

2005

Faculty Senate Minutes-2005

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

Georgia Southern University, "Faculty Senate Minutes-2005" (2005). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 11.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/11>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate 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.

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

February 9, 2005

4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: David Alley, Jean-Paul Carton, Ken Clark, Charles Champ for Steven Damelin, Gary Dartt, Shri M. Davis, 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, Gautam Kundu, Bill Levernier, Michele Davis McGibony, Will McIntosh, Michael Moore, John Nauright, Michael Nielsen, Patrick Novotny, Virginia Richards, Judi Robbins, David Robinson, Kim Ruebel, Debra Sabia, Donna Saye, Candy Schille, Debra Skinner, David Stone, Robert Vogel, Patricia Walker, Mark Welford, Jerry Wilson, Bill Yang

Voting Members Absent: Robert Cook, John Dyer, Chris Geyerman, Kenneth Johnson, Annette Laing, Charisse Perkins, Laura Regassa, Carol Strickland

Senate Officers in Attendance: 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, Jim Bradford, Cindi Chance, Charlie Hardy, Jane Rhoades Hudak, Bede Mitchell, Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Ron Shiffler

Senate Parliamentarian in Attendance: Jeff McLellan

NCAA Faculty Representative: Richard Rogers

Strategic Planning Council Representative: Michael Mills

Senate Liaison: Marilyn Bruce

Visitors: Denise Battles, Adam Crisp, Mohammad Davoud, Luther Denton, David Dudley, Candace Griffith, Luke Hearn, Amy Heaston, Marcia Jones, Clara Krug

*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 February 9, 2005, Meeting:

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) heard a motion that the Agenda for the February 9, 2005 meeting be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

2. Approval of the [November 17, 2004](#), Minutes:

Mark Edwards (COST, Senate Secretary) noted that he was advised by Jeanette Rice Jenkins of a typo on page 8, paragraph 2 of the November minutes: “send” should be “sent.” Edwards then moved that the posted minutes be approved noting the error. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

3. Approval of the [February 9, 2005](#), Librarian’s Report:

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. Mary Hazeldine (COBA) asked if the College of IT had a graduate program to which Charlie Hardy (DEAN, COGS) responded in the negative. The Librarian’s Report was then approved by voice vote.

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

Virginia Richards (CHHS, Undergraduate Committee Chair) was not present at the time this agenda item came up. Michael Moore asked if a motion to approve the minutes of the Undergraduate Committee could be made in the absence of Virginia Richards since the minutes appeared in the current Librarian’s Report. Jeanette Rice Jenkins replied that that was possible. Richard Flynn (CLASS) moved that the minutes of the November 16, 2004 Undergraduate Committee meeting be approved. The motion was seconded and Rice Jenkins asked for discussion. Hearing none, she called for a vote and the motion passed by voice vote.

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

Richard Flynn (CLASS, Graduate Committee Chair) noted that the minutes from the October 21, 2004 and November 18, 2004 meetings of the Graduate Committee both appeared in the current Librarian’s Report. Flynn moved that the minutes of both of these meetings be approved. The motion was seconded and, since there was no subsequent discussion, approved by voice vote.

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

President Grube (President) announced that the search for a new Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs had reached a successful conclusion with the hiring of Dr.

Linda Bleicken. Grube thanked the Search Committee for all of their hard work and named each one:

- Bede Mitchell, Chair
- Mark Edwards, Faculty Senate
- Gene Murkison, COBA
- Ming Fang He, COE
- Joanne Chopak-Foss, CHHS
- Tom Case, CIT
- Peggy Hargis, CLASS
- James Claiborne, COST
- Cynthia Frost, Library
- Anny Morrobel-Sosa, Dean's Representative
- Reggie Brown, Student Representative
- Caroline Price, Staff Representative
- Georj Lewis, Student Affairs Representative

He then called upon Dr. Bleicken to say a few words.

Dr. Bleicken began by thanking the people she worked with in the former positions that she held at Georgia Southern, specifically the Management/Marketing/Logistics Department in the College of Business Administration, Student Affairs, and Academic Affairs. She also thanked Dr. Grube for bringing his vision to the institution. She concluded by saying she looked forward to the coming years and that it was now time to get to work.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins asked if there were any questions for Dr. Grube. Hearing none, she went on to the SEC Report.

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

Jeanette Rice Jenkins reported that the Senate Executive Committee met on Wednesday, February 2, 2005 at 7 a.m. Rice Jenkins stated that the SEC had five Requests for Information (RFI) and two Agenda Item Requests.

The first RFI was from Lorne Wolfe, who queried about the need for mid-term grade reporting and how that information was being used. Acting Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, Teresa Thompson, provided that the information is being carefully tracked to identify problems early and match students with the appropriate resources to assist them.

Pat Humphrey submitted an RFI asking if faculty accrue vacation. The basis for this request was that some faculty in COST were being told by their department heads that they were required to be at their desks during business hours when classes were not in session. The BOR Policy clearly states that nine- or ten-month faculty members do not accrue vacation. Faculty members on twelve-month schedules accrue at the same rate as staff and administrators.

Gautam Kundu submitted a two-part request. The first dealt with the high turnover in the Engineering Technology programs since 2000, and wondered how that would affect program certification by ABET and curricular stability and development. COST Dean Anny Morrobel-Sosa responded that the programs mentioned are served by nine faculty members: five tenured, two tenure-track, and two temporary, full-time faculty members. Two tenure-track searches are underway to fill two positions that were vacated by unsuccessful tenure decisions since 2000. The composition of the faculty is not an issue with the accrediting body which requires only that each program have a permanent faculty member as program coordinator and that the four-year degree programs be staffed by the equivalent of three full-time faculty members. Georgia Southern's programs meet both requirements. Current and future stability depends on the ability of Georgia Southern to identify and secure qualified faculty hires in the Engineering Technology programs that exhibit the desired attributes of Georgia Southern faculty and embrace the expectations of Georgia Southern's teacher/scholar model. These objectives are being aggressively pursued by the Director of the School of Technology. The second part of Senator Kundu's RFI dealt with efforts to raise graduate student stipends and whether non-monetary amenities could be provided such as staff parking. COGS Dean Charles Hardy advised that data collection on stipends from peer and aspirational institutions is being collected and that graduate stipends were at the top of the College's budget request to the Provost, not only to increase the amount, but also the number. The College is working with the Development Office to develop their capital campaign model and Dean Hardy noted that both Provost and the President are supportive of efforts to enhance Georgia Southern's ability to meet the need of graduate students. With regard to parking perks, that needs to go through the Parking and Transportation Committee, and Dean Hardy has begun discussions on that front with the Interim Vice President for Business and Finance, Joe Franklin.

Robert Costomiris submitted an RFI that asked when the University had last considered the subject of the monetary reward for faculty promotion. The answer is: not in quite a while. Provost Bleicken noted that it was worthy of review.

Two agenda requests were received: Chuck Johnson's motion concerning University-level support for computerized exam scoring was withdrawn when Lisa Spence advised that the issue was currently under study. Provost Bleicken's request for the final discussion of the Quality Enhancement Plan report appears as agenda item # 8.

Rice Jenkins further reported that with regard to the earlier Senate recommendation on University-wide policy regarding appeals for violation of procedures in the tenure decisions at the Dean's level, Dr. Grube has responded as follows.

“A workable procedure currently exists for appeals for Deans' decisions regarding faculty tenure or promotion. This procedure provides for a discussion between the faculty member and the Dean during which the faculty member may provide pertinent information that was not available to the Dean during the initial decision-making process. If this discussion does not result in a change of decision, the faculty member may then appeal the decision to the provost. In addition, if

there is a perception that procedures have been violated, the faculty member may choose to have the process investigated by the Faculty Grievance Committee. Given the existence of these workable procedures, recommendation is not approved.”

Regarding the Senate recommendation on the Student Teacher’s Fee, Dr. Grube has responded as follows:

“It has come to our attention that not only did the department of Teaching and Learning follow the appropriate procedures for requesting the approval of a course fee, but the department also involved a number of faculty within the College of Education. Since receiving the Faculty Senate recommendation, Dr. Cordelia Zinskie, Chair of the College of Education Curriculum Committee, has informed me that the Committee voted to recommend keeping the fee in place as approved. Additionally, he has received a document from Dr. Ronnie Sheppard, Chair of the Department of Teaching and Learning, signed by 19 full-time faculty members of that department indicating that faculty involvement in supporting the course fee. Based on this information, the recommendation passed by the Faculty Senate on October 19, 2004, is not approved.”

Rice Jenkins reported that an action item that remained from a previous meeting was Steve Damelin’s query about formal sabbatical policies. The committee has been established by the Provost’s office and includes Dean Fred Whitt, acting as the Chair, Dr. Steve Damelin and Dr. Amy Heaston. They are beginning their task by reviewing the history of educational leave at Georgia Southern and will explore other models to see how we might refine our process.

Finally, Dr. Clara Krug, Chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee (FGC), completed the charge of having the FGC address the concerns raised by Senator Debra Sabia in her motion of 11-1-04 which sought to add to Section A, #5, of the Revised Faculty Grievance Procedures the sentence, “Faculty members whose contracts have been terminated will nonetheless be able to pursue the Grievance Procedures outlined above through the Faculty Grievance Committee.” Krug polled the FGC’s response to the question: 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 has expired? The result was 8 votes “no” and 1 vote “yes” with FGC members Jeanette Rice Jenkins and Michael Moore not voting. As a result, the revision of the Grievance Procedures is not recommended. Rice Jenkins advised that Senator Sabia could bring her motion up during new business if she desired.

There were no questions for Rice Jenkins.

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

Mike Mills (CLASS) began his SPC report by noting that the next listening forum for undergraduate students, the governing council for Black Fraternities and Sororities on

campus will occur on February 14, 2005. The SPC also plans to meet with the Senate Executive Committee and with the full Senate. The SPC is discussing ways to collect information from all members of the Faculty Senate and the general faculty as a whole. At their last meeting, the SPC also accepted in theory a working reconceptualization of a master planning cycle for revision and updating of all elements of the Strategic Plan that will link better planning and assessment at the unit, departmental, and individual levels. This effort is an attempt to reduce report writing workload for chairs and department heads and is designed to provide a clearer, more comprehensive approach to annual review and assessment. And, finally, the SPC brainstormed ways the Strategic Plan and the planning process could be better disseminated to the University stakeholders. A general consensus was reached that members of the SPC will in the future go on the road to visit departments and groups across campus. There were no questions for Mike Mills.

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

Richard Rogers began his report by providing a sheet that reported the team GPA's for all athletic teams at Georgia Southern. The sheet also contained a list of Georgia Southern nominees for Southern Conference Scholarships. David Alley (CLASS) asked about the status of an upcoming NCAA requirement that a certain percentage of athletes graduate in order for the institution to participate in post-season play. Rogers replied that such penalties are not based directly on graduation rate but rather based on how many student-athletes remain in school, and remain academically eligible to compete. There were no further questions for Richard Rogers.

**8. Discussion Item: Dr. Linda Bleicken,
[Draft Quality Enhancement Plan report](#)
[Draft Appendix to QEP](#):**

Jeanette Rice Jenkins gave the floor to Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA) to introduce the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). Bleicken noted that SACS reaccreditation required a "Compliance Report" which detailed the accomplishments of the University over the period preceding the review and the QEP which is a document that contains a plan to move the Institution forward into the future. SACS assesses this plan based on (1) appropriateness to the Institution and (2) achievability of the plan. The overarching part of the QEP is that there are demonstrable student learning outcomes that come about because of the plan. The title of the QEP for Georgia Southern University is "Advancing a Culture of Engagement." With that preamble, Jeanette Rice Jenkins opened the floor for discussion.

John Nauright (CHHS) asked why the College of Graduate Studies was mentioned only in a footnote. Bleicken responded that it started out in the body of the report but was changed to a footnote to make the plan more manageable and that this was the object of some debate.

Virginia Richards (CHHS) asked about opportunities in the QEP for ground-up activities to which Bleicken replied that there were several initiatives in the plan (such as the First Year Experience) that involved ground-up development.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) stated that he wished to see more of a vision related to the development of International Studies in the plan. Bleicken replied that the QEP contained a “wish list” developed by Dr. Nancy Shumaker, the Director of the International Studies program.

Mark Edwards (COST) asked whether there was an email address to which comments on the QEP could be sent and what the time frame for providing those comments was. Bleicken responded that the contact person was Candace Griffith in the Provost’s Office and her email was “in the book.” Bleicken added that it would be most effective if comments could be received by the following Monday.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked how faculty who participated in activities designed to engage students would be rewarded under the QEP. Bleicken said that there were some ideas for this already in the Plan as, for example, stipends and release time for course development. She added they were still considering other ways to recognize and reward faculty effort. Schille also asked about the meaning of the word “contract” in the phrase Social Societal “Contract” connected with the part of the QEP devoted to the American Democracy Project. Bleicken responded that this had not been analyzed deeply and that they would consider the meaning of the word “contract” in the QEP.

Mike Nielsen (CLASS) asked how faculty activities related to the QEP would be monitored and evaluated. Bleicken replied that this issue would be folded into the development of the Faculty Roles and Rewards model being developed.

David Alley (CLASS) asked if there would be a sequel document to the QEP that defined responsibility for various activities at the departmental level. Bleicken stated that many such responsibilities were already defined in the current document.

Ming Fang He (COE) asked why graduate education was not an element of larger discussion in the QEP. Bleicken replied that the QEP was restricted to the Undergraduate Experience largely to keep the plan at a manageable level.

9. Unfinished Business:

There was no unfinished business.

10. New Business:

Debra Sabia (CLASS) asked if she, as Chair of the Faculty Senate Elections Committee, could give an update on the ongoing elections process. Jeanette Rice Jenkins replied in the affirmative. Sabia stated that the self-nomination phase of the process had been

completed and that elections would begin, in all units, sometime later in the month (February). Sabia also noted, for the benefit of Senate Officers and the Administration, that it had been difficult to get faculty members to run for various offices. Faculty members, Sabia said, were weighted down by teaching duties and research commitments and that this contributed to low morale leading to their reluctance to nominate themselves to run for the Senate. Sabia went on to say that there was a perception that Service was not rewarded at Georgia Southern University and that this further contributed to the difficulty of getting people to serve on the Senate. She also said that there was a stated perception that Shared Governance was an illusion, that it was not worthy of faculty time and commitment. Sabia said that she thought that this attitude was a reflection of several realities which included hiring freezes, fewer tenure line professors, and that some junior faculty are being discouraged by department chairs to avoid heavy service commitments. Sabia urged Senate Officers and the Administration to reassure faculty that service was valued and rewarded and that there is a commitment to both the notion and the practice of shared governance. Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) agreed about the difficulty in getting people to serve on the Faculty Senate.

Rice Jenkins asked for any discussion on this issue. Hearing none she moved on to announcements from the Vice-Presidents.

11. Announcements - Vice-Presidents:

Linda Bleicken (Provost) asked for an update on the Search for a new Dean of CLASS from the Chair of that search, Dean Jim Bradford. Bradford replied that three candidates had been identified to bring to campus: Dr. Jane Rhoades Hudak, Dr. Marilyn Lavine, and Dr. Marjorie Morgan. Bradford stated that these candidates would be coming to campus in the latter part of February.

Joe Franklin (Interim Vice President of Business and Finance) announced the beginning of two construction projects: (1) construction of a new Recreation and Activity Center to begin in March, and (2) the conversion of the section of Herty Drive from Georgia Avenue to Cone Hall into a pedestrian which is scheduled to begin over Spring Break.

12. Announcements from the Floor:

Jeanette Rice Jenkins announced that a University System-wide event regarding textbook selection and turnover rate would be held the next Wednesday in the Nessmith-Lane multipurpose room. Rice Jenkins said that she would be there representing the faculty so that, if anyone had comments or suggestions, they should email her before this event.

13. Adjournment:

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Edwards, Faculty Senate Secretary

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

March 23, 2005

4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: David Alley, Jean-Paul Carton, Ken Clark, Robert Cook, Steven Damelin, Gary Dartt, John Dyer, Donald Fausett, Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Godfrey Gibbison, Beverly Graham, Alice Hall, (Constantine Ogloblin for Mary Hazeldine), Ming Fang He, Patricia Humphrey, Jeanette Rice Jenkins, Kenneth Johnson, Gautam Kundu, Bill Levernier, Michele Davis McGibony, Will McIntosh, Michael Moore, Michael Nielsen, Patrick Novotny, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Kim Ruebel, Debra Sabia, Candy Schille, Debra Skinner, David Stone, Patricia Walker, Mark Welford, Jerry Wilson, Bill Yang

Voting Members Absent: Mark Edwards, Chris Geyerman, Mary Hadley, Annette Laing, John Nauright, Laura Regassa, Judi Robbins Donna Saye, Carol Strickland, Robert Vogel

Senate Officers in Attendance: Jeanette Rice Jenkins, Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator (COST), Richard Flynn (CLASS), Michael Moore, Senate Librarian (COE), Patricia Humphrey (COST), Bob Cook (CIT), Bob Fernekes (LIB)

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Linda Bleicken, Joe Franklin, Billy Griffis, Teresa Thompson, Jane Hudak

Senate Parliamentarian in Attendance: Jeff McLellan

NCAA Faculty Representative: Richard Rogers

Strategic Planning Council Representative: Michael Mills

Senate Liaison: Marilyn Bruce

Visitors: None listed.

*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 February 9, 2005, Meeting:

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) heard a motion that the Agenda for the March 23, 2005 meeting be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

2. Approval of the [February 9, 2005](#) , Minutes:

Michael Moore (COE, Senate Librarian), in the absence of Senate Secretary Edwards moved that the posted minutes for the February 9, 2005 meeting of the Faculty Senate be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

3. Approval of the [March 11, 2005](#) , Librarian's Report:

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. Mary Hazeldine (COBA) asked if the College of IT had a graduate program to which Charlie Hardy (DEAN, COGS) responded in the negative. The Librarian's Report was then approved by voice vote.

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

Virginia Richards (CHHS, Undergraduate Committee Chair) was not present at the time this agenda item came up. Michael Moore moved that the Undergraduate Report of March 11, 2005 be approved. The motion was seconded and Rice Jenkins asked for discussion. Hearing none, she called for a vote and the motion passed by voice vote.

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

Richard Flynn (CLASS, Graduate Committee Chair) moved that the minutes from the January 26, 2005 meeting of the Graduate Committee contained in the current Librarian's Report be approved. The motion was seconded and, since there was no subsequent discussion, approved by voice vote.

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

President Grube began by reporting that the University had hired an architect to investigate the feasibility of converting Veazey Hall into an appropriate facility for the Communication Arts Department. He noted that this did not mean that the quest for a multi-purpose academic building was being abandoned. Such a building remained on the capital outlay request list. Veazey Hall is seen as a possible way to bring faster relief than the multipurpose academic building.

The President stated that the recent Scholar's Day was a success. He said that he had never received such a volume of complimentary mail from Parents as he had this year. Grube also reported that the financing of the Recreational Activity Center (RAC) addition

was now in place. He noted that this project would add about 140,000 square feet to the existing facility.

President Grube also summarized the state of budget deliberations in the State Legislature by saying the both the House and the Senate are currently including full formula funding in their respective budgets. Furthermore, both chambers have included money for the College of Information Technology and the Fine Arts IV project into their budgets as well.

David Stone (COST) asked about the status of raises currently being considered by the Legislature. Grube responded that, at this time, they were considering a 2% raise that would begin in January, 2006. He added that the deliberations were not over yet.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) asked if there were any discussion about same-sex couple/partner health benefits. Grube replied that any such questions would be decided at the University System level and he had not heard any recent discussion on this front.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins asked if there were any further questions for President Grube. Hearing none, she proceeded to the SEC report.

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

Jeanette Rice Jenkins reported that the Senate Executive Committee met on Friday, March 11, 2005 at 7 a.m. Rice Jenkins stated that the SEC had three Requests for Information (RFI) and two Agenda Item Requests.

Clara Krug submitted an RFI asking when was the Faculty Senate Secretary removed from the Georgia Southern Foundation Board of Directors. The response, from Vice President William Griffis, was that, prior to November 16, 2002, the Board membership was heavily skewed towards University personnel having twenty ex-officio members. An audit by Alexander, Haas & Martin, which is a fundraising consulting service, in June of 2000, recommended limiting the number of ex-officio members as part of a plan to strengthen private fundraising efforts. An ad hoc committee reviewed the firm's recommendations and concurred on, among other things, the issue of ex-officio membership. The Foundation Bylaws were amended at the January 30, 2000, meeting to include six ex-officio members, and again modified on November 16, 2002 to add the VP for University Advancement.

Robert Costomiris submitted an RFI seeking clarification on the current level of salary compensation for teaching a 3-unit overload, it's uniformity across campus, and the last time it was increased. Linda Bleicken (Provost) reported that, based on conversations with the Deans, the amount is to some extent discipline-dependent. It appears that \$2000 is the general number for overload pay, and when that number increases it's typically due to lack of availability of appropriate instructors. In that case, they often invest in part-time instructors. The cost for these generally ranges upward from \$2,000 and budget analyst, Wendy Deal, is **checking on those pay ranges.**

Debra Sabia (CLASS) requested information on the closing of Herty Drive, particularly with regard to difficulties for commuters and whether a traffic analysis was done. Vice President Joe Franklin responded that the closing was part of the Campus Master Plan completed in January of 2002.

Michael Moore (COE) submitted an agenda request concerning student fees attached to courses or programs. The SEC unanimously approved that and it appears as item number eight on today's agenda.

Debra Sabia (CLASS) submitted an agenda request for a Faculty Senate resolution to the Georgia Board of Regents. That request sought to ask the Board of Regents (BOR) to fund salary increases and bonuses for University Presidents through the state budget process and not by making requests or suggestions to University Foundations. Section 208 of the BOR Policy Manual, Compensation of Presidents states "that salaries and associated fringe benefits for University System Presidents and the Chancellor shall be paid exclusively from state appropriations allocated to each institution." As a result of Section 208, the SEC determined that the first part of Senator Sabia's request was moot. With respect to the wording of the second portion of the agenda request, the SEC determined it to be sufficiently broad such that any resolution sent up by Georgia Southern would have to be applied to the entire University System and this was determined to be outside the scope of Georgia Southern University's authority.

Rice Jenkins further reported that Mark Welford (COST), Chair of the ad hoc committee charged with addressing the presence of administrators on the Senate or on college, tenure and promotion committees, has reported that his committee is ready to return their findings, and their report appears as agenda item number nine

Rice Jenkins reminded Senators that they would be electing a new Senate Secretary and Senate Librarian for the 2005-2006 AY at the April 25, 2005 meeting. She asked anyone interested in running for these positions to contact her as soon as possible.

David Robinson (CLASS) asked, on behalf of Robert Costomiris, whether he would receive an answer to his RFI of January 11, 2005 concerning the size of salary increases that accompany promotions. Rice Jenkins responded that she had consulted the Provost on this matter and that the Provost agreed that it was a question that had not been considered in quite a while and that it should be revisited. She also stated that she had sent Costomiris an email to that effect.

There were no further questions for Rice Jenkins.

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

Mike Mills reported that this semester's Strategic Planning Council (SPC) Listening Forums were designed to engage University stakeholders in discussions of the Strategic Plan and were nearly complete. He further reported that Thursday two forums would be held: one for the University staff personnel and the other for the Faculty Senate. The

Strategic Planning Council meeting with Faculty Senate to discuss the Strategic Plan would be held tomorrow, March 24th, from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. in the Russell Union Ballroom. Mills stated that the final report gleaned from all forums held this semester would be posted on the SPC website by the end of the semester. He finally noted that the deadline for nominations for the open seat on the SPC would be in about ten days.

Candy Schille (CLASS) inquired whether any minutes would be taken at the meeting between SPC and the Senate. Rice Jenkins replied that the session would be recorded and the Senate Secretary would summarize.

There were no questions for Mike Mills.

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

Richard Rogers began his report by saying that the NCAA has developed a new measure of academic performance for athletic teams. This year the NCAA will measure the academic performance of the sports teams sponsored by an institution and issue a report card stating which teams did not meet the standard. Rogers noted that there would be no penalties this year but the academic performance would be measured every year and teams not meeting the standards would be subject to penalties such as loss of scholarships. Rogers also reported that Brent Stephens, a double major in Management and Chemistry and a starting right-fielder for the baseball team, has received a \$2000 scholarship from the Renaissance Insurance Company. Stephens, who has a 3.73 GPA, will be attending medical school next year.

8. Motion from Michael Moore: [Student Fees Attached to Courses or Programs](#)

Michael Moore introduced a motion which read as follows:

“Be it resolved that student fees attached to courses or academic programs (with the exception of breakage fees, lab fees and PEA Activity Fees under \$50) follow the same process as a course or program change for approval as specified in the Faculty Handbook.”

The motion was seconded and, when recognized, Moore immediately amended his motion to removed the parenthetical phrase so that his motion now read

“Be it resolved that student fees attached to courses or academic follow the same process as a course or program change for approval as specified in the Faculty Handbook.”

Moore argued that the addition of a course fee of \$250 for Student Teachers was a change that impacted the curriculum and thus should face the same approval process that all such curriculum changes. This procedure, Moore argued, was in the spirit of shared governance advocated by University administration.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins asked for discussion and first called on Pat Walker (CLASS). Walker, a member of the Art department noted that almost all art courses had fees attached to them. For some of these courses, the fees were determined by the market value of the materials purchased for use in the course. Walker worried that the Art Department would have to go back to the Undergraduate Committee for approval every time the market value of these materials changed. This would lead to a whole new layer of bureaucracy to be negotiated in order to set fees for all of their courses.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked whether a distinction in the objection being made between adding a new course fee and setting the size of the fee. Moore noted that the course revision form asked for course-fee information and so it seemed that both items should be considered. Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) expressed concern about the extra bureaucracy introduced by the motion.

