disapprove. Thus, Senate cannot install policy and make policy work, but are the ones who draft it and bring it forward and then the Senate or the President can disapprove it.

Edwards (COST) asked if it was an accurate understanding that the Faculty Senate can approve and pass something, which the President can then take it as is, reject or amend as he sees fit, and then approve. Cyr (CLASS) responded that, as he read the *Statutes*, no. The *Statutes* say approve or disapprove. However, it was Cyr's (CLASS) opinion that, because of the unopposed amending of the Graduate Faculty Model, a precedent had perhaps been set. When the much more substantive amendments were proposed with regard to shared governance, the SEC recommended disapproval.

Krug (CLASS) requested further clarification on what the objections to the original document were. Cyr (CLASS) referred senators to original document, paragraph one, sentence one. This was interpreted by the Provost as suggesting that Georgia Southern had experienced or was currently experiencing faculty morale problems, which he believed to be inaccurate, and therefore should be omitted. Krug (CLASS) moved as follows:

108.01 Shared Governance Item One, following the initial sentence, "the faculty and administration of Georgia Southern University affirm their belief in the process of shared governance both as a principle and an animating spirit of our institution," that we add, "Shared governance is mutual participation in the development of policy decisions by both faculty and administration and requires shared confidence between faculty members and administrators."

The motion was seconded.

There was a lengthy discussion on the origin of the definition of shared governance and whether a group would be established to define the process of shared governance. This would likely be taken up by the Faculty Welfare Committee.

David Alley (CLASS) asked if Edwards (COST) would accept Krug's (CLASS) motion as a friendly amendment; he would.

Alley (CLASS) asked if the sentence we were adding was one of the sentences that was a concern to the Provost and the President. Cyr (CLASS) offered that there was a specific objection about the paragraph and the sentiments in the paragraph. There was discussion about redundancy in the document. Jim Lobue (COST) felt that while there may be a bit of repetition, he liked the amendment because it expresses mutual participation and shared confidence between faculty members and administrators. Chris Geyerman (CLASS) agreed but noted that is a judgment about the concept and not a defining feature.

Krug (CLASS) withdrew her motion and moved that the word "mutually" be added to sentence number two in 108.01 of Shared Governance in the Senate Executive Committee's requested new shared governance document; the motion was seconded and approved.

Cyr (CLASS) focused the attention back to the original motion to accept the document, continuing with clarification on the objections by the President and Provost. In addition to the points already mentioned, the SEC eliminated the rest of paragraph two because it did not seem to be explicitly needed. The Provost had a problem with the provision about faculty having a role in implementing policy, foreseeing this as potentially being read to mean that one or more elected faculty members would have to sign off on even mundane details of day-to-day operations.

Edwards (COST) added that one of the problems that cropped up in the original document was the scope, i.e., the scope was unbounded because it listed things like short and long range planning, hiring, evaluation, faculty and so on, but it had this “but not limited to” phrase in it, which implied that it could be anything. For example, if you wanted to hire new maintenance personnel, then it would take an elected body of faculty to do that.

Laing (CLASS) suggested that common sense would dictate otherwise. She noted that apparently the Provost objected to the idea that you would need to elect people to all sorts of committees, but noticed that method #1 says that either the faculty governance will be carried out by people who have been elected directly or selected by a committee on committees or other faculty body. So, there certainly is provision for being able to carry out something like this sensibly. She further noted the fundamental problem that the President has to agree, as does the Provost, to relinquish some power in order for us to have any chance for faculty governance.

Kathleen Comerford (CLASS) was recognized from the gallery and expressed agreement with the concept that faculty have the responsibility to participate in shared governance and must have a role in developing and implementing University policies. She echoed the sentiments of Carton (CLASS) about the issue of representation; specifically, there is no resolution of the issue of what representation means.

Cyr (CLASS) clarified that part of the difficulty is the phrase “at all levels” being interpreted to mean around the entire University, i.e., faculty being involved in various areas of Physical Plant, for example. It was a phrasing issue. Krug (CLASS) wondered if we could modify the document. Cyr (CLASS) cautioned that any substantive changes would likely be disapproved again at the President’s level, and that if the document that the SEC put together with the Provost seemed more problematic than the original, or than having nothing in the *Handbook*, then he would suggest that it simply be rejected by the Senate and sent back to the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Carton (CLASS) added that passing this document would at least pass the original Task Force’s recommendations, and the entire discussion could continue at the Faculty Welfare Committee level, which he was in favor of.

Krug (CLASS) encouraged Senators to vote in favor of passing the document and moved to call the question, which was seconded and passed.

Cyr (CLASS) reminded the Senate of the amendment to add the word ‘mutually’ in the third line of item #1. The motion to approve the revised shared governance document passed, with 3

abstentions and no objections.

7. Motion re: representation of VP for Enrollment Management on the Academic Standards Committee: Bill Levernier

Bill Levernier (COBA) moved to amend Article IV, Section 16, of the Faculty Senate *Bylaws* in order to expand the membership of the Academic Standards Committee by one member. Specifically, the motion proposes to have the Vice President for Student Affairs/Enrollment Management or his or her delegate as a non-voting member of the committee. The rationale is that Academic Standards overlaps with Enrollment Management, making it worthwhile to have formal representation from Enrollment Management on the Academic Standards Committee. The motion is to add to the sentence in Article IV, Section 16 concerning non-voting membership the phrase “and the Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management or his or her delegate.” The motion was seconded.

John Brown (COBA) offered an amendment to decrease perceived ambiguity over who actually votes in the event of a tie, and proposed:

Non-voting members shall be the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and the VP for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, or their designated representatives. In the case of tie votes, the VPAA or designated representative can vote to break the tie.

Cyr (CLASS) noted that since this is a *Bylaw* change, any modification to the wording would require bringing this back as an agenda item at the next meeting. Brown (COBA) withdrew his motion.

Edwards (COST) requested clarification on how the coordination between the two committees was envisioned to operate. Levernier (COBA) provided that the Enrollment Management representative would report to that committee on activities of Academic Standards that could impact enrollment, and vice versa. There may be issues that Enrollment Management is not concerned about (e.g., appeals), and in the event of one committee doing something the other dislikes, it would not be likely to get past the administration.

There was additional discussion on the role of the Registrar on this committee (technically the Provost’s delegate) and whether the Director of Admissions serves as well (they do not.)

Vice President Bleicken clarified that Enrollment Management is very interested in appeals and anything else that affects enrollment. She noted her support for the motion, citing enhanced communication between the two groups.

The motion passed unanimously.

8. Report from Mike Mills, SPC Representative

Mike Mills (CLASS) reported that the Strategic Planning Council finished its work on the

University's revised Mission Statement and forwarded that document to the President's Office, where it was approved without change by the President's Cabinet and forwarded to the Board of Regents for final review and approval. This spring the SPC will begin the cyclical review process of the Strategic Plan in accordance with the schedule that Trey Denton (COBA) outlined during the last Senate meeting. Also the SPC is beginning work in its capacity as the University's Institutional Effectiveness Committee for SACS reaccreditation efforts, which are already underway. They are presently gathering assessment data from all over the University for review and evaluation.

9. Report from Richard Rogers, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative

Richard Rogers (CLASS) discussed the need to elect a new Faculty Athletic Representative this spring. The *Bylaws* call for a one-year apprenticeship so the apprentice needs to be in place by the end of this semester. The details for soliciting and screening nominations or applications are currently being discussed by the President and the SEC, but the end result will be that the SEC will recommend a nominee to the Senate for their approval. Additional details on that will be published later. There is a [job description](#) posted on the Senate web site which details the activities and the responsibilities of that position. Anyone interested needs to look at that document to accurately understand the level of involvement associated with this particular service assignment.

A report on student/athlete GPAs from last semester was circulated, containing the fall semester data. The athletes' performance was consistent with the previous year, but their average GPA, which typically exceeds the average GPA for all undergraduates, did not do so that semester. As the athletes' performance was constant, this reflects a big change in our average undergraduate GPA.

10. Old Business

Krug (CLASS) presented a motion to include colleagues from the College of Information Technology on the Faculty Grievance Committee, resulting in ten regular members rather than nine, and 17 alternate members rather than 15. The motion was seconded.

Marilyn Bruce (President's Office) queried whether Faculty Senate was authorized to vote on this since the Faculty Grievance Committee is not a Senate Committee. Krug (CLASS) cited Article IV, Section 4, of the University *Statutes*:

“The Faculty Grievance Committee shall have the authority to conduct inquiries into faculty grievances, and to present to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs its recommendation. The composition of the Grievance Committee, its jurisdiction and its operating procedures shall be developed by the Faculty Senate consistent with the *Policy Manual of the Board of Regents* and approved by the Faculty Senate and the President.”

Cyr (CLASS) noted that this change was originally brought up when we were revising the *Bylaws* having to do with including CIT in the Senate committees. It was mentioned that this

would have to be done with the Grievance Committee as well, but it was not addressed at that time. This is not a *Bylaw* revision, it is a revision of the *Handbook*, and appropriate under Old Business.

There was extensive discussion concerning the feasibility of wording that was not as 'college-specific' thus preventing further modification should additional colleges be created. As the number of representatives is based on the number of faculty in each college, it was deemed inadvisable to attempt that at this point.

The motion to include representatives from CIT on the faculty grievance committee was approved.

11. New Business

Mary Hazeldine (COBA) raised a faculty member's request to have the Faculty Senate readdress the timing of the release of student grades on WINGS, so that if there is a legitimate error in a student's grade the faculty member can catch it and correct it without having to go through a formal grade change procedure. Cyr (CLASS) referred this to the Academic Standards Committee for review and recommendation.

12. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Bob Haney (Provost's Office) noted the approval of two new majors under the existing Bachelor of Arts at Georgia Southern. At the January meeting, the Board approved a major in Geography to complement the BS major already in place. At the February meeting, the Board approved a major in Writing and Linguistics, unlike any other program in the country (to the best of our knowledge). Also at the February meeting, the Board approved the establishment of the Jiann-Ping Hsu School of Public Health that will replace the Department of Public Health in the College of Health and Human Sciences.

The President has forwarded to the Chancellor twenty-nine recommendations for promotion, and twenty-two recommendations for tenure, which will be acted on at the April meeting of the Board of Regents. The individuals represented in those recommendations will be notified of the Board's decision in mid-April.

Mary Hazeldine (COBA) reported that the Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards finalized the report on their data collection efforts and it is now on their [web site](#). The Task Force is currently focused on studying and recommending one or more models for faculty effort assignment, and anticipates having those available for comment in March. All faculty are encouraged to participate in those discussions.

13. Announcements from the Floor

Gautam Kundu (CLASS) announced an upcoming GSU Museum exhibit, "India, Unity of Diversity" which will be inaugurated on Monday, February 23rd at 2:30 p.m. by Dr. Beheruz Sethna, President of the State University of West Georgia. The exhibit will run through May 2nd.

Also, on February 27th and 28th, the Department of Literature and Philosophy will host its 13th Annual British Commonwealth and Post-Colonial Studies Conference in Savannah at the Coastal Georgia Center. The Keynote Speaker this year is Professor Rey Chow of Brown University. The faculty are invited to attend the various conference sessions at no cost.

Edwards (COST) announced that Dr. Wolfgang Ketterle from MIT, one of the three recipients of the 2001 Nobel Prize in Physics, will present a lecture on March 25th at 7:00 p.m. in the Multipurpose Room of the Continuing Education Building. Everyone is invited to attend this free event.

Bob Fernekes (Library) announced that Dr. Robert Martin would be speaking at 6:30 p.m. this evening in the Nessmith-Lane Building on the Role of Museums and Libraries in the Twenty-first Century.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) announced the upcoming CLEC speaker, Dr. Joel Taxel, chair of Language Education at the University of Georgia and an expert in children's literature. That lecture is scheduled for February 17th, at 5:00 p.m., in the College of Education Lecture Hall.

Kundu (CLASS) added that on the 26th of February, the Departments of Literature and Philosophy and Writing and Linguistics will be hosting novelist Diana Abu-Jaber. She will give a reading at 7:00 p.m. Eric Nelson (Writing and Linguistics) is hosting the event, and a formal announcement will be forthcoming.

14. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was seconded and passed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Jeanette K. Rice, Senate Secretary.

Georgia Southern University

Faculty Senate Minutes

March 25, 2004

4:00 - 6:00 p.m.

Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: (Richard Tichich for Kathy Alberston), David Alley, Sharon Barrs, Randy Carlson, Jean-Paul Carton, Ken Clark, Robert Cook, Carol Cornwell, Phyllis Dallas, Gary Dartt, Elizabeth Downs, (Mohammad Davoud for Mark Edwards), Bob Fernekes, Chris Geyerman, Mary Hadley, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Clara Krug, Gautam Kundu, Annette Laing, Susie Lanier, Jim LoBue, Karl Manrodt, Michael Moore, Patrick Novotny, Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Debra Skinner, (Mark Welford for David Stone), Stuart Tedders, Deborah Thomas, Cordelia Douzenis Zinskie

Voting Members Absent: John Brown, Reggie Brown, John Dyer, Kathy Thornton

Senate Officers in Attendance: Marc Cyr, Jeanette Rice, Richard Flynn, Jeff McLellan

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Vaughn Vandegrift, Linda Bleicken, Joe Franklin, Billy Griffis, James Bradford, Kathleen Burke, Kate Conway-Turner, Charlie Hardy, Bede Mitchell, Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Ron Shiffler, Marilyn Bruce

NCAA Faculty Athletic Rep: Richard Rogers

SPC Rep: Mike Mills

Visitors: Barry Balleck, Godfrey Gibbison, Bob Haney, Denise Battles, Candace Griffith, Diana Cone, Marcia Jones, Rebecca Davis, Linda Rohrer Paige, Clifton Price, Tina Whitley, Karen McCullough, Ron MacKinnon, John Nauright, Larry Mutter, Eric Nelson, Thomas Klein, Greg Michaelson, Jean Uhl, (someone whose name I can't read) Rich Clarke, Jennie Dilworth

***Questions and clarification may be directed to the Office of the Faculty Senate or persons identified with each agenda item prior to Senate.**

1. Approval of the Agenda for the March 25, 2004, Meeting

Marc D. Cyr (CLASS, Senate Moderator) moved for agenda approval; the motion was seconded and passed.

2. Approval of the February 9, 2004, Minutes

Jeanette Rice (COST, Senate Secretary) moved for approval of the February 9, 2004 minutes; the motion was seconded and approved.

3. Librarian's Report of March 12, 2004: Richard Flynn, Senate Librarian

Richard Flynn (CLASS, Senate Librarian) noted that approval of the Librarian's Report does not constitute approval of the actions taken by the committees, and moved for approval of the March 12th Librarian's Report; the motion was seconded.

Clara Krug (CLASS) questioned the status of curricular items from the Biology Department and CHHS that had been tabled or requested be resubmitted at the November 20th meeting (p. 22/23 of the Librarian's Report). Flynn (CLASS) noted that all courses were approved, but the minutes of that meeting had not made it into this current report.

Krug (CLASS) requested additional information on the Graduate Committee's recommendation for the Registrar to initiate a campus-wide e-mail calling attention to posted agenda items for upcoming Graduate Committee meetings. Flynn (CLASS) reported that the agenda for both the Undergraduate and Graduate Committee meetings is available on the Registrar's web page. Cyr (CLASS) promised to look into the status of the email.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Sharon Barrs (COST)

Barrs (COST) reported that there are two sets of minutes from the Undergraduate Committee, and that these are the last items that will be in the catalog for the 2004-2005 year. She moved that the recommendations contained in the January 27th and the January 28th minutes of the Undergraduate Committee be approved; the motion was seconded.

Michael Moore (COE) raised concerns regarding COBA's requirement that students earn a "C" or better in selected courses, and have a GPA of 2.5 or better to be admitted to the major, noting that it opened the door to parental complaints, i.e., if their student has a 2.4 GPA and a "C" in the required courses they would not be admitted, even though the University Catalog states that a grade of "C" means the student demonstrated the required mastery in the course.

Mary Hazeldine (COBA) provided that COBA had simply brought their standards in line with peer and aspiration institutions in an effort to have the highest quality program possible. Moore (COE) suggested that we then adopt this campus-wide, as all programs would like to have the highest quality students. The vote was called, and the motion passed with 1 opposed.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Richard Flynn (CLASS)

Flynn (CLASS) announced that the Graduate Committee had two sets of minutes because the October minutes were inadvertently excluded from the last Librarian's Report. He moved for

approval of the curricular changes in the minutes of October and January. The motion was seconded and approved.

4. President's Report

President Grube opened by congratulating Writing and Linguistics and Geography on the approval of their new majors, and expressing his regret having missed the last Senate meeting due to his participation on a review team that was at Western Kentucky University.

The University is preparing for new student housing planned for Fall 2005. This involves approval from the Bulloch County Development Authority and the County Commission, with whom he and Vice President Bleicken have met. The University and the City of Statesboro arranged a land swap, so that Harvey Road will go from Chandler to Lanier, improving traffic in that area. The complex that houses the Fitness and Weight Extensions will be removed, and housing for approximately 775 students constructed in its place. This will be primarily freshmen housing and is part of the Housing Plan that the Regents' approved as an additional step to boost retention on campus.

A second construction project involves the addition of 120,000 square feet to the 80,000 square foot RAC. The expansion will include a swimming facility, and was discussed extensively with students who voted to assess an additional fee to cover the costs. The student discussions revealed the enormous pride they take in that facility, and its usefulness as a recruiting tool.

The budget is an ongoing issue. At last report, the amended '04 budget was locked up between the Senate and the House. The Fine Arts III Project (the Black Box Theater, art galleries, and faculty offices for the Art Department) was in both the House and Senate versions of the amended budget. Disagreement between the House and Senate resulted in the Governor removing nearly all minor capital projects from the amended '04 budget, including Fine Arts III. The Senate has put the project back into its version of the '05 budget, but the House had already reported out the '05 budget and can not add to it. The strategy is that when the House and Senate versions of the '05 budget go into committee, the House will add it and there will be agreement on both sides. There is still reason to be optimistic that the project is going to happen.