Kim Ruebel (COE) stated that the Student Teaching fee that motivated the Moore motion had been discussed over a year's time before it was implemented. Ming Fang He (COE) noted that such fees were charged at many institutions nationwide. Ming also asked Linda Bleicken (Provost) to summarize the history of this student fee.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) stated that this Student Teacher fee was considered by the relevant Departmental and College committees and went through a process that was appropriate for any fee change.

Virginia Richards (CHHS), a member of the Undergraduate Committee, also worried about the extra load this motion might place on this committee. Richards also disagreed with Moore on the issue of whether the addition of a fee constituted a curriculum change.

Charisse Perkins (SGA) noted that she had been approached by several students who were upset by the Student Teaching fee. She thanked Michael Moore for trying to alleviate the new financial burden being placed on the students.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked, if there was a space for fees on the form required for new courses, didn't this already go through the Undergraduate Committee. Jeanette called on Cindi Chance (Dean, COE) who stated that the space on the form was intended for new courses.

David Robinson (CLASS) moved to amend the already amended Moore motion to the effect that any new course that required a fee would need approval by the Undergraduate Committee. After some objections by various senators, Robinson withdrew his motion.

Bob Cook (CIT) called the question so that a vote was taken as to whether debated on the amendment would end. This motion, which required a 2/3 majority to pass, failed.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) moved that the Moore motion be amended to add the word "new" before "student" so the that motion would read

“Be it resolved that **new** student fees attached to courses or academic programs follow the same process as any course or program change for approval as specified in the Faculty Handbook.”

This motion was seconded and debate continued.

Pat Walker (CLASS) wondered why the Senate should be interested in the size of course fees. Rice Jenkins stated that fee size might influence a student’s choice of major. Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) responded that fees influenced all of our choices. Charisse Perkins (SGA) replied that course fees did indeed influence some students’ choice of major.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (Senate Moderator) called for a vote on adding the word “new” to the Moore motion. This motion to amend passed by voice vote. Rice Jenkins then called for a vote on the entire Moore motion:

“Be it resolved that new student fees attached to courses or academic programs follow the same process as any course or program change for approval as specified in the Faculty Handbook.”

The motion passed by a one-vote margin. A hand count was taken with the Senate Moderator casting a tie-breaking vote.

9. Report from Ad-hoc committee: Mark Welford, Chair:

Jeanette Rice Jenkins called upon Mark Welford, Chair of the ad hoc committee charged with studying the question of whether former administrators should be barred from serving on college Tenure and Promotion committees and the Faculty Senate for a period after they finish their administrative duties. Welford’s committee considered the following recommendations/motions:

Motion 1

The Dean must charge/or hold the Tenure and Promotion Committee responsible for solely evaluating each faculty member's tenure/promotion documents, and all discussions and evaluations by the committee should comply with each College's by-laws.

Motion 2

Suggestion 1:

Both members of the Corps of Instruction (see Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 302.02) and Administrative Officers (see Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section

302.03) have the right to be elected to the Faculty Senate. However, all Administrative Officers will act as ex-officio officers without the right to vote in the Senate or hold positions as chairs of Senate committees.

Suggestion 2:

Only members of the Corps of Instruction (see Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 302.02) have the right to be elected to the Faculty Senate. If a member of the Corps of Instruction becomes, during their tenure on the Faculty Senate a member of the Administration, their immediate alternate elected by their College will replace the member.

Welford stated that the committee voted to recommend that the Senate say no to the first motion and, of the two suggestions under motion 2, they preferred the latter but they thought the Senate should decide between them.

Rice Jenkins called upon the Senate to vote whether they should accept the report of Welford's committee. The Senate voted "aye" to that question by voice vote. Pat Humphrey moved that Welford's committee be discharged and this motion also passed by voice vote.

Welford then introduced the motion:

"The Dean must charge/or hold the Tenure and Promotion Committee responsible for solely evaluating each faculty member's tenure/promotion documents, and all discussions and evaluations by the committee should comply with each College's Bylaws."

Welford clarified that the intent of this motion was that college Tenure and Promotion committees should evaluate candidates solely on the basis of the packages presented by those candidates and the Dean should so charge such committees.

Leslie Furr (CHHS) called the question to end debate on the motion and the Senate voted to end debate. Rice Jenkins then called for a vote on the Welford motion. The motion failed on voice vote.

Welford then introduced a second motion:

"Members of the Corps of Instruction (see BOR Policy Manual Section 302.02) have the right to be elected to the Faculty Senate. If a member of the Corps of Instruction becomes, during their tenure on the Faculty Senate a member of the Administration, their immediate alternate elected by their College will replace the member."

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked if this amendment would exclude the Director of Women's and Gender Studies. Rice Jenkins replied that it would exclude anyone who has accepted a full-time administrative post.

Rice Jenkins then called for a vote on this motion. **The motion failed by hand count.**

10. Unfinished Business:

There was no unfinished business.

11. New Business:

Clara Krug was recognized from the floor. Krug stated her wish to thank the campus community for their response to her question about membership of the Board of Directors of the Georgia Southern Foundation.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) stated that she met with Mr. William Griffiths and that one result of this meeting was that Foundation Board meeting [agenda and minutes](#) would be made available to faculty via the Foundation web site.

12. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Linda Bleicken (Provost) announced that Jane Hudak had accepted the job of Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences. Bleicken also noted that, of the 84 faculty searches, 54 acceptances had been received with 12 offers outstanding. Finally, Bleicken noted that the SACS onsite evaluation team would be coming to campus April 5-7. She added that faculty had been mailed bookmarks on which were printed the talking points of the Quality Enhancement Plan required for SACS reaffirmation. She encouraged faculty to take a look at these talking points.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) announced that the Senate would reconvene the next day to participate in a listening forum with the Strategic Planning Council. Rice Jenkins also noted that President Grube and Provost Bleicken have seeded \$500 from their budgets to start a Faculty Senate Foundation account. She added that this account would become a line item in the "A Day for Southern" campaign.

13. Announcements from the Floor:

Pat Humphrey (COST) announced that Scott Tam, a math education major, scored a Georgia Southern University record ten points on the Putnam math exam. Humphrey also announced that the team of Scott Tam, John Gerow, Martin Dunbar, and Daniel Linder won the preliminary round in the Math Jeopardy tournament held at the Southeastern Section of the Mathematical Association American Meetings last week in Raleigh, North Carolina. She further announced that the 2007 Section meeting of the Mathematical Association of America would be held here at Georgia Southern during March 15-17, 2007. Finally, Humphrey announced that Senator Steve Damelin is one of

two faculty members selected nationwide to participate next year in the IMA New Directions Visiting Fellowship at the University of Minnesota.

Gary Dartt (CLASS) announced that there would be a special event held in honor of retiring professor Mical Whitaker on April 23, 2005.

Cindi Chance (Dean, College of Education) finally announced that, for the second year in a row, the Georgia Teacher of the Year is a Georgia Southern alumnus.

14. Adjournment:

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Edwards, Faculty Senate Secretary

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

April 25, 2005

4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: David Alley, Jean-Paul Carton, Ken Clark, Robert Cook, Steven Damelin, Gary Dartt, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Donald Fausett, 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, Gautam Kundu, Bill Levernier, Annette Laing, Michele Davis McGibony, Will McIntosh, Michael Moore, John Nauright, Michael Nielsen, Patrick Novotny, Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, : Judi Robbins, David Robinson, Kim Ruebel, Debra Sabia, Candy Schille, Debra Skinner, Carol Strickland, David Stone, Robert Vogel, Patricia Walker, Mark Welford, Jerry Wilson, Bill Yang

Voting Members Absent: Donna Saye

Senate Officers in Attendance: Jeanette Rice Jenkins, Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator (COST), Richard Flynn (CLASS), Michael Moore, Senate Librarian (COE), Patricia Humphrey (COST), Bob Cook (CIT), Bob Fernekes (LIB)

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Linda Bleicken, Joe Franklin, Billy Griffis, Teresa Thompson, Jane Hudak

Senate Parliamentarian in Attendance: Jeff McLellan

NCAA Faculty Representative: Richard Rogers

Strategic Planning Council Representative: Michael Mills

Senate Liaison: Marilyn Bruce

Visitors: None listed.

*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 April 25, 2005, Meeting:

After thanking the members of the Senate Executive Committee and the indispensable Ginger Malphrus for their service, Jeanette Rice Jenkins (COST, Senate Moderator) noted that there were two changes to the posted agenda. These were that there would be

no NCAA Report and that Dr. Maurer's name had been misspelled under item eleven. Rice Jenkins then heard a motion that the Agenda for the April 25, 2005 meeting be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

2. Approval of the March 23, 2005 Minutes:

Mark Edwards (COST, Senate Secretary), stated that he had two things to say before moving that the posted minutes of the March 23, 2005 Senate meeting be approved. The first thing was to apologize for having posted revised minutes of the previous meeting. Edwards noted that the first set of minutes he posted incorrectly reported the outcome of a vote on a motion. Furthermore, Edwards stated that he had neglected to include some important information given by Clara Krug at the previous meeting. Then, for the record, he read, verbatim, what Clara said near the close of the previous meeting. It went as follows:

“I just would like to thank the campus community for your response to my request for information about the change in membership of the Board of Directors of the Foundation. Specifically, Jeanette Rice and the other members of the Senate Executive Committee, and, Billy Griffis, who I know had to work quite hard to do research into procedures that predated his arrival by at least several years. And I know that that must have taken a lot of time. I also would like to thank my colleagues who have communicated with me about their own reactions to the information that that research provided. In regard to reducing the number of those associated with the University on the Board of Directors from 20 to 6, and then 7 on the Board of Directors the rationale that was produced and I quote “reduce the number of trustees and limit the number of ex-officio members restructuring the Board would enhance the Board’s independence and allow volunteer membership to conduct the Foundation’s business more officially, collegial, and effectively.” Perhaps, without increasing the number to 20, it could nonetheless be increased. I will repeat my rationale, “Faculty in all colleges are asked to solicit donations to the Foundation from other faculty members. Faculty in all colleges are encouraged to make donations. Sometimes, faculty hear that the goal is 100% donations. We are told that a high percentage of faculty donations is helpful in soliciting from the Statesboro/Bulloch County community. Given these expectations, it seems logical that a representative of the faculty serve on the Board.” I intend to propose this increased number as a motion to be considered at the next Senate meeting. I think it’s possible for all of us to work collegially together, whether we be faculty or non-faculty. Thank you.”

Edwards then moved that the revised minutes for the March 23, 2005 meeting of the Faculty Senate be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

3. Approval of the [April 18, 2005 Librarian's Report](#):

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. The Librarian's Report was then approved by voice vote.

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

Virginia Richards (CHHS, Undergraduate Committee Chair) moved that the Undergraduate Report be approved. The motion was seconded and Rice Jenkins asked for discussion. Hearing none, she called for a vote and the motion passed by voice vote.

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

Richard Flynn (CLASS, Graduate Committee Chair) moved that the minutes from meeting of the Graduate Committee contained in the current Librarian's Report be approved. The motion was seconded and, since there was no subsequent discussion, approved by voice vote.

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

President Grube began his report by thanking all of the people who helped with the SACS site visit. He noted that the visit was a successful one and that now Georgia Southern was responding to errors-in-fact from the committee report. He also stated that the Commission would make a decision regarding accreditation in December.

The President next reported that the University's budget for fiscal 2006 would be up by about 7.7% and one of the items at the top of the list would be new faculty positions. Grube also assured the Senate that funds for the ICAPP program would be forthcoming and he further reported that Georgia Southern has had about \$78.4 million appropriated which is about \$5.6 million increase from last year. Grube noted that tuition will increase by 5% this year and that there will be several new and/or increased fees including a transit fee to support a new transit system, a fee to support the new RAC expansion, and the technology fee.

Grube also reported on some relevant activity that occurred at the recent Board of Regents meeting. The BOR approved the renovation of Veazey Hall that will be converted to a multipurpose academic building to house primarily Communication Arts faculty. Further, the BOR will now need to approve any change in athletic affiliation at any level, and the addition/deletion of any sports at any level. These decisions were formerly in the hands of the institutions. The President also noted that Georgia Southern received the highest audit rating (Code I) that an institution can receive.

Finally, Grube reported that Georgia Southern has received permission to apply to take on additional doctoral degrees. The first one that we will put forward will be the PsyD in the department of Psychology. He noted that the additional degree programs would be initially budget-neutral but would become part of the formula and would pay for themselves over time. Grube stated that this was a fundamental change from the past.

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

Jeanette Rice Jenkins reported that the Senate Executive Committee met on Monday, April 18, 2005 at 7 a.m. Rice Jenkins stated that the SEC processed four Requests for Information (RFI) and two Agenda Item Requests.

INFORMATION REQUESTS

- ✓ Patrick Novotny requested information regarding University policy on maintaining academic and student code of conduct in light of World Wide Web sites that potentially facilitate cheating and any plans to make recommendations to new students. Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Teresa Thompson provided the following:

“Although we don’t have the resources to police thefacebook.com for all conduct code violations, the site is in no way affiliated with Georgia Southern University, and we have very little influence over what is placed on this site, our office currently has students who frequently monitor thefacebook.com “conversation groups” to identify possible irregularities in on-line conversations.

Dr. Ed Bayens will cover thefacebook.com and other websites that may be used to violate the student conduct code during his training with SOAR Leaders.

Every Georgia Southern University student is held accountable to adhere to the student conduct code on-campus and off-campus (this includes on-line activity as well). If charges are filed and a student is found in violation, he/she will be adjudicated according to sanctioning guidelines.

If some of the communications are simply offensive, we will encourage students to contact thefacebook.com website Web Master.

Any university student, faculty, or staff member has a right to contact the Office of Judicial Affairs for possible violations of the conduct code. Upon this contact, an assessment will be made of the potential violation. This also includes cases involving thefacebook.com.”

Dr. Thompson then provided a link that shows how other institutions have dealt with this issue and that link is available under the RFI section on the Senate Web Page.

- ✓ The second RFI was from Lori Amy who wondered when the practice of asking students to declare a minor when they clear for graduation came into being and why it is our current practice. VP Thompson provided that:

“Prior to the implementation of the current student information system (Banner), there was no method of electronically tracking minors. Therefore, it was practice to have minors officially recorded in the Registrar’s Office when the student applied for graduation. Since Banner allows for the recording of up to two minors in the student information system, a section for minors has already been added to the Change of Major form and students may declare a minor at any time and preferably early in the student’s educational career. Many students are already completing the “minors” section of the Change of Major form to declare their minors. The Registrar’s Office will develop a Minor and Concentration Declaration Form to be used for students to have their minors recorded in the student information system. Advisors for minors will be given these forms and should encourage students to officially declare their minors by completing this form. Dr. Thompson suggested a proposed statement to be added to the University Catalog under the “Minors” section in “University Programs and Courses.”

- ✓ Steve Damelin asked the following questions regarding departmental annual reports.

1) What role does this report serve in terms of individual faculty as well as departmental advancement in the university?

2) What guidelines, if any exist, to decide what gets included in a department annual report to the Dean's Office specifically in terms of what information faculty report to the Department Chair in their annual reviews?

Provost Linda Bleicken provided the following:

“The Office of the Provost provides a template to the colleges and departments for the annual report. The template was developed a number of years ago; it requires each unit to evaluate its progress toward achieving its academic year goals and objectives, to establish goals and objectives for the coming academic year, and to report faculty accomplishments in the areas of scholarship and service (teaching accomplishments are reported elsewhere).

Information submitted by faculty members for annual evaluations is used to complete the portion of the annual report related to accomplishments in scholarship and service. The purpose of the annual report is to chronicle

accomplishments of the university in a format that can be reviewed by the Board of Regents. The university's profile can then be assessed relative to the other institutions in the system.

Individual accomplishments contribute to the overall accomplishments of a department and subsequently, a college. Ultimately, the compilation of accomplishments of all the units on a university campus determines the university's profile. In summary, the university's annual report is used to aggregate accomplishments of the university and its personnel that have previously been assessed at unit levels. The report is not used in decisions regarding an individual's merit pay."

AGENDA REQUESTS

- ✓ Clara Krug submitted an agenda request concerning an addition to Section 211-Policy on Pre-Tenure Review in the Faculty Handbook. That agenda item was approved by the SEC and appears as item #10 on the current agenda.
- ✓ Trent Maurer submitted an agenda request to amend the operating guidelines for the Faculty Research Committee. This item was approved by the SEC for inclusion in the Senate meeting.

Rice Jenkins noted that the SEC also discussed the need to elect representatives from COST, CIT, and the Library to serve on the SEC next year as well as the election of Senate Secretary and Librarian. She concluded by reporting that, in response to Robert Costomiris' previous RFI regarding association dollars (dollars associated with promotion,) Dean Shiffler would be chairing a committee to consider this question. This committee is expected to report by late 2005 with recommendations to take effect in 2006.

There were no further questions for Rice Jenkins.

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

Mike Mills, SPC Representative, read the following statement.

"Since the last Senate meeting, the SPC has met twice. In preparation for the SACS reaccreditation process we undertook a review of our activities during the past year and later met with the SACS Review Team during their site visit. At our last meeting, the SPC went through a final review of the information we gathered through our annual round of listening forums. A summary of which, along with a run-down of the SPC activities for the past year, will be compiled into an end-of-the-year report to be forwarded to the President's Cabinet. This report will, in short order, be posted to the SPC Web Site, and available for general examination. The SPC would like to thank the Faculty Senators for their interesting and often insightful input, which was gathered either at the listening forums or through the

SPC Web Site. That is my final report. I rotate off the Strategic Planning Council as one of the elected faculty representatives, and also leave this august body as the SPC Representative to the Senate. The overly competent Dr. Jerry Wilson will be delivering the endlessly fascinating and often earth-shaking SPC reports in the future. Please welcome him into his new post, but be sure to pepper him with irksome, yet insightful questions. I have enjoyed my three years as SPC Representative and wish to praise the commitment of the members of the SPC, but I would especially like to commend the SPC Chair, Trey Denton, for his diligence and professionalism. To the Senate, I wish you all well in the coming year. I believe this body continues to make itself even more meaningful and responsive to the interests and needs of the faculty of this University. That's my report."

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked Mike Mills about any planned departures. Mills replied that his wife, Denise Battles has accepted a position as Founding Dean of the College of Natural and Human Sciences at the University of Northern Colorado at Greeley. Mills noted that he and Denise had been faculty members at Georgia Southern for 15 years and he, himself, had been here for 22 years. Mills stated that he and Denise looked forward to the next year with excitement but were a little bittersweet about leaving Georgia Southern. Mills stated that he and Denise leave behind a lot of good friends and many memories. Rice Jenkins asked the Senate to express their appreciation for his service and they did with enthusiasm.

7. Election of 2005-2006 Senate Librarian:

Jeanette Rice Jenkins, Senate Moderator, stated that the Senate Librarian is responsible for compiling the committee reports and sits as a non-voting member of the SEC. She also noted that Robert's Rules of Order provided that, unless the by-laws of an organization explicitly allow plurality votes, where the winner is the candidate receiving the most votes, the method that shall be used is majority. That is, the winner must receive at least 50% of the votes. Rice Jenkins then announced that the three candidates for election to the office were Mike Nielsen, Jean-Paul Carton, and Mark Welford. She suggested that if one candidate receives a majority of votes in the first round, the election would be over and that candidate would prevail. In the absence of a majority, the top two candidates will stand in a run-off election. There was no objection to this method. The first round ended with J-P Carton the leader and a tie for second place prompting a runoff for second place. The second-place election went to Mike Nielsen. The final runoff election was won by Jean-Paul Carton. The Faculty Senate Librarian for 2005-2006 will be Jean-Paul Carton.

8. Election of 2005-2006 Senate Secretary:

Jeanette Rice Jenkins announced that the only candidate for Senate Secretary who was nominated prior to the meeting was Donna Saye. Rice Jenkins then asked for nominations from the floor. Hearing none, Rice Jenkins asked for all those in favor of electing Donna Saye as next year's Senate Secretary to say "aye". The election was

approved by voice vote. The Faculty Senate Secretary for 2005-2006 will be Donna Saye.

9. Motion from Senator Bob Cook on behalf of Clara Krug (CLASS). [An Addition to Section 211, Policy on Pre-Tenure Review:](#)

Speaking on behalf of Clara Krug, Bob Cook (CIT) made the following motion.

“The Faculty Grievance Committee of Georgia Southern University believes that a decision to terminate the employment of a faculty member after 3 years, during his or her pre-tenure review, be made only after the faculty member has been clearly warned that his or her performance is not acceptable, and he or she has had time to correct the situation.”

Cook’s motion requested that wording to this effect be included in Section 211 of the *Faculty Handbook*.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins called upon Bob Cook to speak first in favor of this motion. Cook chose to recognize Clara Krug from the gallery. Krug explained that, while the *Faculty Handbook* states that the pre-tenure review process “looks forward to tenure,” no portion of the policy states that a faculty member should be told or warned in advance of pre-tenure review that his/her performance is not acceptable. She said that, speaking on their behalf, many members of the Faculty Grievance Committee felt that the *Handbook* policy should cover this.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked who was going to develop the appropriate language to be placed in the *Handbook*. Mark Edwards (COST) moved that this motion be referred to the Faculty Welfare Committee so that appropriate language could be crafted. The motion was seconded and was approved by voice vote.

Bob Cook, speaking as a member of the Welfare Committee asked for some guidance from the Senate as to how to handle this motion. After some discussion Rice Jenkins suggested that the Committee talk to the Grievance Committee and to Provost Bleicken in developing their recommendation. Rice Jenkins noted that Bleicken has some ideas about the standardization of annual evaluations across the campus.

10. Motion from Senator Michael Moore on behalf of Trent Maurer (CHHS) [Amendment to Operating Guidelines for the Faculty Research Committee](#)

Michael Moore (COE) made the following motion on behalf of Trent Maurer (CHHS).

“Being that the research grant competition that the Faculty Research Committee oversees is intended as a source of research funding for all scholars at Georgia Southern University;

Being that this competition is the only major source of internal funding/seed

money available to all faculty for research;

Being that participation incentives are crucial to many research projects at this university, especially in the human sciences, and that the samples that are required for this research are frequently difficult or impossible to recruit without incentives or remuneration;

Being that such research with difficult to recruit populations is considered valuable by the University;

Be it resolved that the Faculty Research Committee be required to:

1. Give full consideration to participation incentives as a legitimate item for funding request in the Research Grant Competition;
2. Solicit additional information from the applicant and allow the applicant to provide a counter-argument before making a decision to disallow funding for participation incentives in cases where such incentives are required to secure acceptable participation rates (when so indicated by the applicant);
3. Establish a procedure by which applicants who are awarded partial funding may appeal budgetary items that have been disallowed.”

Moore noted that the rationale for the motion is:

“The campus Research Grant Competition is supposed to be open for applications by all scholars at GSU. However, the committee has routinely disallowed a very specific category of funding: participation incentives. These incentives are disproportionately required by many programs of research in the human sciences. Refusal to award funding for participation incentives thus creates a de facto bias against such human subjects’ research, much in the same way that refusal to award funding for scientific equipment could create a bias against research in the hard sciences. If the grant is supposed to be open to all, the committee should not be allowed to discriminate against particular lines of research simply because the types of costs required for that research are different.”

Mike Moore deferred to Trent Maurer from the gallery. Maurer stated that performance incentives (money paid to people to be subjects in research) were specifically disallowed as a funding line item by the Faculty Research Committee. Maurer noted that some types of research depended on these incentives to ensure that enough people would participate in the study.

Pat Humphrey (COST) asked Maurer whether these incentives were specifically disallowed by the Research Committee. Maurer responded by quoting the letter he received from the Committee stating that this was the case.

Mike Nielsen worried that there would be logistical problems associated with the proposed appeals process contained in the motion. Nielsen asked David Alley (CLASS and Chair of the Faculty Research Committee) to comment on this issue.

David Alley responded first by stating the responsibilities of the Faculty Research Committee. He said these were

1. To review and evaluate faculty research.
2. Allocate funds budgeted to the committee for distribution.
3. Recommend policies and procedures for the promotion and support of faculty research.

He said that item three was relevant here and that the policy of not funding such items stemmed from members of the Research Committee who questioned the reliability and validity of such research efforts. He also noted that there were logistical problems associated with the appeals process. Alley noted that it was much more effective to simply revise the proposal and reapply in the next funding cycle. Alley also stated that it was a slippery slope for the Senate to micromanage the inner workings of the Research Committee. Alley also stated that it was not possible to develop a static set of guidelines about which things would or would not be funded from year to year.

Ming Fang He (COE) worried that the appeals process would place too large of a burden on the Committee. Annette Laing (CLASS) wondered at the inability of the Committee to produce guidelines. Laing also asked Alley how many proposals were received by the Committee and how many were funded. Alley replied that fifteen proposals were received but he did not know how many were funded.

Mike Moore (COE) noted that this information was contained in the Librarian's Report. There were 15 proposals requesting a total of \$101,590.57 of which 11 were either totally or partially funded and that a total of \$55,742.37 was awarded.

Virginia Richards (CHHS) called upon Trent Maurer to explain the impact of not funding the participation money on his research effort. Maurer explained that not receiving this funding gutted the entire proposed project and that he would not have bothered applying if he had known that such money would not be funded.

Candy Schille (CLASS) moved to end the debate. The motion was seconded and carried by voice vote. Rice Jenkins then asked the Senate to vote on the Maurer motion. The motion carried by hand count.

11. Unfinished Business:

There was no unfinished business.

12. New Business:

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (Senate Moderator) called on Pat Humphrey (COST). Humphrey made the following motion.

“Minors and second minors may be declared as early as the freshmen year but should always be declared as soon as possible so that students have adequate time to plan the completion of their minors. Minors may be declared by completing a Minor/Concentration Declaration Form. A student changing their major may also declare or change a minor by completing the Minors section of the Change of Major Form.”

The motion was seconded and Rice Jenkins called on Humphrey to speak in favor of the motion. Humphrey stated that this motion originated as a request for information from Lori Amy on tracking minors, and the actual wording change was made by Teresa Thompson in her response to that RFI. And this motion was primarily to get the blessing of the Senate and to inform them that this will be changed in the course catalog.

Hearing no further discussion, Rice Jenkins called for a vote on the Humphrey motion. The motion carried by voice vote.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins, in the interest of providing the Senate with some information regarding Executive compensation, read the following statement to the Senate.

“In approximately June of 2003, UGA President Michael Adams denied the request of University of Georgia Athletic Director Vince Dooley to retract his decision to retire, and extend his contract an additional four years. This angered many alumni who contributed to the UGA Foundation and resulted in the Foundation threatening to withhold the approximately \$300,000 they contributed to supplement President Adams’ salary. Clearly the supplement to the UGA Foundation had been providing to their minds gave them a measure of control over the actions of President Adams. In May 2004, in a special session of the BOR the Regents recognized the impropriety of this perception and began to question the propriety of foundations supplementing presidential salaries. This resulted in the Regents directing President Adams to give notice that UGA would terminate its memorandum of understanding with the UGA Foundation, and no longer recognize it as a cooperative organization. At the same time, the Regents discussed paying presidential salary strictly with state dollars to eliminate any doubt as to where the presidents report and to whom they are responsible. The Chancellor was asked to bring such a policy back to the Board in June 2004. In June 2004, the Board approved the addition of a new Policy Section 208, Compensation of Presidents to the BOR Policy Manual, which requires that salaries and fringe benefit expenses for all University System of Georgia presidents and the Chancellor be funded exclusively from state appropriations effective July 1, 2005. In executive session at this same meeting the Chancellor presented his recommendations for presidential salaries, which were then

discussed, moved upon, and unanimously approved. The action taken at the June meeting transferring all presidential salaries to state funds was the first of its kind in the country. Due to the new ground that was being covered and the complexity of the issue, Chancellor Meredith contacted consultant Raymond D. Cotton, Vice President for Health and Higher Education for ML Strategies LLC, Washington, D.C. Mr. Cotton presented the August meeting with a two-phase report. The first was an overview of national trends, and the second was guidance on how to best implement the newly adopted section 208. Regent Chair Joel Wooten summarized the outcome of Mr. Cotton's report and the Board actions as follows:

1. The total compensation of the 34 presidents in the University System will stay the same with one exception.
2. Foundations who had been supplementing presidential salaries will be asked to give the same or similar amounts that they would otherwise have been paying for the respective president's supplemental compensation to the respective institution's general fund in support of the general mission of the institution. That money will not be directly used or allocated to pay for presidential compensation.
3. No state dollars can be used for entertaining, civic clubs, etc.
4. As a result of number 3, the Board will ask the foundations to continue to make funds available to assist the presidents in doing their jobs, i.e. providing funds for items in #3 that cannot be provided by state dollars.
5. Future salary increases will continue to be based only upon the base state salaries, as is currently the case, and not on total compensation packages.

At the same August meeting, University of Georgia Foundation reps Lynda B. Courts, Chair of the Foundation, and James H. Blanchard, Foundation Trustee and Executive Committee member, spoke to the Regents expressing their eagerness to cooperate and reiterate their commitment to serving the best interests of the Regents and UGA, i.e., they kissed and made up. As mentioned, MCG President Daniel Rahn was found to be underpaid for what he does, and his salary was adjusted significantly to the tune of \$180,000. On September 18, 2004, despite not being required to do so, as Georgia Southern was not an institution who's Foundation had previously been supplementing presidential salary, the Foundation Board voted to contribute \$40,000 to our University's education and general fund. The funds never left Statesboro, were not channeled through Atlanta or the Board of Regents, and had the Board, not of the Foundation, not of Regents, not voted to make this gesture of goodwill it would not have affected the salary approved by the Regents in June 2004. In approximately February 2005 the *Statesboro Herald* picked up the story. All of this information was retrieved from publicly available information."

Rice Jenkins then asked if there was any other new business.

Debra Sabia (CLASS) made the following motion.

“Be it resolved, that it is the expressed opinion of the Georgia Southern Faculty Senate that the Georgia Southern Foundation should no longer participate in providing funds for GSU presidential salary supplements.”

The motion was seconded and Rice Jenkins asked for discussion.

Candy Schille (CLASS) voiced an “objection to consideration of the question.” Debra Sabia voiced a “motion to rescind.” Rice Jenkins stated that the “objection to consideration of the question” was first. This objection required no second, Rice Jenkins explained, and was non-debatable but must be ruled upon immediately. To pass the motion requires a two-thirds majority. She further explained that a negative vote would be in support of Senator Schille’s motion in response to a question posed by Virginia Richards (CHHS). Schille’s motion did not carry by hand count. Thus, the Senate then took up the Sabia motion.

Debra Sabia spoke in favor of the motion. She began by saying that her motion was not meant to disparage President Grube or the work that he has done here at Georgia Southern. She stated that the Georgia Southern Foundation initiated a conversation with the Chancellor of the Board of Regents (BOR) about raising the President’s salary. Sabia went on to say that the BOR requested that the Georgia Southern Foundation send \$40,000 to Atlanta so that the money could be put into the operating budget of Georgia Southern University. This funding was then used to supplement the salary of the President. Sabia asserted that she had been told by a member of the BOR that this salary supplement was not initiated by the Board. That the salary increase was not allocated, or the money paid for the salary supplement was not paid from state funds, and that if we had a problem with that then what we needed to do was to speak to our Foundation.

Rice Jenkins asked Sabia if there were any public documents corroborating the meeting Sabia had with one of the Regents. Sabia stated that at least one other person in the room was at the meeting. Sabia further stated that the Regent asked them if it would be proper for the Regent to speak to President Grube about the fact that the meeting had taken place.

Bob Cook (CIT) called the question to limit debate. The motion failed by hand count and discussion continued. Annette Laing (CLASS) noted that the public perception of the President’s salary supplement being supplied by the Foundation was very negative. She further stated that it would negatively impact fund raising. The sentiment was echoed by Mike Nielsen (CLASS).

Candy Schille (CLASS) stated that it seemed to her that BOR Policy 208 stated exactly Debra Sabia’s position. Schille stated that it looked to her as if Dr. Sabia was saying that the BOR in congress with the Foundation did not honor their own decision. Then her next questions to Sabia were 1) how do she think passing this resolution was going to fix that

duplicity and 2) did she have evidence that this is going to happen again next year, and if so, what is that evidence?

Sabia replied that the resolution would be a collective statement of the Faculty Senate that they do not approve of the practice of Foundation monies being used to supplement Presidential salaries. She noted that it does make a difference when people complain.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins noted that any resolution passed by the Senate would have to be approved by the President. This presented an ethical issue to ask the President to sign a resolution concerning a salary he has no control over.

Billy Griffis (Vice President for University Advancement) stated that he was not aware of any negative reaction to the Foundation's action. Instead he said that the community was supportive of it. This assertion was met with some skepticism by Senate Laing.

Bob Cook (CIT) spoke in opposition to the motion by saying that the BOR has difficulty in finding and retaining University Presidents. He was against any motion that would restrict the Foundation's ability to help the University.

Mark Edwards (COST) called the question and this time it passed by hand count. Rice Jenkins then asked the Senate to vote on the Sabia motion. Sabia moved that the vote be by secret ballot. The motion was seconded and the motion carried by hand count.

Rice Jenkins also called for a motion to extend the meeting duration by fifteen minutes. This was so moved, seconded and passed by voice vote. The vote was "aye" 12 and "nay" 23 and the motion failed.

13. Announcements from Vice Presidents:

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA) made two announcements. First, noting that the SACS reaffirmation Quality Enhancement Plan would need to be streamlined in the next few months, asked people to give this some thought. Second, Bleicken announced that, after an internal search, Amy Heaston had accepted the position of Associate Provost while Nancy Shumaker had accepted the position of Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs replacing acting AVPAA Diana Cone.

14. Adjournment:

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Edwards, Faculty Senate Secretary

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

June 23, 2005

4:00 to 6:00 p. m.

Nessmith-Lane Multipurpose Room

Voting Members in Attendance: Barry Balleck for Jean-Paul Carton, Gary Dartt, Lisa Yocco for Donald Fausett, Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Chris Geyerman, Godfrey Gibbison, Beverly Graham, Kent Murray for Mary Hadley, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Patricia Humphrey, Kenneth Johnson, Gautam Kundu, Michael Moore, John Nauright, Michael Nielsen, Patrick Novotny, Elaine Gore for Judi Robbins, Kim Ruebel, Tim Giles for Debra Sabia, Donna Saye, Candy Schille, Debra Skinner, David Stone, Robert Vogel, Patricia Walker, Jerry Wilson, Bill Yang

Voting Members Absent: David Alley, Ken Clark, Robert Cook, Steven Damelin, John Dyer, Mark Edwards, Ming Fang He, Jeanette Rice Jenkins, Bill Levernier, Michele Davis McGibony, Will McIntosh, Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Carol Strickland, Mark Welford

Senate Officers in Attendance: Patricia Humphrey, Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator (COST); Donna Saye (2005-2006) Senate Secretary (COST); John Nauright (CHHS); Richard Flynn (CLASS); Michael Moore, Senate Librarian (COE); Mary Hazeldine (COBA); Donna Saye (COST); Bob Fernekes (LIB)

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Linda Bleicken, Joe Franklin, Billy Griffis, Teresa Thompson, Charlie Hardy, Jane Rhoades Hudak, Anny Morrobel-Sosa

Senate Parliamentarian in Attendance: Jeff McLellan

NCAA Faculty Representative: Richard Rogers

Strategic Planning Council Representative: None present

Senate Liaison: Marilyn Bruce

Student Government Representatives: Laurie Markle

Visitors: Greg Brock (COBA), Marcia Jones, Amy Heaston, Nancy W. Shumaker, Olivia Carr Edenfield, Stephanie Kenney, Clara Krug (CLASS)

*Prior to the Senate meeting, questions and clarification may be directed to the Office of the Faculty Senate (fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu) or to persons identified with each agenda item.

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the June 23, 2005, Meeting.** Patricia Humphrey (COST, Senate Moderator) heard a motion that the Agenda for the June 23, 2005 meeting be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote. The question was then asked: Do we have a quorum? In response, Patricia Humphrey (COST, Senate Moderator) responded: Yes, we do. She stated that there were 45 Senate members and that 25 were present.

2. **Approval of the [April 25, 2005](#) Minutes.** Mark Edwards, Secretary, was attending a conference. Donna Saye (COST) Secretary-elect moved that the minutes be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

3. **Approval of the [June 15, 2005](#) Librarian's Report.** Michael Moore (COE) Senate Librarian moved that the Librarian's Report be approved. The motion was seconded after which Pat Humphrey asked for discussion. Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked if anybody from the University Library Committee was in attendance at the meeting to answer a question about the minutes from the Library Committee. No one from the committee was in attendance. Richard expressed concern about electronic journals. He had noticed that the back issues of electronic journals received through Project News (which he regularly linked to his syllabus for his students' use) were no longer available due to changes in the way the subscription is aggregated. He wanted to express concern about what appeared to him to be diminishing library resources. Debra Skinner (LIB) stated that although she is not a member of the Library Committee, she worked in the Library and had read the Librarian's Report. She stated that *Project News* changed the way they packaged their titles, so it was not that the Library dropped any titles, it was that what was available had changed. After discussion, she suggested that Richard give the Library a list of the missing titles that he used in his classes for the library staff to look at. Richard noted that he had already written such a notice to Bede Mitchell, Dean of the University Library. The Librarian's Report was then approved by voice vote.

a. **Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Mary Hazeldine (COBA) for Virginia Richards (CHHS):** Mary Hazeldine (COBA), representing Virginia Richards (CHHS, Undergraduate Committee Chair) in her absence, asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the Undergraduate Committee. The motion was seconded. Patricia Humphrey asked for discussion. Hearing none, she called for a vote and the motion passed by voice vote.

b. **Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Richard Flynn (CLASS):** Richard Flynn (CLASS, Graduate Committee Chair) moved that the Graduate Committee report be approved. The motion was seconded and, since there was no subsequent discussion, approved by voice vote.

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

President Grube shared the following update information on numerous projects with the Senate:

- Summer enrollment was about 7,800, which was almost a 4% increase over last year.
- Fall enrollment has been going up each year at a rate of about 400 or 500 students.
- There is expected to be another significant increase in the average SAT scores for the newly-entering freshman class.
- Phase I of the library renovation and expansion has proceeded well. It has involved an addition of approximately 103,000 square feet.
- Work on a building for Alternate Network Operations Center (ANOC) will begin soon near the Ceramic and Sculpture facility. ANOC will allow us to have a complete communications circle on the campus.
- ANOC's building is to be built in the area where the rifle range and the rappelling towers are currently located, so both of these are going to be re-located to the RAC area, near where the ropes course now exists.
- Construction on the Fine Arts Phase III project, a gallery space of approximately 30,000 square feet, is scheduled to begin in November.
- Funds from the Woodruff Foundation and private donations to the Wildlife Education Center have provided for a one million dollar expansion for an Aviary for The Center for Wildlife Education.
- The RAC project, the addition of approximately 135,000 square feet to the current facility, is moving forward.
- Renovation of the J. I. Clements Stadium is almost completely finished now. There is only some touch-up work remaining to be completed.
- The Iron Works project is almost completely finished.
- Two projects are being completed near Paulson Stadium: 1) The track/soccer facility, and 2) The new brickwork on the concrete walls along the sidelines and along the side of the seating area as well as a planter arrangement around the scoreboard.
- Eagle Village, a 319,000 square feet facility that will provide about 776 beds for freshmen students, will be open this fall. A special, community interest program has been planned for the students living there in an effort to boost student retention and success rates.

- Herty renovations are proceeding in several phases. The Herty Building's top floor has been renovated for the Biology Department. Renovations on the main floor have now begun. During July of next year, work will begin on the Physiology/Anatomy facility to be located on the ground floor of Herty. These renovations will serve both COST and CHHS.
- A new Parking and Transportation facility is under construction on the site of the old Dorman Residence Hall.
- The Board of Regents has been asked to appoint Lavendar & Associates to renovate Veazey Hall to accommodate the Communication Arts Department, Graduate Studies, the Office of Strategic Research and Analysis, and the Academic Success Center.
- Cone Hall is also on the renovation list to accommodate the offices currently housed in the "nursing trailers."
- A bus turn-around for the new shuttle system on campus is under construction in front of the bookstore.
- Herty Drive has also been closed off for vehicles entering campus. A pedestrian path has been developed on Herty, and the landscaping is almost completed on it.
- A new exit to the parking lot between the Herty Building and the Hollis building was constructed, but the exit slope was far too great, so that slope is being reconfigured.
- Plans have been made for visiting legislators in their hometowns to bring them up to date on Georgia Southern University, and to thank them for all of their hard work.
- Shelley Nickel, the Executive Director of the Georgia Student Finance Commission, informed President Grube during a reception for Georgia High School students at the Governor's mansion that Georgia Southern University ranks fourth among colleges and universities in Georgia as a choice for higher education for valedictorians from Georgia high schools. The ranking order is as follows: The University of Georgia, Georgia Tech, Emory, and then Georgia Southern.

Patricia Humphrey asked if there were any questions for Dr. Grube. Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) asked if there were plans for providing off-campus public transportation for students. Dr. Grube replied that there were no such plans at this time. Gary Dartt (CLASS) asked Dr. Grube to comment on the Scene Shop. Dr. Grube explained that the Scene Shop is located next to Old Register Road just off Hwy 301, and that the shop has been considered for relocation for some time. Relocation, however, has been difficult due to cost and changes in personnel involved in the decision-making. It has been finally decided, according to Dr. Grube, to place the Scene Shop near the Sculpture/Ceramics facility. Dr. Grube stated that he believes the project for relocation is still being pursued. Hearing no more questions, Dr. Humphrey continued

to the SEC Report.

5. Report from Patricia Humphrey, Chair, Senate Executive Committee:

Pat Humphrey reported that the Senate Executive Committee met on Monday, May 16th at 1:00 p.m., to make appointments to committees for next year. She noted that those who were nominated have been notified, and that the information is available on the Senate web pages. Dr. Humphrey announced that the SEC would be making some additional nominations due to resignations from both the faculty and the Senate and encouraged interested individuals to let her know.

Dr. Humphrey stated that since the last Senate meeting, there had been three information requests:

1) Luke Hearn from the *George-Anne* asked to be able to review the tapes of the April 25th meeting regarding the items discussed under new business. He also filed his request under Open Records. He received a typed transcript of the meeting through Lee Davis, of Legal Affairs, in Jeff McLellan's absence.

2) Patrick Novotny submitted an RFI regarding administration's efforts to encourage students to use their GSU email accounts. That RFI was responded to by Teresa Thompson. There has been a plan in place for over three years and the use of GSU email accounts is covered thoroughly for both students and parents at SOAR and is also covered again in GSU 1210 classes. Her full response was posted on the web on May 3rd.

3) Debra Sabia requested information on whether it was legal for individuals to view the personnel and/or grievance files of others, and whether the comments about this by former Moderator Rice were made with the knowledge of the administration, and whether her comments set precedent. After consulting with Jeff McLellan and Jeanette Rice, Pat Humphrey responded to the RFI. Georgia is an Open Records state. Anything that is not specifically forbidden by the law is fair game as long as the requestor abides by the rules in making the request, and agrees to pay the cost of obtaining the requested records. The precedent was set long ago with the enactment of the law.

Moderator Humphrey stated that two agenda requests had been received. She noted that the SEC had met by email to discuss these requests. Jean-Paul Carton submitted an agenda request from the Faculty Welfare Committee concerning faculty evaluations. This request came from the referred motion on pre-tenure review from the April 25th meeting. That request appears as item #7 on today's agenda, and is to be presented by Barry Balleck as Jean-Paul is in Europe. Ming Fang He submitted an agenda item related to retaining good faculty. It is the feeling of the SEC that her request was not a motion, but more of a request for information. Her questions have been discussed with Dr. Bleicken and Dr. Grube. Associate Provost Amy Heaston has been asked to provide numbers regarding voluntary resignations for further study.

There were no questions for Pat Humphrey.

Prior to the NCAA report from Richard Rogers, Pat Humphrey asked Dr. Rogers to come forward and be recognized for his many years of service to Georgia Southern as NCAA Representative. Dr. Rogers is retiring this year. President Grube congratulated Dr. Rogers. He announced that Dr. Rogers served as the President of the Southern Conference and did a tremendous job for the entire conference, but that his representation of Georgia Southern at the conference was very important and absolutely first-rate. Dr. Rogers was presented with a gift in recognition of and thanks for his service. Dr. Rogers stated that he had been a senator for 19 years and thanked the senate for the gift and the recognition.

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

Richard Rogers began his report by announcing the approval of an additional regular season football game for Division I-A. He noted that the additional game does not apply to Georgia Southern, since GSU is Division I-AA. Rogers then noted that the Southern Conference Academic All-Conference team had been announced for spring. Members of this team are required to have a 3.2 GPA, and compete in half of their team's competitions during the season. Georgia Southern had sixteen student-athletes selected for that honor, and of those sixteen, four of them were from the women's tennis team. Rogers lastly shared the accomplishments of Georgia Southern's golf team. The men's golf team went to the NCAA Championship tournament, where they finished 13th in the nation in Division I. That is not I-AA or the Southern Conference; that is Georgia, Florida, Southern California, etc. That was a tremendous accomplishment. Furthermore, five of the top 14 teams in the country were from the state of Georgia. Two individual players were honored: Aron Price was First Team All-American and David Palm was Honorable Mention All-American. That was probably the highlight of the season as far as nationwide accomplishments go. Rogers ask if there were questions, and there were none.

7. [Motion from Senator Barry Balleck on behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee, "Amendment to section 205.06 - Procedures for Faculty Evaluations."](#)

Patricia Humphrey then called on Barry Balleck (CLASS) for Jean-Paul Carton to present Jean-Paul Carton's Motion. This motion, on behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee, is to insert in Section 205.06C of the *Faculty Handbook* the following sentence, which would be the third sentence in that section, "A written statement must be made in regard to an individual's progress toward the entire tenure, promotion and review process." Richard Flynn seconded the motion. Patricia Humphrey gave the floor first to Barry Balleck to lead discussion on the motion.

Balleck began the discussion by noting that the motion is in response to a charge from the SEC, which came through the Faculty Grievance Committee as presented by Dr.

Clara Krug, who came before the Faculty Welfare Committee on April 29. There had been a situation in which an individual had come before the Faculty Grievance Committee regarding a third-year review. The individual had received positive yearly evaluations from chairs but had been told at that third-year review that his/her contract would not be renewed. The process taking place among chairs in terms of providing proper evaluation and written documentation as to how colleagues are being evaluated was questioned. It seemed to the Faculty Welfare Committee that there is currently quite a bit of difference among departments on campus in terms of the amount of written feedback that faculty receive during the review process. Balleck noted that Amy Heaston from the Provost's Office had attended the Faculty Welfare Committee meeting on April 29th, and that she had told the committee that there is an attempt on the part of the Provost's Office to make the process more uniform among the various departments. The Faculty Welfare Committee determined that their discussion of this problem needed to include the entire process of tenure and tenure review rather than just the discussion of the third-year review. As a result of discussion at the meeting, the committee has recommended that there must be an adequate paper trail that includes written evaluations by chairs, and that the process must be uniform across campus.

Candy Schille (CLASS) stated that the language might be a little vague and asked what "in regard to" meant. She wanted to know if the motion had "teeth." Balleck replied that the intent was to make sure that there was something documented. He also stated that the intent was to make sure that we could go to a personnel file and find written documentation as to how the chair rated that faculty member. Schille replied that she liked the idea, but that she was not clear on exactly how many written evaluations should be required and when they should be required. Balleck replied that Amy Heaston from the Provost's Office had stated at the meeting that there is an attempt on the part of the Provost's Office to make the process more uniform among the various departments. Schille then questioned whether this motion refers to something other than an annual evaluation. Balleck replied that what prompted this motion was that during annual evaluations some faculty members are not receiving anything in written form, and that written statements of progress need to be part of their permanent personnel file, even if it is not a third-year review or a tenure and promotion review circumstance.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) stated that he wondered why annual evaluation forms were not being found, since, without the added language, the policy states that a narrative summary of the evaluation will be written by the department chair. He suggested that the language be appended to that by saying that the statement needs to assess the individual's progress towards tenure and promotion. He noted that it seems that people who are not providing annual written evaluations are not following the policy, as it is presently constituted. In response to Flynn, Balleck stated that he agreed with Flynn and that it had been determined that there was not continuity among the

various departments in terms of what the chairs were providing.

Clara Krug (CLASS) spoke on behalf of the intent of the motion and reminded the Senate that the original motion (which was somewhat different) had been presented at the Faculty Senate in April, and that it was recommended that the sentence be inserted in a different place by the Grievance Committee. She stated that at the meeting of the Faculty Welfare Committee, which she had been invited to attend on April 29th, there was a lot of discussion about the original motion. At that meeting she said that she became convinced that positioning the new statement as the third sentence of Section 205.06C is the more appropriate place for the sentence, because it does apply to all evaluations. The motion means that at whatever point in his/her path a faculty member is in regarding term of years of service, then there will be a statement about the appropriateness of the person's contributions in teaching, service, and research for the next level of personnel decision. That was the intent. Krug also noted that this placement was discussed at the Faculty Welfare Committee meeting by Amy Heaston, and that it was Heaston who recommended the placement of the statement. Krug stated that based on this motion, the department chair will have it incumbent upon him/her to in some way put in writing something so that if unfortunately there is a problem there is a, as Balleck said, "paper trail." Krug urged the Senate to pass the motion today so that all faculty would know where they stand throughout the tenure process.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) stated that he believed that the language of the motion needed to be "worked over," so that it actually requires a report on the progress of the candidate towards the next step in the tenure/promotion process.

A motion was then made by Chris Geyerman (CLASS) and seconded that the motion under discussion be amended to state "the faculty member's progress" rather than "an individual's progress." He stated that the change would make the sentence consistent with the sentences that come before and after it. He stated also that the change would make the statement more specific than the broader term "individual." Balleck (CLASS) stated that he liked the re-wording. Flynn (CLASS) stated that there is nothing in the sentence that clearly states that the written statement should be given to the faculty member. Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) noted that the last sentence of Section 205.06C says, "A copy of the evaluation and comments will be given to the faculty member." Flynn said that it is not clear to him that the written statement under discussion is part of the evaluation. Balleck pointed out that the statement is located in the paragraph, and based on the paragraph, it is clear that anything the chair writes would have to be available for the faculty member to see. Flynn said that he would like to remove the passive voice of the paragraph. Pat Walker (CLASS) asked if Richard would rather the statement read, "a written statement must be made in regard to a faculty member's progress regarding research, teaching, and service." Flynn suggested that it read, "A written statement must be provided to the

faculty member concerning teaching, research, and service, as part of the evaluating progress toward tenure/promotion, etc.” Balleck stated that what Flynn was saying was implicit in the entire evaluative process and that adding his statement would be redundant.