In terms of the general budget, full-funding of the formula for fiscal '05 seems to be holding. If that remains, the worst case scenario for the University is a stable year. President Grube encouraged faculty to attend the forums for the Vice President of Business and Finance candidates. The Summer '04 schedule continues to be checked and rechecked to ensure we have the needed enrollment.

President Grube moved on to discussing Faculty Grievance Procedures, noting that specific grievances are confidential, but he wanted to address an issue regarding our Grievance Procedures in a manner that does not violate the confidentiality of any specific grievance. As President, he believes most faculty understand that his responsibilities extend to all members of

the campus community, and that if due process becomes an issue, it becomes an issue with regard to everyone. Until last Fall, he had not given any attention to the Grievance Procedures on campus. When he became aware of a particular grievance last Fall, he went directly to Georgia Southern's website and *Faculty Handbook*, because he was an involved party. Upon review of the Procedures, his attention was drawn to the absence of any clear statement that would require that a person being accused of wrongdoing be informed in writing as to the nature of the charge in advance of any investigation. In his opinion, this is problematic because (a) it is wrong not to do so and (b) there is potential legal liability in the Procedures for the University. On the advice of Counsel, he requested a written description of the charges in that particular grievance.

President Grube stressed that the issue is simple: Is a person accused of misdoing entitled to a written description of the charges before being formally investigated? He did not see harm to anybody by providing that. He noted that there were individuals of goodwill on all sides of this issue, and that it was not a case of 'good guys vs. bad guys'. However, he was requesting something that the Faculty Grievance Committee was not explicitly required to do in the Procedures, and an impasse resulted. One perspective simply said honor due process. Another said there is nothing that entitles the Grievance Committee to do that and it is not consistent with established procedures. He noted that a more cynical view would be that it was never a problem until the President of the University became involved, and that this was simply a way to avoid something and/or not have to play by the rules of the game. The problem with that interpretation is that Board policy states that no president on any University System campus is subject to the jurisdiction of a campus grievance committee. So, he was never a direct party at all and there were no rules for him to ignore or avoid. What the Board of Regents is not saying here is that if the President does something that aggrieves a person there is no recourse. Rather, with regard to presidents, the appeal or complaint is directly to the Chancellor and the Board.

The issue of due process stalled the investigation of this particular grievance, and the only way to get resolution was to put it into a venue outside of the campus. It was heard at the Board of Regents level. President Grube noted that the administration tries to recognize fundamental fairness for people, protection of freedom of expression, and core values on which the University is based. He requested that the Senate Moderator and the SEC, in consultation with the Grievance Committee and others, examine the Grievance Procedures with due process in mind. By April, there will be recommendations on the table for the Senate to look at, and we will proceed. He noted that his motivation on this issue was not to insult faculty, insult the Grievance Committee, or open the door to the notion that no faculty member could dream of filing a grievance and getting anywhere. He thanked the Senate for their indulgence of time.

Krug (CLASS, Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee) noted that the Faculty Grievance Committee always operates on the highest principle and always follow their procedures. President Grube acknowledged that the Grievance Committee was good willed in the proceedings, and the fact that groups of people of good will can disagree is appropriate for a University campus, particularly if it allows issues to be sorted out by people in an elected forum. Cyr (CLASS) commented that nobody at Georgia Southern knew that the BOR had a policy that

did not allow a grievance to be filed on campus against the President, which was integral in generating the aforementioned impasse.

Annette Laing (CLASS) opined that for faculty who were not privy to this particular grievance, there is no way to evaluate the situation and wondered why President Grube chose to make a public statement knowing that most faculty have no idea as to the need for it.

President Grube clarified that it was not his intent to evaluate a specific situation; in fact, he intended to avoid discussion of confidential matters. However, he believes there has been substantial talk about it on campus, which has strained confidentiality limits. His intent was to provide insight into the motivation for decisions he made, particularly with regard to written notification. There was no conspiracy or deeper motivation and that is what he wanted to present.

Cyr (CLASS) noted that he heard the name of the complainant and the nature of the complaint from people not connected with the Faculty Grievance Committee. Krug (CLASS) added that it is difficult to maintain confidentiality when one of the respondents in a grievance sends a letter to all members of the Grievance Committee regardless of whether they were serving on the grievance in question. When she queried Jeff McLellan (University Counsel) about the propriety of that, she was informed that members of the Faculty Grievance Committee may not violate confidentiality, but any respondent or complainant may share information about any grievance with anyone. Krug (CLASS) was adamant in noting that the Faculty Grievance Committee did not violate confidentiality.

Bob Cook (CIT) praised Krug's attention to detail and experience on the Faculty Grievance Committee. Faculty should complain about things that need to be addressed, and anything that the committee charged with revision of the Grievance Procedures does is going to be oriented toward clarifying and improving the procedures.

5. Report from Marc D. Cyr, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

Cyr (CLASS) noted the Ad Hoc Committee on Job Search and Hiring Practices is getting ready to put out a questionnaire or survey to the members of search committees.

The SEC had two requests for information. Bill Levernier (COBA) requested information regarding efforts to block SPAM e-mail, which was referred to David Robinson (CLASS), the Senate member of Information Technology Advisory Committee. Robinson (CLASS) reported as follows:

SPAM, or unsolicited e-mail, falls into several categories: unsolicited commercial mail from off campus sources, unsolicited quasi-commercial mail from on-campus sources, and viral mail, which is mail created by computer worms attempting to spread themselves. IT services currently filters for viruses and

unsolicited commercial from off-campus sources with a software package called RAV. Suspected SPAM is passed on to recipients with special notification in the subject heading. RAV has been a limited success, and is being discontinued by its new owner, a spunky little startup named Microsoft. Georgia Southern will replace it with a new hardware-based solution called Barracuda. (A link is provided for information on [Barracuda](#).) Barracuda uses a range of state-of-the-art methods for detecting and filtering SPAM, none of which are very good. It has been selected by IT Services based on price and the experience of other academic institutions. More advanced content filtering will be possible, and configurations of this will be tried out during a testing period before the final purchase decision is made. ITAC will review these plans and make recommendations as necessary. The principle user concern is that whatever filtering solution we have not block mail so successfully we no longer get legitimate mail

The lesser problem of unsolicited quasi-commercial mail sent over GSINFO was discussed at the March 9th meeting of ITAC. A range of possible policies will be forwarded to the Provost for action. In reference to the increase in SPAM in recent months, this is not Georgia Southern specific; it is universal. As to the question of how commercial enterprises come into possession of our e-mail addresses, the Georgia Open Records Law permits outside entities to obtain campus e-mail lists, but according to Jeff McLellan (University Counsel) this has rarely been done. In general, spammers obtain addresses by harvesting them from internet discussion lists, from web pages with programs that surf the web looking for them, by buying them from disreputable online vendors with whom you have done business, or by randomly generating likely user names. Viral mail is typically sent to addresses which the invading computer virus has stolen from a machine that is already compromised, which is another way these addresses get out there, and why you get viruses from people you think you know. With the death of our old e-mail addresses, we may see a downward spike in SPAM shortly after the end of this academic year.

Cyr (CLASS) reported that the second information request was submitted by Laing (CLASS), asking for the numbers on denials of tenure and promotion applications. A handout was provided to all present, and the response to the information request was deferred to Provost Vandegrift.

Vaughn Vandegrift (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs) stated that questions have come up in the past few years concerning the number of tenure and promotion applications and their disposition. A recent policy change requires that applicants that are denied at the college must be passed through the system unless they specifically state otherwise, which means it is hard to go back too many years owing to insufficient data.

There were 24 applicants for tenure in 2002-2003. Twenty were recommended by department committees, 20 by department chairs, 21 were recommended by college committees, and 21 were

recommended by deans. The Provost disagreed with a dean's recommendation and reversed that recommendation so the original 20 were recommended for tenure. This year there were 29 applicants. Twenty-six were affirmed by department committees for a reduction of three, 26 were recommended by department chairs, and 24 were recommended by college committees. Twenty-two of those 24 were recommended by deans and all 22 were recommended at the institutional level. There was a request for a break down by college, but because there are so few tenure recommendations that come forward that do not ultimately receive tenure, to do so would be identifying individuals.

Laing (CLASS) stated that the guiding philosophy of the current administration appears to be from the top down, with emphasis on the proper 'chain of command'. Given that, she wondered what it means when someone is turned down by a college dean. It was her understanding that administrators are evaluated, in part, according to their loyalty, which makes it difficult to know exactly who is turning applicants down and raises concerns when the institution steps in to turn people down more than they are stepping in to rectify injustices done at lower levels. This is particularly troublesome because outside the department, those making decisions are often not familiar with the requirements of a discipline. She stressed the catastrophic effect this is having on morale, which is counterproductive.

Provost Vandegrift responded that he had never taken a loyalty oath, nor does he believe he has used the term "chain of command". Regarding the logistics of decision making, he referenced two personnel actions this year. One had letters and a petition from faculty that reiterate Laing's feelings: someone who is making a recommendation either has no right to make that recommendation because the person is not in the discipline or the recommendation is not consistent with the faculty recommendation. The second personnel action had letters and a petition from faculty that says the faculty in a department have made an erroneous recommendation and it is the obligation of the Provost to overturn and countermand that faculty recommendation. The point is that there will be disagreement between the recommending groups. He recalled that during his interview for this position, he was asked in an open forum if he was the Provost at Georgia Southern and was to receive a recommendation for tenure, and if there had been differences in the recommending authorities, what would he do? He answered at that time that in his experience, when there is a difference of opinion along the way, unless there was an obvious injustice like discrimination, it would be his inclination to decide on the part of the institution and say no. He further noted that when he has not recommended for tenure, he was never the first of the recommending groups to do so.

Laing (CLASS) argued that there is widespread perception that the deans will not countermand the Provost and, with respect to a particular case she had in mind, only the Provost and Dean thought that this person should not have tenure.

Provost Vandegrift was not convinced this was accurate, but in any event, the data shows that last year he did countermand a dean's recommendation. He looks at whether there have been reasonably held differences of opinion along the way and how those stack up with respect to the

institutional decision he has to make.

Rice (COST) agreed that while there can be fundamental differences of opinion, she understood Laing's (CLASS) concern about faculty demoralization. Faculty morale suffers the most when tremendous amounts of time are invested by different groups of faculty in evaluating their peers, resulting in either unanimous or overwhelmingly positive support for a candidate only to have it overturned at the dean's level. Under those circumstances, three bodies have been overturned: the department, the department chair, and the college committee. Faculty involved in the process at all of those levels question why they invest so much time in the process if their recommendations do not matter. Additionally, the actual counts for and against by the groups that do the evaluations do not make it to the Provost's level. Ideally, when there is a situation where recommendations are positive all the way up to the dean's level and then overturned, the Provost should ask for the counts and do a very close examination of what went wrong in the process, i.e., why three groups have overwhelmingly supported a candidate and one person has acted in vast difference to the recommendations of those three groups.

Provost Vandegrift queried that, in this year's data, the reduction from 26 to 24 at the dean's level are more destructive to faculty morale than the previous two or the three that were initial? Rice (COST) agreed and Cyr (CLASS) noted that those are the ones he would look at first because they look most questionable. Rice (COST) reiterated that the Provost should take a very hard look at those two. Provost Vandegrift assured the Senate that he did, and noted that there is no hidden agenda. Over the last two years, there were 45 recommendations for tenure, and 42 were affirmed. The goal is to make that 100%, recognizing that we are talking about people's lives and careers.

Laing (CLASS) pointed out a larger issue behind this discussion: nobody has a clue what the standards are except that they are going up at the time when resources are going down. There is an effort to raise the standards without saying that we are raising the standards.

Krug (CLASS) wondered what criteria would constitute an 'institutional perspective' that the college committee representing various departments might not have? The Provost clarified that when he said 'institutional perspective' he meant that he and the President alone have the responsibility to evaluate and look at every tenure decision that takes place at the university; they have reviewed every one of the 45 applicants. No one else has. It gives them a different context and they are evaluating within that context. Krug (CLASS) asked what that context would be? Provost Vandegrift responded "The context of knowing all 45 dossiers are that are being recommended for tenure, as opposed to knowing only the context of a discipline or a college. It's just different."

Laing (CLASS) asked if that meant they were just comparing numbers? The Provost responded that he was not talking about numbers or even comparing people. He adjudicates every tenure case on its own merits, but since he reads so many dossiers a year, his perspective is different. Krug (CLASS) appreciated the fact that the Provost read 45 dossiers, but also appreciates the fact

that the way a person delivers a course, article or other research differs among the disciplines. Since no one discipline is any better than any other, why would the people who are acquainted with the discipline, with all respect to the Provost and Dr. Grube, not know more about that discipline?

Provost Vandegrift reiterated that when a question is raised, he has to bring the institution in and ask whether those non-recommendations should be changed to a positive recommendation, and that every tenure case is unique. He and the deans are sensitive to what Laing (CLASS) and Krug (CLASS) have said about faculty morale. He believes we should hire the best faculty we can find, tell them what they need to be doing, as a university, to be successful and support them so that they can be. It is his hope that faculty morale is not really affected negatively by this.

Robinson (CLASS) asked what measures the Provost was taking to communicate back down the line why that process is broken in each of those specific cases where a decision was overturned after department or college support was provided. The Provost responded that if the process is broken it should be fixed. The Senate took the promotion and tenure criteria and clearly articulated from a university-wide viewpoint what the expectations are for all faculty personnel decisions. While that clarification took place at a university-wide level, it may not have made it down to all departments. The deans have been informed of their responsibility to ensure that clarification exists at the department level.

Krug (CLASS) noted that the tenure guidelines on pages 26-27 of the *2003-2004 Faculty Handbook* do not give criteria for tenure. The Provost said that they give institution-wide criteria for tenure which are to be implemented at the department level. Krug (CLASS) disagreed. The Provost referred her to page 23, Criteria for All Types of Faculty Evaluation: "The criteria described below, along with the Faculty Attributes in *Section 204*, apply to all types of faculty evaluation. . . ." He wondered if Krug (CLASS) had not just identified a problem in that new faculty were not being referred to this section of the handbook.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) asked if it was safe to assume that when somebody is denied tenure or promotion, there is a letter that goes back which says exactly why they are not promoted or tenured?

Provost Vandegrift provided that in the case of promotion an explanation of what additional work might be required was provided either in a letter or by the dean. In the case of tenure, the Board of Regents' policy is that no written reason for non-recommendation be provided. However, he has told the deans and the department chairs that they can and should characterize verbally what the deficiencies were that led to the non-tenure recommendation. Verbally, he thinks there should be a clear indication of what the issues are, and if that is not the case those individuals can write to him and he will make sure it becomes clear.

Laing (CLASS) reiterated that faculty do not know what the standards are, nor how to meet them. As the goal posts shift, and the deans and Provost articulate on occasion what is expected, that

information filters through only to discover that by next year it has changed again. Therefore, regardless of what the Provost says at this point, people are coming away feeling as confused and angry as ever. The Provost expressed his sincere hope that that was not the case, and that where decisions have been made people generally understand, and may not accept, but do understand the reasons.

Cyr (CLASS) reminded the Senate that he was still in the middle of the SEC report. He asked LoBue (COST, Chair, Elections Committee) if elections were proceeding well. LoBue (COST), confirmed they were.

Cyr (CLASS) moved to the motion regarding teaching loads for temporary faculty, reporting that the Provost prepared a response to some of those questions in the form of a draft for a section in the *Faculty Handbook*, which is now being considered by the Welfare Committee. SEC member Bob Cook (CIT) will introduce the motion because the individuals involved are not on the Senate.

The Committee developing nominees for the position of Faculty Athletic Representative has ended its nomination process. They are reviewing the applications and will be consulting with the SEC shortly. That election will be held in April, along with the elections for Senate Secretary and Librarian. One year's experience on the Senate is required to be Secretary or Librarian, but it does not have to have been this session.

Laing (CLASS) commented on the recent discussion on the Senate Listserv, noting that Listservs are a fine vehicle for messages and a terrible venue for discussion, making it virtually impossible to communicate effectively.

6. Report from Mike Mills, SPC Representative

Mills (SPC Representative) reported that the SPC has turned its attention to the SACS Reaccreditation efforts. Work was completed on the section of the SACS Report having to do with the University's Mission Statement, and a draft was submitted to the University SACS Steering Committee. More recently the SPC began work on its charge as the University's Support Team on Institutional Effectiveness, compiling data for a report in accordance with the SACS Principles of Accreditation pertaining to quality enhancement. They are presently reviewing program reports from units all over the University, examining the assessment cycles in institutional effectiveness with the ultimate goal of producing a document which will be included in the final SACS Report.

7. Motion re: [election of alternates for the Undergraduate Committee](#)

LoBue (COST) explained that in the past an alternate was not elected for the Undergraduate Committee, though one was for the Graduate Committee. The simplest solution is to provide at least one alternate in every unit for the Undergraduate Committee. He moved that the Senate

approve and authorize the Senate or College Elections Committees to elect alternates for the Undergraduate Committee. The motion was seconded and approved.

8. Motion re: administration declaration on temporary faculty loads

Bob Cook (CIT) moved that the Faculty Senate request a formal declaration from the Administration stating “The increase in teaching load for temporary faculty is one forced solely by the current and temporary budget woes of the state and will be reduced when the present budget situation improves.” The motion was seconded.

Cook (CIT) noted that one of the jobs of the administration is to accomplish the work of the University, and one of the jobs of the faculty is to attempt to maintain the quality of the student experience. Therefore, it is incumbent upon everyone to have a continuing discussion with respect to workload and its impact on the quality of instruction. Professors Price and Whittle believe the increase in teaching load for faculty is occurring University-wide effective Fall 2004. This will affect many students, especially the two departments who host the largest number of temporary faculty, Writing and Linguistics and Mathematical Sciences. An increase in teaching load will be a detriment to the quality of education received by students of the affected teachers, who will be separated from the professional development which the University’s proposed new Mission Statement states is essential for effective classroom performance. This change could also set a precedent for an increased teaching load for all faculty. In addition, if the increased teaching load eliminates the need for temporary positions, the hypothetical increase for all could result in the elimination of some permanent lines as well. Finally, the Summary of Recommendations to the Faculty Senate, Faculty Research Committee meeting of December 1, 2003, item 3, states “temporary faculty members are eligible to participate in the Faculty Research Grant Competition”, based on the rationale that it is unfair to penalize or give advantage to some faculty members solely on the basis of employment status, especially since many temporary faculty continue on to become full-time tenure-track faculty. Increased teaching loads reduce the time available for scholarly activity.