Patricia Humphrey (COST, Senate Moderator) reminded everyone of the motion currently on the floor to amend the original motion to change the words “an individual” to say “the faculty member’s.” She asked for a vote on that motion. The motion was approved by voice vote. Humphrey declared that statement now was amended to read, “A written statement must be made in regard to the faculty member’s progress toward the entire tenure, promotion, and review process.”

Richard Flynn (CLASS) questioned whether the written statement would follow from the oral discussion between a department chair and a faculty member. Alice Hall (CHHS) stated that, in her opinion, it is very clear that a sentence will be written among all the other written statements in a faculty member’s files that addresses whether the faculty member is (at that time) meeting the criteria for tenure and promotion. Candy Schille (CLASS) asked how much weight that statement would have. She asked if the statement would guarantee that the faculty member would get a “yes” on whatever step he/she was trying to take. David Stone (COST) stated that he did not think there are any guarantees that can be written down. He stated that he felt that the statement was clear, and that the intent of the motion was to have a paper trail. He noted that the Senate could wordsmith the motion all day, but that he is in favor of the motion and ready for a vote. Jerry Wilson (COBA) stated that he did not have a problem with the statement either. He noted that he did not see how the statement addressed the issue that caused the statement to be before the Senate. He stated that for the faculty member that had three positive reviews, and then received a letter of non-renewal, he himself did not see how the chair’s writing the good things down that were said for three years would make the process any easier for the person. Leslie Furr (CHHS) stated that what we are actually trying to do is create documents for those who are reviewing a person’s case. She said that there should be a series of papers that say, “Yes, you are doing a fine job.” Bill Wells (COBA) said that he did not see where the motion addressed the issue of department chairs not providing written summaries. He noted that we could keep putting sentences in that say summaries will be written, but that the sentences will not make it happen, and will not correct the problem. Balleck (CLASS) stated that this motion is to declare that there must be some written statement of progress or lack of progress by each faculty member’s departmental chair each year. Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) asked whether faculty could appeal, using the paper trail that would have been created, with the Grievance Committee, if after a third-year review he/she is given a non-renewal letter. Patricia Humphrey (COST, Senate Moderator) replied that apparently Gibbison was correct, since the situation under discussion developed because a faculty member had completed a grievance file for his/her non-renewal.

Patricia Humphrey (COST, Senate Moderator) called for a vote on the motion as amended. The motion being to insert in Section 205.06 Paragraph C, "A written statement must be made in regard to the faculty member's progress toward the entire promotion, tenure and promotion review process." The motion was approved by voice vote.

8. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

9. New Business

There was no new business.

10. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Linda Bleicken (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs) gave an update on the SACS visit that occurred in April. She said that the formal response from the SACS On-Site Peer Review Team was received in May, and that the results expressed in the formal response were not a surprise. There were some concerns about closing the feedback loop on Georgia Southern's institutional effectiveness process. In other words, rather than simply measuring progress, there should be a method for feeding the findings back into the system and using the results of the findings to prepare for the future. To the Site Team, Georgia Southern did not seem to be able to document that process very well. Bleicken noted that there is currently a response being crafted. The response is due on September 7th.

Dr. Bleicken also noted that a second concern to the On-Site Peer Review Team was the lack of meaningful student learning outcomes, as they were inserted in our curriculum. She said that this concern must be addressed during the coming year as well. She stated that she would be meetings the next day with the department chairs and deans to begin discussion about that process. She noted also that a group from Georgia Southern would visit Texas A & M to be trained on how to address the two concerns. Marilee Bresciani, a consultant who will also be visiting in Texas, will come to Georgia Southern for a visit in the Fall.

Finally, Dr. Bleicken announced that the SACS Peer Review Team thought that the Quality Enhancement Plan developed at Georgia Southern was too broad. The number of goals in the plan must be reduced. The process for streamlining the plan will begin this summer.

Dr. Bleicken then announced that there would be 77 new faculty members coming to campus in the Fall. She stated that there were 77 successful searches this year, and that will dramatically change once again the face of this campus. Furthermore, it looks like there will be searches for just about that many faculty again in the coming

year. The deans have already put forward their search requests and many of those are already in process. Bleicken also stated that there is a desire to reduce the reliance on temporary faculty. She noted that eight new chairs have been hired as well. The new chairs will be oriented during the summer in an effort to give them an opportunity to serve faculty as best they can.

11. Announcements from the Floor

There were no announcements from the floor.

12. Adjournment

Before adjourning, Patricia Humphrey (COST, Senate Moderator) recognized the people who would be rotating off the Senate and thanked them for their years of service.

The Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Donna Saye, Faculty Senate Secretary

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
September 26, 2005
4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Russell Union Ballroom

**Questions and clarification may be directed to the Office of the Faculty Senate (fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu) or persons identified with each agenda item prior to Senate.

Voting Members in Attendance: Kathy Albertson, David Alley, Spyros Andreou, Barry Balleck, Jean-Paul Carton, Nirmal Das, Don Fausett, Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Leslie Furr, Godfrey Gibbison, Tim Giles, Bev Graham, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Ming Fang He, Pat Humphrey, Marc Cyr for Clara Krug, Margaret LaMontagne, Ron MacKinnon, Mary Marwitz, Norman Schmidt for Michele McGibony, Bruce McLean, Michael Moore, Kent Murray, John Nauright, Michael Nielsen, Constantin Ogloblin, Broderick Oluyede, Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Donna Saye, Candy Schille, Sonya Shepherd, Caren Town, Stuart Tedders for Robert Vogel, Pat Walker, Jianping Wang, Mark Welford, Bill Wells, Jerry Wilson, Michael Reksulak for Bill Yang

Voting Members Absent: Ken Clark, Gautam Kundu, Marla Morris

Senate Officers in Attendance: Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee, and Moderator, Faculty Senate; John Nauright (CHHS); Ron MacKinnon (CIT); Richard Flynn (CLASS); Mary Hazeldine (COBA); Michael Moore (COE); Donna Saye (COST); Sonya Shepherd (LIB); Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) Senate Librarian; Donna Saye (COST) Senate Secretary

Administrative Members in Attendance: Linda Bleicken, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Joe Franklin, Interim Vice President for Business and Finance; Billy Griffis, Vice President for University Advancement; Fred Whitt (CHHS); Jim Bradford (CIT); Jane Rhoades Hudak (CLASS); Cindi Chance (COE); Bede Mitchell (LIB)

Senate Parliamentarian: Lee Davis for Jeff McLellan

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS) NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative

Strategic Planning Council Representative: Jerry Wilson (COBA) Strategic Planning Council Representative

Senate Liaison: Marilyn Bruce (President's Office)

Student Government Representative: Laurie Markle

Visitors: Donna Fisher (COBA Alternate); Candace Griffith (Provost's Office); Wayne Smith (Registrar's Office); Bret Danilowicz (COST); Olivia Carr Edenfield (CLASS); Jonathan Buckner (SGA Exec. VP); Jamie Lawrence (SGA Senator CHHS); Georj Lewis (Student Affairs); C. Douglas Johnson (COBA); Chris Ford (SGA Senator COBA); Patrick Novotny (CLASS faculty); Nancy W. Shumaker (Provost's Office); Marcia Jones (Institutional Compliance); Amy Heaston (Provost's Office)

The September 26, 2005, Faculty Senate meeting, was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Dr. Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator and Chair of the Senate Executive Committee.

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the September 26, 2005, Meeting.** Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, made several announcements prior to starting the meeting. She first asked alternates to please sign next to the senator's name and not in the visitor's section. She asked that all senators please remember to identify themselves and state college affiliation when granted the floor. She noted that Dr. Grube was in Maine on a site visit. She then announced that Jeff McLellan would be resigning from the University, and that he was not in attendance for the meeting because he was on a house-hunting trip. She stated that Lee Davis was serving as parliamentarian for this session of the senate. She then heard a motion that the Agenda for the September 26, 2005 meeting be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

2. **Approval of the [June 23, 2005](#), Minutes:** Donna Saye (COST), Senate Secretary, noted that she did receive one correction to the minutes for the June 23, 2005 meeting. The correction was that Leslie Furr had attended the meeting for Virginia Richards. With that correction, she moved that the minutes be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

3. **Approval of the [Sept. 16, 2005](#) Librarian's Report:** Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS), Senate Librarian moved that the Librarian's Report be approved. Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator reminded senators that when approving the Librarian's Report, senators were approving that it is correct in substance rather than approving the motions or actions of the individual committees. The motion was seconded after which Pat Humphrey asked for discussion.

Barry Balleck (CLASS) asked for clarification regarding the online student evaluation project, and whether or not the ad hoc committee that was put together to discuss the project still existed.

Dr. Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA) said that she had talked with Lisa Spence about that recently. Dr. Bleicken stated that the project was still in process and that a pilot test was expected to be done this fall in an effort to work out some of the glitches. Dr. Bleicken also stated that the evaluation instrument itself must be examined again as well. She said that she thinks that people might be very pleased with the project, because, in addition to the standard questions typically asked, the new evaluation document would provide flexibility by allowing individualized questions to be asked.

Barry Balleck (CLASS) then asked what the rationale was for doing evaluations online, because he felt concerned that there would be a great potential (unless password protections and things like that were provided) for fraud to take place. Furthermore, online evaluations have the potential for students who rarely attend class to have the same exact input as a student who attends every class session, and that, in his opinion, would skew the results.

Dr. Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA) replied that part of the issue that led to the discussion of online evaluations was some tampering that had occurred with the paper ballots that were being completed. Paper ballots have not proven to be foolproof methods for evaluation. She stated that she was sure that the issue of "foolproof" evaluations could be addressed in either case—paper or online. She added that any student who is in a WebCT class currently completes an evaluation online, so there is some understanding of how the process of online evaluation works. One of the reasons that online evaluations are being considered is that we do want to see what the issues will be, and before we would ever roll this out to the full campus we would certainly do a test.

Barry Balleck (CLASS) stated that he understood that tampering has been an issue. He stated that he thinks we address that issue by having graduate assistants within a department, or someone like that, administer the evaluations. He said that it seems that taking online surveys is often a very tedious process, that students will be allowed to complete the evaluation over the course of a week or two weeks or something like that, and that he, therefore, is dubious of the ability of the process to really capture what we want from students. He also stated that when evaluations are given in the classroom, the students are aware that the evaluation process is going to take place on that particular day, and they are prepared to complete it. Furthermore, the process is enhanced in that we provide them with pencils, and we provide them the materials necessary to complete the evaluation that day.

Dr. Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA) thanked Barry Balleck for his comments and noted that his ideas would certainly be noted as we go forward.

David Robinson (CLASS) stated that he would like to add to Professor Balleck's remarks. He said that a more basic problem with these surveys is that there is so much emphasis and importance placed on what really is a pretty questionable instrument to begin with. Student course evaluations are not popular among a lot of faculty because we are not convinced that they actually measure anything directly that is necessarily worth measuring. If there were not so much resting on these particular evaluations, I think people might be less nervous about the conditions under which they were being administered. It seems that there is really not a very effective assessment tool for finding out anything useful about what happens in a classroom. There is no systematic university-wide effort to have peer observations or anything like that past the first couple of years. At least a peer observation process would be measuring something and could be documented.

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA) replied that she understood.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS) asked what kind of outcome would there need to be in the pilot test in order for the online evaluation process not to be carried out? How inevitable is online evaluation?

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA) replied that, since she was not the chair of that committee, she was not sure if the answer to his question had been determined yet. She stated that the committee was looking at it.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS) replied "Okay."

Laurie Markle (Student Government Association Representative) said that she wanted to reiterate what Dr. Balleck had mentioned. She stated that the Student Government Association Executive Board met and discussed the issue earlier today and agreed that, as students, we can genuinely say that we do not feel as though we would actively participate in online evaluations if they were optional. And, as they are still optional right now, there is more motivation to actually participate in them if you are in the classroom setting where everything is provided for you and time set aside for it. We feel that if students have a mediocre feeling about a professor, or something like that, students would not necessarily be as inclined to make any comments about him or her online. The online evaluation would just be one more thing to add to the *to do* list.

Candy Schille (CLASS) said that Laurie's comments were so interesting, because they seemed to suggest a kind of indifference about the whole process--whether or not students do it, in class or out of class. If students care, seems like they would go online. It often seems to me when I administer these for my colleagues that it is a quick process--mark a few boxes and get out. I don't really have anything meaningful to suggest, but Dr. Robinson's idea, that we rethink the whole thing of what student evaluations are supposed to be and how we use them, is maybe where we ought to go from here.

Bruce McLean (COST) asked if the GPA issue was also in the Librarian's Report.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, replied, no, that the GPA issue was a separation motion to be heard later. Dr. McLean apologized.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked if the committee was also evaluating the instrument used for evaluations. He said that when the current evaluation form was instituted, it was considered temporary. Additionally, senior faculty were told that they would have to have evaluations completed by every class while the instrument was being tested. No one has ever told us the results of the testing of the instrument, so I was wondering how do you know whether or not it is effective?

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA) replied that she was not aware of the temporary nature of the evaluation instrument, but that the issue had actually come up as a point of discussion. The whole campus has been going through something called "Evidence-Based Decision Making" training, and the discussion of whether the particular instrument was measuring what it says it is measuring was one of the topics that actually came up as a result of that training. We have put that on our list to review. Getting back also to Dr. Robinson's comments, I would agree that we probably do not have an extensive way of looking at the quality of teaching or the effectiveness of teaching, and so I think, as we move forward, you are also going to see us examine that in a more systematic way. Any decisions to change any form of evaluation are going to include a lot of discussion with faculty members.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator noted: "The world's shortest Librarian's Report generates the world's longest discussion." The Librarian's Report was then approved by voice vote.

a. **Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair:** Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator announced that the Chair for the Undergraduate Committee for this year would be Donna Saye. She asked if Donna had anything to report regarding the Undergraduate Committee. Donna Saye (COST) replied, no that she had just been

elected the previous week. She asked Virginia Richards (CHHS), previous Chair of the Undergraduate Committee, if she had anything to report. Virginia Richards (CHHS) replied, "No."

b. **Report from Graduate Committee Chair:** Richard Flynn (CLASS) said that the names for the Undergraduate and Graduate Committee Chairs were reversed on the agenda. He then stated that the Graduate Committee met electronically for its September meeting, since there was little business to conduct. Those minutes were not compiled or approved in time for this Librarian's Report, so they will be in the next one.

4. **President's Report:** Dr. Linda Bleicken (in Dr. Grube's absence):
Good afternoon, again. Dr. Grube is at the University of Main in Orono, and he is heading an NCAA Recertification Team. We are, as you know, off to a roaring start this fall. We have somewhere around 16,500 students with an SAT average at around 1100. This is a remarkable accomplishment. The enrollments, contrary to what so many of us thought would happen as we raised the floor on the SAT, have continued to go up, and I think that is gratifying to all of us. We actually have a freshman class that is almost exactly the same as the size last year. The reason that we have more students this fall than last is that we have had a higher retention rate this past fall. We had a higher retention rate from the freshman to sophomore group, from the sophomore to junior, and also from the junior to senior, which is something that we have been hoping would happen for a very long time. I think those of you who have been here for a number of years will recall the years when we actually were exporters of students. Once they reached that magical sophomore point, they went somewhere else--somewhere that may have been their first choice. What we are hearing more often recently, is that students who come here are choosing us as a first choice. Even students who have come and spent a couple of years with us thinking that they were going to transfer are now changing their minds. So, I think that there is something that has changed here that not only is attracting students of higher quality, but is also helping us to retain our students. I think that is something we can all be very pleased about, because obviously it is one thing to get them here, and it is another thing to keep them here, and a lot of what keeps them here is the experience that they have both in the classroom and out. I thank you for your part in that.

Speaking of students, we obviously need some faculty to support them, and we actually do have more faculty this year—that is good. We have more faculty, both at the tenure-track and tenured levels, as well as more temporary faculty. I will tell you that I had hoped we would have a reduction in the number of temporary faculty this year, but the increase, particularly the relatively unexpected increase that we saw

through retention, forced us to go out and get some additional temporary faculty members. We added 77 new faculty this year. Seventy-two of those are tenure-track faculty, and the other five are non-tenure-track. That was an increase over the 39 that we added last year. So we have more at the tenure-track level, and we are searching for somewhere in the range of 90-plus for the coming year on tenure-track lines. We will have another busy search year, but I do want to say *hats off* to so many of you. I think I said this in the spring, but I do want to reiterate that we were able to recruit some excellent faculty members this past year. I don't know if any of you had the opportunity to look at the fold-out that came in the *Statesboro Herald*, right after we started school. It was very impressive, because I think we brought in faculty who are diverse, and we brought in faculty who are very competent in their field. I do thank you for all of that.

I want to say a special thank you to those of you who have stepped up and worked with students who wound up in your class some three weeks after we started school. There were not a lot of these students. I think we wound up with about sixteen students that came to us as a result of Hurricane Katrina. These students, as you know, came from Tulane, the University of New Orleans, Xavier, and Dillard Universities, and they will be with us throughout this fall. We are not certain of what their status will be in spring semester. Some of them have privately said to us they are having such a good experience here that they do not want to leave, but we are trying to play that down a little bit because it is not our role to recruit these students from schools that are obviously having a lot of trouble.

We have had some very good things happen in the last couple of weeks, and I am going to defer here to Billy Griffis. He had a very successful *A Day for Southern* campaign, so, rather than steal Billy's thunder; I am going to let him talk about this one.

Billy Griffis (University Advancement):

As many of you probably know by now from the press releases and involvement, a couple of weeks ago we had our largest *Day for Southern* campaign ever: \$1,220,000 plus. That was well publicized. The part of that that had not been publicized just yet was that on campus our faculty and staff campaign was also a record. We had \$195,000 of that total given by all of us on campus, and that was an increase of about \$5,000 over last year. Many of you were volunteers, and worked on the campaign. Many of you gave to the campaign this year, and for that we are truly grateful. And thank you so very much.

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA):

Thanks Billy. Now I am going to do an update on the Capital Projects. We have had an awful lot of activity going on this summer.

- ◆ **Library:** If you were away for the summer, you have probably noticed that there was a lot of progress that occurred on the library. The new part of the library construction is going very well. What you may not realize is that we are not only adding to the library, but we are also going to be renovating the existing structure. That renovation is going to begin in summer of 2006, and it will require moving all of the books, or a great majority of the books that are currently in that library to another location. We are still looking for that location, and we have looked at many sites.
- ◆ **Fine Arts Phase III:** This is the 30,000 square foot addition that will house the black box theater. It is scheduled to begin construction in March of 2006. For those of you who are looking around for the Marvin Pittman gym, it disappeared, and that is because that is where this new facility is going to be.
- ◆ **Center for Wildlife Education:** We actually have an addition to that structure. It is not so much an addition that you would notice right away. It is a campground that is nearing completion, and an aviary that will begin there fairly soon. The aviary is going to provide an enclosed structure, but the enclosed structure will be a net, if you will, that will provide a home for a lot of birds. It will provide safety for them, and yet as much a natural environment as we can make it. So I think it's going to be very exciting.
- ◆ **RAC expansion:** It is proceeding on schedule now.
- ◆ **The athletic venues:** J. I. Clements, as you know, has been essentially finished. We had a reception there in the fall.
- ◆ **Soccer/and track stadium:** We have a temporary certificate of occupancy that was issued on August 22nd, so that is moving along.
- ◆ **Eagle Village:** This is really pretty much complete. We moved in over 700 freshmen in prior to the first week of school. It was quite an experience. The problems that we are still having with Eagle Village are because of the rain that occurred some time ago. We have not been able to move forward as quickly on the parking lots. I think we have one finished, but, which is it the upper or the lower Joe? Joe Franklin (Business and Finance) replied that the upper is finished. Dr. Bleicken continued then that we are still working on the lower parking lot. And we are also working on getting a certificate of occupancy, I

believe, for the community building. Joe Franklin replied that we have that certificate.

- ◆ **The Herty Renovation Phase III:** One of the things that had been of some concern there was that Phase III actually contained an emergency generator. That is the last part that has been scheduled for completion--the bottom floor. We have moved that, I believe, up to the phase that is currently ongoing, so that if we have any power outages in that facility we can go ahead and preserve some of the experiments that so many people work very hard on that do not need to go down the drain.
- ◆ **Veazey Hall:** We are working for a design completion date, I believe, of December, but we have some design issues that are still in process. That, as you know, will be the home of our new Communication Arts Department.
- ◆ **Cone Hall:** The occupants of that renovation are still under some bit of discussion, and so that is not quite ready for prime time.

Dr. Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): I want to just turn this over, just for a second, to Joe, because I think he wanted to say just a couple of words about the transit system, right?

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): Thank you. I want to tell you a little bit about the transit system. Those who might have been on the Faculty Senate a few years ago may have remembered my many trips here to talk about the Parking Master Plan, and at that time, we also talked about transit. We projected a number that would indicate the need for a transit system, and that was when the population hit 17,500 students. When it hit 16,000, we realized we were a little off our mark. The issue of parking was just too great. So over the last year, we have put together a transit system, and I am glad to tell you that it is off to a pretty rousing start. I had two fears: One fear was that nobody would ride it, and the second fear was that everybody would ride it. Well, I only have one fear today, because when I went out there the first day of the system at 7:00 in the morning, I saw about 50 students standing in a line waiting to get on the first bus. I went, oh my goodness. But we have had about 7,000 students a day riding the buses. We have six buses running. Generally, Monday through Thursday, they are running from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. After about 5:00 p.m., we start phasing down. Problems: We have had some overcrowding on the buses. Students are going to have to learn that they cannot all get on the bus at the same time to get there five minutes before class. We have found the air conditioning does not work so well when the heat index is 120. Oddly enough, when it is about 100 it works pretty well, but at 120 it does not. One of the results

that we found was that we have about 40 percent less people parking in the commuter parking lots, which was great because our biggest issue was that we just had too many commuters. As a result of the transit system, don't ask me how I got to this number, but I calculated that we are saving about 1,000 gallons of gas a day because people are taking the transit as opposed to driving into campus with their cars. Another thing that has been unusual is that the RAC parking lot has been jammed full. We have not resolved that issue yet, but we did a survey out there and we found that 70 people over a two-hour period were walking from the RAC to campus. Now, a year ago or two years ago that might have been 2 people. So we really have changed. We are in a process of changing the culture on campus from a "driving-in-and-parking-up-close" to a "riding a transit, walking, riding your bicycle" campus. I just want everybody to know that. If you have any questions, Bob Chambers will be glad to answer them for you.

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): Finally, some of us had a lot of fun this summer finalizing the SACS' accreditation response, which went out during the final days of August. I want to say thanks again to the Leadership Team who were a great help through this whole thing. Candace Griffith is sitting in the back, and she was a wonderful help in editing this response. The Leadership Team also was comprised of David Dudley, a member of the faculty; Anny Morrobel-Sosa; Jayne Perkins Brown; Trey Denton, and chaired by the President. For those of you who would like to see everything from the beginning to the end about SACS' accreditation, you can find it on our web site. That is at <http://sacs.georgiasouthern.edu/>. The Commission will use the report to finalize their decision about our accreditation. Their decision will be announced at their December meeting in Atlanta. We are hopeful of a good response. Thank you.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator asked if there were any questions for Dr. Bleicken. Hearing no questions, Dr. Humphrey continued to the SEC Report.

5. Report from Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee: First thing to note is that Orientation for new senators and alternates was held September 12th and 13th. At the meeting on the 12th, there were 13 new senators and alternates. At the meeting on the 13th, there were 6 attendees, and since then CLASS has finished their elections, and I am informed that they feel that they do not need a separate orientation. Since the last senate meeting in June, there has been one information request. Michael Moore, from the College of Education, asked about the allocation of technology fees. The short answer is that no money from these fees automatically goes to any college. You have to apply for it. There is a committee comprised of six students and six faculty that evaluate the proposals, rank them, and award the money. Information that we received from Dr. Bleicken indicates that

priority is given to the number of students impacted and to accessibility. She just gave me some information, just to hit the highlights, but there will be more detailed information coming soon. FY 2003, there were 124 proposals totaling \$2,723, and some odd dollars. They awarded 31 proposals totaling a little over \$1 million. FY 2004, there were 87 requests totaling \$1,862,000, and 43 proposals were awarded a total of \$959,000. FY 2005, there were 158 proposals totaling roughly \$4.2 million, and 50 proposals were funded for about \$1,900,000. She will be getting some more detailed information to me as to what exactly was funded where.

There were two agenda requests. The Senate Executive Committee met September 20th to discuss these. Godfrey Gibbison submitted an agenda request from the Academic Standards Committee concerning the Adjusted Grade Point Average. This request is coming back to the Senate from a deferred motion from the February 2004 meeting. That request appears as Agenda Item #8 on today's agenda. Linda Bleicken submitted an agenda request for discussion of the Proposed Revisions to the Educational Leave Policy, which was drafted by a committee composed of Steve Damelin, Fred Whitt, and Amy Heaston. This was in response to Steve Damelin's Request for Information last October, and that item appears as #9 on today's agenda.

The SEC discussed the resignation of Jeff McLellan from the University, and from his position as Senate Parliamentarian. It should be noted that Jeff has served in this position since the Senate was reconstituted in 1999. We decided to ask for volunteers or nominations from the faculty for this position. As of today, I have received one nomination from an individual who said she had not talked to the nominee. We have one person who is a Senator who said he was willing to serve; however, since by rights the parliamentarian, and I salute Lee Davis for serving in that capacity today, is supposed to be totally impartial and not participate in debate or discussions, the Senate Executive Committee prefers that the parliamentarian not be a Senator. As parliamentarian, the Senator would lose his/her voice.