Cliffton Price (CLASS) was recognized from the gallery and added that he is a temporary instructor in the Department of Writing and Linguistics, one of 20 temporary instructors there. He teaches four classes, which is 96 composition students per semester. Increasing that to five will mean 120 composition students per semester, which is double their professional organization’s standards. He and his colleagues *can* teach five courses, if they no longer care about what they are teaching. This is not about not wanting to work, it is about the quality of education provided. Five courses will prevent students from receiving the quality of education that our proposed Mission Statement and the Strategic Plan are based on. Students will not be able to write as effectively as students who get a non-temporary faculty member. The primary concern is what we are doing to our students.

Clara Krug (CLASS) referred to the July 6, 1998 memo from Linda Bleicken, Acting Provost, to the Deans, which does not mention a distinction between the “full load” of temporary faculty and

that of tenure-track and tenured faculty, nor does she specify that only tenure-track and tenured-track faculty are “full-time faculty.” Laing (CLASS) affirmed her belief that research informs teaching, which means that everyone needs to be given the ability to do research. She encouraged the Senate to approve the Motion.

Provost Vandegrift passed out the language that has been proposed for the Welfare Committee to consider. The standard teaching load for full-time temporary faculty is 15 credit hours per semester. Full-time temporary faculty may have opportunities to make non-teaching contributions in support of the University’s mission. In the absence of non-teaching assignments, or in cases where those assignments total fewer than three hours, the unit head with the approval of the dean shall adjust the teaching load such that a 15-hour work load is maintained. There is no increase in saying there is a 15-hour load. Faculty in the College of Education and CHHS have been teaching 15-hour equivalent loads for a long time. The faculty in Composition and Mathematics have not. The document says that if you are not, as a temporary faculty member, given some responsibility — research, service or something else — that the University would make your load comparable to the tenure or tenure-eligible faculty by making up that difference in a teaching assignment.

Michael Moore (COE) pointed out that the Provost’s web site contains a description of the desired attributes of Georgia Southern faculty: commitment to excellence in teaching/learning, the promise of productive scholarship, and commitment to professional service within the University. It is the Provost’s responsibility to ensure that all three are an inherent part of temporary faculty work and he supported the Motion. Mary Hadley (CLASS) added her support, noting that this has the potential to affect retention, which is a major thrust of this University.

Cyr (CLASS) interrupted with a note that time was running short. There followed a discussion concerning maintenance of a quorum if the meeting were extended until 6:30. It was determined that a quorum would not be maintained after 6:00 p.m.

There was additional discussion on the workload issue, wherein Laing (CLASS) queried whether getting research assignments for temporary faculty depended on having money, which is hard to come by in the humanities. Rice (COST) thought that the proposed wording opened the door for adjustment in teaching loads, but would require resources that may not be available, and noted that she would like to see some kind of commitment to provide those resources. Provost Vandegrift recognized that concern, adding that the intent was not to make Professors Price and Whittle teach 120 students but to equalize the expectation of the load of our full-time faculty among the groups of temporaries, tenured, and tenure-eligible.

Virginia Richards (CHHS) expressed a problem with the wording of the motion in that asking the President and the Provost to make a public statement that the workload is tied to budget woes. Cyr (CLASS) noted that if they find they can not make the statement, they will have to explain why. Chris Geyerman (CLASS) felt this definitely needed to be addressed, but that the phrasing “when the budget system improves” is sufficiently ambiguous that it makes the Motion have no

teeth. Linda Rohrer Paige (CLASS) was recognized from the gallery, noted her support of the Motion and that educational standards be the foremost issue at this university. Rice (COST) called the question, which was approved with one opposed. The Motion presented by Cook (CIT) was voted on and passed.

Cyr (CLASS) noted that time was short, and remaining on the agenda were old business, new business, and announcements. He would entertain a motion to eliminate the rest of the agenda. Rice (COST) wondered if eliminating the remaining NCAA report would be problematic. Richard Rogers (NCAA Representative) conceded it would not be a problem. Rice (COST) moved to eliminate the rest of the agenda; the motion was seconded and approved.

A motion was made for adjournment and seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

April 22, 2004

4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Kathy Albertson, David Alley, Sharon Barrs, Godfrey Gibbison (for John Brown), Randy Carlson, Jean-Paul Carton, Robert Cook, Carol Cornwall, Gary Dartt, Elizabeth Downs, Mark Edwards, Fred Smith (for Bob Fernekes), Chris Geyerman, Mary Hadley, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Clara Krug, Annette Laing, Bill Leverneir, Jim LoBue, Karl Manrodt, Michael Moore, Patrick Novotny, Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Debra Skinner, David Stone, Deborah Thomas

Voting Members Absent: Reggie Brown, John Dyer, Susie Lanier, Charisse Perkins, Stuart Tedders, Kathy Thornton, Cordelia Douzenis Zinskie

Senate Officers in Attendance: Marc Cyr, Jeanette Rice, Richard Flynn, Jeff McLellan

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Vaughn Vandegrift, Linda Bleicken, Joe Franklin, James Bradford, Kathleen Burke, Cindi Chance, Kate Conway-Turner, Charlie Hardy, Bede Mitchell, Anny Morrobel-Sosa

NCAA Faculty Rep: Richard Rogers

SPC Rep: Mike Mills

Senate Liaison: Marilyn Bruce

Visitors: Bob Haney, Denise Battles, Candace Griffith, Marcia Jones, Clifton Price, Karen McCullough, Ron MacKinnon, Will McIntosh, Michael Nielsen, Laura Kalloniates, Jean Bartels, Steve Black, Ann Crowther

***Questions and clarification may be directed to the Office of the Faculty Senate or persons identified with each agenda item prior to Senate.**

Prior to the official start of the meeting, Marc D. Cyr (CLASS, Senate Moderator) acknowledged the contributions of Ginger Malphrus for her invaluable administrative support to Faculty Senate with the presentation of a plaque and a gift.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the April 22, 2004, Meeting

Cyr (CLASS, Senate Moderator) moved for agenda approval; the motion passed.

2. Approval of the March 25, 2004, Minutes

Jeanette Rice (COST, Senate Secretary) noted that John Brown was incorrectly listed as absent from the March meeting, and reminded alternates to sign in next to the Senator's name they are substituting for. She moved for approval of the March 25th minutes; the motion passed.

3. Librarian's Report of April 14, 2004

Richard Flynn, (CLASS Senate Librarian) moved for approval of the April 14, 2004, Faculty Senate Librarian's Report; the motion passed.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair

Sharon Barrs (COST) moved for approval of the Undergraduate Committee minutes for November 18, 2003, and February 25 and March 23, 2004.

Clara Krug (CLASS) noted a correction involving the November 18th minutes, page 27 regarding the changes in the B.S.Ed. requirement in upper division Spanish and German courses. Both moved from 27 hours to 30 hours, and the B.S.Ed. in French moved from 27 hours to 30 hours, rather than 21 hours to 24 hours. Barrs offered to check on the discrepancy.

Krug (CLASS) noted page 36, "Proposal for Studies Abroad Program", which reads "As the vast majority of students take INTS 2130 in lieu of an intermediate foreign language, this course will provide an educational and intellectual experience potentially unmatched in their undergraduate career." After discussion with the Chair of the Department of Foreign Languages they believe the wording "the vast majority" is probably overstated and wanted the minutes of the meeting to reflect that.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair

Richard Flynn (CLASS) moved for acceptance of the Graduate Committee minutes of February 26, 2004, which involved only selected topics announcements.

4. President's Report

President Grube noted that tuition invoices are now handled via WINGS, and asked faculty to remind students to pay their summer tuition.

A synopsis of changes involving HOPE was passed out. The main changes deal with GPA calculation, and the method of payment for books and fees.

Senators were provided with the Lieutenant Governor's "Academic Bill of Rights", and

reminded that since this is a Senate Resolution, it carries no force of law.

As this is an election year, President Grube reminded faculty to not use University facilities to promote candidates and/or campaigns. Official policy can be found in Section 914.01 of the Board of Regents Policies.

The President reported that a budget has been passed, with a disagreement over \$57 million that is supposed to be used for indigent legal defense. It is hoped that the Governor will reconvene the legislature in special session and ensure that legislation gets passed that enables the funding of that part of the law. Full formula funding has held to date, and funds for repair and maintenance have increased. With regard to tuition and fees, they will not be set by the Board until May.

The University of Georgia announced that they would be laying people off, which resulted in the University System wanting to ensure that we have language in our policies that is uniform. This will include our campus, however, this affects classified people and is not a faculty issue. Nonetheless, while we are required to go through this exercise, we anticipate no layoffs.

At the Board of Regents meeting in April, a consortium consisting of Armstrong Atlantic, Clayton State, Georgia Southern, Macon State, and Southern Poly, who have joined in offering a web-based Bachelor's Degree in IT, was passed. The Board also voted on and passed the items needed to facilitate our Student Housing project.

Finally, the President acknowledged the contributions of CLASS Dean Kate Conway-Turner, who has resigned to accept the position of Provost at the State University of New York at Geneseo.

5. Report from Mike Mills, SPC Representative

Mike Mills (SPC Rep) reported that the SPC has continued to address its charge as the Institutional Effectiveness Team, as part of the SACS reaccreditation process. They have reviewed the Institutional Effectiveness reports from across campus and are assisting in revision of those plans. A report will be produced responding to four SACS' mandated principles pertaining to institutional effectiveness as part of the larger SACS document. A second charge regarding review of the NCAA recertification report to ensure its congruence with the Strategic Plan is ongoing and should be completed within the next few weeks.

6. Report from Richard Rogers, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative

Richard Rogers (NCAA Rep) reported that the Southern Conference has elected Cathy Beene to be the Conference's representative on the NCAA Championships and Competition Cabinet.

The Management Council recently passed Academic Reform Legislation, which is fairly complex and will be reported on at the next meeting.

7. Report from Marc D. Cyr, Chair, Senate Executive Committee

Cyr (CLASS) noted that the June meeting will have two important agenda items: the Research Committee's proposed revision of their grants competition and the proposed revisions to the Grievance Procedures. Additionally, there will be a Graduate Committee motion to amend the Senate *Bylaws* to reflect the new Graduate Faculty Model passed by the Senate.

Flynn (CLASS) was asked to address Krug's (CLASS) concern from the March meeting regarding e-mails to be generated by the Registrar to announcing agenda deadlines for the Graduate Committee. An agreement has been reached to have those emails sent.

Cyr (CLASS) continued that Provost Vandegrift and Bob Haney explained the status and contract situation of our full-time temporary faculty to him, which he summarized and submitted to them for accuracy checking. That will be forthcoming in the near future. The Shared Governance document, passed in February, calls for a system of administrative review to ensure that there are no disconnects between policies in place at various levels of the University. However, no schedule for such review is indicated. Independent of each other the Welfare Committee, the SEC, and the President have mentioned that such a cycle should be established so that it can become a regular part of administrative practices, and the Welfare Committee and Administration will be working on that in the coming year. Also, all the Senators and Alternates who will be on the Senate next year will be compiled in a list and preference forms for committee assignments will be going out to everyone who will be on the Senate next year.

Krug (CLASS) questioned what the reviews referred to. Cyr (CLASS) provided that the Shared Governance language passed in February mentions a review of policies to ensure that we do not have policies in place at one level that are in conflict with policies at another. No cycle was established for that to occur. For personnel items, such as criteria for promotion and tenure, it will probably be annually, and then perhaps a two or three-year cycle for other elements of policies.

Krug (CLASS) wondered if this would be in place for the 2004-2005 academic year. Cyr (CLASS) noted that if policies were going to be checked, then they would have to be in place, therefore all departments and colleges will have all such policies in place next year, which was confirmed by the Provost.

Provost Vandegrift clarified that at meetings with department chairs, deans, and directors he indicated documents will have to be produced, if they are not already in existence so that they can be reviewed.

8. Faculty Athletic Representative election: SEC nominee is Chris Geyerman

Michael Moore (COE) noted that four applications for NCAA Representative were received, and

the review committee elected Chris Geyerman to serve as Faculty Athletic Representative to replace Richard Rogers. He moved that the Senate appoint Chris Geyerman as our Faculty Athletic Representative; the motion was seconded. A call for nominations from the floor provided no additional candidates and the motion passed.

9. Senate Secretary election

Rice (COST) moved to appoint Mark Edwards (COST) for Senate Secretary for the 2004-2005 term; the motion was seconded. A call for nominations from the floor provided no additional candidates and the motion was passed.

10. Senate Librarian election

Rice (COST) moved to appoint Mike Moore (COE) for Librarian; the motion was seconded. A call for nominations from the floor provided no additional candidates and the motion was passed.

11. Load Statement Motion: Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS, Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee)

Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) moved that the Faculty Welfare Committee recommended that consideration of the faculty workload statement be delayed until after the [Task Force on Roles and Rewards](#) has submitted its report.

Flynn (CLASS) suggested a friendly amendment that revises this motion to say until after the report has been submitted and considered, to ensure thorough discussion of the entire report before the motion is passed. Carton (CLASS) revised the motion.

Annette Laing (CLASS) wondered when the Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards would be presenting their findings. Deborah Thomas (Senate Representative on the Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force) provided that the report would be coming out next week.

Carton's (CLASS) motion was passed.

12. Reports from the Vice Presidents

Provost Vandegrift deferred to Deborah Thomas (Senate Representative on the Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force) who added that the Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards has completed its charge, which had three components: (1) compiling a summary of current faculty roles through conducting a faculty assignment survey; (2) identifying any disconnections between current faculty activities and those activities that faculties desire; and (3) studying and recommending a model for faculty effort assignment that will address any disconnections identified in the second part of the charge. With regard to the model for effort assignment, the parameters they were working with included:

- Maintenance of the institutional student credit hour production,
- Cost-neutrality,
- Adherence to institutional work load standards,
- Maintenance of the expectation for faculty activity in teaching, scholarship, and service,
- Accommodation of disciplinary differences and accreditation requirements, and acknowledgment of the distinct role of temporary faculty members,
- Appropriate fit of the model within our current reward structure, and
- Development of guided principles for this model to reflect equity, flexibility, responsiveness to the work load needs of the academic unit, decentralization, linkage of work load assignment and evaluation processes. accountability tied to productivity outcomes and activities, and consistency with Georgia Southern's mission, priorities, and Strategic Plan.

The model will be available within a week, and the Task Force looks forward to lively and robust conversation about the model. Provost Vandegrift acknowledged the work Task Force and encouraged all faculty to read the report and recommendations.

Linda Bleicken (Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) reported that the report on NCAA Recertification was being prepared and would be available on the web site. She also noted that she has been privileged to attend numerous banquets honoring our best and brightest students, who have consistently noted the contributions of Georgia Southern Faculty in their success.

Joe Franklin (Interim Vice President for Business and Finance) reiterated Dr. Grube's comments regarding layoffs and encouraged faculty to quash any rumors that may be circulating.

Bids are being accepted for the Henderson Library Project, and construction should start in 30-45 days. Budget projections look fairly positive for Georgia Southern, and the Fine Arts Phase III appears to be in the budget for next year.

13. Old Business

Krug (CLASS) called attention to the Librarian's Report, pages 3 and 4, wherein Laing (CLASS) raised concerns about why individuals were being denied for promotion and tenure, and whether feedback was being provided. She urged pursuit of this issue.

Cyr (CLASS) noted that this would go in tandem with the discussion of the review cycle.

14. New Business

Flynn (CLASS) wondered if the Academic Bill of Rights provided by President Grube would be on our web site and offered to provide a motion that it not be. President Grube assured him it

would not be on Georgia Southern's web page.

Kathy Albertson (CLASS) asked what faculty who received travel grants for the funding cycle that begins in July should be told since we do not yet have a budget. Provost Vandegrift provided that the University will be trying very hard to keep its commitment to faculty development.

15. Announcements from the floor

Mark Edwards (COST) commended the work of Clara Krug on the Faculty Senate, noting that she would be rotating off after the June meeting. He noted that it has been a pleasure to serve on the Senate with a person who is such a model Senator, who is always engaged and well prepared. In his opinion, the Senate will miss her activism next year.

President Grube clarified that, despite what may be circulating, he is not looking for a job, nor does he want another job.

16. Adjournment

There being no other business, a motion for adjournment was passed and the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanette K. Rice, Senate Secretary

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
June 23, 2004
4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Nessmith-Lane Continuing Education Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: David Alley, Barry Balleck (for Patrick Novotny), Sharon Barrs, John Brown, Randy Carlson, Jean-Paul Carton, Ken Clark, Gary Dartt, Mohammad Davoud (for David Stone), Bob Fernekes, Chris Geyerman, Mary Hadley, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Clara Krug, Gautam Kundu, Hsaing-Jui Kun (for Bob Cook), Susie Lanier, Jim LoBue, Karl Manrodt, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Fred Smith (for Debra Skinner), Carol Strickland, Stuart Tedders, Deborah Thomas

Voting Members Absent: Kathy Albertson, Phyllis Dallas, Elizabeth Downs, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Annette Laing, Bill Levernier, Michael Moore, Charisse Perkins, Laura Regassa, Kathy Thornton, Cordelia Douzenis Zinskie

Senate Officers in Attendance: Marc Cyr, Jeanette Rice, Richard Flynn, Jeff McLellan

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Vaughn Vandegrift, Linda Bleicken, Joe Franklin, Cindi Chance, Jane Rhoades Hudak, Anny Morrobel-Sosa,

NCAA Faculty Rep: (Richard Rogers was not able to attend.)

SPC Rep: Mike Mills

Senate Liaison: Marilyn Bruce

Visitors: Candy B. K. Schille, Candace Griffith, Denise Battles, Bob Haney, Marcia Jones, Michael Nielsen

1. Approval of the Agenda for the June 23, 2004, Meeting

Marc D. Cyr (Senate Moderator, CLASS) amended the agenda to reflect that there would not be an NCAA report, and moved for approval of the amended agenda; the motion was seconded and passed.

2. Approval of the [April 22, 2004, Minutes](#)

Jeanette Rice (Senate Secretary, COST) moved for the approval of the minutes of April 22, 2004; the motion was seconded and passed.

3. Librarian's Report of [June 17, 2004](#)

Richard Flynn (Senate Librarian, CLASS) moved for approval of the Librarian's Report of June 17th; motion was seconded and passed.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair

Sharon Barrs (Chair, Undergraduate Committee, COST) moved that the recommendations contained in the Undergraduate minutes from April and May, 2004 be approved; the motion was seconded.

Clara Krug (CLASS) noted that the two items related to the Foreign Language Department on page 29, under April Faculty Senate Meeting, are accurate, but that additional wording would be submitted to the undergraduate committee in the fall with respect to the Bachelor of Science in Education with a major in French to further clarify the requirements. Barrs' motion passed.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair

Flynn (Senate Librarian, CLASS) moved that the curriculum changes contained in the Librarian's Report for the Graduate Committee [April 20, 2004] be approved; the motion was seconded.

Krug (CLASS) wondered if on pages 8 and 10, where it states 'NURS 7221 is being replaced by NURS 7224' and then below that 'NURS 7224 is being deleted' was a typographical error and that it should read that the course 7221 is being replaced by NURS 7234. Flynn (CLASS) clarified the scheme to Krug's satisfaction and the motion was passed.

4. President's Report

Bruce Grube (President) reported that he and Bill Golden (Director of Governmental Relations) were visiting legislators and regents, and that those visits were going very well. Terry Coleman, Speaker of the House, has agreed to be involved in a videotape that Georgia Southern will have out in the fall as part of its Capital Campaign media, and Dr. Grube expressed his appreciation of the ongoing support from that office.

While as of the meeting date the Governor had not signed the '05 budget, Dr. Grube felt it was imminent, and noted that the '05 budget will not, for this campus, involve any more cuts. Once it is ascertained exactly what Georgia Southern's status is with this budget, it may be possible to begin to restore monies to departments.

Dr. Grube notified faculty that salary increase letters were due out the day of the meeting and that the Deans were working on them.

The Provost Search will commence at the start of the fall semester, and will have a faculty representative from every academic college and the library, plus one to two Deans, a student and a staff member. Any individuals interested in serving can submit their names to him.

The search for the Vice President for Business and Finance will start at the same time, and Joe Franklin will stay on as interim until that position is filled.

Summer enrollment is at an all-time high of slightly over 7,500 students. Fall semester should be very close to the 16,000 mark. Efforts to increase enrollment by 400-500 students during bad budget years paid off well since the Governor and the legislature agreed to fully fund the formula that brings money to the system and thus to the campuses. An increase in average SAT scores is also anticipated with the incoming class.

The Fine Arts-III project, which will furnish faculty offices and art galleries for the Department of Art, and a black box theater for Communication Arts and Theater, is still in the works. Georgia Southern will fund the remainder of the design costs for that based on information coming from individuals in the University System, legislators and the Governor's office. There is optimism that the funds for that project will be released.

Jim LoBue (COST) queried how minority enrollment is affected by our trends. Dr. Grube pointed out that enrollment depends on, among other things, retention, and that Georgia Southern retains minority students at a rate of 11% over non-minority students. The relative proportion of minority students in the general student population has remained fairly stable.

John Brown (COBA) asked for the status of the Capital Campaign. Dr. Grube announced that Georgia Southern will go public with it at homecoming, and should have 60-70% of the total goal in the bank at that time. Typically, only 40-50% is complete at the time such campaigns go public, so it has been very successful so far.

5. Report from Marc D. Cyr, (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee

Cyr (SEC Chair) reported that the Senate Executive Committee received one information request from Richard Flynn, which noted that many associate and full-professors who had served at Georgia Southern for many years are being paid at about the same rate as newly hired assistant professors, and that according to the AAUP, full and associate professors at Georgia Southern have seen their salaries decline in 2004, the first time since 2000. Flynn asked if such salary compression is being addressed by the administration, and specifically asked that when funding becomes available would back merit pay be considered for those who have had high levels of achievement in these recent years of dearth.

Cyr (SEC Chair) noted that President Grube responded to this request by pointing out that Georgia Southern ranks #1 for full and assistant professor salaries among the 34 schools of the University System of Georgia according to *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (not counting the research institutions) and #2 for associate professors. Georgia Southern has slipped in relation to other southern region states, and the Chancellor, the President and all concerned are working to improve the situation. Any fund established to level up the salaries of some associate and full professors would have to come off the top of any raise monies given by the legislature.

President Grube added that the Provost had compiled a list of the most serious cases in terms of equity and compression and that approximately half of those have been addressed. He noted that this year he is serving on the Budget Advisory Committee to the Chancellor, who recently asked

for Georgia Southern's top priorities for the '06 budget. Dr. Grube's first, second and third priorities were for faculty and staff salaries, restoration of operational funds and maintenance of our funds that allow us to repair and maintain our physical facilities.

Cyr (SEC Chair) added that Provost Vandegrift brought to his attention that one reason the gap between new assistant salaries and long-tenure full-professor salaries has closed in recent years is that the administration has worked to raise salary offers to new hires in order to make Georgia Southern more competitive. The perception that full-professors are losing ground is due to the University making up-ground on the assistant professor front. On the question of back merit pay, Cyr (SEC Chair) reported that President Grube advised there was no such thing. Cyr noted that he sent a follow up query about whether, when money becomes available, unit heads could be directed to consider a longer period than the most recent year or two when figuring merit raises, but has not heard back on that issue.

Available members of the 2003-2004 SEC, plus two new members who will be on the SEC next year, met to staff committees for next year. All new members on committees should have received a message about their appointments, but everyone is encouraged to check the committee membership rosters to find their assignments.

Cyr (SEC Chair) was informed that a disaster recovery task force is being established by the Provost, to be chaired by Lisa Spence. Senate was requested to have a faculty representative on that committee, and Mark Edwards (COST) was nominated and appointed at the SEC agenda setting meeting.

The committee chaired by John Brown (COBA) that is looking into search and hiring practices has been slowed down by the illness of a key member, but should have a questionnaire going out in the fall. The committee chaired by Cyr (CLASS) which is revising the Faculty Grievance Committee Procedures had hoped to have those procedures ready for consideration at this meeting so that the Grievance Committee would be in good shape for the beginning of fall term, but several issues could not be finally considered by the deadline for agenda item requests and it is now anticipated that they will be brought forward in September.

Finally, Cyr (SEC Chair) thanked the members of the SEC for their very hard work over the past year.

Brown (COBA) noted that the committee on search and hire practices will not be distributing a questionnaire, but will have the survey up on the web site.

David Alley (CLASS) wondered what a disaster recovery committee was. Cyr (SEC Chair) clarified that they would be establishing operations procedures for natural (tornado, hurricane, etc.) or technological (wide-spread computer system failure) disasters.

6. Report from Mike Mills, SPC Representative:

Mills (SPC Representative) reported that since the last senate meeting, the Strategic Planning Council met twice in its capacity as the University's Institutional Effectiveness Team to complete

its review of campus-wide institutional effectiveness plans and is now in the process of drafting the University's response to five of the SACS' Principles for Reaffirmation.

7. Motion by Richard Flynn re: Bylaws change:

Flynn (CLASS) moved to replace the penultimate sentence of Article IV, Section 13 of the Senate *Bylaws*, which formerly read, "Senate and faculty representatives must hold graduate faculty status, full or associate," with "Senate and faculty representatives must be members of the graduate faculty." The motion was seconded and passed.

8. Motion by Jeanette Rice re: administrator evaluations:

Rice (COST) moved as follows:

"That all end-of-year self-evaluations of administrators (i.e., Unit Heads, Deans) be made available to faculty, along with the corresponding performance evaluation from their superior, prior to faculty being required to complete evaluation questionnaires."

The motion was seconded.

Brown (COBA) offered a friendly, clarifying amendment,

"That end-of-the-year self-evaluations of unit heads and Deans be made available to faculty prior to faculty being asked to complete evaluation questionnaires."

Rice (COST) accepted the amendment and noted that the rationale for the motion was to improve faculty's ability to participate in the evaluation of department/unit heads and Deans. Since faculty are asked to comment on how well they represent us to the outside community, etc., it would be helpful to have a sheet providing goals, activities and future objectives to facilitate the evaluation process. While the information is available via open records, faculty should not have to use that route to have access to it. Virginia Richards (CHHS) wanted confirmation that we are not seeking performance evaluations, which Rice (COST) confirmed.

Vaughn Vandegrift (Provost) noted possible difficulties with time-lines since only six months may be available prior to faculty doing their evaluations. Rice (COST) noted that she had queried Bob Haney (Associate Provost) about evaluation time frames and deferred to him. Haney (Associate Provost) noted that administrators are evaluated on a fiscal year, but they are evaluated on the fiscal year that is coming to an end. Thus, faculty would not see March, April, May, and June on such a report.

Rice (COST) wondered if administrators could provide something at the end of the calendar year, like faculty do. There was additional discussion on time-lines for evaluations, with Cyr (Moderator) noting that the first trial of this, faculty would be missing approximately four months of that year, but thereafter they would have the four months of the previous year plus the six months of the current year so that nothing would actually be missing any time after the first

set of evaluations. Haney (Associate Provost) stated that he did not believe most administrators went back and picked up those previous 4 months.

Rice (COST) reiterated that it seems pointless for faculty to try to complete these surveys, and again asked if it was possible that they could submit on the same yearly cycle that faculty do, providing a self-brag sheet that would facilitate evaluation. It would be beneficial to the administrators and nice for the faculty to be able to see what is going on at that level.

Krug (CLASS) thought it could be helpful because some faculty have no idea what meetings our Department Chair or our Deans typically attend, and if faculty are asked about certain information they have to indicate that there is no opportunity to observe. President Grube thought it was perfectly honest and acceptable to say "I don't know" when that is the case, as he has to do in some areas when evaluating the Chancellor.

Cindi Chance (Dean, COE) did not think any Dean would have an objection to sharing what we have. Her concern would be asking them to submit another form when, in fact, they could be out doing something more beneficial than writing another piece of paper. She added that she would be concerned if she were participating in an activity and not letting her faculty know, in which case there is a problem with the way she is communicating with her faculty.

Rice (COST) agreed with the latter portion of Dean Chance's statement, but noted that faculty invest a tremendous amount of effort every year on self-evaluations that takes an inordinate amount of time for the purpose of justifying our existence, and that time could also be better spent by faculty doing something more productive. In response to President Grube's comment, Rice (COST) noted that she was unable to answer questions on the evaluation form relating to how well her unit head and/or Dean represents the unit/college to society and/or within the local community, which is something that directly impacts her, that she is concerned about, and that should be available.

President Grube noted that Deans and Department Chairs do justify their existence, as we all do. The problem is that the evaluation is from July 1 to June 30, and so if you ask for something in March, what would be available is the previous fiscal year's evaluation.

Mary Hadley (CLASS) wondered if changing some of the Scantron questions might be in order, agreeing with Rice (COST) that when filling these forms out, she can not answer certain items. The idea of seeing how well goals were met would be appropriate, and would provide a much stronger, better relationship between faculty, Department Chairs and Deans.

Krug (CLASS) asked why administrators were not changed to a calendar year when faculty were, but no information on that was available. Rice (COST) noted she would be in favor of an end of the calendar year report. LoBue (COST) pointed out that the current motion focused only on providing self-evaluation and not the specifics, so the details could be ironed out in a subsequent motion, and noted that passing this motion would provide faculty with more than they currently have. The motion was passed.

9. Motion by David Alley re: [revised Research Committee procedures](#):

David Alley (Chair, Faculty Research Committee, CLASS) reminded the Senate that the upcoming motion is a series of recommendations that grew out of other recommendations made at the April 2003 Faculty Senate meeting concerning the procedures of the Faculty Research Committee. The following recommendations were presented:

1. There is to be one research competition whose deadline would be the last day of classes in Fall Semester, with awards announced in early January. Grant recipients would have the following fiscal year to spend those funds.
2. Research grant proposals should be judged exclusively on merit. Junior and senior faculty status should not be a criterion for evaluation.
3. Temporary faculty members are eligible to participate in the Faculty Research Grant Competition.
4. No faculty member will be eligible to receive funding from the Faculty Research Committee for two consecutive years.

Additional recommendations have to do with the forms that are available on the web page for applications. The bigger issue is the recommendations and if those recommendations are approved, then corresponding changes would be made on the application forms. The motion was seconded.

Brown (COBA) clarified that the handout passed out said awards would be announced at the end of February.

Rice (COST) questioned how applicants' lists of all previous awards would be verified, noting that Howie Kaplan's office (now Julie Cole's office) used to provide that information to committee members. Alley (CLASS) assured that the information would be verified.

Randy Carlson (COE) wondered if the funds awarded, even though announced in February, would not actually be available to be spent until July 1st, when the new fiscal year begins. Alley (CLASS) confirmed that was the case.

LoBue (COST) thought the due date would be problematic as faculty have so much going on at the end of a semester. Alley (CLASS) noted that the faculty had the entire semester to prepare proposals, but was willing to entertain suggestions for a new due date. Extended discussion on due dates ensued, with Ken Clark (COE) noting that since the money is not available until July 1st, there should not be a problem moving the due date to January with announcement of awards sometime in March.

Alley (CLASS) noted that with one funding cycle there would be somewhere around 40 to 60 proposals, and reviewing them is a large task. In addition, committee members are responsible for deciding on the Award for Excellence in Research (2 awards given). A December deadline

would give the committee additional time to carefully consider the proposals. Further, a January deadline would delay review because of time needed for photocopying.

Discussion concerning having faculty submit multiple copies and deadlines continued, with Flynn (CLASS) and Rice (COST) noting that this committee's workload is extremely high and anything that can be done to facilitate their job should be provided.

Provost Vandegrift provided that whatever is decided, after the first cycle it will become part of the institutional culture and faculty will be aware of it well in advance. He then queried whether he correctly understood that so called "true temporary faculty" would have the opportunity to compete for funding in the same fashion as tenured and tenure-track faculty. Alley (CLASS) confirmed. Provost Vandegrift wondered if difficulties might arise from a temporary receiving an award and then not being part of the corps of instruction the following year. Alley (CLASS) recognized the possibility but noted it could be true for an assistant professor as well. Extensive discussion on the topic followed, with President Grube noting that money would not be allocated for spending to someone who was not going to be part of the university in the subsequent semester.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) supported the motion as written, noting that discussion was now centered on problems that may or may not arise. Rice (COST) agreed and called the question. Both the motion to call the question and Alley's (CLASS) motion passed.

10. Old Business

Krug (CLASS) asked what the time line was for implementation of post-tenure review of administrators. Provost Vandegrift provided that there is a quadrennial evaluation of administrators that is required.

Haney (Associate Provost) added that while someone holds an administrative title, the quadrennial evaluation is carried out. For post-tenure review, for those that hold tenure, that is carried out five years after they return to the Corps of Instruction. No post-tenure review is conducted until they return to a teaching position.

11. New Business

Rice (COST) clarified a signature on the sign-in sheet.

12. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Vaughn Vandegrift (Provost) announced that he has been Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs and CIO for the past several years and upon his recommendation Drs. Bleicken and Grube have agreed that the CIO part of the title is better assumed by Lisa Spence. Therefore, as of July 1, 2004, Lisa Spence will assume the title of Chief Information Officer at Georgia Southern University.

As this was his last Senate meeting at Georgia Southern, the Provost expressed his appreciation for the work of the Senate and the Senators as faculty, as well as all of the Corps of Instruction of

Georgia Southern University. He was thrilled to have gotten this position, and noted that his accomplishments over the last four years were a result of the hard work of the faculty, which he appreciates. Georgia Southern's reputation is far reaching and he wanted everyone involved in University operations to be proud of that.

13. Announcements from the Floor

Deborah Thomas (Senate Representative on the [Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force](#)) noted that the model drafted by the task force is on the web site and encouraged faculty to read it. It is also available off-campus and the user name and password can be gotten from her.

President Grube extended a sincere thank you to Marc Cyr (Moderator) for a job extremely well done. He praised Cyr's dedication to the job, hard work, and "absolutely devilish and delightful sense of humor." Cyr was presented with a plaque which reads:

"In recognition of Dr. Marc Cyr for his dedicated service to Georgia Southern University
Moderator of the Faculty Senate 2003-2004."

14. Adjournment

A motion was made to adjourn, was seconded and the meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Jeanette K. Rice, Senate Secretary

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
September 16, 2004

4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Nessmith-Lane Multipurpose Room

Voting Members in Attendance: David Alley, Jean-Paul Carton, Ken Clark, Robert Cook, Charles Champ (for Steven Damelin), Gary Dartt, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Donald Fausett, Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Chris Geyerman, Godfrey Gibbison, Beverly Graham, Mary Hadley, Larry Mutter (for Alice Hall), Mary Hazeldine, Ming Fang He, Patricia Humphrey, Jeanette Rice Jenkins, Kenneth Johnson, Ellen Hendrix (for Gautam Kundu), Annette Laing, Bill Levernier, Michele Davis McGibony, Will McIntosh, Michael Moore, John Nauright, Michael Nielsen, Patrick Novotny, Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Michael L. Daniel (for Kim Ruebel), Debra Sabia, Donna Saye, Candy Schille, Debra Skinner, David Stone, Larry Mutter (for Carol Strickland), Robert Vogel, Patricia Walker, Mark Welford, Jerry Wilson, Bill Yang

Voting Members Absent: Shri Davis, Charisse Perkins, Judi Robbins

Senate Officers in Attendance: Robert Cook, Mark Edwards (Senate Secretary), Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Mary Hazeldine, Patricia Humphrey, Jeanette Rice Jenkins (Senate Moderator), Michael Moore (Senate Librarian), John Nauright

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Linda Bleicken, Joe Franklin, Teresa Thompson, Billy Griffis, Cindi Chance, Charlie Hardy, Fred Whitt, Jim Bradford, Jane Rhodes Hudak, Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Bede Mitchell, Brent Tharp

Senate Parliamentarian in Attendance: Jeff McLellan

NCAA Faculty Representative: Richard Rogers

Strategic Planning Council Representative: Michael Mills

Senate Liaison: Marilyn Bruce

Visitors: Amy Heaston, Candace Griffith, Denise Battles, Sharon Barrs, Clara Krug, Anastasia Sims, Marcia Jones, Gregory W. Harwood, Ron MacKinnon, Jennie Dilworth, Mohammad Davoud.