We also discussed several other continuing items. One was voluntary faculty resignations, which was an item raised by Ming Fang He last summer. I did get some data from the Provost's office yesterday. In a nutshell, I cannot really make much sense out of it, because I am not sure if it is answering the questions. Looking at the number of total separations in tenure/tenure-track ranks from 1999 to 2005, covering a period of six academic years, roughly 50 people per year left. Some of them are due to resignations, and some are due to retirement. We need to try and separate some of that out, and examine why people are resigning. One thing I will share with you, when I spoke with Dr. Grube last Thursday, he did say it would be an extremely rare event if Georgia Southern should ever enter into a bidding war for somebody who has been

looking elsewhere. So we will have to keep that in mind, but we would like to take a look at that still further.

Student course fees, has come up as an item of concern. At the March meeting, the Senate voted that new course fees must be approved by the respective College, Undergraduate or Graduate Committees, and the Senate, and there are still some questions floating about this. I should mention that the Provost's office is still working to consolidate the administration of all course fees, so that they show on students' tuition invoices, and, among other things, on WINGS. Not all course fees are disclosed to the students on WINGS. We have communicated to the Provost and to Nancy Shumaker that all course fees should appear on WINGS.

Are there any questions for the Senate Executive Committee?

Michael Moore (COE): On the two requests for information, you said more information would be coming. Would this be brought up again at the next Senate meeting? Or, how will that be handled?

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair of the Senate Executive Committee: Yes, and it will also be posted online.

Michael Moore (COE): Okay, so it will probably be better to wait until all the information is in.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair of the Senate Executive Committee: I think so, yes.

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): Could I just address that? We actually do have a pretty full report that actually came as a result of my discussing this with Marcia Jones in our office of Compliance. She worked with Lisa Spence and also Human Resources to compile a full report, and that one can be put online, so that any Senator can see it that looks at retirements, both voluntary and involuntary separations. We can get that out for you as soon as we can get it up on our web site, and we will be happy to do that.

Ming Fang He (COE): I have had a request before about how to maintain good faculty. I am not trying to blame any administrator, and I know all the people here are working very hard to try to maintain the good faculty. But I would like to ask you to provide the figure each year. In the past, from 1998 to 2005, each year we have lost 50 people. But out of which range? Could you provide that figure next time if it is possible? We spend a lot of time trying to maintain faculty, mentoring faculty, and I would like to know how much money it costs to mentor a faculty member and help

him/her earn promotion from assistant to associate, and then we let those people leave. I'm not trying to blame anybody; it is just a matter of fact observed on the campus that we do lose some very good faculty. I hate to see somebody I like leave. I want good people to stay here. So, Dr. Bleicken, is it possible to give us some figures about two things: One is about faculty who leave by rank, and the other is the cost roughly to mentor a faculty from assistant level to associate or associate to full professor.

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): Ming Fang, I think there were two things that you asked, and let me just repeat them so that I am certain that I have heard them. One is you want to know by rank who has left, and we certainly can provide that. In fact, that will be in the information that is posted on the web site. The second is going to be a little more interesting to get after, and I think that question that you asked me was what does it cost to mentor a faculty member from the time that they enter as an assistant professor until they would leave? Is that correct?

Ming Fang He (COE): Yes.

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): I don't know that it is going to be possible to put a solid figure on that. We certainly can talk about recruiting costs. I think, in spite of our best efforts, one of the things that is going to happen with us at Georgia Southern, is that sometimes we are going to lose people. And sometimes we lose people who are very good, and part of our continuing effort to recruit the best faculty that we possibly can to come here, has that result also. The sometimes unintended result of recruiting those best faculty, is that once they have some experience that they have gained here, they are very marketable. This year we are trying harder than ever to mentor new faculty that are coming in through a series of workshops that are somewhat custom-made for the new faculty. We also try very hard to mentor our new administrators, and so we have been working with them as well. But we will do our best to look at the data and see what we can come up with as a cost. I will also tell you that actually in this data that Dr. Humphrey referenced, we have seen a decline actually in the total number of separations. In 1999-2000, we had 50; this past year we had 46, but I would remind you that the base from which we are working was higher in this past year. We had quite a few less faculty in the 1999-2000 range than we actually had this year. The highest percentage that we had was actually 2000-2001, when we had 59 who left. So actually over the past few years we have been declining in the number of faculty who leave. I just put that out there for you. Hearing no more questions, Dr. Humphrey continued to the Strategic Planning Counsel Report from Jerry Wilson.

6. **Report from Jerry Wilson (COBA), SPC Representative:** The SPC has met twice since the beginning of the fall semester.

At the August 31st meeting, Chair Trey Denton introduced new members and asked Dean Charlie Hardy to provide a historical overview of SPC activities. Warren Riles then described the SPC "mindset" - noting that the SPC is a team with a University-wide perspective and long-term vision, and members are encouraged to engage in professional, open, and frank discussions.

Dr. Denton next presented an overview of the University's Strategic Plan, and progress to date on each strategic theme. He also introduced the new Planning and Assessment Schematic that graphically depicts the University strategic planning and quality control processes. He then outlined the SPC agenda for this academic year, which included the following topics:

- retention and graduation rates
- socialization of new faculty and staff
- reassessment of the Level II Plans

At the second SPC meeting, on September 14th, President Grube addressed the members on the role and importance of the Council, and summarized recent changes in the University environment.

Chair Trey Denton then assigned groups of Council members to begin working on the following tasks:

1. Rewrite the Level I Plan Summary
2. Develop Strategic Planning Acculturation Programs for new faculty, new students, and new staff
3. Revise each area of the Level II plans, which we were all extremely excited about, I can tell you.

The meeting concluded with the election of the SPC Chair for the current academic year. Jean Bartels and Trey Denton were nominated to serve as co-chairs. They were elected by acclamation. That concludes my report.

Hearing no questions, Dr. Humphrey continued to the NCAA report by Chris Geyerman.

7. **Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:** The Southern Conference has introduced three proposals into the 2005-2006 legislative cycle of the NCAA. The intent of each proposal is as follows:

- ◆ **First proposal.** Intent: In men's basketball to permit the permissible 8 hours of out-of-season practice to include conditioning, weight training, or skill instruction of which not more than 4 hours per week may be spent on individual skill instruction.

- ◆ **Second proposal.** Intent: To allow institutions that have been granted a non-traditional academic calendar waiver pursuant to Bylaw 14.1.8.2.2.1.1 to award summer financial aid to an incoming student-athlete who is enrolled in a minimum number of credit hours that are the equivalent of ½ of regular full-time course load at the awarding institution.

- ◆ **Third proposal.** Intent: To limit the one time transfer exception to:
 1. A student-athlete who transfers from a Division III institution to a Division I institution, or;
 2. A graduate student who is enrolled in a graduate or professional school of an institution other than the institution from which he/she previously received a baccalaureate degree.

Also, the Southern Conference released its honor roll for the 2004-2005 academic year. This honor roll is comprised of Southern Conference student-athletes with a grade point average of 3.0 or higher. Georgia Southern University is represented by 81 student-athletes on this honor roll. That concludes the FAR report.

Hearing no questions, Dr. Humphrey continued to the motion from Senator Godfrey Gibbison.

8. **Motion by Godfrey Gibbison (COBA), "[Revised Grade Point Average Policy](#)" [Attachment](#):** I want to just emphasize that actually this is not my motion, but the motion of the Academic Standards Committee. I'm just their spokesperson for today. The motion is to amend the language in the undergraduate and graduate catalog, pages 40 and 42. Page 40 of the catalog now has the first paragraph of the motion including the word "does not include transfer course work." It is bolded, but that is not part of our motion, that is currently in the catalog. The second paragraph in the motion is in the catalog now and that would be removed, and the paragraph in red would be added. The fourth paragraph is currently in the catalog as well, so that is just verbatim. And then on page 42, regarding repeating courses; we would replace the paragraph in the catalog as it is right now with two paragraphs that are in the motion. If you would like me to read them from the current catalog I can certainly do that.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator: I think since everyone has a handout, it is fairly clear, and Ginger also has the handout for the minutes.

The motion was seconded, and Patricia Humphrey gave the floor first to Godfrey Gibbison to lead discussion on the motion.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Thank you. I have been here for three years, and I have been hearing about the Campaign for National Distinction. It seems to me, and to the rest of the members of the Committee, (several of whom are here today) that this is one more step in raising our academic standards at the University. Dr. Bleicken mentioned that since we have raised the floor for incoming SAT scores, enrollment has actually increased and not decreased, as was feared, and that our retention rates have also gone up. Yet we still have this sort of abnormal system of an adjusted GPA which, in a sense, is a disincentive for students to perform at their full capacity. Furthermore, we spent a lot of time in the Committee last year looking at what we consider peer and aspirational institutions to see how many of them still have any such thing. Most of them do not have an adjusted GPA at all, and are operating along the lines that we propose, which is that the student can repeat a course if they so wish; all of the grades would count toward their GPA. The only exception we found was in the Florida System. In their system, a student can repeat a class, but after the third attempt, the student is charged a triple tuition. So there is a real cost to repeated courses beyond the second time in the Florida System. Other than that, I think this really fits in with a long-term plan of the University for National Distinction, and very much fits in with what institutions that we compare ourselves to on a regular basis, are currently doing.

Laurie Markle (SGA): As a representative of the students, the Student Government met and discussed this issue. We came to the conclusion that the Student Government Association does not support this. We feel that it does not hurt the students to have it there, and we just want more clarification as to why it is absolutely necessary for us to do away with it.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Well, actually, it does not help the students to have this. First of all let me make a couple of clarifications. It would not affect students who are currently enrolled. Students starting in the fall of 2006 would be affected by this. That's number one. Number two, it does not hurt students when their transcript has six Fs, and then one eventual C for College Algebra. However, when an employer or anybody else looks at the transcript, that looks really bad. And all we are doing here is raising the bar a little bit to say those six Fs and the one C will cost you something. The student will then make sure that from the very first time he/she takes College Algebra, he/she will get that C or B or A. So a student will leave here, starting after

that group comes in next year, with a much stronger transcript than somebody who was relying upon the adjusted GPA before. In a sense this is actually very good for the students in terms of the strength that they are going to leave the University with.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I'm the Senate Liaison to the SGA, and I have been involved in some of these discussions. I think what the students are saying is, and they understand that this is going to apply to students matriculating or coming in next year, they represent not only the body of students that are here, but the body of students that are potentially going to be here in the coming years, and again they do not see the damage to this. As you say, a potential employer may look at that and say, well, they took this class five times, and eventually got a C, but the converse is true as well. You may have a student who does poorly in a class for whatever reason, and yet they retake that class and gain a better grade. Our own Student Government President has an experience with that. My point was that sometimes this might be an abusive situation where you have somebody who comes for four weeks, never drops a class, receives an F, comes back the next semester, gets an A, and then, of course, they show that adjusted GPA. The discussion that I encountered with the SGA as I was sitting there was that this is a number that looks good on a transcript. It is not a falsification of their record by any stretch of the imagination. It is true representation of what they have done. They have retaken that class; it is recalculated, readjusted, and so forth. And as I said, I think their major argument has been: What is the damage in having that at Georgia Southern? If it is simply a question of nobody else does it, is that a good enough argument? Is that a good enough argument for it to be done away with at this point, and how much have the students been involved in this discussion? How much student input have we had in terms of this idea?

Alice Hall (CHHS): I have served on the Academic Standards Committee with several other colleagues in the room, and I was amazed at the stack of student appeals that we reviewed every semester. Our conclusion was that if the students are not performing well academically, we are doing them an injustice by letting them stay and by taking their money semester after semester. Without adjusting, the GPA will be an accurate assessment of student performance academically for all the classes taken. And Wayne is here. He can speak about how we looked statistically from an Enrollment Management point of view at how many students this would actually affect.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Or I can, because I have the figures with me, Alice.

Alice Hall (CHHS): Okay.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): I have got the figures, so, as Alice mentioned, in the

Academic Standards Committee we review students who have been excluded from the University and want to come back in. We do a lot of these each year, and, in most cases, we are talking about students who were doing rather poorly. If you look at undergraduate students with cumulative GPAs of less than 2.0 whose adjusted GPA has actually kept them on the campus, we are looking at somewhere between 3.5 to 4.5 percent of the students. (For any cohort, somewhere between 120 and 160 students.) And, basically, as Alice mentioned, the core of our discussion is that we are giving these students hope that they are actually going to finish a degree. And bear in mind, by the time students get to the Academic Standards Committee; they have had at least three semesters of really poor performance. They have had probation, and they have had restricted enrollment before their file comes to the Academic Standards Committee. And when a student spends twelve semesters here, and, in some instances, have had several semesters with a GPA below 2.0 or 1.0, they are either taking a student loan (because they have long lost the HOPE Scholarship) or paying themselves, it is almost as if we are cheating them to continuously take their money when they fail a course over and over again in the hope that they are going to pass. It is really unfair to the student, I think. And if the students eventually fail out, they could actually owe money for a degree never earned.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): On the front of it looking good on a transcript, I think I would have to disagree. I'd never even heard of an adjusted GPA before I came to Georgia Southern, and if I were an employer in a regular situation, and I saw an adjusted GPA, as well as a cumulative GPA, on a transcript, I'd wonder what the heck it was and what kind of school this person had gone to. I think that the cumulative GPA is much more reflective of a student's academic performance. I think it is a spur to academic performance, and I think that making our transcripts for our students more reflective of the standards that are held at the best schools in this country is doing our students a service all the way down the line.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I do not disagree with the premise. In fact, I would probably be supportive of this. My whole premise is how much were the students brought in on this? Because what I am saying is that we have got the Academic Standards Committee saying this is the law of the land, and yet we have not had student input. It sounds as though the SGA has sort of had this as a *fata compli*, and they have been presented with this, and I don't know how much input we have gotten from the Student Government or from the students themselves in terms of how this is going to impact them. My sense in the SGA discussions was that many students were concerned about this, and wanted to be able to voice their opinion. Of course, they were voicing it in the SGA meetings. Have we had a forum on this where we have had students? I mean, we have forums on this campus for everything.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator: In all honesty, to answer your question, no, there has been no forum, and I would submit that if a change in major or something like that is coming through the Undergraduate Committee or Graduate Committee, do we ever consult the students about that either?

Barry Balleck (CLASS): No, but you are saying something that is directly impacting students in this situation, and students are concerned obviously about these sorts of things, and, again, we are a teaching institution first and foremost. We are concerned about our students. That is our primary audience here; our primary target. My suggestion would be to put a cap on the number of times you can take a course. You know, we could say that a student might take a course twice or three times, and that would be it. You cannot take a course after that long a time. And that happens in other universities as well. I know that.

Jonathan Buckney (Executive VP, SGA): I would like to ask the Faculty Senate if we can have a look at those numbers that we did not have a chance to look at before. All I can say is that during this summer, maybe July, we received an email from somebody from the Faculty Senate, with the proposed changed paragraph, and the email asked us to discuss this without seeing numbers; without seeing anything else. And when we took this to our general senate, we ran into this problem that we are presenting to you today. This is what the students have said to this. We would like to see those numbers, and we would like to bring more than just the Student Government Association in on it. We would like to plan a forum, if we could. This affects all students.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): I just have two comments. One is they got the proposal in July, and nobody responded to ask us about the proposal. I would have responded to a request. Number two is that we do not have forums on the catalog, and everything in this catalog affects students. We make changes to the catalog every single year that affects the new cohort who comes in under that catalog. We do not have forums with the current students on those issues.

Bruce McLean (COST): On the other side of the issue, if you do not put a cap on the number of times students can take a class, a math major could take college algebra, eight semesters, and get As every semester, and raise his average. What prevents that?

Richard Fynn (CLASS): I would like to call the question.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator: The motion has been made to call the question. That requires a two-thirds majority. A vote was taken and the motion

carried, so we call the question. We are now voting on whether or not we want to approve the motion and the catalog word change about the adjusted GPA. The motion was approved by a show of hands.

9. Discussion Item, Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA), "[Proposed Revisions to Educational Leave Policy](#)" [Attachment](#)

Patricia Humphrey gave the floor to Dr. Linda Bleicken to lead the discussion. She asked two people to help her with this discussion. One was the chair of the task force that actually looked at this, Dean Fred Whitt. The other was Dr. Amy Heaston from her office. She began by briefly giving some background. This was a request for information that came from Steve Damelin last fall. When we began looking in the Provost's office at our current Educational Leave Policy, one of the things we found was that there appeared to be some confusion as to who was eligible, how often they were eligible, and so forth, and quite frankly, when we started looking around we could not find the documentation that made all of that very clear. So at that point, I asked Dr. Rice Jenkins (Senate Moderator at that time) if she thought that Dr. Damelin would mind serving on a task force for such a thing to be put together. First, the task force would look at our Educational Leave Policy and decide whether there was a need for a firmer structure. Dr. Damelin did agree to serve. Dr. Whitt agreed to chair that task force. Dr. Whitt, I called upon because he had the longest institutional memory about educational leave, and I thought he would probably understand or remember some more about it than maybe the rest of us did. And Dr. Heaston also served on the task force to be a resource person from our office. You see before you, I think, about draft number 8, of this document. The process began with the original draft that came from the task force. It was then discussed more than once in Deans' Council. It has certainly been discussed with the President. And what you see before you is the latest draft. I hope you have had a chance to read it. It does lay out who is eligible, how often the individual is eligible, the process that would be used to consider educational leave, and some forms that that helped make that a little bit more understandable. It also, I think, provides some lead time because one of the other problems that we had quite frankly with the educational leave as it stood was that we were sometimes putting departments in a bit of a bind. Sometimes chairs, and I do not know how this happened, but sometimes chairs were not as aware as they might have been of who was coming up for educational leave. So we found ourselves actually shorting some departments where more educational leaves had been given than probably were prudent in a certain time. Not that the educational leaves were not appropriate, but simply the spacing of them made it somewhat difficult for departments. This document is really trying to put some structure around that. I don't know, Dean Whitt, is there anything else you would like to say?

Candy Schille (CLASS): I actually have two questions. One is, when one signs off on these, do the several levels of recommendation or non-recommendation include providing the applicant with a rationale especially when the recommendation is denied? That is my first question. Next one is, if the endorsement or the recommendation is denied at one level, say at the department chairs', does the process stop? Or may the applicant seek recommendation at a higher level?

Fred Whitt (Dean, CHHS): I do not know that we actually addressed appeals, if you will, but we were really just trying to get something on paper that we could discuss.

Candy Schille (CLASS): How about rationales then for the choice?

Fred Whitt (Dean, CHHS): This was all part of, I think, Chancellor Portch's initiative on faculty development. Part of this had to do with the institution spending a certain percentage of their budget toward faculty development, had to do with the post-tenure review process, and also had to do with establishing educational leaves. It was interesting even though I had some institutional memory my dean colleagues did not know we had an educational leave policy, and many of the faculty did not know that either, so we pretty much started from scratch and tried to look at what others were doing, both in the System and also our peer institutions. To do these things, you have to be able to facilitate leave with a schedule, so the faculty chair needs to understand who is interested in coming up and whether they can facilitate the faculty leave--can the classes be covered, etc. The Dean would need to be aware of that as well, and the Provost. I am not sure I heard your question, but I thought it was, why do we have those levels?

Candy Schille (CLASS): Basically two questions.

Fred Whitt (CHHS): Okay.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Big hot SPC word these days is *accountability*. What kind of accountability does the administrator have for making a choice up or down on the candidate's application? That is one thing. Is there any rationale say in writing? And then the other thing is the appeals process. I do not know if you want one, but I was just wondering should we have one.

Fred Whitt (CHHS): Well, I would assume everything is appealable on all decisions made at the department level, and I think we were constructing this as a document to try to facilitate these, not to be punitive toward who can and who cannot. But, if you did have five people there would have to be some sort of level, at the department level. No, as a small ad hoc committee, we did not get into what levels would decide

this one would be and this one would not. (Just as we don't dictate how much travel fund is available to faculty. Each department does that individually.) We certainly could go back and take a look at that.

Candy Schille (CLASS): That would be great. Thank you.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): I am wondering whether it is conceivable that everyone who applied for the leave might actually be granted it, or is there some cap or limit that the institution has?

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): Yes, Mike, I think that these have to be considered within the budgetary realities that we have. But I do not know that we have ever been punitive at all about not granting these. There has been in the past a process in which one wrote a proposal, and that proposal was considered by the Faculty Development Committee, and then it was signed off on, but prior to that the proposal had a recommendation certainly from a department chair and a Dean as well. Part of what we are really trying to do is put some better structure around it so that we do not have a whole slew of people inadvertently applying for leave and draining a department in a semester so that the work of the department cannot happen. Also, we certainly want to provide as many of these as we can, but it has to be within budget guidelines. If you will note, there is an extra group that is going to be looking at this, and that is a college group, a group at the college-level. The reason for that was that we sometimes had people on the Faculty Development Committee who would look at a proposal, and, if there was no one on the committee who was familiar with a specific discipline, there was sometimes a question as to how to evaluate that particular proposal. We want to add that college step to be sure that there is some review by one's peers. I do not know if that got after your question.

Fred Whitt (CHHS): There is not a separate budget for educational leaves. There is not a separate Foundation budget or a separate University budget just for these. The way they are funded is you may pick up an extra class, or you may try to cover a class, or if you know ahead of time maybe there will be some temp money available or part-time money available to help offset this, and then hopefully when your turn comes around the same thing will happen. For some reason, there seemed to be a perception from Steve, and talking with the other faculty members, that folks did not know we had an opportunity to do it, and those that did thought it was on hold, and we were not allowed to do it, and, frankly, there just had not been any applications. So we thought by getting something out and kind of reigniting this we would generate some interest among the faculty and try to encourage this.

Mary Hazeldine (COBA): I would like to know if the phrase "enhancing teaching" in the

introduction could be put back in, please?

Fred Whitt (CHHS): I guess it could be. We discussed that. We literally decided to go with the language exactly from the Board of Regents Policy Manual, and it is written word-for-word this way. We did not mean that it would be exclusive of teaching. I think you are talking about where it talks about "promoting scholarly work and encouraging professional development." That is exactly out of the Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 802.0804, word-for-word. We just were trying to be consistent with that, but certainly it would be to enhance teaching, scholarship, etc.

Mary Hazeldine (COBA): Well, considering that we have a primary mission of teaching, I would like to see it in.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): I notice that there is a time line for when faculty should apply, but there is no time line for feedback, so there is nothing outlined here as to when the department chair, Dean, or Provost's office will reply to the faculty about whether they have been approved or not.

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): Good point.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Last thing. I know there is no punitive intent at all, but when I see a sentence like "Educational leave is awarded to highly productive faculty who demonstrate academic excellence," then I would like a rationale, as to why, say if I applied for this, I either was considered one of those or was not. So a rationale would be very nice.

Fred Whitt (CHHS): Of why the language is as is?

Candy Schille (CLASS): All I really want is for the people that pass on the recommendation to their higher ups, at every level to provide some kind of a written rationale for their choice.

Fred Whitt (CHHS): I understand.

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): Good point.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): And a system of what those choices are based on, so we will know not just why they were turned down, but what we should include and why we should include it.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I think for many opportunities on campus we have, for

instance, if you apply for a Faculty Research grant, you can go over to the Faculty Research office, and look at successful proposals, and the like. I was hoping that part of instituting the revision of this Educational Leave Policy would be some mechanism for that kind of assistance for the faculty member applying--looking at particularly good proposals or that sort of advice. This is going to be administered by the Faculty Development Committee to make its recommendations to the Provost, is that correct?

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): Yes, but also, once again, remembering that there will be a college committee also that would look at this, and so I guess my question to you would be since we are having this discussion about, the final form that this might take, would those examples be best if they were discipline-specific? In other words, available at a college rather than a University, because I would think that sometimes proposals that you might look at from Information Technology, for example, might not be suitable or good models for you.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Yes, I think most likely that would probably be true. I want to point out a couple of real advantages to this proposal as I know I had to wait ten years to get my first educational leave, and you no longer have to under this system, and I think that is good. There has been heretofore nothing specified about when you can apply for another one. And I know that there are people who have gotten them say after three years, second ones, so I think it is a good idea to have the seven-year cycle written in the document. I would also like to say that I think that when this proposal is in its final form that the Senate should probably vote to endorse it, or not endorse it.

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): I think that's a very good point. One of the reasons that it was brought for discussion is that there would be some very good suggestions to be incorporated, so thank you.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): So if someone were contemplating applying for this next year, is there a time frame in terms of when this might take effect, and those kinds of things?

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): I think that it would not be that difficult for us to revise according to some of the suggestions that have been made here, and bring this back for the next Senate meeting. What is your thinking on that?

Fred Whitt (CHHS): I would hope so, because I think that the date was like January 10th, the earliest date. June for spring and January for fall, so there would be a lot of

planning by the chair. We really would like to get this implemented, and I would share your comments with Steve as well. Steve is a very valuable member of this committee, and he really led us through, wanting it to be more flexible, not to tie down exactly what should be in a proposal, but to provide some opportunity for some creativity among the faculty, among the projects. So we tried not to be too restrictive in this, and to make it much more faculty friendly, and he was very helpful in that.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator: One thing I might remind people of is Steve Damelin, who is on the committee, is on academic leave this year.

Fred Whitt (CHHS): That is why he wanted to do this.

Patricia Humphrey (COST): Senate Moderator: But, I know from personal experience he will certainly weigh in by email. Are there any other comments on the revised academic leave proposal?

Fred Whitt (CHHS): Thank you.

10. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

11. New Business

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Just one comment on the unfinished business, because it came up in a previous senate meeting that the SGA Representative actually cannot vote in the Senate. They are guests of the senate.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I got an email from Shri Davis about that today, and I did check the University *Statutes*; it says in the *Statutes*, not the *Bylaws*, that the SGA Representative is a voting member. There was a mistake last year.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Now we know that.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator: Yes, it's in the University *Statutes*.