*Prior to the Senate meeting, questions and clarifications may be directed to the Office of the Faculty Senate or to persons identified with each agenda item.

Prior to the official start of the meeting, Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) thanked the Senators present for accommodating the change of venue from the Russell

Union Ballroom to the Nessmith-Lane Multipurpose Room. She explained that this change enabled the Governor's Conference on Tourism to be held in the Union Ballroom. Rice Jenkins also requested that Senators speak clearly into the microphones so that accurate minutes could be taken. She further announced that, in future, Senate business will be conducted with a stricter adherence to Robert's Rules of Order as dictated in the Senate By-Laws and asked that Senators try to address their comments to the motion or topic on the floor rather than to the individual making the motion. Finally Rice Jenkins noted that the *Old Business* agenda item would be renamed *Unfinished Business* in accordance with Robert's Rules of Order.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the September 16, 2004, Meeting.

Before asking for a motion for approval of the Agenda, Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) amended the agenda posted on the web in advance of the Senate meeting by deleting the Graduate and Undergraduate Reports. Rice Jenkins then asked for, and received, a motion for approval of the Agenda; the motion was seconded and then approved by voice vote.

2. Approval of the [June 23, 2004, Minutes](#).

Mark Edwards (COST, Senate Secretary) moved that the Minutes of the June 23, 2004 Faculty Senate meeting, as posted on the web, be approved. The motion was seconded and passed by voice vote.

3. Librarian's Report of [September 8, 2004](#):

Michael Moore (COE, Senate Librarian) reminded Senators that approval of the Librarian's report was an acceptance of the accounts of the activities of the Senate Standing Committees rather than an approval or disapproval of their decisions. Moore then moved for approval of the Librarian's Report. The motion was seconded after which Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) then asked for discussion.

Debra Sabia (CLASS) asked if the Faculty Welfare Committee was planning to request Tenure and Promotion statistics for years other than those already provided by the Provost for the years 2002/2003 and 2003/2004 at an earlier Faculty Senate meeting. Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS, Faculty Welfare Committee Chair) responded that the committee had no plans to do so at this time but stated that Senator Sabia could request such statistics if she wished. Sabia asked if the procedure for the request would be to contact the Welfare Committee directly and, after some discussion, it was clarified that the correct procedure would be to file an Information Request with the Senate Executive Committee which would then decide whether to pass the request on to the Welfare Committee.

Debra Sabia (CLASS) asked if the Faculty Senate would consider the report of the Faculty Roles and Rewards (FRR) Task Force and what, generally, was the next step for that document. The response to this question came from Linda Bleicken (Provost and

Vice-President for Academic Affairs) who said that, after two informative forums were held in August and September, some formatting issues related to the FRR Task Force Report arose. Denise Battles, the Chair of the FRR Task Force, is planning to meet with the Faculty Welfare Committee to discuss these issues and so that is the next stop for the Report.

Debra Sabia (CLASS) also asked Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) about the status of the Shared Governance Document. Carton replied that the Welfare Committee held a meeting with former Provost Vandegrift in which Vandegrift recommended that the Committee try to implement the policy passed at the February meeting of the Faculty Senate before attempting to modify further the Shared Governance Statement. Carton pointed out that the results of that meeting were already described in the Librarian's Report.

There being no further discussion about the Librarian's Report, Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) called the question on its approval and the Report was approved by voice vote.

4. President's Report:

The President began his report by discussing the budget situation. He noted that, due to the fact that the University System of Georgia has been asked to absorb about \$69 million of the \$180 million "Payroll Shift" budget cuts mandated by the Governor, another 4.2% permanent reduction in Georgia Southern's budget can be expected this year. The President also noted that one of the proposals which the Board of Regents was considering to offset this budget cut was a mid-year tuition increase. He emphasized that, even though we have had a workforce reduction (through attrition) of 250 jobs since 2001 as well as a 500- to 600-student enrollment increase each year, there are no plans lay off any workers unless it is directly ordered by the Chancellor's office.

Annette Laing (CLASS) asked whether, if she told people in the community about the University's budget plight, she would be speaking on behalf of the University. She also wanted to know why anyone should believe her if she did say so. The President responded by saying that, while she was not free to operate a campaign in favor of political candidates out of her office, she was certainly free to speak her mind to people in the community. He answered the second question by comparing the 250-employee loss through attrition to the workforce to a medium-size industry leaving town and noting that such a loss was bound to have a negative impact on the economic health of the community. Laing commented that, up until now, the students had mostly been protected from the budget cuts because tuition increases had been small. She asked whether the President thought the students could absorb such increases easily. The President replied that a 10% tuition increase would be felt by students from all economic backgrounds.

Pat Humphrey (COST) asked what effect the budget cuts will have on faculty searches being conducted this year. The President replied that Provost Bleicken has authorized 84 searches but that these searches would only be completed if the formula used by the

University System of Georgia to determine the cost of running each Institution was fully funded by the State.

Larry Mutter (CHHS) asked why the University System did not raise tuition by an amount that would enable them to give faculty significant raises especially since tuitions were skyrocketing elsewhere around the country. The President said that it would take a significant increase just to offset the current round of budget cuts and that increasing tuition by the amount needed (for example, 40%) to both make up for the budget cuts and increase salaries by a reasonable amount would significantly limit access to higher education.

5. Senate Executive Committee Report:

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) began her SEC report by recounting how the SEC processed two Requests for Information (RFI) submitted by Jim Braselton of COST regarding a planned change in the Monday-Wednesday 2:00 pm to 3:15 pm class time slot to one that would meet on Monday-Wednesday-Friday from 2:00 pm to 2:50 pm. Rice Jenkins stated that the first RFI asked for the reasons for the planned change and that her query to the Registrar provided that the President had asked the Enrollment Management Council and the Deans to review the standard class times to consider revisions that would spread the schedule across the week. When she passed this response on to Braselton, he asked how this planned change might be altered at which point Rice Jenkins urged Braselton to submit the second RFI which asked this question. Provost Bleicken's response provided that the Management Council had made the change in response to considerations of facilities use, which Georgia Southern has to report on annually, and which potentially affects the outcome of our request for funding for additional facilities.

Rice Jenkins also reported that a request to bring a motion to the floor was submitted by Robert Costomiris (CLASS). The motion read that an appeal (regarding process only) of a Dean's decision regarding tenure and/or promotion be heard by someone other than the Dean who made the original decision at the college level. Costomiris would like this to be a process that is standardized across the University where the appeal goes to a specified committee or individual. As his original motion lacked the appropriate specifics with regard to what was being appealed and where it would ultimately end up, the SEC voted to ask him to re-word and re-submit the motion. This motion will likely be under consideration by the SEC for the October agenda.

Rice Jenkins then turned to Agenda Requests. She reported that an Agenda Request was submitted by Don Fausett of COST, entitled "Promotions Guidelines Modification." It requested that the fifth paragraph of Section 208 of the 2004-2005 *Faculty Handbook*, which sets the time guidelines for promotion to Associate and to Full Professor at Georgia Southern be deleted in its entirety. The rationale for this request was that the paragraph in question is inconsistent with the corresponding Tenure Guidelines at Georgia Southern and this is not required by the Board of Regents. Rice Jenkins stated that the SEC voted to refer this Request to the Welfare Committee. She also said that

another Agenda Request was submitted by Don Fausett and that the SEC voted to bring this request to the floor and that it was on the agenda.

Finally, Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) reported that the SEC voted to retain Jeff McLellan as Senate Parliamentarian. Rice Jenkins also noted that a new Senate Moderator must be elected at the November meeting to begin a 6-month apprenticeship. Thus, Senators should begin thinking now about who might fill this position.

Rice Jenkins asked if there any questions about the SEC Report. Mark Edwards (COST, Senate Secretary) pointed out that nominees for Senate Parliamentarian presented by the SEC must be approved by a majority vote. After consultation with the current Senate Parliamentarian, Jeff McLellan, Rice Jenkins called for discussion on the nomination of Jeff McLellan for the Parliamentarian position.

Debra Sabia (CLASS) noted that the Senate Parliamentarian, per the By-Laws, could be anyone in the University Community and she wondered whether the Senate might be better served by appointing a faculty member who is well-schooled in parliamentary procedure. Rice Jenkins replied that the Parliamentarian works most closely with the Senate Moderator (Rice Jenkins) and that she had a comfortable working relationship with McLellan. This led her to ask the SEC to reappoint McLellan to his position as Parliamentarian. There being no further discussion, the Senate voted to retain McLellan as Parliamentarian.

6. Report from Michael Mills, Strategic Planning Council Representative:

Michael Mills, Strategic Planning Council (SPC) Representative, reported that the SPC had met twice already this semester and that those meetings focused on setting overall goals and priorities for the next twelve months. These goals and priorities include the following:

- Refine and promote the University's Quality Enhancement Plan.
- Organize "Listening Forums" to gather feedback about issues related to strategic planning.
- Investigate ways the University can improve its efforts to socialize new faculty into their roles within the University.
- Study the potential implications of advancing the Teacher/Scholar model.
- Begin the annual cycle of meetings between the SPC and each of the Vice-Presidents of the University to monitor the progress of each Division toward meeting their strategic objectives.

There were no questions from Senators.

7. Report from Richard Rogers, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:

Richard Rogers, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative handed out a list of NCAA Rules violations reported by Georgia Southern University to the NCAA either through the Southern Conference or directly. All of the violations listed were what the NCAA calls "Secondary Violations" and the NCAA has not asked Georgia Southern University

to do anything other than what Georgia Southern has already done. There were no questions from Senators.

8. Motion by Don Fausett re: Supplementary Procedures for Faculty Dismissal:

Don Fausett (COST) made the following motion:

1. That a faculty member has the right to know the issues of a meeting with administrators when summoned to such a meeting. Upon request, the individual be presented with a written agenda of issues to be discussed so as to allow him/her an opportunity to prepare for said meeting.
2. That prior to such meeting, the individual be apprised whether or not the university is to be represented by an attorney.
3. That the faculty member has the right to have legal counsel present at any meeting in which the university will have legal counsel present. In meetings where the university does not have legal counsel present, the faculty member has the right to bring a faculty colleague to act as an academic advisor.
4. That a written record of the meeting be preserved. That the faculty member be entitled to a copy of that record and able to contest the version of events as stated in the written record of the meeting.
5. That any administrator who violates established methods of procedure should be accountable for failure to adhere to university procedures.
6. That grievance procedures be allowed for faculty even if termination or forced resignation was the outcome of discussions with the administration. In short, people who have been terminated or who have been forced to resign should still be able to appeal their termination of employment according to established "procedures."

Fausett immediately amended his original motion by deleting items 5 and 6 and by adding a phrase to item 4. The amended motion is as follows:

1. That a faculty member has the right to know the issues of a meeting with administrators when summoned to such a meeting. Upon request, the individual be presented with a written agenda of issues to be discussed so as to allow him/her an opportunity to prepare for said meeting.
2. That prior to such meeting, the individual be apprised whether or not the university is to be represented by an attorney.
3. That the faculty member has the right to have legal counsel present at any

meeting in which the university will have legal counsel present. In meetings where the university does not have legal counsel present, the faculty member has the right to bring a faculty colleague to act as an academic advisor.

4. That a written record of the meeting be preserved upon request of the faculty member. That the faculty member be entitled to a copy of that record and able to contest the version of events as stated in the written record of the meeting.

The motion was seconded.

Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) called on Don Fausett to speak first in support of the motion. Fausett, citing Section 210.02 of the *Faculty Handbook*, responded by saying that this set of procedures was an effort to supplement the dismissal procedures of the University as allowed by the Board of Regents. Rice Jenkins then called for discussion.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked who would be keeping the written record of the Faculty/Administrator meeting referred to in item 4. Fausett replied that he thought it ought to be the designate of the person calling the meeting. Rice Jenkins then asked Fausett if the meetings to which these procedures applied were meant to be those held between Faculty and Administrators prior to any formal dismissal for cause action. Fausett replied in the affirmative.

Pat Walker (CLASS) asked why Fausett wanted to delete item 6 in the original motion. Fausett and Rice Jenkins both responded to this question by saying that grievance issues were more properly dealt with by the Faculty Grievance Committee and deletion of item 6 brought important items 1-4 to the floor more expeditiously.

Chuck Johnson (COBA) asked what the definition of an “Administrator” was in the context of item 1. Johnson was concerned that these procedures would require a written agenda every time a faculty member had a meeting with his/her department chair. Fausett replied that “Administrator” meant anyone in the chain-of-command above the faculty member. Rice Jenkins explained that a written agenda was not required for all meetings but that, if a faculty member were called to an administrator’s office, the faculty member was entitled to receive at least a verbal description of the meeting agenda if desired.

Bob Cook (CIT) inquired if this motion intended these procedures to appear in the *Faculty Handbook* and, if so, then where in the *Handbook*. After some discussion, Cook offered a friendly amendment that these procedures appear in Section 210.01 which Rice Jenkins said contained a general statement of Renewal/Non-renewal of Faculty on Probation in a probationary period. Fausett agreed to this friendly amendment to his original motion.

At this point, Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) recognized Clara Krug, Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee, from the gallery and asked her to make a statement. Krug said that the charge of the Faculty Grievance Committee was not to make policy.

She further stated that this committee would consider matters related to item 6 in the original motion and make recommendations that would ultimately come back to the Senate for consideration.

John Nauright (CHHS) commented that the language in item 1 was too broad and suggested that the wording be revised to apply only to meetings relating to renewal or non-renewal of probationary faculty. Nauright felt like the current wording required a written agenda for every meeting with administrators. Fausett replied that he thought that Nauright's suggested language was too restrictive and pointed out that a written agenda was not required at every meeting but only when requested by the faculty member.

David Robinson (CLASS) stated that the proposed procedures seem to assume that a faculty member currently does not have the right to have an attorney present at a meeting with administrative personnel. He then asked Jeff McLellan if that was the case. McLellan declined to answer the question stating that he was present in the capacity of Senate Parliamentarian rather than as University attorney. Robinson then directed the same question at Dr. Grube who suggested that this question be studied by a Senate standing committee. Robinson explained that, if faculty members do not have the right to an attorney, then nothing that is put in the *Handbook* will make any difference and so the legal question needs to be answered before the motion is considered. Robinson wondered if referring the motion to a committee for study might not be the best course at present. Rice Jenkins reminded the Senate that, if they wished to send the motion to committee, someone could move to commit the motion to a specific committee and this needed to be passed by a majority vote.

Debra Sabia (CLASS) said that this motion arose as a result of an actual incident indicating that faculty members are currently not allowed to bring in their own attorneys. This circumstance has generated much discussion among faculty and is a good indication of what is missing from the dismissal process. Richard Flynn (CLASS) agreed with Robinson that one needs to know the legal fact about having an attorney present before being able to vote intelligently on the motion. Ming Fang He (COE) asked if faculty members have the right to know that they are not doing well before such meetings take place. Mary Hadley (CLASS) replied that these meetings involved dismissal for cause rather than poor performance.

Virginia Richards (CHHS) complained that there were many questions still outstanding in this motion such as too many people to fit in the meeting room, who would be taking notes, and what about the rights of the administrator. Richards then moved that the motion be sent to the Welfare Committee for further study. The motion was seconded. Rice Jenkins asked for discussion on the motion to send the Fausett motion to committee.

David Stone (COST) stated that the motion should not go to committee because the people that wrote the motion had thought about it a lot. He said that he was not worried about rooms being too small or administrator's rights. The purpose of these policies is to protect faculty rights. The administrator is not the one being threatened with dismissal.

Debra Sabia (CLASS) worried that the Fausett motion might stay in the Welfare committee for up to a whole academic year before coming back to Senate for consideration. Rice Jenkins stated that the Richards motion to send to committee could be amended to put a limit on the time the motion sat in committee.

David Robinson (CLASS) reiterated that the legal position of a faculty member in the position considered by the Fausett motion is unknown by anyone on the Senate and so, for that reason, it should be referred to committee. Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) reminded the Senate that, because all Senate actions are advisory to the President, the choice before them was either to pass the Fausett motion and let the President make a decision about it or to send to committee to study the legal underpinnings before considering the motion again.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) stated that time was not of the essence in passing this motion since such meetings between faculty members and administration personnel were relatively rare. Gibbison was in favor of sending the Fausett motion to committee.

David Alley (CLASS) commented that there was a motion on the floor and then another motion was made. Rice Jenkins responded that the current debate focused on the Richards motion to send the Fausett motion to committee. If passed, the Fausett motion becomes moot. Chuck Johnson (COBA) said that the Fausett motion ought to read as a motion to modify the *Faculty Handbook*. Rice Jenkins reminded him that Bob Cook's friendly amendment had taken care of that.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS) pointed out that, if the Senate voted to approve the Fausett motion and there was a legal problem, the President would surely apprise the Senate of that fact in thirty days time.

Mark Edwards (COST, Senate Secretary) asked what steps would the Welfare Committee take to discover the answer to the legal question if the Fausett motion were referred to them. Rice Jenkins asked Jeff McLellan (as University attorney) if the Welfare Committee could call upon his expertise to receive an answer to the legal question. McLellan replied in the affirmative.

Michael Moore (COE, Senate Librarian) referred to a response Jeff McLellan gave to an ad hoc committee charged with revising faculty grievance procedures in which McLellan stated that faculty members are free to consult with attorneys in conducting their private affairs. Moore held that this essentially answered the legal question that, yes, faculty members have the right to have an attorney present at meetings with administrators if they chose. Moore's opinion was that the Fausett motion need not go to committee.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) stated that, if faculty already had the legal right to an attorney, then there is no need to have a motion passed. However, he believed that it was not so clear and thus the motion should go to committee. Flynn then "called the question" on whether to end the debate on the Richards motion to send the Fausett motion to the Welfare Committee.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) reminded Senators that the Flynn motion to end debate on the Richards motion by “calling the question” was not itself debatable but required a two-thirds majority to pass. That being the case, the vote would be taken by a show of hands. This vote failed to garner the needed number of votes and so debate continued.

Don Fausett (COST) pointed out that many items in the *Faculty Handbook* were there merely for informational purposes. He compared these procedures to the Miranda rule which provides that suspects arrested for a crime be told their rights. He noted that people’s rights do not depend whether they know them or not. If it is not illegal, he said, there is no harm in stating it.

Ellen Hendrix (CLASS) suggested that Virginia Richards (CHHS) amend her motion to send the Fausett motion to committee to include a date certain by which the Welfare Committee should report on their study of this motion. Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) then asked Virginia Richards if she was interested in doing so. Richards then moved to amend her motion to send the Fausett motion to the Welfare Committee so that they bring back their report by the November 17 meeting of the Faculty Senate. Rice Jenkins asked for debate on this amendment.

Debra Sabia (CLASS) wondered why the report couldn’t be given in time for the October meeting of the Senate. Richards responded that the Welfare Committee only met every two weeks and Rice Jenkins noted that they have a full agenda already. The motion was seconded and, as there was no further discussion, Rice Jenkins asked for a voice vote on the amendment which passed.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) stated that the question before the Senate was then the amended Richards motion to send the Fausett motion to the Welfare Committee with the proviso that the Welfare Committee report back to the Senate by the November 17, 2004 meeting. She then asked if there was further debate.

Candy Schille (CLASS) reiterated that her original comment about who would be taking the minutes of any meeting had not been answered to her satisfaction and so she was in favor of sending the Fausett motion to the Welfare Committee.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins then asked if there was more discussion. Hearing none she then asked if the Senate was ready to vote on the amended Richard motion that the Fausett motion be referred to the Welfare Committee with the proviso that this committee report back by November 17, 2004. This motion passed by voice vote.

9. Unfinished Business

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) asked for any unfinished (formerly old) business. There was none.

10. New Business

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) recognized Bob Cook (CIT) who made a motion on behalf of Jim Braselton of COST. Cook moved that the new restrictions on class scheduling be suspended beginning in the fall semester of 2005, and that, in the interim, the problems being addressed be communicated to the faculty in order to give the faculty an opportunity to participate in the solution of those problems. The motion was seconded and Rice Jenkins asked for discussion.

Bob Cook (CIT) commended Braselton for bringing this motion forward. He said that, in his experience, he had seen class schedules change for a host of different reasons and that faculty were generally agreeable to whatever the motivation for the changes were. But in this case, he said, restrictions were being placed on class scheduling without the benefit of faculty involvement. Thus faculty members do not know what the motivation for the changes is. Perhaps, if faculty members were involved in the planning they might come up with a better solution than the one proposed at the moment.

Annette Laing (CLASS) also commended Jim Braselton for bringing the motion forward and stated that the Senate should send a firm message to the Registrar's Office that imposing class-schedule changes without the benefit of faculty guidance was counterproductive. Rice Jenkins asked Laing if she was in favor of the motion on the floor and Laing answered in the affirmative.

Mark Edwards (COST, Senate Secretary) noted that the Registrar's Office did not decide the class schedule changes. At this point, Rice Jenkins took the opportunity to call upon Linda Bleicken (Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs) to explain just how the new class schedules were decided upon.

Linda Bleicken noted that the idea to revise class time slots began in March, 2003 when Joe Franklin (Interim Vice-President for Business and Finance) suggested that Georgia Southern University probably could avoid building additional parking simply by having a more-efficient class schedule. The President sent a memo to Ron Core, then Vice-President for Business and Finance, on April 22, 2003 which focused on facilities utilization and the parking situation. This precipitated further discussion that resulted in the Enrollment Management Council being charged with making recommendations for altering the class schedule. The Council was responsible for devising the new schedule and they did consult the Dean's Council but, Bleicken said, was slow to communicate the new schedule to the Faculty. She apologized for that and said that the change was not made by fiat, however.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator), hearing no further discussion, called on Bob Cook to reread the motion. She then asked the Senate to vote and the motion passed by voice vote.

11. Announcements: Vice-Presidents

Linda Bleicken (Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs) called upon Mary Hazeldine (COBA and Faculty Roles and Rewards Liaison) to report on the status of the Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force. Mary Hazeldine read the following statement.

“The Faculty Roles & Rewards Task Force made available to the campus in April 2004 our draft model for faculty effort assignment for Georgia Southern University. Since that time, we have provided a number of opportunities for comments and discussion of the draft model. These have included multiple presentations, our electronic Feedback Form and two forums held in recent weeks. Summary notes from those forums are now posted on the Task Force’s website. We appreciate the participation of faculty members and administrators in these discussion sessions. The Task Force is scheduled to meet on Tuesday, September 28, 2004 when we will seek to finalize our recommendations on a faculty effort assignment model. We encourage all faculty members to review the draft model and provide us their thoughts on it. The Task Force will make a presentation to the Faculty Welfare Committee. When the report is finalized, the task force will submit its recommendations to Dr. Bleicken for her action. This step will complete the task force’s charge.”

There were no other announcements from the Vice-Presidents.

12. Announcements from the Floor

Patrick Novotny (CLASS), in his role as Faculty Senate Liaison to the Social Security Number and Identification Number Task Force, reported on the progress of that body. Novotny informed the Senate that the goal of conversion of all ID numbers away from Social Security numbers is on-track for making its November 19-21, 2004 deadline. Additional information regarding campus workshops and forums will be available in the coming weeks on a to-be-established website. There were no questions for Novotny.

13. Adjournment

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) asked for a motion to adjourn. It was so moved and seconded. The motion passed by voice vote at 5:52 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Edwards, Faculty Senate Secretary

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

October 19, 2004

4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Jean-Paul Carton, Robert Cook, Steven Damelin, Gary Dartt, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Donald Fausett, Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Godfrey Gibbison, Beverly Graham, Mary Hadley, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Ming Fang He, Patricia Humphrey, Jeanette Rice Jenkins, Kenneth Johnson, Gautam Kundu, Bill Levernier, Michele Davis McGibony, Will McIntosh, Michael Moore, John Nauright, Michael Nielsen, Patrick Novotny, Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, Judi Robbins, Kim Ruebel, Debra Sabia, Charles Champ (for Donna Saye), Candy Schille, Debra Skinner, David Stone, Carol Strickland, Robert Vogel, Patricia Walker, Mark Welford, Jerry Wilson, Bill Yang

Voting Members Absent: David Alley, Ken Clark, Shri Davis, Chris Geyerman, Annette Laing, Charisse Perkins, David Robinson

Senate Officers in Attendance: Robert Cook, Mark Edwards (Senate Secretary), Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Mary Hazeldine, Patricia Humphrey, Jeanette Rice Jenkins (Senate Moderator), Michael Moore (Senate Librarian), John Nauright

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Linda Bleicken, Joe Franklin, Teresa Thompson, Billy Griffis, Ron Shiffler, Charlie Hardy, Fred Whitt, Jane Rhoades Hudak, Brent Tharp, Bede Mitchell

Senate Parliamentarian in Attendance: Jeff McLellan

NCAA Faculty Representative: Chris Geyerman

Strategic Planning Council Representative: Michael Mills

Senate Liaison: Marilyn Bruce

Visitors: Denise Battles, Missy Bennett, Diana Cone, Robert Costomiris, Marc Cyr, Candace Griffith, Amy Heaston, Stephanie Kenney, Clara Krug, Marcia Jones, Ron MacKinnon, Betty Nelson, Ronnie Sheppard, Deborah Thomas

*Prior to the Senate meeting, questions and clarifications may be directed to the Office of the Faculty Senate or to persons identified with each agenda item.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the September 16, 2004, Meeting:

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) called the meeting to order. She advised the Senate that neither Richard Rogers (NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative) nor Mike Mills (Strategic Planning Council (SPC) Representative) had anything material to report. Rice Jenkins then asked for a motion to amend the previously posted agenda to delete the SPC Representative Report and the NCAA Representative Report. Rice Jenkins then asked for, and received, a motion for approval of the Agenda; the motion was seconded and then approved by voice vote.

2. Approval of the September 16, 2004, Minutes:

Mark Edwards (COST, Senate Secretary) moved that the minutes of the September 16, 2004 meeting of the Faculty Senate that were posted earlier on the web be approved. The motion was seconded and, since there was no discussion, approved by voice vote.

3. Librarian's Report of October 19, 2004:

Michael Moore (COE, Senate Librarian) reminded Senators that approval of the Librarian's report was an acceptance of the accounts of the activities of the Senate Standing Committees rather than an approval or disapproval of their decisions. Moore then moved for approval of the Librarian's Report. The motion was seconded after which Rice Jenkins asked for discussion. Hearing none, the Librarian's Report was approved by voice vote.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Virginia Richards (CHHS):

Virginia Richards (CHHS, Undergraduate Committee Chair) moved that the minutes of the September 22, 2004 meeting of the Undergraduate Committee that were contained in the October 19, 2004 Librarian's Report be approved. The motion was seconded and there was no discussion. The Undergraduate Committee was then approved by voice vote.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Richard Flynn (CLASS):

Richard Flynn (CLASS, Graduate Committee Chair) moved that the minutes from two meetings of the Graduate Committee be approved. Flynn noted that the minutes of the March 24, 2004 meeting had been inadvertently omitted from the Librarian's Report submitted at the final Senate meeting of the previous academic year. Flynn went on to say that the other minutes were from the May 27, 2004 meeting. The motion was seconded and, since there was no subsequent discussion, approved by voice vote.

4. President's Report: Bruce Grube (President):

The President spoke about two issues. Regarding the budget, he noted that the Board of Regents voted not to raise students' tuition at midyear. Despite this development, he

reported that the \$2.9 million slice of the payroll-shift deficit that had been assigned to Georgia Southern would now be somewhere between \$850,000 and \$1.1 million with some details still to be worked out. The President went on to say that the Board of Regents used the health insurance reserve fund to pay for the payroll shift deficit with the result that the reserve had been reduced to a 30-day period.

The President also announced the kickoff of the Georgia Southern University *Campaign for National Distinction*, a fund-raising effort whose ultimate goal is to raise \$40 million. He noted that 65% of this goal had already been achieved and that a link to the Campaign's website appeared on the main university web page. There were no questions for Dr. Grube.

5. SEC Report from Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator):

Jeanette Rice Jenkins reported that the Senate Executive Committee met on Monday, October 11, 2004 at 7 a.m. Rice Jenkins stated that there were two Requests for Information (RFI) both of which were submitted by Debra Sabia (CLASS). The first was submitted on October 4, 2004 and requested information on why the minutes of the September Senate meeting were not yet available. Her rationale for the request was that the Faculty Welfare Committee was unable to begin its charge to process Don Fausett's (COST) motion from the September Senate meeting entitled "Supplementary Procedures for Faculty Dismissal." Rice Jenkins stated that the SEC response to this request was to point out that the *Bylaws* of the Faculty Senate provide that the minutes must be posted no later than ten working days prior to the next Senate meeting. Ten working days prior to October 19, 2004 would be October 5, 2004 so that the time allotted had not yet expired. Rice Jenkins commended the work done by the team involved in the process of producing the minutes: Robbie Thompson and crew for recording the meeting audio, Ginger Malphrus for typing a verbatim transcript, and the Senate Secretary for summarizing this transcript. She noted that she had been assured by Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS, Faculty Welfare Committee Chair) that the Faculty Welfare Committee was already at work processing the Fausett motion.

Debra Sabia's second request for information queried why salary disputes were not part of item #6 of the Revised Grievance Procedures to be submitted to the Senate at the current meeting. She specifically asked what the established procedures for dealing with salary disputes were and why this should not be under the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) purview. Rice Jenkins explained that she herself had served on the FGC and that, as such, was able personally to provide a response to this RFI. The response was that salary disputes arising collaterally in complaints about improper action or treatment are open to be grieved. The current method for resolving other salary complaints were through the Unit Head, the pertinent Dean, and the Provost. Rice Jenkins also welcomed discussion of allowed salary grievances at the appropriate time later in the meeting.

Rice Jenkins next turned to Agenda Requests and noted that there were five such requests which were as follows:

1. *Revised Faculty Grievance Procedures* submitted by Marc Cyr on 9/23/04,
2. *Proposed Faculty Workload Statement for Faculty Handbook* submitted by Jean-Paul Carton on 10/1/04,
3. *University-Wide Policy Regarding Appeals for Violation of Procedures in the Tenure Decisions at the Dean's Level* submitted by Robert Costomiris on 10/4/04,
4. *Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force Report* submitted by Linda Bleicken on 10/4/04, and
5. *Revision Suggested for the Revised Faculty Grievance Procedures* submitted by Debra Sabia on 10/4/04.

Rice Jenkins reported that the SEC voted to put the first three of these items on the agenda of the current meeting. The agenda item submitted by Linda Bleicken (item #4) was intended to be a request for comments and does not require a Senate vote. Rice Jenkins noted that it, too, was placed on the agenda. She also reported that the SEC voted to request that Debra Sabia withhold her proposed revision of the Cyr motion (item #1) until the November Senate meeting so that an undivided debate of this motion could take place in the Senate at the current meeting. Rice Jenkins stated that Sabia graciously agreed to this and Rice Jenkins thanked Sabia for this action.

Rice Jenkins also reported that the SEC had received a response from the President to a motion (made by Rice Jenkins herself) at the June 23, 2004 meeting of the Faculty Senate. The motion was as follows:

“That all end-of-year self-evaluations of administrators (Unit Heads, Deans) be made available to faculty, along with the corresponding performance evaluation from their superior, prior to faculty being required to complete evaluation questionnaires.”

Rice Jenkins read the President's response aloud for the record which was as follows:

“College and unit level goals for each academic year will be shared with college faculty through mechanisms such as fall college meetings and fall department meetings. These goals will also be available on college and department web pages and may be placed in unit newsletters. Evaluation of goal accomplishment, an integral assessment of unit and individual effectiveness, will be shared at the time of evaluation — typically in late spring or early summer — through the same mechanisms stated above.”

She noted that it was now incumbent upon faculty to ensure that this information is, in fact, forthcoming and to use it as they see fit to help complete evaluation forms for Deans and Unit Heads.

Finally, Rice Jenkins reported that the SEC selected a nominee to replace Mike Mills (CLASS, Strategic Planning Council (SPC) Representative) as the Faculty Senate Representative on the SPC. The SEC voted to put Jerry Wilson (COBA) forward as its nominee. She noted that this election would take place later in the meeting. Rice Jenkins also warned the Senate that a vote for SEC Chair for the 2005/2006 academic year would

take place at the November meeting and that Senators should forward nominations to her so that a list of nominees could be made available, ideally, one week before the November meeting.

6. Election of SPC Representative:

Mary Hazeldine (COBA) nominated Jerry Wilson of COBA to be the Faculty Senate Representative to the Strategic Planning Council. Jeanette Rice Jenkins asked if anyone wished to make a nomination from the floor. There were no other nominations. Mike Mills (CLASS, SPC Representative) pointed out that the new SPC Representative would serve a one-year apprenticeship before becoming the new representative next fall. Rice Jenkins then asked the Senate to vote to approve Jerry Wilson as the next SPC Representative and approval was given by voice vote.

7. Motion by Jean Paul Carton (CLASS), “Proposed Faculty Workload Statement for the Faculty Handbook”:

Jean-Paul Carton, on behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee, moved that the second paragraph of Section 216.07 of the *Faculty Handbook* be deleted and that the first paragraph be kept as is. The motion was seconded and Jeanette Rice Jenkins called for discussion.

Laura Regassa (COST) remarked that the term “credit hours” that appears in the first paragraph is problematic in the biology department because they can teach a four credit-hour class with labs which is actually eight contact hours. Regassa offered a friendly amendment to the Carton motion that “credit hours” be changed to “contact hours” in the first paragraph. Carton accepted this amendment but commented that he was now speaking on his own behalf and not on behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee. Robert Cook (CIT) stated that he was a member of the Faculty Welfare Committee and was against modifying the motion. Rice Jenkins interpreted that to mean that the friendly amendment was not accepted by the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Debra Sabia (CLASS) asked about the history of the proposed policy change. Carton replied that the motion was brought forward in response to a proposal for a new faculty workload statement for the *Faculty Handbook* and submitted to the Faculty Welfare Committee last spring by former Provost Vandegrift. Carton went on to say that this faculty workload statement appears as an attachment to the motion.

Robert Cook (CIT) noted that the Faculty Welfare Committee had been and continues to be deluged with policy revisions to the *Faculty Handbook*. Cook stated that his opinion on the matter was that, unless someone presented the committee a specific problem that needed to be solved and suggested rewording to address the problem, he was reluctant to revise the *Handbook*. He said that the committee considered many variations of “contact hour” and it got so complicated that doing nothing seemed the best solution. This seemed

especially true given that the university seems to operate fine even the way the *Handbook* reads now and that this was the basis for his objection to modifying the motion.

Debra Sabia queried whether the Faculty Welfare Committee shaped the motion intentionally to leave the first paragraph of Section 216.07 of the *Faculty Handbook* intact and to strike the second paragraph. Rice Jenkins confirmed this.

Mark Welford (COST) commented that other language in the paragraph referred to a “15-hour total workload” and that this related to the Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force Report where they want to develop such a thing as the concept of a “workload” hour. He then moved, therefore, that the whole motion be sent back to committee for reevaluation. The motion was seconded and Rice Jenkins asked for discussion on the question of whether to commit the motion back to committee for the purpose of discussing the implications of the “15-hour teaching load.”

Jean-Paul Carton commented that, if the motion were sent back to the Welfare Committee, the committee would need to know the scope of the revisions the Senate wants. If that was not clarified, he was not in favor of having the motion sent back.

Candy Schille (CLASS) noted that the Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force Final Report would be discussed later in the meeting and that the workload discussion should be postponed until after that discussion had occurred. Consequently, she supported not sending the motion back to committee. Richard Flynn (CLASS) commented that the only effect of the current motion was to remove archaic language from the *Faculty Handbook* and thus should not be sent back to committee.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins, asking for and hearing no further discussion on the question of whether to send the motion back to committee, called for a vote on this issue. The vote on the Welford motion to send the Carton motion back to committee was taken by voice and failed. Debate on the original Carton motion therefore continued.