Ming Fang He (COE): Could I add one more request? Could we know how many new positions we have open each year and how many faculty, new faculty we hire and how much money we spend?

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator: You mean for the searches?

Ming Fang He (COE): Yes, because, if I see those figures, I can figure some meaning

out of it.

Pat Walker (CLASS): And just from earlier when you were talking about the lab fees. Is that going to be coming back to the Senate for another vote? Are we going to be re-discussing this? I was not sure what you were talking about.

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): I think there was a vote last year. Correct?

Pat Walker (CLASS): Yes, there was.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator: I think at this point it is more of a question of how does it get administered, as opposed to the idea of going through the committees and everything.

Pat Walker (CLASS): But that is not changing.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator: The question is now more of a case of trying to consolidate. Who is administrating billing them, making sure that students are aware before they sign up that there will be a lab fee and that sort of thing? Any other new business?

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): I've had at least two or three colleagues ask questions about the timing of the Faculty Development Proposals, and the lack of an announcement because Hobson left. I guess normally he sent those announcements out, and these two faculty members were very concerned that the normal process just sort of slipped through the cracks, when he left. And so I wonder if there is a need for perhaps a revised time frame for those proposals because the time line is already passed. The deadline has passed, but I know in the case of the Service Committee that I chair, we do not meet until next month. Maybe there is a more pressing need for the Faculty Development Committee to meet earlier, but I would like to suggest that they meet a little later and then, actually send through the mail, or at least by email the normal invitation proposals.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator: I think the deadline was September 15th.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): Yes, it was something like that, and normally Steve, is his name Steve Hobson?

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator: Eric Hobson

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): Eric, yes. He would normally send out that flyer and it never happened, and so people who had been here for a long time and planned on being able to apply never got the reminder. It apparently was on the web site, but I spent some time myself trying to find the information about each of the different awards. So my request is that if it is at all possible that the first meeting be delayed or supplemented in some way, well, it may have been too late to delay it.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator: Is there anybody who is on Faculty Development who might want to respond to that? I don't have my list.

Kathy Albertson (CLASS): I'm not on it this year, but I was the last two years, and all I can say is, if those dates are there, and that committee is in place, once that deadline is there, we had already set up when we would meet to start reading those, so they have been distributed to the committee's to read, and having read dozens of them, I don't think I would want to be asked to delay and wait for more, but that is just from experience. I am not on the committee this year.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): If I can respond, I feel the same way about the Service stuff, but people need to be able to know and I suspect that since the announcement did not go out there were not as many as normal that came to the committee to begin with.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator: Why not try and make a note and see if we can look into things?

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I just have a point of inquiry. Is there an interim director now at CET? I have not heard if either Raleigh or Steve is sort of acting in that capacity right now since Eric left?

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): Dr. Heaston would you like to address that? Dr. Heaston's actually the supervisor of that group, and so I think she can provide an update for you on that.

Amy Heaston (Provost's Office): What we are doing Barry is we are doing a search that closes October 3rd to get a full-time director in there beginning January 1st, so in the intermediary period of time, what we are doing is dividing responsibilities. They are reporting to me in the interim, because given the late notice, trying to find someone, and pulling someone from faculty for fall semester would have put a hardship back on departments.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Quick question, or maybe long question, but God forbid we have a Katrina event here, and we have to all head North or West, do we know if there is system in place that would deal with us getting paid, if that say happened? If it happens on the 27th of the month and we have to all get out of here, do we know that our paychecks would actually get into the banks and so forth?

Linda Bleicken (Provost and VPAA): I am not going to respond to that. I am going to pass that one to our Business and Finance VP. I think that he can address that.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): Actually, a good question. I am not sure I know the correct answer to it. All this is done electronically, of course, and when the electronic means breakdown, so would your ability to make the electronic transfers. I know that as a result of Katrina and Rita, we are looking again at our emergency preparedness plan, and I think we even plan to do an evacuation type simulation. I will put this on our list to check to see just what our plans are for paychecks. Mostly we have been concerned with the safety of people naturally and I do not think that the actual looking at paychecks has been part of our plan. It is probably an omission we have not checked on, and we will do so.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I just have one more question for Joe, in talking about trying to relieve congestion on campus; do we know how many bicycle spaces we actually have on campus? I don't see many racks around campus. I see a lot of bikes parked next to trees and hooked up to poles.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): I do not know how many we have either, but we do occasional census counts where we count the number of bicycles at the racks and number of spaces that are there. Last year, as I recall, we had ample spaces, but you still would see bicycles parked next to trees and signs. A lot of that is the location of the racks and, of course, if we put a rack everywhere everybody wanted one, we would have racks everywhere. This year, I have asked them to do a bicycle census, and I have not gotten a report on that at this time. But it is something that we do regularly. We count the bikes and empty spaces at peak times, and if we are lacking racks, then we will add racks to those places.

12. Announcements: Vice Presidents

There were no announcements from the Vice Presidents.

13. Announcements from the Floor

There were no announcements from the Floor.

14. Adjournment

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

Respectfully submitted,
Donna Saye, Faculty Senate Secretary

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
October 25, 2005
4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Russell Union Ballroom

**Questions and clarification may be directed to the Office of the Faculty Senate (fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu) or persons identified with each agenda item prior to Senate.

Voting Members in Attendance: Kathy Albertson, David Alley, Spyros Andreou, Barry Balleck, Jean-Paul Carton, Ken Clark, Gustavo Molina for Nirmal Das, Lisa Yocco for Don Fausett, Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Godfrey Gibbison, Tim Giles, Bev Graham, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Ming Fang He, Pat Humphrey, Clara Krug, Gautam Kundu, Ron MacKinnon, Mary Marwitz, Michele McGibony, Bruce McLean, Michael Moore, Kent Murray, John Nauright, Michael Nielsen, Greg Brock for Constantin Ogloblin, Broderick Oluyede, Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Donna Saye, Candy Schille, Iris Durden for Sonya Shepherd, Caren Town, Pat Walker, Jianping Wang, Bill Wells, Linda Mullen for Jerry Wilson, Bill Yang

Voting Members Absent: Leslie Furr, Maggie LaMontagne, Marla Morris, Robert Vogel, Mark Welford

Senate Officers in Attendance: Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee, and Moderator, Faculty Senate; John Nauright (CHHS); Ron MacKinnon (CIT); Richard Flynn (CLASS); Mary Hazeldine (COBA); Michael Moore (COE); Donna Saye (COST); Iris Durden for Sonya Shepherd (LIB); Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) Senate Librarian; Donna Saye (COST) Senate Secretary

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, President; Linda Bleicken, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Joe Franklin, Interim Vice President for Business and Finance; Teresa Thompson, Interim Vice President for Student Affairs; Billy Griffis, Vice President for University Advancement; Jane Rhoades Hudak (CLASS); Ron Shiffler (COBA); Anny Morrobel-Sosa (COST); Bede Mitchell (LIB)

Senate Parliamentarian: Bob Cook

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS) NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative

Strategic Planning Council Representative: Linda Mullen for Jerry Wilson (COBA) Strategic Planning Council Representative

Senate Liaison: Marilyn Bruce (President's Office)

Student Government Representative: Laurie Markle

Visitors:

Nancy W. Shumaker, Lee Davis, Georj Lewis, Jeff McLellan, Patrick Novotny, Jonathan Buckner

1. Approval of the Agenda for the October 25, 2005, Meeting. Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator called the meeting to order and made several announcements prior to hearing a motion for the approval of the minutes. She first announced that alternates should sign next to the senator's name and not in the visitor's section. She then asked senators to please identify themselves and their college affiliations clearly before speaking, for the minutes. She also asked senators, since the senate had a very full agenda, to please keep comments brief and on subject. She then heard a motion that the agenda for October 25, 2005 be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

2. Approval of the [September 26, 2005, Minutes](#). Donna Saye (COST), Senate Secretary, made a motion that the minutes of the September 26, 2005, meeting be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

3. Librarian's Report of [October 17, 2005](#). Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS), Senate Librarian, made a motion that the Librarian's Report of October 17th be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair. Donna Saye (COST) said that the Undergraduate Committee met September 21st, and that the minutes of the meeting in the Librarian's report were accurate. She moved that the senate accept the actions of the Undergraduate Committee. Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, reminded everyone that in approving the actions of the Undergraduate Committee, the senate is making a recommendation on their actions to the President for further action. The Undergraduate report was seconded and approved.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair. Richard Flynn (CLASS) said that the Graduate Committee met electronically on September 15th and approved a course revision in Nursing, took note of a selected topic announcement, and approved a program revision change in the admission index for the College of Business Administration. He moved that the actions of the Graduate Committee be approved. The motion was seconded and the Graduate Committee report and recommendations were approved.

4. President's Report: Bruce Grube, President: Thanks, Pat. Good afternoon everybody.

- ✓ **Henderson Library:** You will recall that approximately 103,000 square feet is being added to our library. The structural steel erection and the roof trusses are

100% complete. The completion of Phase I, the addition, is June of 2006.

- ✓ ***Fine Arts Phase III:*** This project was approved a little more than a year ago, and it will include art galleries, faculty offices for Art, and a black box theatre. Construction is now scheduled to start in March of 2006. It will be next to the Pittman School--where the Art Department is.
- ✓ ***RAC Expansion:*** The expansion is moving along very rapidly. The pool is now being dug. The completion date on the RAC expansion, which will also include indoor pools, is December of 2006.
- ✓ ***Herty Renovation:*** Renovation of the first floor of the Herty Building, where Geology and Geography are located, is under way. The completion date is estimated to be March of 2006.
- ✓ ***Parking and Transportation:*** The Parking and Transportation building, being built behind Landrum (off of Chandler Road), is going to be ready for move in November 15th.
- ✓ ***Veazey Hall:*** We expect a design completion on that building this December. The major occupants for Veazey will be Communication Arts.
- ✓ ***Lupton Building:*** We have some new projects funded by private donations. The first is the Lupton building. The building will be demolished, and there will be a new field house built in its place. The Lupton building (funded by Morris Lupton, who was in the convenience store business) is actually two Time Savers stacked on top of each other. We have no idea whether anybody did the structural engineering studies to figure out whether in fact that should have happened, but it did. When the football season is over the Lupton building will be demolished, and in January the construction of the new field house will begin. It will just about double the size of the current Lupton building.
- ✓ ***Alumni House:*** The second one is a new Alumni House and Alumni Center. The site for that on Akins Boulevard, on the other side of the boulevard from the RAC. That building will house the Foundation, the Alumni Association, and a couple of other functions.
- ✓ ***Homecoming:*** We had a lot of folks on campus. It was a real pleasure to talk with our alums from the '30s, and '40s. We have a very active '50s and '60s alumni group. There were numerous events including the 1906 Society Gala, which featured Bob Newhart. It was entertaining and fun. Teresa Thompson and Student Affairs sponsored a fireworks show at 8:30 Friday night over at Clements baseball stadium, and it was one of the better firework shows I've ever seen. If you have children or family, keep an eye out for that next Homecoming. I think you will really enjoy that.
- ✓ ***Some miscellaneous things.*** I am currently meeting over breakfast with new

faculty. We have some extremely bright new folks, and a very diverse group of new folks on the campus. I think supporting them and nourishing them is going to be really important. It has been extremely enjoyable.

- ✓ **GSU opera.** Mozart's *The Marriage of Figaro*, Act II, will be playing at the Averitt Center. Tamara Watson-Harper has done some really nice things, and I think this will be one of them at the Arts Center downtown.
- ✓ **Volleyball.** GSU will be playing at Furman and then at Wofford this weekend, and the football Eagles are at South Dakota State University.
- ✓ And in the back of the room is your former Parliamentarian, one Jeff McLellan, who is on his way to Southern Illinois University, so Jeff, I suspect this is probably the last Senate meeting that you will sit in. We thank you for all of your help over the years here. Thanks.

5. Report from Patricia Humphrey, Chair, Senate Executive Committee:

I would also like to thank Jeff for all of his support. The next item of business is the Senate Executive Committee report. Since the last Senate meeting, there were two information requests.

One request was from Michael Moore who asked further about the technology fees, "Were policies and procedures posted? What was the composition of the committee? And could colleges receive a fixed or proportional amount based on numbers of majors?" There is a [web page](#) containing the guidelines and procedures, which is under the Provost's Student web page. It lists both their guiding principles and their formal procedures, as well as has the actual form for putting in a request. The committee itself is comprised of six students: the SGA president; the Vice President for Academic Affairs; and 4 other students named by the SGA President. They represent a number of different majors. There are also six administrators and faculty on the committee. Additional information on priorities for allocation was given by Dr. Bleicken. In addition to the key criteria of the number of students served and the learning outcomes achieved, this year's requests will also be categorized according to the following:

1. Replacing failed technology equipment;
2. Required maintenance. (For example, having a supply of bulbs on hand; Bulbs for some of these projectors are very expensive. Lab supplies are expensive as well);
3. Upgrades, particularly to address curricular requirements; and
4. Purchasing new technology.

A list of everything requested and everything funded for the past three fiscal years was provided to the Senate in a spreadsheet.

A second request came from Barbara Hendry, Sue Moore, and others. They submitted an RFI about the due dates for the Faculty Development funds request that was discussed at last month's Senate meeting. Basically, they wanted to know if the deadline

could be extended. I conferred with Dr. Amy Heaston, the Associate Provost, and Bill Yang, the Chair of the Faculty Development Committee. Dr. Heaston said that she had well publicized the deadline to new faculty. In addition, the committee did not feel that an extension was warranted in light of a typical number of proposals. Dr. Heaston did request an additional link to [General Internal Faculty Grant Opportunities](#) from the faculty/staff web page. That has been done and is in place.

Additional information on Ming Fang He's request about terminations was provided. There was a very interesting report that categorized (for the last six year) reasons for termination, retirement, voluntary, involuntary, death, by rank of faculty. There was also information provided in terms of recruitment expenses. This year 77 new faculty members were recruited which averaged approximately \$3773 each, with an additional \$108 spent for the new faculty orientation in August. Additional monies spent for mentoring through the years provided at the college and department level are unfortunately uncategorizable.

Agenda requests: There are three agenda requests. The SEC met October 18th to discuss these. Michael Moore submitted an agenda request about clear publication of student course and lab fees. That request is agenda item #9 on today's agenda. Linda Bleicken submitted an agenda request for approval of the proposed revision to the Academic Leave Policy that was discussed last month. That item is #10 on today's agenda. Barry Balleck submitted a request to further discuss online student evaluations in light of the discussion about this topic and evaluations in general which took place on the Senate Listserv last month. Michael Moore volunteered to check with Bryan Griffin and others on the committee that developed the current form. He prepared a small history, which was also posted on the web. The item about discussing online student evaluations is #11 on today's agenda. The SEC again discussed the resignation of Jeff McLellan, as University Attorney and Senate Parliamentarian. Sonya Shepherd suggested Bob Cook from CIT as Parliamentarian, and he has agreed to serve. His ratification is #8 on today's agenda. And one last item at this point, according to the Bylaws, we will be having an election next month to select the 2006-2007 Senate Moderator and SEC Chair. Anyone wishing to volunteer to run for the position must be a current Senator, with at least one year remaining on the term. If anyone would like to volunteer, please contact me. Thank you.

Are there any questions?

Michael Moore (COE): I wanted to make a comment, if I might, on the technology fees, and I appreciate the information that we did receive in response to my request. I brought this up on behalf of a number of faculty members from the College of Education, and I don't know that the response we have received really gets at a couple of the issues that prompted the request. 1) Faculty representation. Pat Humphrey (COST; Senate Moderator) said that there is a faculty member on that committee. Well, there is a department chair on that committee, and the rest of the committee is made up of administrators. There are six students, and these are there by Board of Regents' mandate from 2003. None of those students represent the College of Education, and none of the others on the committee represent the College of Education. Furthermore,

some figures that we generated show that the College of Education has generated \$856,000 in fees, student fees, from its students. We have requested \$124,000 in terms of the proposals for funds. We have received \$9,500 over the three years of the funding cycles that are two per year, and I think the awards are going to be announced tomorrow for the 2006 fiscal year. And our concern is that we wonder if this structure is still serving the University as well as it might. And one of the items that we asked about was whether or not there should be a fixed amount that goes to every college from the fees that their students generate. And this is something that that we hope the committee would consider, especially for us in the College of Education, where we have received so little funds. We feel that if we receive say 20 or 30% of the funds our students generated that we would be able to assess our needs to our own technology committee, and apply those funds where we feel they are needed. A number of departments have received (smaller departments than the whole College of Education) quite a bit of money. Biology, for instance, has received \$64,000. Writing and Linguistics has received \$75,000. COBA has received \$242,000. IT Services has received over a million dollars. Our college has only received \$9,500. I think that our request for information really wanted to see if the committee could possibly address these concerns further down the line.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I will respond briefly. There has been an awful lot of information already shared with the Senate on this. If you will recall, some criteria that are used to distribute these funds, and remember there are six students that sit on this committee all the time, and that student representation varies from year to year, so I dare say that at some point we have had a representative from the College of Education. Sometimes we simply do not have someone on the Senate perhaps who is chosen for that specific role. One of the major criteria for funding is the number of students served. When you see a large amount of money like the amount that was given to the College of Business Administration for funding computer labs, it was awarded based on student accessibility. There are three large computer labs in the College of Business that are open very late and that are staffed with lab assistants. Students from anywhere on the campus can access not only the Library, which is open many hours, but also the College of Business. The labs are not restricted to only College of Business students. The students on the committee find two criteria to be very powerful in considering proposals: What is the accessibility, and how many students are served? The proposals are extensive. They go out to the committee, which has sufficient amount of time to review them. We sit down as a committee and make the determination. One of the reasons that there are as many administrators, I suppose, on the committee is simply that they provide a slightly more global perspective. Some of these administrators who are on the committee are maybe quasi administrators. For example, a representative from Auxiliary Services who also represents the University Housing interest. There are many labs that we have now in our housing units, and so that is very good representation for student interests. Lisa Spence, CIO, sits on the committee. She also provides a global perspective. If there is a question about the amount of money that is devoted on this committee to IT Services, once again, remember that is a global sort of expense. That goes to serve the whole campus and the students who are here on the whole campus. So those are just some thoughts that I have in responding. You know, certainly the committee has not yet met this year. We meet twice a year. We meet in the

fall to make the initial allocations, and that is the largest amount of money that is allocated during the year. We meet again in the spring to allocate any monies that are remaining, and then any monies that are sitting there also go during the rest of the summer to address needs that inevitably come up. Some of you may remember a few years ago, I think it was two years ago, we had the exploding projector bulbs in some of our smart classrooms, and so there was a need to replace those for life safety issues. Those are some ways that these dollars are used, and we really try to take a look at how do we serve student need with this fee. Thank you.

Laurie Markle (SGA): In reference to College of Education representation on the Student Technology Committee, I received information from our President Shri Davis yesterday that there will be a College of Education Senator there to take my place tomorrow. I am not going to be able to attend the meeting tomorrow because I will be giving a presentation in Dr. Graham's class. The College of Education Senator will be there because there has been information shared about the College of Education concerns about lack of representation.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): If we are talking global representation, then I think we need to have the part of the globe that is made up by colleges and by the faculty also represented. One can have such a large view that one loses sight of what is going on in the trenches. I think that very often faculty members in departments and colleges are a little closer to the needs of their colleges, and I think that a little better representation of faculty from various colleges might help somewhat in the distribution of the funds.

Candy Schille (CLASS): As I understand it, this is a University committee, not a Senate committee in any way? [Someone replied: Correct.] Candy then continued by saying that the only thing that we can do is sort of suggest, hope, pray, etc., etc.?

Pat Humphrey ((COST) and Senate Moderator): That would be my impression.

Candy Schille (CLASS): You know, it really looks to me like Linda's answers were pretty good, but it still looks to me like Michael's remarks are very compelling. Insofar as what this body can do, it does not look like much. Linda talked about the two meetings that the committee is going to have, and it sounds like they are going to have a really full agenda on those days. So if the committee was willing to, perhaps they might take another look at their organization, their priorities, and at what seems like a pretty convincing inequity in numbers. Maybe they need to have a third meeting--just a suggestion.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Point taken.

6. Report from Jerry Wilson (COBA), SPC Representative: Linda Mullen, reporting in Jerry Wilson's absence, announced that Dr. Wilson had class, so he could not attend the senate meeting today. The University's Strategic Planning Council has met twice since the last Senate meeting. The September 28th meeting began with a discussion of Level II Strategic Plans with their importance to the overall strategic planning process on campus. After considerable discussion members agreed that all

nine of the Level II plans should be reviewed by both the SPC and the President's Cabinet for clarity, consistency in coverage of the six strategic themes. Stephen Ward, Director of Marketing and Communications then provided members with an overview of the staff and functions of the Office of Marketing and Communications. He indicated that he is working to clarify staff responsibilities within the unit and to strengthen connections between the unit and the University community by assigning staff members to specific areas of the University. Current academic year priorities for staff include: facilitating enrollment management and the university advancement; expanding university involvement within the service region; and updating our marketing tools, including the University Web Site, and all print publications. The October 12th meeting opened with an overview of the RAC activities and an update on the RAC expansion that is underway. Gene Sherry, Director of Campus Recreation and Intramurals, provided a detailed description of the new facility. The new RAC will include 18,000 square feet of fitness space, both indoor and outdoor pools, an 8,000 square foot Wellness Center, and a new climbing wall. Completion of the expansion is scheduled for December of 2006. Co-chair Trey Denton reported that evidence based-decision making (EBDM) worksheets have been submitted by all campus divisions. The next step will be to review and evaluate the worksheets and provide feedback to the unit. While the SPC has played a major role in evaluating institutional effectiveness plans over the past two years, the focus now needs to shift to building linkage between strategic planning and assessment activities. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Linda Bleicken then provided an update on the activities of the Academic Affairs division. Issues she discussed include: academic program review, faculty roles and rewards, professional development opportunities, and research funding. She noted that the NCAA Reaffirmation process has been finalized and that the SACS Reaffirmation outcome will be communicated to us in December of this year. She then identified the following important strategic issues and challenges: assessment documentation and EBDM, the retention, progression, and graduation initiative of the University System. Provost Bleicken concluded her report by encouraging the SPC to provide input and support as the academic year progresses. Thank you.

7. Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic

Representative: One of the most pleasurable aspects of being the Faculty Athletic Rep, is that I sit in with the Student-Athlete Advisory Board, which is mandated by the NCAA, and they are a great group of young people. And I thought what I would do today is share with you some of the projects that they are involved with, that they have identified as service projects for the year, so that you can tell them way to go, keep up the good work. Some of the project ideas, listed below, were sent to me in an e-mail from Kim Wollett, who is the President of that group:

- ❖ They are volunteering to build houses with Habitat for Humanity.
- ❖ They raised over \$500 for Hurricane Katrina relief, and we signed the card and sent that check off last night.
- ❖ They are talking about doing reading day at all of the elementary schools — ones in the Bulloch County area.

- ❖ They are doing Holiday Helpers Christmas gifts for less fortunate children in Bulloch County.
- ❖ They are doing Relay for Life Cancer Walk, \$100 per team raised, and all plan to participate in the walk--with several different teams.
- ❖ They are working the hospitality rooms for the volleyball conference tournament, which is coming up in November. Georgia Southern's hosting the Southern Conference Volleyball Tournament. If any of you plan to go to that please know that it is a Southern Conference event, not a Georgia Southern event, and you will be charged admission to get in to that. It is really cheap--\$12 gets you an all tournament pass, so please pass that on to your colleagues.
- ❖ They are volunteering to work at the track conference tournament.
- ❖ They are helping with the Ronald McDonald Aluminum Can Tabs Drive. They are collecting those little tabs off of aluminum cans. When they donate them to the Ronald McDonald Foundation, every 1,000 tabs gets a child with cancer one hour of free chemotherapy. So I am certainly going to try to bug my colleagues in the Com Arts Department to start putting our tabs in a dish and help them out that way. I would appreciate it if any of you could do the same in your departments on campus, so we can help these kids make a really positive impact.
- ❖ They are also going to have a GSU Olympics, where they will have events like a spoon race, team against team, and they have plans for a couple of other things like that. That concludes my report. Thank you.

8. Ratification of Parliamentary nominee: Bob Cook (CIT): Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Our next item of business is confirmation of a new senate Parliamentarian. As was mentioned earlier, Jeff McLellan has served as Parliamentarian since about 1999. He is leaving for Southern Illinois. Senate *Bylaws* state that the SEC shall appoint a Parliamentarian who must be confirmed by a majority vote of the full body.

Ron MacKinnon (CIT) nominated Bob Cook to be ratified by the Senate for Parliamentarian. The nomination was seconded. Bob Cook was then voted to be the new Senate Parliamentarian.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Congratulations, Bob, you are now officially Parliamentarian.

Bob Cook (CIT): To be condemned to listen and never speak is the ultimate compliment.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The next item of business is a motion on

University Course or Lab Special Fees from Michael Moore.

9. Motion “[University Course or Lab Special Fees](#),” Michael Moore (COE): I move that for the University courses or labs that have special fees that students must pay, the fee amount be disclosed in the section comment screen (SSATEXT) on WINGS. Courses with flexible fees must disclose that a flexible fee is assessed and display the actual fee charged from the prior semester of the course or lab offering. The motion was seconded.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Michael, as maker of the motion you get the floor first.

Michael Moore (COE): Thanks. Currently, unless it is a PA class, students really have no idea whether or not a fee is assessed in the class or the lab. It does not show up on the registration schedule. I talked to the Registrar about this, and he said that they are upgrading and hoping to get the software that would put the fee on the registration form that students have when they register. For the time being this motion would let the students know when they go to register on WINGS that there is a fee for a particular class or lab, and that fees are not covered by HOPE Scholarships. This would allow students a better opportunity to both plan their schedules and their budgets.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Point of information. The fee on the SSATEXT screen will show when students search the schedule. Hearing no other discussion, Dr. Humphrey called for a vote, and the motion carried by voice vote. She then stated that the next item of business was a motion from Dr. Bleicken to approve proposed revisions to the Educational Leave Policy.

10. Motion “[Revised Educational Leave Policy](#),” Linda Bleicken, Provost and VPAA: I think you have a copy of this, and the text that has been changed or added is in red. There were several suggestions that were made last month when I brought this for discussion, and I bring it forward today I hope for endorsement by this group. Maybe if we just start from the top and work down I can share with you what was changed and why.

- ✓ The suggestion was made to add enhanced teaching back into the policy, and so that has been done.
- ✓ If we drop down to the next red spot, you see that a statement regarding feedback for faculty has been added to the policy. It was suggested that if a proposal were not recommended at any administrative level, the faculty member should be given feedback as to why it was not recommended.
- ✓ Also that section addresses the question of whether a proposal would be forwarded to the next step if it were not recommended at any administrative level.
- ✓ There was also a question about the timeline for reviewing submitted proposals,

and so if you look at the next page under timeline, there are some dates that have now been inserted that specify the timeline.

- ✓ And, finally, we were asked whether successful proposals would be made available for review so that someone thinking about submitting one would have that information. We will make those available for review upon request.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Thanks for making all of the changes. Would it be a good idea to have the document state that written feedback should be provided to a faculty member?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Yes. Unfortunately Dr. Heaston, who was on the committee, is out today because of an illness in her family, and Dean Whitt, who was chairing the committee, is not here. I truly think that is what they intended in the wording of the document.

Candy Schille (CLASS): So, could we just assume that that will be changed to written?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Do you want to assume it, or do you want to amend the motion?

Candy Schille (CLASS): I would like to move that the language be changed to “written feedback will be provided to a faculty member throughout the process.” The motion to amend was seconded and discussion began on the amendment.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I think that the intention here was not to provide extensive written feedback, but rather, something that would indicate the proposal has been to this level and has not gone on or it has been to this level and has been passed on. It was really more of a tracking mechanism I believe.

Candy Schille (CLASS): I’m totally cool with that. I just would like to have something written in the case that somebody is turned down; something explaining why, not merely that it has been turned down, but why.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Well, I have a concern about making a commitment of that sort, because of the different levels that the proposal will go through. It is not simply going through administrative levels; it is also going through a faculty review committee. It will go through a university-wide one and a college-wide one. I am hesitant to make commitments on behalf of such committees.

David Alley (CLASS): I would just like to echo that comment, because the document says, “throughout the process.” I think just inserting “written” in that particular sentence does not quite work, because that would make each of the five steps or six steps accountable in something other than just we received it, and we signed off on it. So perhaps another kind of revision might work better.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): It seems to me, recalling Candy’s comments in the last meeting, that it would also be very good for whoever is reviewing the applications to

provide these feedbacks. I remember one of Candy's comments suggested that two people might apply from the same unit, and you say yes to one and no to the other. Somebody will want to have an explanation. I certainly would want to have an explanation as to why this guy got through and I did not, when we both have the same years of service. So somebody needs to provide some comments that say here is what distinguishes your application from that person's application, etc. I certainly would love to see that.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): Since the issue seems to be not so much feedback to people who are successful, but feedback to people who are not, could we amend it to say "written feedback will be provided to a faculty member whose application is not successful."

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Parliamentarian: We already have one amendment on the floor?

Marc Cyr (CLASS): I thought we passed the amendment?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: No, we haven't.

Bob Cook (Senate Parliamentarian): No, we are still discussing it, but you have the option of treating it as an amendment to the amendment, or with the occurrence of the proposer since it relates to just the same sentence. She could accept the revision to the second part of the sentence

Candy Schille (CLASS): Okay.

Bob Cook (Senate Parliamentarian): And maybe save some time.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Yes, I'll definitely do that. So I'd like it read this way now.

Bob Cook (Senate Parliamentarian): You need to re-read your motion.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Certainly. "Written feedback will be provided to a faculty member whose application is not successful throughout the process."

Bob Cook (Senate Parliamentarian): If it is not successful, it is not successful.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Right, but you could be turned down by a department head, then you could be turned down by your dean, so I want each of the individuals to be accountable, and I know that is a big hassle, but accountability seems kind of good.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Do we need to second that, Bob?

Bob Cook (Parliamentarian): No, because it was a revision of her original amendment, so it has been proposed, seconded, friendly amendment, discussion, and then vote – if there is no discussion.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): Candy, I'm just thinking about tweaking your language. Perhaps it could read, "should be provided to a faculty member who is turned out at any stage of the process?"

Candy Schille (CLASS): That is nice.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: All right. If I understand things correctly, we currently have that first sentence in red on the first page to read "Written feedback will be provided to a faculty member whose application is not successful at any stage of the process." Hearing no further discussion, Dr. Humphrey called for a vote, and the amendment carried. We have now replaced the first sentence in red. We are back to the main motion. Is there any further discussion on the main motion of the Educational Leave Policy?

Bill Yang (COBA): I just have a question about the seven-year eligibility. Does this mean that someone could apply at the beginning of the seventh year or at the end of seven years and in the eighth year?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Faculty would not be eligible to apply until they had completed seven years of service. Does that address your question?

Bill Yang (COBA): Yes. One more comment about the time line. A recommendation is due to the University-level committee by August 1st, but that is during the summer which makes it difficult for the committee to meet.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Officially, contracts begin on August 1st. I do not really think it would be up to that committee to determine when you would meet, but my sense is that it could be sometime fairly soon after August 1st.

Bill Yang (COBA): Thanks.

John Nauright (CHHS): Just a clarification on the time line. If I understood what you just said, a person applying would have to wait until the completion of seven years of service and apply in the eighth year to go in the ninth year. I would think that somebody who is in the process of completing the seventh year could apply to go in the eighth year.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I think that the statement here addresses when one would be eligible to have educational leave. You would have had to have completed seven years of service before you could go on educational leave. So I do not think that precludes someone who is at 6 ½ years thinking about a seventh year from doing that. A good point here though would be at what point does the individual have tenure, and I really do not think that there would be a consideration of these proposals at a point prior to someone's actually having achieved tenure. That is an interpretation on my part, but, once again, unfortunately I am not the one that that did the work on the revisions, so that is my best interpretation for you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator, hearing no other discussion, called for a vote

on the amended motion on Educational Leave. The motion was approved by voice vote.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Thank you for the endorsement of this policy.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The next item of business is a request from Barry Balleck to discuss online student evaluations.

11. Discussion item “[Online Student Evaluations](#),” Barry Balleck (CLASS): I think that if anyone follows the listserv or the Senate discussion list, and I hope you do, there was about a two week flurry of activity on the list during the time between our last meeting and this meeting, containing expression of some very strong sentiments about online student evaluations. I want to make the point that I realize that this is in its formative stages right now, but I think in discussing this matter with members of my own department, with student government leaders and so forth, that there is a lot of confusion about what we are actually trying to accomplish with online evaluations. There is confusion about what these evaluations are actually going to do. Are they simply taking the place of the paper evaluations we have now, or are we trying to do something more? And to me, I think the larger question is whether this is an example of how the Senate has been placed in a reactive rather than proactive situation. Obviously, this is a situation that greatly affects faculty, greatly affects students, and yet, as I understand the process that took place, a committee met last spring with Lisa Spence of IT services, not much was done (as Dr. Humphrey said on the discussion list), and not much was done over the summer. Yet in the Librarian’s Report in September there was a blurb that we are going to start testing this thing. There was absolutely no indication on the part of faculty members or student leaders or students in general as to what these were about. I think there has also been some good subsequent discussion on the list, as David Robinson pointed out. What are we trying to measure? Are we simply going to translate what we have now into an electronic form? Is there something more that we should be trying to measure with these evaluations? Is it something that is going to benefit us in the long run, or are we simply buying into the technology spree that seems to be out there? And I think another thing that concerned me as I began thinking about online evaluations, was that, as I brought this up at the SGA, a student senator came up to me afterwards and stated that it is a great idea as long as students can have access to them as well. The student said that way he/she will not have to subscribe to pickaprof.com. Students can simply see what the evaluations from students here at Georgia Southern say about a professor, and they will be able to make determinations of which class to take and which professors to stay away from based on those evaluations. I think there are some real issues here that we need to discuss and decide regarding how we are going to approach these things, primarily for the reason of being able to inform our colleagues. As I said, the Political Science Department, when I brought this up was absolutely clueless as to what was happening here and quite frankly I have to admit that I was clueless as well. I do not think I had a good understanding as to what we are trying to accomplish with evaluations from our last meeting. That is why I made this item.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Point of information for those of you who may not have noticed it, I did distill all of the emails that crossed my computer and put them in chronological order and had those posted on the senate web page, as well as Dr.

Moore's short history on the process.

David Robinson (CLASS): I think that the effort from Lisa Spence and the administration to streamline the process of evaluations is a good one. I think that electronic solutions are an obvious improvement in a lot of ways. What specifically I'm worried about at this present juncture is that we are about to embark on a test program, if I understand correctly, about how to actually administer these. We have vendors who are coming in trying to sell us solutions, and I think that alone seems problematic in view of the fact that faculty unease, or displeasure about the general state of evaluations was never taken into account in a formal way leading up to this. So I think that we maybe throwing money in a fairly arbitrary direction, if we actually start purchasing solutions for implementing some particular version of evaluations on campus. I think it might be a good time to pause, and maybe appoint a different kind of working group or committee to examine this situation; a Senate ad hoc committee to review the broader context of all those questions that we were just listening to. What are we measuring? How do we want to measure it? How well is the current situation working? So, before we charge off into the brave new world, which I am a card-carrying citizen of (I like it there), I would still like to see some reflection principally from faculty.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I just want to address, as a point of clarification, at least one of your statements, David. I think you raised some very good points. The notion that we were going out and spending a lot of money to do this is one that is not the case. In fact, we have a company that we have contracted with known as TK20, which has been working for the last couple of years with the College of Education. They are also working with us as part of an already in-place contract, which means no additional dollars. They have some additional applications, and this is one of them. And so that was a piece of how this came about, and once again, please understand this was not a conspiracy. It was really an attempt to look at an issue that had arisen primarily because of the security of these documents. We were having some problems with the security of administering evaluations, and that resulted in a question that came before the Deans' Council. It was discussed fully in the Deans' Council, and I am sorry that that did not filter down to you. And we did talk with Lisa about the possibility of looking at a pilot. She worked with a small committee of faculty members on a pilot. The idea was simply that here is another way of administering evaluations. Thank you.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): I just had a couple of thoughts. I thought the Listserv discussion was interesting, useful, and many of you brought up points that I found instructive. I had the opportunity to talk with Bryan Griffin yesterday about his experience with evaluations, and, as was mentioned, he was on the committee or in charge of the committee that came up with the current system, and so he was thoroughly immersed in the process. What I found most interesting about his comments is that for the past several semesters, he has been teaching online courses where all the instruction is online, so the students customarily use that mode of interaction as the class. He said that he was troubled, as I recall, by the fact that in his online classes, only about 30% of the students complete the evaluations. So there is a good statistical reason to be very skeptical of those kinds of data, based on such a small sample of the population. Those are the two main things I thought would be worth contributing to the discussion now.

Gautam Kundu (CLASS): On a lesser note, I would be curious to know how many of our peer institutions or aspiring institutions have done something like this, and with what results?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator): I have no idea.

Ken Clark (COE): Dr. Bleicken has anybody looked at the online courses, and what percentage of the students in the online courses actually fills out evaluations compared to the number of students in the online courses?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I really do not know the answer to that question. I do not think that was part of the charge that Lisa had; it was more of a technical issue. They may have. I just simply do not know the answer to that.

Ken Clark (COE): I was just wondering, because I taught two online courses last semester and had a total of 65 students. I had 3 out of 65, after I told them during one of their online chats about the online evaluations, actually do an online evaluation, and talking to other faculty in the College of Education, that is about norm.

Alice Hall (CHHS): I do not know what the methodology for the pilot would be, but I would think if you give the online evaluation and the written evaluation to the same students and use a secure protocol (because I can understand if it is not given correctly in a written form and you do not secure it, it could be falsified), and then compare those results and see statically whether you are getting the same feedback at least as we were in writing, you would have an idea of whether you are going to get the same information online as you did in written form. So, looking at the methodology of the pilot, I think would be important.

Pat Walker (CLASS): I think my comment goes back to what David Robinson said before about forming an ad hoc committee. I thought I was getting a lot from the discussion we were having. It seems to me at this point that maybe we are putting the cart before the horse. Before we start talking about how to administer the evaluations in a new way, it might make sense to evaluate the content and effectiveness of the current model and to create an effective evaluation model that the faculty feel comfortable with, and then talk about administering.

Ming Fang He (COE): I do have personal experience with online evaluation. I have no objection to doing a pilot project on online evaluations. I do have personal concerns. I can share some of my experiences with online evaluations. Some of the online evaluations were never done with undergraduate students, but with doctoral students. You imagine the doctoral students would be more responsible, but some are adults, and they are not very technology-oriented. So, because of limited technology capabilities, some of the graduate students tended not to do the evaluations.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): We need to know what kind of questions we are going to ask first. That is linked to how we do it--electronically or paper, but they are really two separate issues for consideration. You have to take them in series. Then you have a third issue,

which is how to apply or use the data, for personnel actions or for allowing students to read them, and perhaps not take my classes. How will online evaluations be applied? To whom will the evaluations be available? They are all related issues, but you have to move in a series on this.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): As an economist, I have got to ask to what extent were there problems, or inaccuracies, or tinkering with the previous system? If we are going to spend money, and it seems like we are going that way, to do online evaluations at some point, somebody needs to show that there were grave problems with the previous evaluations to justify spending some money doing that; otherwise, we best use that money to do something else.

Mary Hazeldine (COBA): First of all, Godfrey, there are major problems when you have 65 students and only 3 respond. That is a major problem right there. Now, what I want to know is whether the questions on the online survey will be the same as the ones that we deliver in our classroom. They cannot be. Okay. So, first of all, I would suggest that we pick a cohort of online students and run a factor analysis of some kind of construct validity and look at the reliability of it, so that we can feel good about the content of the questions. The second problem, of course, is even if you have a valid and reliable instrument, how do you get students to fill it out? When I walk into a classroom and administer class evaluations of a colleague of mine, the students are sitting ducks. They fill it out. This is not going to be the case online. So the procedure to fill this out is very important.

Bev Graham (CLASS): I would like to go back to Godfrey's point. I really would feel a whole lot better about this if we could see how widespread the impact of the existing problem is. We heard one situation; one case, but I think it would help us to have some grounding to sort of see and know what kind of problems we have with the current system.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I think what Ken was saying was that the online evaluations did not work; not that the current paper ones did not.

Bev Graham (CLASS): Yes, right, but I would feel better before we continue with this discussion of throwing out the old and trying something new, if we knew exactly what some of the concerns were, what some of the problems were, what the impact of those problems was, how severe they were.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): And paying money for it.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Just to sort of facilitate things, I wonder if David Robinson's idea was not sort of one way to get the ball rolling--have some kind of an ad hoc committee with a carefully drafted charge that would include, for instance, things like Dr. Kundu's suggestion that we look into sister institutions' practices. I think that the handwritten evaluations are of limited use as a measurement of my professionalism frankly, but we have got to have something, so I wonder if David Robinson's idea is a workable one. Or shall we just have more conversation here this evening? Or how do we

want to proceed?

Bob Cook (CIT) Parliamentarian: Agenda item as discussion. So you could limit discussion, go to new business, and then propose to have a committee.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked for a vote to limit discussion and move forward to unfinished business. A vote was taken, and discussion was terminated.

12. Unfinished Business

Ming Fang He (COE) expressed her genuine thanks for the response to her motion made during the summer about how we can retain good faculty members, and foster the advancement of Georgia Southern. She particularly thanked Dr. Linda Bleicken and Dr. Amy Heaston as they did a lot of work, organized a lot of things including a task force to look at the salary bumping system for promotions at Georgia Southern. Dr. Shiffler, chair of that committee, and Dr. Robert Costamiris, from English and Literature, actually did most of the work, but Dr. He was also invited to work on that committee, probably because of the motion she made. Dr. He also thanked those faculty members who, since she made the motion, have expressed support. She urged colleagues to be patient about this because it will need time to make some changes and get approval from the President's Cabinet.

13. New Business

David Robinson (CLASS): I move that we appoint a Senate ad hoc committee to address the following questions:

1. First of all, the current state of evaluation procedures on this campus.
2. The advisability and methodology of implementing that method, or some other method, electronically, and
3. To organize a statistically, scientifically valid study or guarantee that this does take place when this pilot program, which otherwise sounds like its going to be merely a technical exercise, takes place.

I would hope that lots of people from the College of Education who know something about creating surveys, and understanding them would be involved in this. Anyway let's form a committee to discuss all these issues, and also to meet with the existing working group that is constituted by the administrators, Lisa Spence and whoever else.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there a second? All right, we have a motion to appoint an ad hoc committee to examine among other things:

1. The current state of evaluations;
2. The advisability of and methodology of the method of administration, paper versus online; and
3. To organize a statistical validity study, and
4. Confer with the current task force looking at online evaluations.

Is there a discussion?

Michael Moore (COE): I want to underscore what David said, especially in part one, and not think of the evaluation instrument as the sole instrument in how we evaluate teaching. Because when I talked to Bob Haney a few days ago in regard to this matter, one of the things that he mentioned to me that he thought was more important than even the instrument, were the principles of using the results, and at the time the current instrument was adopted, we were we were going through a kind of teaching assessment revival. We had McKeachie on campus. We had department chairs undergoing, I'm sure Dr. Bleicken might remember this, sensitivity training on evaluation and evaluating faculty. And there were a number of principles, some of them included such things as trying to find out what happens if someone who had consistently had high evaluations suddenly started to receive low evaluations. Other results, or other means of evaluation, then the instrument, syllabi, observation by colleagues, and those sorts of things, so I think that for the charge of this committee we've got to be very careful, in how we charge the committee, and also look at you know the broader issue of this instrument being just one component of an assessment.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I have another question, Dr. Humphrey, you said in one of the discussions that there was supposed to be representatives from the software company here on Monday, October 8th to discuss the capabilities of the system if the meeting goes well, further identify processes, and so forth. Did those people show up? Did that meeting occur? Did those things happen?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: To tell you the truth, I haven't heard anything back.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): The software company was on campus. They are on campus for a much broader purpose though than simply to look at online evaluations, as I said before, this company has been working with the College of Education for over two years looking at an electronic way of gathering assessment data. The meeting that they had and I do believe that they had that meeting was one that this was a very small part of. So we did not invite somebody here for the sole purpose of that.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): Okay. Well, I have another question. Along those lines, I mean, when we start talking about assessment data and things like this, I mean, I guess one of the concerns that I have as well is, you know, at what point do we take this information beyond simply using it for evaluation. At what point do we start breaking people down by race, or age, or whatever other criteria we want to do, and maybe somebody wants to do a statistical study on something like this, and that information is out there. What legal ramifications are there to keep that information sacred, if you will, and not only that, I mean, are we all naïve enough to think that that there are no ways to break into these systems, and have, you know, complete security, just as we have had problems in the past with the written ones? I mean, I think that's another thing we need to look at and address. That there's got to be some sort of online security that we can be assured of that these are going to be kept in the purview that they need to be kept. That they are

going to be kept within the realm of who should be looking at them. Are other faculty members going to be able to access these things? Are we going to have to have a passcode to access our own evaluations? Is the chair going to get a hard copy of these, and then he or she is going to discuss these, in our annual evaluations. I mean, I think these are all questions that this task force has to, or this ad hoc committee has to look at. I mean, there obviously are a lot of questions that we need to answer and I think also that I don't know how this wasn't addressed in the motion, but are we going to proceed with this, you know, pilot study, if you will, in the light of the, this ad hoc committee, if in fact it is formed.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Again, we are talking as if we're going there, we're talking about results of a process as if we're going there without anybody saying why, and what the cost is going to be, and whether or not it's justified, and what I'm basically saying, to be plain about it, is if one guy cheats on his evaluation in one hundred years should we run out and change the system, that's all I'm asking. If it's two guys who cheated on their evaluations in thirty years, is it worth go completely in another direction? I would like for somebody to say, what exactly, how widespread and deep are those problems?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Candy

Candy Schille (CLASS): Call the question.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Okay, the question has been called. That's not debatable, and requires a two-thirds vote. All those in favor of calling the question, please raise your hand. Motion carries. All right. So as I have it the motion before us is that the Senate, that we shall appoint a Senate ad hoc committee charged with the following:

1. Examine the current state of evaluations;
2. Look at the advisability and methodology of different modes of administration;
3. Organize a statistical validity study, and
4. Meet with the current online task force.

All those in favor of the motion, please say aye. All those opposed? Thank you. The motion passes. The SEC had discussed this issue at our meeting last week, and we had already envisioned forming an ad hoc committee. Thank you, David. Mary Hazeldine with lots of experience in statistical studies and marketing research has agreed to chair the task force. And we will look at expanding that with a good cross section of other colleges and possibly some student representation as well. Does that meet the approval of the body? Is there any other new business?

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): I'm not quite sure where this falls, but I did ask the last time about if we got blown away by a Katrina if we are going to get paid and what the system is that's in place, and I'm hoping that at some point we get a feedback on that. And also I have one additional question. I know there's a committee out there looking at the sort of

raises that we get when we get promotions and so forth, and I'm not sure if there's a timeline for that report to come back to us.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I think that's what Ming Fang was referring to earlier. That the committee has been formed, and she's on it. Is that what you were talking about?

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Right, if there's a timeline for the report to come back to the Senate, so that we'll know?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Would you like to address the question, Ming Fang?

Ming Fang He (COE): I think I'll let Dr. Dean Shiffler answer that question; it's more appropriate.

Dr. Ron Shiffler (Dean, COBA): Godfrey, thank you for your question. Our committee has completed its preliminary work. We have a draft prepared and I believe by the next Senate meeting, we will have a report here. I would say we're 98% finished.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I understand Joe Franklin under Vice President's reports is prepared to answer your other question.

Ming Fang He (COE): I do have one more request, which is a follow-up on my previous motion. If it is possible, I'm not saying the President's Cabinet has to take immediate action, I do understand it takes time, but hopefully we will see it happen soon. If the President's Cabinet can look into the following possibilities: look into the equity of salary of faculty members across the campus. The reason I say that is as I understood since I came to Georgia Southern, a lot of faculty members have been working here more than ten years and started with a very low salary, and now days the starting salary is getting higher and higher because of challenging the job market. I'm not saying those faculty at a higher pay, or higher starting salary, should get underpaid, that's not my point. They deserve to get a good pay, and because there is a difference between disciplines. But I do want the President's Cabinet to look into this issue very soon to bring up those salaries of faculty members who have stayed here for a long time, and who also were very much underpaid throughout the years, and they have no chance to bring up their salary, and if that's possible. That's my request.

Bruce Grube (President): Ming Fang I appreciate your request of the Cabinet. That's not going to be a Cabinet action though. That will be something that academic affairs can take a look at, however. The second part is to remember we have a merit system. And so you would assume in a merit system you wouldn't necessarily have everybody advancing at exactly the same pace. However, I think there are some other complications out here, as well. Salary compaction, you know, is one of our issues we've gotten. We've got some disciplines that are extremely market driven, like Accounting, for example. There are others that are not so much market driven, so there are any number of variables that need to be taken into account when we look to see whether or not faculty salaries are

distributed equitably and fairly, and the Provost does have an interest in that, but that is also something that has to be done carefully, and, as you well know, cannot be done in any immediate sense, but, yes, that that's on the agenda.

Ming Fang He (COE): Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there any other new business? Reports from the vice presidents? I know Joe Franklin has some information for us.

14. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Mr. Joe Franklin (VPBF): To the question of what would happen to us if we were hit with a catastrophe such as Hurricane Katrina: our payroll is run at the University of Georgia in Athens. So if something hits Statesboro, it would rely on what happens in Athens. If something hits Athens, the payroll is run at the University of Georgia, but is also backed up at the OIIT office, which is in Athens, probably 10 or 12 miles away from the campus, so they have a redundancy of information there from which to provide information for payroll. Both offices have emergency generators to run in case of some sort of catastrophe. In the worst case that Athens got hit very hard, then Georgia Southern would be able to produce a manual payroll, so I feel like as much as we can have it covered, we have it covered. Another question that was asked last month was to take a study of bicycle racks, and we did that. We found out that we have plenty of racks on campus, but they're not always in the right place. We have, I'll give you a few numbers because I like numbers so much. We have 260 racks on campus, with a capacity of 1,820 bikes in those racks. We have about 1,056 bikes that we counted in those racks. That's 58%. However, if you go to certain locations you will find that that does not hold true for certain locations. Particularly, all the residence halls were very tight in the amount of bikes versus bike racks. We probably need to take a look and add a few to nearly all of the residence halls. In the academic corridor, we found the following buildings that had capacity issues: the Administrative Annex, the Biology Building, the IT Building, the MPP Building, Technology Building. Also we found that Ceramics Studio has no bicycle racks, so I guess they have a capacity issue as well. Also, by counting bicycles that were locked to trees, or posts, or any number of things, we find that location is a problem, and most of those same locations with the exception of Biology, had location problems, so we're going to be working on adding a few bike racks in specific locations, moving some bicycle racks around and trying to make sure we have them in the appropriate location. So I appreciate that question; if anybody wants to see all the numbers just see me and I'll provide you with a long spreadsheet of numbers showing you where bikes are and where the racks are.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Are there any other announcements from vice presidents?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): This is really just to thank several of you and to keep you informed as well. A number of you in this room have received a survey recently that has come under my name, I think, and perhaps the President's name as well, asking you to provide us some feedback as it relates to our First Year Experience, here on campus, and

so we are very grateful we have a response rate that is already quite good on that one. This is not a survey that's being done haphazardly, its part of the process of the Foundations of Excellence. We are one of 13 schools that has been chosen to participate in this, and the express purpose is to review our current First Year Experience processes, and basically to do a self-study of them, with the ultimate goal that those will be not only reviewed but enhanced and improved. The first stage of this obviously is to get feedback to find out how we are doing currently, and that is being achieved through faculty at the moment. The next stage of this will be to do that same sort of feedback from students, and you'll be happy to know that is not an online survey, but rather an in class survey that's going to be done in our Writing and Linguistics English 1101 classes, so that will be proceeding, but I did want to take a moment and just update you that that is going on and to thank those of you who have participated. Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Are there any other announcements from vice presidents? Announcements any from the floor? May I have a motion to adjourn? Is there a second? All in favor. We stand adjourned at 5:31 pm.