Mark Edwards (COST) suggested that the motion could be amended to read only that the second paragraph be removed from the *Handbook* with no mention of retaining the first paragraph. Rice Jenkins asked whether Edwards wished to offer a friendly amendment and he said yes. Jean-Paul Carton did not accept this friendly amendment and Edwards withdrew his motion to amend.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins asked for further discussion on the original Carton motion. Hearing none, she called for the vote. The Carton motion, i.e., to leave the first paragraph of Section 216.07 of the *Faculty Handbook* intact and strike the second paragraph, passed by voice vote.

8. Motion by Patricia Humphrey on behalf of Robert Costomiris, “University-Wide Policy Regarding Appeals for Violation of Procedures in the Tenure Decisions at Dean’s Level”:

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) next called on Pat Humphrey who stated that Robert Costomiris of CLASS submitted the following motion to the SEC:

“When a ‘do not recommend’ decision on a faculty member’s tenure and/or promotion package is received at the Dean’s level, and the faculty member believes there was a procedural error made in the review of the application package, the appeal of that decision will be heard and decided upon by a council consisting of the Deans from all units other than the faculty member’s. Timeframes for tenure and promotion materials will be modified to allow sufficient time for this appeal process to occur.”

The SEC voted to revise this motion to read

“When a ‘do not recommend’ decision on a faculty member’s tenure and/or promotion package is received at the Dean’s level, and the faculty member believes there was a procedural error made in the review of the application package, the appeal of that decision *should first be made to the Dean who made the decision. If the reconsideration is not granted, the appeal* will be heard and decided upon by a council consisting of the Deans from all units other than the faculty member’s. Timeframes for tenure and promotion materials will be modified to allow sufficient time for this appeal process to occur.”

Humphrey then moved that this language be incorporated into Section 220 of the current *Faculty Handbook* after the first paragraph. The motion was seconded. Rice Jenkins clarified that the SEC had revised the original motion [as shown in italics above] to add a request for reconsideration by the Dean who first made the decision before having the application review by a council of the other Deans.

Rice Jenkins then called on Robert Costomiris from the gallery to speak on behalf of this motion. Costomiris stated that his intention in submitting this new language for the *Handbook* was two-fold: (1) consideration of the application by Dean’s Council (minus the relevant Dean) in case of procedural errors would result in a more unbiased review, and (2) placing the language in the *Handbook* would result in a uniform procedure for this type of review across the university.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) noted that this issue had been discussed in Dean’s Council even before the Humphrey motion appeared. She said that one of the efforts underway currently was to try to have consistency in the decision-making process as it applies to promotion and tenure. She also stated that the Faculty Roles and Rewards Document would provide a basis for looking not only at this particular process but the whole evaluation process. She went on to say that the current procedure would have the appellant go back to the Dean to make the Dean aware of either additional information or of a procedural error, have the Dean look at it, and then make a ruling. If the appellant is still unsatisfied with the result, the application would go to the Provost’s office for a possible decision.

Robert Cook (CIT) noted that Section 220 of the *Faculty Handbook* already contained a passage that reads “recommendations made at the College level or beyond may be appealed to the Provost within fourteen calendar days of notification of the decision.” He pointed out that, while this does not include a review by Dean’s Council, it has the advantage of covering all appeals rather than ones of a procedural nature. Consequently, Cook stated that he was against passage of this motion. Rice Jenkins replied, as a point of information, that there had been cases in the past where candidates had appealed to the Provost and had not received a response.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA), speaking in favor of the motion, pointed out that the current wording in the *Handbook* is quite vague and there would be some value in specifying who looks at the appeal between the College level and the Provost level.

Candy Schille (CLASS) stated that, while she was in favor of the motion, she thought that Robert Cook made some good points about the revision of the language. She asked if it would be possible to amend the motion to read the way Robert Costomiris originally submitted it. Rice Jenkins replied that such action would require a motion to amend the Humphrey motion but Schille declined to so move.

Debra Sabia asked Robert Costomiris (1) if he could give the Senate some guidance as to his intent in bringing this issue forward and (2) does this motion substitute for what is currently in the *Handbook*? Robert Costomiris, speaking from the gallery, stated that he had no idea about the second part but commented that it seemed that having more precise language in the *Handbook* regarding procedural appeals would be preferable.

Candy Schille changed her mind and offered a friendly amendment to eliminate the language, added by the SEC, to the motion originally submitted by Robert Costomiris. The friendly amendment was accepted by Pat Humphrey. Rice Jenkins encouraged members of the SEC to speak since their revision was amended out.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) said that, if the Senate wanted to change procedure stated in the *Handbook*, the procedural change should be considered by the Faculty Welfare Committee. Rice Jenkins replied that, as she read Section 220, it referred only to appeals on matters of merit and that there should be another opportunity for opinion before it reaches the Provost. Costomiris concurred that this was, indeed, his intent.

Debra Sabia commented that adding this language might disallow appeals of a non-procedural nature. Rice Jenkins replied that the new language did not replace the paragraph already found in Section 220 of the *Handbook*. Robert Cook restated his objection that the *Handbook* had language that already covered this matter.

Candy Schille called the question and a hand-count vote was taken on whether to end debate on the motion. The motion to end debate, which required a greater than 2/3 majority, passed. Rice Jenkins then called for a vote on the Humphrey motion as

amended by Schille which returned the language to that originally submitted by Robert Costomiris. The motion passed by voice vote.

9. Motion by Michael Moore on behalf of Marc Cyr, “Revised Faculty Grievance Procedures”:

Michael Moore (COE, Senate Librarian) moved that Section 219 of the *Faculty Handbook* entitled “Grievance Procedures” be replaced with the revised version developed by a committee for the purpose and chaired by Marc Cyr. The motion was seconded and Rice Jenkins noted that the Revised Grievance Procedures had been posted on the web for some time so that everyone should have a copy available. She then asked for discussion.

Debra Sabia asked about salary grievance procedure under the revised policies. Marc Cyr, speaking from the gallery, noted that Section A-6 of the Revised Grievance Procedures put in writing a previously unwritten agreement that existed between former Provost Vandegrift and the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC) insofar as grievances having to do with salary are concerned. Grievances of the “I’m worth more than you are paying me” variety are not considered by the FGC. Salary issues that are collateral with other grievances where practices, procedures, or established criteria have not been followed can be appealed to the FGC.

Sabia asked who makes the decision that a grievance is of one type or another. Cyr replied that this determination would be made by the Chair of the FGC.

Virginia Richards (CHHS) stated that she wanted to change the second sentence of Section B-3 of the Revised Grievance Procedures from “An individual may be reelected to an unlimited number of successive terms,” to “An individual may be reelected after a one-year break in service.” Rice Jenkins asked if she wanted to offer a friendly amendment, file a motion to amend, or ask for some discussion about the genesis of the original sentence. Richards asked for discussion.

Richards stated that most committees had term limits for elected members and she was surprised that this one did not. Marc Cyr replied that term limits were also suggested by the President and Provost. Cyr said that the need for continuity on the committee overrode the arguments for term limits.

Clara Krug, Chair of the FGC and speaking from the gallery, said that it was very difficult to find people who wanted to serve on this committee and that there were presently several vacancies. Krug asked if Marilyn Bruce (President’s Office) could be recognized and Bruce confirmed that she had great difficulty in finding people to serve on the FGC. Krug went on to say that, when the committee does consider a grievance, the work is very time-consuming and that is another reason why this is not a popular committee. Krug said, finally, that all meetings of the FGC are confidential, no minutes are kept, and the only record of the proceedings was audio tapes whose location is known only to the Chair of the FGC.

Rice Jenkins then asked Virginia Richards if she still wanted to make a motion. Richards moved to amend the Revised Grievance Procedures Section B-3 second sentence to read, "An individual may be reelected after a one-year break in service." The motion was seconded and Rice Jenkins asked for further discussion.

Debra Sabia argued against term limits saying that, if a FGC member was not doing a good job, he/she could be voted out. Mark Edwards pointed out that, since no minutes were kept of the work of the committee, there was no way for a voter to tell whether a member was doing a good job or not. Mike Moore said that a voter could decide on a candidate's suitability for sitting on the FGC by whether they would represent faculty fairly and that there was no need to sift through minutes of meetings.

Richard Flynn argued against tinkering with a document that had been carefully considered by the committee that drafted it. Trying to revise the document on the floor of the Senate was a bad idea. Candy Schille concurred and said that term breaks were trumped by continuity concerns.

Rice Jenkins, hearing no further discussion on the Richards amendment to the Moore motion, called for a vote. The motion failed by voice vote. Rice Jenkins then called for a vote on the original motion made by Michael Moore. The motion passed by voice vote.

10. Request for Comments by Provost Linda Bleicken, "Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force Report":

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) called on Linda Bleicken (Provost) to introduce, for Senate comment, the Faculty Roles and Rewards (FRR) Task Force Report. Bleicken noted that the FRR had been at work on the document for the past two years. She went on to say that a version ready for comments had been presented in faculty forums held in August and September of this year and that FRR Chair Denise Battles had met with the Faculty Welfare Committee for further input which she then took back to the FRR Task Force. The document as it now stands is offered to the Senate for comment.

Richard Flynn stated that, at one of the forums, he had asked why could there not be a maximum workload value 50% for scholarship when there was a minimum of 40% for teaching. He noted that the document remained unchanged and wanted to know why. Mary Hazeldine, a member of the FRR, asked that Denise Battles (FRR Chair) answer that question. Battles replied that there had been extensive discussion on this point and that former Provost Vandegrift had said that he did not want a system in which the lowest value for teaching was lower than the highest value for scholarship. Battles said that language was added to the document to say that these numbers should be revisited later on to maintain alignment with the University's Mission and Strategic Plan. Battles also noted that Flynn was the only individual to make that comment.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS) wanted to know how Rutgers University managed to appear on the list of Peer and Aspirational Institutions listed in the back of the report and why the lists are such a hodgepodge of institutions. Rice Jenkins called on Bruce Grube (President) to answer. Grube stated that the Board of Regents gave Georgia Southern University a list of “Peer Institutions” at the beginning of strategic planning. It was decided at that point to make another “Aspirational Institution” list of institutions from which we could really learn something and that was the origin of the two lists.

Candy Schille commented that the workload agreement between the faculty member and unit head looked like a contract model. That is, the faculty member and unit head contract for what work will be done during an academic year. She noted that journal articles sometimes take several years to appear and wanted to know how long-term items like this would be evaluated after a “contract” has been set up. Mary Hazeldine said that faculty members could go back to the unit head and go over the “contract” to account for things such as articles that suddenly appear after a long review time or a large, unforeseen service commitment.

Candy Schille further asked if there were any type of appeals process if, for example, you did not get along with your unit head. Linda Bleicken replied that that had not been considered in the FRR document presented to the Senate. Jeanette Rice Jenkins asked Linda Bleicken whether the document could be revised at a later date to which Bleicken replied in the affirmative.

Pat Humphrey (COST) worried that a faculty member might go along fine for a few years under the “contract” model and then be told at tenure/promotion time that he/she doesn’t have enough papers or such like. Linda Bleicken replied that it was up to the unit head to let a faculty member know how he/she was progressing toward these long-term goals.

Ming Fang He (COE) asked whether class size would be taken into account when determining workload. Mary Hazeldine replied that such decision would be made within the unit and Denise Battles noted the concept of “workload” was flexible enough to allow departments and colleges to devise equivalencies for teaching hours that account for class size. Debra Sabia noted that there were serious inequities across campus as to teaching classes of different size and that regular-sized classes have grown in recent years, but which faculty members still get same credit for these as in the past. Linda Bleicken agreed with that assessment and said that the FRR Task Force had looked this issue and had also found this to be true.

Ming Fang He worried about the effect of increased teaching load on the evolution of the future vision of Georgia Southern University. Right now, she said, if we want to move beyond a Master’s Tier One University, the workload would be a critical issue. President Grube responded that the Teacher/Scholar model coupled with the “workload hour” concept defined in the FRR Report was a system that accommodates Georgia Southern University’s evolution toward a more research-intensive institution.

Pat Walker (CLASS) asked what would become of the document now. Linda Bleicken replied that it would go to Dean's Council to be used as a foundation so that the Deans can begin to establish or refine their workload policies within their colleges. Walker asked that this process be made as transparent as possible to which Bleicken concurred.

11. Unfinished Business:

Robert Cook (CIT) noted that the Provost's Office gave him a history of the development of the change in the class schedule as requested at the last Senate meeting and that he would be happy to share it with anyone who asks.

12. New Business:

Candy Schille (CLASS) moved that the meeting be extended to 6:45 p.m. The motion was seconded and the motion passed by hand-count vote.

Michael Moore (COE) moved that the Senate recommend to the President that the Student Teaching fee of \$250, to begin with the spring semester in 2005, for student teachers be suspended for the Fall of 2005 term until there has been faculty and student input at the appropriate forums for such input. The motion was seconded and Jeanette Rice Jenkins called on Moore to begin the discussion.

Michael Moore said that a week and a half earlier, the College of Education had been informed by email that students were being notified that, due to budget cuts, a \$250 fee would be charged to Student Teachers. Moore stated that he inquired as to the process by which this fee was approved. The process, he was told, was department request, Dean of Undergraduate Teacher approval, COE Dean approval, Provost approval, Presidential approval. Moore went on to say that there was no faculty or student input in this process and that he was not necessarily against the fee. He said that the decision to impose the fee should have had faculty and student input. This was the basis of his motion. He further stated that the fee should have been discussed, at least, in the Undergraduate Committee and should have been reported to the Senate as required by Section 9 of the Faculty Handbook.

Judi Robbins (COE) asked Moore if it was not the case that the request was sent to the Dean of Undergraduate Teacher Education by a COE Standing Committee which had faculty on it. Linda Bleicken then called on Amy Heaston of the Provost's Office to give a detailed account of the process by which fee approval was granted.

Amy Heaston (Provost's Office) stated that she was formerly the Director of Field Experiences in Partnerships and that she was on the committee that considered this fee. Monies used to pay cooperating classroom teachers who work with student teachers formerly came from a Capstone Grants Program paid by Professional Standards Commission (PSC). In July, 2003 the PSC stopped paying this money. In August, 2003 a request was made to have the Demonstration Teacher Partner School Council examine the issue. In September, 2003 the Council, consisting of faculty from COE, CHHS, and

CLASS as well as representatives from the public schools, was convened. In October, 2003, the Council recommended four options for consideration by the Dean and these were communicated to the Dean in November. In January, 2004, the Department of Teaching and Learning decided to impose the student teacher fee. This decision was approved up the chain of command to the President's level.

Rice Jenkins asked Amy Heaston if there was any information she could provide to address Moore's concern that the process of imposing the fee did not come through the Undergraduate Committee which, he said, as being necessary in the *Handbook*. Heaston replied that the student teaching fee did not affect curriculum or course content so that the course-fee policy was followed.

Rice Jenkins asked Moore if he had anything further to add. Moore restated his position that while he was not against the fee, the process of imposing the fee should have had faculty and student input and should have come through the Undergraduate Committee.

Rice Jenkins asked if there was any further discussion. Ronnie Sheppard, the Chair of the Department of Teaching and Learning and speaking from the gallery, stated that his department had two faculty meetings at which the fee was discussed. He reiterated their perception that this was a course-fee issue rather than a curricular one and so the proper channels were used.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) pointed out that the natural extension we might draw from Dr. Moore's concern is that any course fee proposal would need to go through the Undergraduate Committee and there are many fee proposals this would place an undue burden on this committee.

Chuck Johnson (COBA) called the question to end debate on this issue. The motion passed by voice vote. Rice Jenkins then called for a vote on the Moore motion to suspend the Student Teacher fee effective fall, 2005 so that, in the interim appropriate channels can be involved in providing alternate solutions to the fee. The motion passed by hand count and Rice Jenkins announced that the count was 18 for, 17 against.

13. Announcements - Vice-Presidents:

There were no announcements from the Vice-Presidents.

14. Announcements from the Floor:

Virginia Richards (CHHS) announced that the College of Health and Human Sciences would host a speaker named Melinda Southern from Louisiana State University in the COE Auditorium at 7 p.m., October 21, 2004. All of the community was invited.

15. Adjournment:

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 6:06 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Edwards, Faculty Senate Secretary

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

November 17, 2004

4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: David Alley, Jean-Paul Carton, Robert Cook, Steven Damelin, Gary Dartt, Shri M. Davis, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Donald Fausett, Charles Skewis for Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Chris Geyerman, Godfrey Gibbison, Beverly Graham, Mary Hadley, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Ming Fang He, Patricia Humphrey, Jeanette Rice Jenkins, Kenneth Johnson, Bill Levernier, Michele Davis McGibony, Will McIntosh, Grigory Dmitriyev for Michael Moore, Michael Nielsen, Patrick Novotny, Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, Judi Robbins, Kim Ruebel, Debra Sabia, Donna Saye, Candy Schille, Debra Skinner, David Stone, Carol Strickland, Robert Vogel, Patricia Walker, Mark Welford, Jerry Wilson

Voting Members Absent: Ken Clark, Gautam Kundu, Annette Laing, John Nauright, Charisse Perkins, David Robinson, Bill Yang

Senate Officers in Attendance: Robert Cook, Mark Edwards (Senate Secretary), Richard Flynn, Mary Hazeldine, Patricia Humphrey, Jeanette Rice Jenkins (Senate Moderator)

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Linda Bleicken, Joe Franklin, Teresa Thompson, Jim Bradford, Cindi Chance, Charlie Hardy, Jane Rhoades Hudak, Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Ron Shiffler, Brent Tharp

Senate Parliamentarian in Attendance: Jeff McLellan

NCAA Faculty Representative: Richard Rogers

Strategic Planning Council Representative: Michael Mills

Senate Liaison: Marilyn Bruce

Visitors: Denise Battles, Missy Bennett, David Bonebright, Greg Brock, Diana Cone, Robert Costomiris, Olivia Edenfield, Candace Griffith, Marcia Jones, Stephanie Kenney, Ron MacKinnon, Ronnie Sheppard, Deborah Thomas, Victoria Zwald

*Prior to the Senate meeting, questions and clarifications may be directed to the Office of the Faculty Senate or to persons identified with each agenda item.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 17, 2004, Meeting:

Pat Humphrey moved that the Agenda for the November 17, 2004 meeting be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

2. Approval of the [October 19, 2004, Minutes](#):

Mark Edwards (COST, Senate Secretary) noted that there were two errors in the minutes for the October 19, 2004 Senate meeting posted on the web. These were (1) that Chris Geyerman was counted present when he was, in fact, absent, and (2) that the minutes stated that the Senate approved the September meeting minutes at the October meeting. Edwards then moved that the posted minutes be approved noting those two errors. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

3. Approval of the [Librarian's Report of November 17, 2004](#):

Richard Flynn (CLASS), making the motion on behalf of Michael Moore (COE, Senate Librarian) who was at a conference, reminded Senators that approval of the Librarian's report was an acceptance of the accounts of the activities of the Senate Standing Committees rather than an approval or disapproval of their decisions. Flynn then moved for approval of the Librarian's Report. The motion was seconded after which Rice Jenkins asked for discussion. Hearing none, the Librarian's Report was approved by voice vote.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Virginia Richards (CHHS):

Virginia Richards (CHHS, Undergraduate Committee Chair) moved that the minutes of the October 18, 2004 meeting of the Undergraduate Committee that were contained in the November 17, 2004 Librarian's Report be approved. The motion was seconded and there was no discussion. The Undergraduate Committee was then approved by voice vote.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Richard Flynn (CLASS):

Richard Flynn (CLASS, Graduate Committee Chair) moved that the minutes from the September 23, 2004 meeting of the Graduate Committee be approved. Flynn noted that these minutes reflected the fact that the committee wisely elected him to be the chair of the committee. The motion was seconded and, since there was no subsequent discussion, approved by voice vote.

4. President's Report: Bruce Grube (President):

The President covered two issues in his report. He first reported that the search for a new Provost was progressing according to schedule and that candidates would be brought in for interviews in early January, 2005. The President next noted that the Peer Review Team for the NCAA re-certification process had just left that afternoon and the results of an exit interview with them was very positive.

5. SEC Report from Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator):

Jeanette Rice Jenkins reported that the Senate Executive Committee met on Monday, November 8, 2004 at 7 a.m. Rice Jenkins stated that the SEC had one Request for Information and three Agenda Item Requests.

The RFI came from Steven Damelin from COST, which sought information on the benefit to Georgia Southern faculty of adopting a faculty professional leave program similar to those in place at Georgia Tech and UGA, particularly in light of the increasing focus on faculty as teachers and scholars. This matter was presented to the Provost who concurred that, in light of the numerous changes that have occurred at Georgia Southern since the inception of our faculty leave program, it was appropriate to reevaluate this and a committee is being put together to do just that.

The first Agenda Item Request came from Robert Costomiris from CLASS concerning the allocation of duties of tenure and promotion committees at the college level. The SEC decided that this was a CLASS-specific governance problem as opposed to a university-wide issue and so they voted to place it on the agenda as a discussion item to gather additional information.

The second agenda request came from Debra Sabia requesting that the Faculty Grievance Procedures be revised to read as follows, "Faculty members whose contracts have been terminated will, nonetheless, be able to pursue the grievance procedures outlined above through the Faculty Grievance Committee." Rice Jenkins noted that the SEC had some concerns that the word "contract" would limit the scope of the new wording to employees who had contracts and that, perhaps, that wasn't Sabia's intent when she made the request. The SEC thus voted to refer this request to the Faculty Grievance Committee via its chair, Clara Krug for discussion and recommendations. The SEC requested that the FGC return with its recommendations by December 15, 2004.

Rice Jenkins also reported that FGC Chair Clara Krug is conducting a poll of the members of the FGC who are being asked to respond to the following questions:

1. Is it accurate that no faculty member whose contract has been terminated is able to pursue a grievance?
2. If the faculty member signs a letter of resignation, either with or without pressure from another individual, should that person be eligible to file a grievance?
3. Is there any member who is aware of a situation where a temporary faculty member has had an annual written contract?
4. Does an individual who is no longer a faculty member have faculty privileges? That is, may he or she file a grievance after the grace period of employment mentioned in #1 has expired?
5. Are there any additional related questions or concerns?

Rice Jenkins stated that she included this information in her SEC Report because these questions may ultimately need to be considered by the Senate.

The third agenda item request came from Dr. Patrick Novotny in CLASS and requested that a Bulloch County voter precinct be established on the Georgia Southern campus. That request was unanimously approved by the SEC and was included on the agenda of the November Senate meeting.

6. Report from Mike Mills (CLASS), SPC Representative:

Mike Mills (CLASS) began his SPC report by noting that the Strategic Planning Council has begun a discussion of a variety of initiatives across campus designed to link educational outcomes, program review and assessment, resource allocation, and strategic planning. To this end the SPC is studying ways to integrate and consolidate assessment efforts across campus by seeking ways to reduce the number of reports that units are required to submit by combining and/or eliminating redundancies in the end of the year reporting. They will also be looking at refining the annual reporting process to help units in preparation for program review and/or re-accreditation. Mills also reported that the SPC will be holding listening forums the spring that will involve faculty, staff, and students. He also said that there will be a special forum for members of the Faculty Senate and that Senators will be able to provide feedback to the SPC via a special web page. Details will be forthcoming. There were no questions from Senators regarding Mills' report.

7. Report from Richard Rogers (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:

Richard Rogers began his report by stating that he heard a talk by Myles Brand, the President of the NCAA, in which Brand speculated that the requirements for membership in Division I-A such as minimum attendance, minimum size of stadium, minimum number of scholarships would not be reduced. Rogers related that Brand also reported that new legislation would be passed that would allow I-A teams to count games against I-AA opponents towards their bowl eligibility every year rather than every four years as is currently the case. Rogers noted that this would increase the frequency with which a I-AA school would play a I-A school.

Rogers also reported that two members of Georgia Southern's men's soccer team were just named to the CoSIDA Academic All-America, All-District Team. CoSIDA is the National Organization of Sports Information Directors. The two student-athletes are Josh Chatraw, who is a senior Business Management major with a 3.96 GPA and Tommy Irwin, also a Business student with a 3.55.

Finally, Rogers circulated the Annual Graduation Rate Report for Georgia Southern University from the NCAA. Rogers noted that, for student-athletes that entered and

finished their athletic eligibility here, the graduation rate was 89%. There were no questions for Rogers and that concluded his report.

8. Election of Chair, SEC. SEC nominee is Patricia Humphrey (COST):

Jeanette Rice Jenkins called on Mary Hazeldine of the Senate Executive Committee to nominate Patricia Humphrey as the SEC nominee for SEC Chair. Hazeldine nominated Humphrey, the nomination was seconded and Rice Jenkins as for nominations from the floor. Hearing none Rice Jenkins declared the nominations closed and called for a vote to elect Patricia Humphrey the next SEC Chair. Humphrey was elected by voice vote.

9. Motion by Patrick Novotny (CLASS): [A Resolution Pertaining To A Bulloch County Voting Precinct On The Georgia Southern University Campus](#)

Patrick Novotny (CLASS) made the following motion:

“Aware that Georgia Southern University is the largest and most comprehensive center of higher education in Southern Georgia,

Recognizing that civic engagement of Georgia Southern University students through voting is one of the most important and cherished rights at the core of America’s democratic values,

Recognizing that Georgia Southern University has embraced “Advancing a Culture of Engagement” as an institutional theme for the University’s Southern Association of Colleges (SACS) Reaffirmation,

and Aware that the Student Government Association (SGA) has endorsed the request herein by a unanimous vote of the Student Government Association’s Senate on Wednesday, September 29, 2004,

Be it resolved that a motion is made that the Faculty Senate does hereby request the President of Georgia Southern University, Dr. Bruce Grube, formally ask that Bulloch County Probate Judge Lee DeLoach place a voting precinct on the Georgia Southern University campus.”

After a second and hearing no discussion, Rice Jenkins called for a voice vote. The motion passed unanimously.

10. Discussion Item: Agenda Request by Robert Costomiris (CLASS): [Allocation of Duties of Tenure and Promotion Committees at the College Level](#)

Robert Costomiris submitted the following request for a motion to the SEC:

“That Members of the College Tenure and Promotion Committees not evaluate, vote on, or discuss the tenure and promotion materials of faculty members from their own departments.”

The rationales for this motion were:

1. College committee members have already evaluated these materials at the departmental level and thus have already made a significant statement about them.
2. To ensure the fairest evaluation of a candidate’s materials, the materials should only be reviewed by faculty from other departments who have not reviewed them before.
3. To avoid any potential influence on behalf of or against the candidate it would be best if College committee members were not involved in decisions regarding applications from members of their own department.

Rice Jenkins noted that the SEC placed this motion on the Senate Agenda as a discussion item and allotted fifteen minutes for this discussion to take place. She called on Robert Costomiris from the gallery to speak first on behalf of this issue.

Robert Costomiris noted that he had two more points to add in addition to the three points mentioned in the rationale. The first was that it was inequitable that sometimes colleagues serving on College Tenure and Promotion Committees supported candidates in their own departments and sometimes they spoke against a colleague. The second point was that excluding colleagues that might speak against a candidate would lessen the possibility of bias at the College level.

Pat Walker (CLASS) said that having a member of the department that a candidate is from is helpful to other committee members who may not know how to assess elements of the candidate package.

Virginia Richards (CHHS) stated that, in her College, the Tenure and Promotion committee membership was not secret as it is in CLASS. She also noted that the most of the Professors in her College were ethical enough to recuse themselves from the process if they felt that they could not give a candidate a fair evaluation. Costomiris responded that such information ought to be in the candidate’s package.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) noted that, in her College, members of the Departmental committees are banned from serving simultaneously on the College committee. Thus the members of the College committee have not seen a candidate’s package.

Mike Nielsen (CLASS) said that it was extremely rare for a person to change their vote between the Departmental and the College levels. Thus the tendency would be for that person to lobby for the opinion already expressed at the Departmental level.

David Alley (CLASS) pointed out that, while he was concerned about the secrecy of the CLASS Tenure and Promotion Committee process, he had also been the Chair of the Faculty Research Committee. In that committee, evaluating science proposal would have been very difficult had not some science faculty been present.

Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) said that not everyone in his department looked at the candidate's package. So, for example, he would not evaluate a Spanish-language candidate. Thus, if this were to come up as an actual motion, it would require special wording for different situations.

Carol Cornwell Strickland (CHHS) stated that she agreed with what Virginia Richards said earlier. In CHHS, the process was transparent, the committee members were known and that it was up to committee members to behave in a professional manner. Mary Hazeldine (COBA) also noted that in COBA the committee membership was not secret and that the requirements for tenure were clearly stated in the COBA by-laws.

Bob Cook (CIT) recommended that, if this issue returned to the Senate as a motion, that it be stated as a language change in the *Faculty Handbook*. Furthermore, he also made the point that, since most of the College committees have already met, that there was plenty of time to consider this issue before it had any effect next year.

Jane Hudak (CLASS Dean) stated that there was currently a shared-governance task force working on this particular issue.

Judi Robbins (COE) stated that, in the COE, the membership of the Tenure and Promotion Committee was also not secret.

Mark Edwards (COST) noted that it seemed as if every other College except CLASS had an open Tenure and Promotion membership and this seemed to be a problem specific to CLASS and thus did not come under the purview of the Faculty Senate.

Ming Fang He (COE) said that, in the COE, if there was some concern about a member of the College committee, that this person could be replaced by a less-biased person at the next election.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins noted that the discussion time was up.

11. Unfinished Business:

There was no unfinished business.

12. New Business:

Don Fausett (COST) reintroduced a motion that he originally made on September 16, 2004. The motion was to eliminate the fifth paragraph of Section 208 of the *Faculty Handbook*. This paragraph reads as follows:

"At Georgia Southern, promotion to the rank of associate professor is typically not considered until the sixth year of service at the rank of assistant professor, four of which have been at Georgia Southern; promotion to the rank of professor is typically not considered until the seventh year of service at the rank of associate professor, five of which have been at Georgia Southern."

Jeanette Rice Jenkins asked for and received a second of the motion. She noted that this motion was originally sent to the Welfare Committee for recommendation and that committee voted to leave the paragraph in the Handbook. By reintroducing the motion, Don Fausett is asking for the will of the full Senate to be heard. The rationale, she said, was that the time-in-rank stated in this paragraph overstated the actual typical time-in-rank at Georgia Southern University.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked why the Welfare Committee voted to retain the paragraph. Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) replied that the vote was 5 to 4 and that the argument put forth by the majority was that the system described in the Handbook wasn't broken and that some people actually liked having a little more time to make a decision.

Richard Flynn (CLASS), speaking in favor of the motion, noted that the language in the Handbook described "typical times" rather than University policy and that these typical times differed from actual policies set forth by the Board of Regents. Flynn said he did not understand why these typical times needed to differ from Regents policy. Bruce Grube (President) noted that Regents Policy tended to set minimum standards as they must grapple with institutions that range from Valdosta State to the University of Georgia. Ming Fang He (COE) agreed with Flynn that Georgia Southern ought to conform to Regents policy and also she wondered why our standards were tougher than those of Research I universities. Mary Hadley (CLASS) also agreed with Flynn and wondered how long this paragraph had been in the Handbook. She noted that Georgia Southern had evolved greatly in the ten years she had been here while this policy had not been altered. Rice Jenkins opined that the language had been there only three or four years.

Steven Damelin (COST) asked how this policy affected hiring faculty from other universities. Specifically, would the language in the paragraph preclude hiring a person as a Full Professor? Linda Bleicken (Provost) replied that, in cases where a person is hired as a Full Professor, the primary consideration was the accomplishment of the candidate.

Candy Schille (CLASS) then "called the question" so that an immediate vote was taken to decide whether debate should end. The Senate Parliamentarian noted that a two-thirds majority was required. The Senate voted (by hand) to end debate. Rice Jenkins then put the Fausett motion to a vote and it passed by voice vote.

Mark Welford (COST) introduced a motion entitled “A Resolution to Reduce Bias in Tenure and Promotion Decisions within the Unit and College on the Georgia Southern University campus.” The motion was the following:

“Aware that administrators (e.g., chairs, unit heads, deans) have access to personal files on tenure-track faculty throughout their 6-year probationary (now 5-year probationary) term before tenure is requested.

Be it resolved that a motion is made that all administrators upon returning to full-time to the corps of instruction shall be prohibited from serving on their respective unit and college Tenure and Promotion committee’s for a period of 5 years.”

Mary Hazeldine (COBA) spoke in favor of the motion by saying that former administrators who are returning to a role as full-time faculty need to concentrate on teaching and scholarship in order to prepare for post-tenure review and shouldn’t be burdened by extra service.

Bruce Grube (President) asked Welford what was meant by the word “bias” in this motion. Welford replied that former administrators who served on Departmental- and College-level Tenure and Promotion Committee often based their decisions on information that they were privy to during their administrative duties. This information was, many times, not in the package being judged by the committee. Other committee members had no way of knowing or independently verifying whether this information was true or not. Grube also wanted to know if the term “administrator” extended to include Department Chairs and Welford replied that it did.

Virginia Richards (CHHS) noted that this motion would place a burden on small colleges such as CHHS where every tenured associate and full professor was needed to staff the necessary committees in the College. She further stated that the possibility of bias did not exist in her College.

Debra Sabia (CLASS) spoke against the motion saying that former administrators should be entitled to all of the rights and privileges of rank-and-file faculty members. Richard Rogers (NCAA Representative) noted that there were some administrators (e.g., graduate program director) who did not make personnel decisions and who should not be disenfranchised from making them later.

Mark Edwards (COST) spoke in favor of the motion and made two points. The first was that the term “administrator” should not be lower than the Dean because a Dean made decisions about personnel across an entire College while Department Chairs only made decisions about personnel in a single department. His second point was that perhaps this issue should be considered by an ad hoc committee which would carefully consider the definition of “administrator” in this motion. Rice Jenkins asked if Edwards was willing to make this motion and Edwards replied in the affirmative. That is, the motion was that this motion should be considered by an ad hoc committee. After some discussion it was determined that referral to an ad hoc committee was allowed by parliamentary procedures.

David Alley (CLASS) spoke in favor of the Edwards motion to commit the Welford motion to an ad hoc committee saying that, from what he had heard, the definition of “administrator” was an important question here.

Rice Jenkins thus asked for the Senate to vote on whether the Welford motion should be considered by an ad hoc committee to be appointed by the SEC. The motion to commit was passed by voice vote.

Mark Welford (COST) now introduced a second motion entitled “A Resolution to Ensure the Faculty Senate on the Georgia Southern University Campus Is Maintained within the Hands of Full-time Instructional Faculty as Proposed by President Grube.” The motion read as follows:

“Be it resolved that a motion is made that faculty senators can only be elected from the corps of full-time instructional faculty, and cannot at the time of election hold part-time, temporary or full-time administrative positions. If during the term of a faculty senator, a faculty senator accepts a part-time, temporary or full-time administrative position, the said faculty senator must immediately resign from the faculty senate and cease all faculty senate activity (e.g., remove themselves immediately from all senate committees). Thereafter, either 1) a special faculty senate election must be held to replace this senator, as soon as possible, within the senator’s term or 2) an alternate from the ex-senator’s college be selected or elected to replace the ex-senator. Replacement would be for the remaining length of the ex-senator’s term.”

Welford also suggested that, to maintain continuity and reduce disturbance to the function of the faculty senate this year, 2004-2005, the motion be implemented in the 2005-2006 senate session.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) noted that some of the definitions, such as “full-time faculty” in this motion were as tricky as in the previous motion. Flynn moved that this motion be referred to the same committee as the previous motion. Bruce Grube (President) stated that the University Statues provided that Senate membership is open to “full-time faculty” and doesn’t distinguish between tenure-track and temporary faculty. Grube noted that the Senate by-laws cannot be changed to subvert something stated in the Statues.

Rice Jenkins then asked for a vote on the Flynn motion to commit the second Welford motion to the same ad hoc committee as the first Welford motion. This motion was passed by voice vote.

13. Announcements - Vice-Presidents:

Linda Bleicken (Provost) announced that there was an ongoing search for a new Dean of CLASS. The Chair of that search was Dean Jim Bradford. Bradford had informed

Bleicken that they had over sixty applicants for that position and that these applications were currently being screened.

14. Announcements from the Floor:

Gary Dartt (CLASS) announced that the play “Hotel Paradies” was opening that evening at the Performing Arts Center and everyone was invited.

15. Adjournment:

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Edwards, Faculty Senate Secretary