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
November 14, 2005
4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Russell Union Ballroom

**Questions and clarification may be directed to the Office of the Faculty Senate (fsoffice@georgiasouthern.edu) or persons identified with each agenda item prior to Senate.

Voting Members in Attendance: Kathy Albertson, David Alley, Barry Balleck, Jean-Paul Carton, Ken Clark, Nirmal Das, Don Fausett, Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Leslie Furr, Godfrey Gibbison, Bev Graham, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Ming Fang He, Pat Humphrey, Marc Cyr for Clara Krug, Gautam Kundu, Margaret LaMontagne, Ron MacKinnon, Mary Marwitz, Michele McGibony, Bruce McLean, Judi Robbins for Michael Moore, Kent Murray, Michael Nielsen, Constantin Ogloblin, Broderick Oluyede, Norman E. Schmidt for Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Donna Saye, Candy Schille, Sonya Shepherd, Caren Town, Robert Vogel, Pat Walker, Jianping Wang, Mark Welford, Linda Mullen for Jerry Wilson, Bill Yang

Voting Members Absent: Spyros Andreou, Tim Giles, Marla Morris, John Nauright, Bill Wells

Senate Officers in Attendance: Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee, and Moderator, Faculty Senate; Ron MacKinnon (CIT); Richard Flynn (CLASS); Mary Hazeldine (COBA); Judi Robbins for Michael Moore (COE); Donna Saye (COST); Sonya Shepherd (LIB); Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) Senate Librarian; Donna Saye (COST) Senate Secretary

Administrative Members in Attendance: Linda Bleicken, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Teresa Thompson, Interim Vice President for Student Affairs; Jim Bradford (CIT); Jane Rhoades Hudak (CLASS); Ron Shiffler (COBA); Cindi Chance (COE); Anny Morrobel-Sosa (COST); Bede Mitchell (LIB)

Senate Parliamentarian: Bob Cook

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS) NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative

Strategic Planning Council Representative: Linda Mullen for Jerry Wilson (COBA) Strategic Planning Council Representative

Student Government Representative: Jonathan Buckner for Laurie Markle, Vice President for Academic Affairs

Visitors: Donna K. Fisher (COBA); Candace Griffith (Provost's Office); Amy Heaston (Provost's Office); Clara Krug (CLASS); Lisa Spence (IT Services)

1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 14, 2005, Meeting.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator called the meeting to order and made several announcements prior to hearing a motion for the approval of the minutes. She first announced that alternates should sign next to the senator's name and not in the visitor's section. She then asked senators to please identify themselves and their college affiliations clearly before speaking, for the minutes. She then heard a motion that the agenda for November 14, 2005 be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

2. Approval of the October 25, 2005 Minutes: Donna Saye (COST), Senate Secretary, announced that she had one correction to the minutes from the previous meeting. She noted that at the last meeting Marc Cyr substituted for Clara Krug. With that correction, Donna made a motion that the minutes of the October 25, 2005, meeting be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

3. Librarian's Report of November 7, 2005: Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS), Senate Librarian: Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS), Senate Librarian, announced that he had one correction to the Librarian's Report. Virginia Richards is no longer the chair of the Undergraduate Committee. Donna Saye is currently chair of that committee. With that correction Jean-Paul made a motion that the Librarian's Report of November 7, 2005, be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Donna Saye (COST) said that the Undergraduate Committee met on October 18th, at 3:00 p.m., and at the meeting course revisions for the College of Education and Information Technology were approved. A program revision was also approved for the College of Information Technology. Numerous selected topics announcements were made from CLASS and from the CHHS. The committee heard selected topics from COST and approved two new courses in COST--a military science independent study and Chemistry 1147. The Chemistry course will have a \$20 special course fee, as do both Chemistry 1145 and 1146. The committee also approved a program revision for International Studies. Donna moved that the senate accept the actions of the Undergraduate Committee. Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, reminded everyone that in approving the actions of the Undergraduate Committee, the senate is making a recommendation on their actions to the President for further action. The Undergraduate report was seconded and approved.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Richard Flynn (CLASS) said that the Graduate Committee had met twice, but that none of the minutes had made it to the Librarian's Report yet. Therefore, he has no report to make at this meeting.

4. President's Report: Bruce Grube, President (Given by Provost Linda

Bleicken in the absence of Dr. Grube): Thank you very much. Good afternoon everybody.

- **Enrollment.** The good news is that the enrollment has been finalized for the semester. The final enrollment this year was 16,646, an increase of 546 students over last year's enrollment of 16,100. The number is quite impressive when you consider that once again the floor for admission for the SAT requirement was raised once again this year. The SAT average for entering freshmen this year is 1098. Last year the average SAT for entering freshmen was 1080, so once again, we have seen a remarkable increase. It was around about 1998 when we began talk about the possibility of raising the floor for admissions, and there was a fear that raising the floor would cause a downward turn for enrollment (which could have been disastrous for funding and many other things). That has in fact not happened, as we have increased the standard, we have increased enrollment. We are very pleased with that. We are going to raise the floor again this year. Dr. Thompson, would you remind me what the floor for the SAT will be for the incoming freshmen in Fall 2006? [Dr. Teresa Thompson replied that the floor would be 1000.] So, at this point, we see that there has been no diminishment in demand, and we see that recruitment is in fact running ahead of last year. Thanks to those many of you who have been out on the road recruiting with us. I know that many of you go on the road and attend recruiting receptions, and some of you will be here this Saturday at Open House. We do thank you in advance for that, and for working on the road with us. When we meet with these students who have increased abilities (and with their parents), it is very meaningful for them to have an opportunity to interact with some of the faculty before getting to campus.

- **Capital Projects.** We are seeing some progress in a lot of areas.

- **Library.** The library is taking shape, and it makes people like Bede Mitchell very happy. The new addition is being put up now, and you can actually begin to see what the exterior of the Library is going to look like when it is completed. Remember that when the new addition is completed, the Library staff and the entire operation will move into that. Once that occurs, renovation will begin on the old part of the library. That work will continue from the summer of 2006 to 2008. I would like to say "hats off" to all of the library staff, because they have been living with an intense amount of noise and dust and disruption, and they have remained calm and cheerful throughout the process.
- **Fine Arts Phase III.** This includes the art galleries, the black box theater, and administrative offices. Construction documents are now complete, and it looks as if construction will begin on that in the spring of 2006.
- **The RAC.** Work on the 135,000 square foot addition to the existing 80,000 square feet of the RAC is progressing well. This work is a student-funded project. The students voted for it, and payment for it is coming from their student fees. The walls are up and the pool shell is in place.

- **The Athletics Venues.** These venues include J.I. Clements Stadium, the Iron Works, and the Soccer/Track Stadium. They are completed.
- **Eagle Village.** The parking lot is finally completed. However, all is not perfect with Eagle Village. There are still numerous items that are on the agenda, particularly for the community building. It is not yet the way we want it, and Joe Franklin is in Atlanta today in mediation with the contractor on that project.
- **Herty Renovations Phase II.** We are making every effort for these renovations to be completed by December 15th, so that during the break folks can move in. Phase III, construction on the bottom floor of Herty, is to begin in summer of 2006.
- **Veazey Hall.** The Veazey renovation is going to be the home of Communication Arts, and the Dean, the Chair, and I met this afternoon to reach a final agreement on that project. Veazey will contain a couple of other units as well--Graduate Studies and the Office of Strategic Research and Analysis. The design is nearing completion, so we should begin construction fairly soon.
- **Searches:** We have 96 searches going on now. I thank all of you who are participating in that. Many folks in this room are among those who are working on these searches. We are very grateful to have the positions, but we are also very much aware of the burden that it places on all of you. So, we thank you.
- **RPG and EBDM.** I feel like it is important that you keep hearing two acronyms come up over and over again. One of those is RPG, and the other one is EBDM. RPG is an initiative that is in place from the Board of Regents this year. It stands for Retention, Progression, and Graduation, and it means just exactly what it says. EBDM stands for Evidence-Based Decision Making. RPG is something that has been on the national agenda, on the state agenda, and certainly on the international agenda for a number of years. I think the fact that the Board of Regents has made this their focal point this year is instructive to all of us. From the state's standpoint, our legislators are more and more expecting us to be accountable for what we do. And remember that we are in the age of numbers counts, data counts, and so they are looking at retention rates and graduation rates as measures of success. In January of 2004, then Chancellor Meredith charged a task force to look at graduation rates, because the nationwide data showed that the graduation rate for public institutions in the University System of Georgia was a full 10 points below that of the graduation rate nationwide. And his concern was that our graduation rate was not only lower than places like Maine and New Hampshire and Michigan, but it was also lower than South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, and Florida. The governor, on his web site, has a report card that shows the graduation rates and the retention rates, at institutions across the state. We also have that on the University System web site. The legislators are consistently wondering why we are not doing better, and they are very interested in hearing what we are doing to improve graduation and

retention rates. Our accreditation agencies also want us to be more accountable. Some of these agencies include SACS, ABET, NCATE, AACSB, and even the NCAA. So when we start talking on this campus about being concerned about how our students are doing and about trying to enhance their progress, it really is not divorced from the conversation that is going on at the state, the system, and the national level. And when we engage in things like the Quality Enhancement Plan better known by another acronym, the QEP, and when we participate in things like the Foundations of Excellence (which many of you have participated in), we are really looking at ourselves and asking

- How are we doing?
- What are the things that are working?
- How can they be enhanced?
- What else can we possibly do to make this better?

Beyond this year, we will begin having budget implications related to retention and graduation rates. In fact, the fiscal year 2007 will be used as a base year for us in which we gather data. We will then look at the data in the funding year of 2008, and there will be some dollars that will accrue to institutions that have essentially done well--above and beyond what we might have received otherwise. So these are issues that will ultimately have budget implications. I have every confidence because I know what this institution has done, is doing, and will continue to do, that we are going to do well in this. Therefore, as we talk about making decisions based on evidence, please understand that it is not divorced from something that is in the bigger picture. It really is important for our students, but also for our state. The success of students in our University System is really tied to the success that we have as a state; to the extent that we have educated people in our state, the level of economic prosperity that we are likely to find is going to be greater.

5. Report from Patricia Humphrey, Chair, Senate Executive Committee:

- **Information Requests:** Since the last Senate meeting, there have been a couple of information requests from the same individual. David Seaman from CLASS asked about a faculty club. First, he wanted to know who legally owned the funds in the Foundation. How does a representative of the faculty go about getting the funds to use them for creating a Faculty Club? According to Billy Griffis, Vice President for University Advancement, the legal owner is "all faculty and staff of Georgia Southern." There is currently a balance of \$129,287.65 in the fund. The source of the funds was the old Faculty Club, a totally private entity that ran an establishment off-campus. Jay Fraser was apparently the last treasurer of the old Faculty Club, and he had custody of the funds. At the time that he retired and was moving to Savannah, he no longer wanted to have the responsibility, so that is when the money was transferred to the Foundation. Since then, Billy Griffis and Dr. Grube have been acting totally in a caretaking fiduciary aspect. They do not have any power over the funds. Furthermore, having spoken with Billy and talked with him on Saturday during the game at half time, it is his opinion, at this point, that to legally withdraw any money would

require approval from Dr. Grube, Dr. Bleicken, myself as chair of the Faculty Senate, and the chair of the staff council. We would all have to agree. It also should be noted that the given ownership of the account as designated by Dr. Fraser when he committed the funds to the Foundation is that it is a University Club not a Faculty Club. Apparently, my information is that staff were eligible to be members of the old club; it was not strictly restricted to faculty. Dr. Grube also replied at that point that the long-range plan is to set some sort of facility in the Eidson Alumni House after a new alumni house has been built. The new alumni house is in the works -- they have a site selected, they have been doing fundraising, and they have some preliminary plans. According to Billy Griffis, they received their first set of architects' drawings last week, and the estimated price was a million dollars over what the budgeted amount was. So they have got to go back and do some rethinking on that one. At any rate, a new alumni house is a year-and-a-half or so out in the future.

Secondly, Dr. Seaman asked about immediate establishment of a faculty club, and I have been doing a little investigation on this question. Currently there is no space available on campus for a full-time faculty club. We have been doing some exploring of other options. One thought that has been investigated is using the Williams Center dining hall periodically. I spoke with Leslie Furr just before the meeting and he has indicated that Hospitality has a facility that might be available periodically. So, we are thinking about an interim facility for use as some sort of periodical weekly, monthly, place where we can have some sort of faculty camaraderie. Before we can make such a thing a reality, we would need to survey faculty and staff about what do they want, about what they might be willing to pay for dues, and about what sort of programs they might be interested in. We would also want to establish a committee to be in essence a founding board, draw up bylaws, operation rules, etc. However, some of these things are not totally insurmountable, and I think we could do something fairly quickly, hopefully, maybe for next semester even.

Another point of information-- interestingly enough in my research I found out that currently there is no other institution in the University System that has a faculty club. UGA used to have one; they had about 4,800 square feet in a place called Memorial Hall, but that has been turned into a general dining facility for the whole campus.

- **Agenda Request:** There was one agenda request. Dr. Bleicken submitted an agenda request for discussion on the proposed changes to raises for promotion, and that appears as item #9 on today's agenda. One thing I should mention, very clearly, at this point, since this is a budgetary consideration. Faculty Senate does not have any role, per se, in budgetary considerations. We can merely advise the Provost on whether or not we are in favor of the proposed changes.
- **Just another update:** The ad hoc committee on student evaluations met November 7th for an initial meeting. We looked briefly at some information from Lisa Spence that she had gathered on the TK2o System, and we talked about

some other ideas. We have distributed the old studies that were done by Brian Griffin of the College of Education back when the current instrument was put in place and piloted. The group is going to be meeting again on November 28th, after they have had a chance to digest some of the material and decide on further plans. It is a pretty big job; I would hope they would have something at least very preliminary to say by our February meeting. Just for the record, the members of the committee are Mary Hazeldine, Chair; Broderick Oluyede from COST; David Robinson from CLASS; Bryan Griffin from COE; Doug Johnson from COBA; Bob Cook from IT; Laurie Markle representing Student Government. I am still trying to find somebody from CHHS. Are there any questions?

Candy Schille (CLASS): Could you give me the figure on the fiduciary count again for the faculty club?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: You mean the fund balance?

Candy Schille (CLASS): Yes.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Currently, it is \$129,287.65.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Well, that is not very much. If we decided not to have a faculty club, could we just share that among ourselves, perhaps?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I have no idea. One would have to look at the documents and how it was set up by Jay Fraser.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Thank you.

Virginia Richards (CHHS): I have a volunteer for you. Leslie Furr has volunteered very kindly to be on that committee.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: To be on the Student Evaluation Committee?

Virginia Richards (CHHS): Yes.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The next item of business is the Strategic Planning Council report, and since Jerry cannot be here today, Linda Mullen is going to give his report.

6. Report from Jerry Wilson, SPC Representative: Linda Mullen (COBA), reporting in Jerry Wilson's absence, announced that the University Strategic Planning Council had met twice since the last Senate meeting. The October 26th meeting opened with an update from Joe Franklin, Vice President for Business and Finance. Among the items he presented are the following:

Auxiliary Services:

- Successful implementation of the transit system this semester.

- The new parking and transportation building will be completed this semester.
- The health services building renovation is complete.

Athletics:

- The baseball stadium, track and soccer field projects have been completed.
- A new golf practice facility will be built off Pulaski highway on donated land.
- The Lupton Building will be replaced with a new, larger facility.

Controller's Office:

- Received a state award of \$15,000 for annual audit results and procedure.
- Human Resources completed an update of job descriptions and policies.

Physical Plant:

- Upcoming projects include renovations of Veazey and Cone Halls, and Fine Arts Phase III is ready to bid.
- A grant has been applied for from Georgia DOT for a campus greenway that will eventually connect the downtown greenway.
- A \$1.8 million enclosed aviary is being planned.
- The campus master plan is scheduled for revision.

Public Safety:

- Is expanding course offerings in the area of public safety.
- Is responsible for all campus environmental issues.

The meeting concluded with a presentation on the Graduate Student Organization, prepared by Marty Spieler, Graduate Student representative to the SPC. He noted that approximately 2,000 students are enrolled in graduate programs and 70% of them are part-time students. Among the issues he discussed were developing a competitive, nice facility for the Graduate School, and increasing number and amount of graduate assistantships. The strategic plan calls for the expansion of graduate enrollment to 20% of total student enrollment.

At the November 9th meeting, Vice President Billy Griffis provided an update on University Advancement activities. Last year, approximately 10% of the GSU alumni contributed to the University at some level. The goal this year is to increase that percentage to 12%, and the long-term goal is to achieve 18% participation. In January, there will be two full-time Alumni representatives in Atlanta in permanent office space. The University Centennial celebration will officially begin on December 1st, 2006 — the same day that the 5-year capital campaign officially concludes. The Centennial celebration will involve many activities, both on and off campus, and will conclude with Homecoming in October 2007.

The second portion of the meeting was conducted by Jon Simpson, Student Government Association representative to the SPC. He provided an overview of SGA operations and organization, and explained the mission of the organization, as defined by the current leadership. He also discussed three challenges that the SGA has identified as important for this academic year. They are:

- To create a more unified University community;
- To create a more involved University community; and
- To create a more informed University community.

Several members of the SPC suggested that a joint meeting of the Faculty Senate and the Student Government Association, open to the University public, would be an excellent means of increasing awareness and understanding of issues of importance to both bodies. As the Senate representative to the SPC, Jerry Wilson was charged with bringing this request to the Senate.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Any Questions? Candy.

Candy Schille (CLASS): I am on the SPC, and in the conversation, academic dishonesty came up. We talked about getting the Faculty Senate and the SGA together with maybe the student community to have some kind of forum. I am meeting with Linda Bleicken's equivalent on the SGA, the Academic Affairs representative, Laurie Markle, on Thursday, to discuss it. As this develops, what I would like to do is use the Senate listserv to just keep you informed and also to get ideas as to questions you might ask, or how to organize this thing, so thank you very much.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Are there any other comments or questions?
Mike

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): I missed it. What is the current percentage of students who are graduate students?

Linda Mullen (COBA): "He noted that approximately 2,000 students are enrolled in graduate programs, and 70% of them are part-time. . . . The Strategic Plan calls for expansion of graduate enrollment to 20%."

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Which would be a little over 3,000.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): Thanks.

7. Report from Chris Geyerman, NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: I have no report.

8. Election of 2006-2007 Chair, Senate Executive Committee, and Senate Moderator

Pat Humphrey (COST): Senate Moderator: The next item on the agenda is the election of the 2006-2007 Senate Moderator, and the election will be conducted by SEC member, Ron MacKinnon.

Ron MacKinnon (CIT): Some of you might be wondering what is going on. The moderator cannot run her own election for her own seat, so the Parliamentarian has advised us that somebody else has to do the job. So nominations are open, any

nominations for the moderator?

Candy Schille (CLASS): Pat Humphrey. I would like to nominate Dr. Pat Humphrey.

Ron MacKinnon (CIT): Okay, there is a motion. Is there a second for the motion? The motion was seconded. Are there any other nominations? A vote was taken and Pat Humphrey was elected.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Thank you, I think.

9. Discussion item “Analysis and Recommendations from the Task Force to Study Salary Increases tied to Faculty Promotions,” Dr. Linda Bleicken,

Provost: Well, good afternoon. Let me give you just a little brief history on this. In the spring of 2005, Robert Costomiris, a faculty member in CLASS, requested some information on the last time that raises attached to promotions had been had been increased, and he also, in his request for information, wanted to know if our raises were competitive. I appointed a task force and asked Robert if he would serve on the task force, and he graciously said, “yes.” Then I also asked one of our deans, Ron Shiffler, to chair the task force. Ron agreed to chair the task force. And then a Senate member, Ming Fang He, very graciously agreed to serve on the task force. I need to recognize and thank Candace Griffith who provided a lot of background work on this issue. And I want to start out by saying thank you to Robert for raising this issue, because what the committee found as they looked at this was that it had been at least twelve years, if not longer, since we had last looked at this and actually made an increase in the promotion amounts. You see what the current block salary increases are: \$1,000, \$1,500, and \$2,000 respectively going from Assistant Professor to Full. As the task force began its research, they discovered that if we looked at schools throughout the University System, and certainly some of our peer and aspirant institutions, we really were not as competitive as we might be. Since Dean Shiffler is not here yet, Ming Fang would you like to talk about the recommendations the task force has made?

Ming Fang He (COE): I will try my best. I joined the task force in the summer, after I raised the issue about how to maintain good faculty. It was a very good experience working with Dr. Robert Costomiris. He is very productive, and he offered a lot of insight for the committee. It was also a pleasure, and a very good learning experience working with Dr. Ron Shiffler. If you read the report here, initially we started with 50 institutions, and then we narrowed the number down to 17, and then finally we choose seven institutions to analyze. You can see from the analysis that we found that the “bumping” system scale at Georgia Southern is at the bottom. We feel there is a need for change, so we have made this recommendation. Dr. Bleicken had a meeting with us, and she commended all the work we had been doing. We raised some other issues. For example, one of the issues was that some people felt insulted because full professors were not included in this process. Also, faculty like me who have already been promoted from one rank to another are excluded from the process. What happens to those? And remember at the last Senate meeting, I raised the equity issue. Perhaps Dr. Bleicken can organize another task force to study these issues.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): I would like to second Ming's suggestion that we need another study or group, something charged specifically with looking at eliminating the difficulties that we have with salary compression, particularly for current full professors. While I like the proposal here, it does not address that issue. It might also even exacerbate the salary compression problems for people who are currently full professors. And, by the way, I am not. I recognize Clara Krug.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I am insulted not as an individual, but I am professionally insulted, because to be used as a point of comparison, and then not be included in the outcome, I find that professionally insulting. And I agree there should be something done about equity. For full professor, there is no other thing that can be done, but equity.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Let me address that, please, and I appreciate certainly the comment, Clara, and, also, Marc. Equity was something that we did talk about as the committee brought forward its recommendations, and I think as Ming Fang has already mentioned; this was discussed briefly at the last Senate meeting. This is certainly something that we recognize. We have information from at least one college that has already done an analysis, and so I have looked at the data as it relates to that one college and it is significant. We want to do a stepwise progression. Our initial step was to recognize people who are promoted, but it is not the last step. It is certainly very understandable that those of you who were promoted — whether you were promoted to associate or to full, and particularly those of you who might have been promoted last year, and are now looking at this — might have some consternation. What has been an approach in at least one college was to begin looking at people, and looking at the salary compression issue, and essentially looking at what are the worst cases, and to begin to address those. And I will tell you that in that particular college, the way that those are beginning to be addressed, is not by some new infusion of money, but it has been a managed process by a dean who essentially took part of the raise pool off the top to actually help those who are most affected by salary compression begin to move up. This has not been a fast process, because the raise pool in the last few years has not been too great. This compression issue is very much recognized, not only by the President and me, but also by Joe Franklin. He has seen some of the preliminary data. So if you have fears that we are not aware of this issue, please, do not be afraid. We are looking at this not only for faculty, but also for staff members who are experiencing the same kinds of issues that we are talking about with faculty. We really are beginning down that pathway, and I will tell you that it is certainly a very real issue. And Dr. Krug I certainly do understand your consternation about this, as well as others. The report is essentially a way to begin addressing some of the issues.

Ming Fang He (COE): Dr. Ron Shiffler just walked in, so maybe he would be more competent in responding to questions, but I think just to look at this issue from a positive side, we have to start from somewhere, and we should be happy that those faculty who are going up in the future will get a "bumping." And, our task force did not have any intention of excluding any group. We just worked on the task force, but I think I do understand that senior faculty are underpaid, and this may be one of issue of priority we should address.

Dr. Ron Shiffler (Dean, COBA): Sorry to be late.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): The issue that we have been discussing is the fact that the report suggests that an elimination or an alleviation of salary compression for senior faculty is one of the aims of the increases. And we are suggesting that that is not the case, and that in fact it may exacerbate salary compression. Certainly that it does not do anything to alleviate the situation for current full professors, and will very likely exacerbate their situation, but I will let somebody else bring you up-to-speed on what happened after that.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Ron, would you like to address that?

Ron Shiffler (Dean, COBA): I will try. Our task force was simply asked to take a look at the amount of money that was given to faculty who were being promoted from one rank to another. As you can tell by the report, we got off to a rather ambitious start with lots of universities, and it took us a while to sort of get focused. But we really tried to stay true to the charge which was "are our promotion increases competitive?" The answer that we felt that we got was, no, they are not. So we then considered what would make them more competitive, and you saw what our recommendations were. Now, those who are full professors, especially, someone who got promoted last year to full professor, are probably screaming foul. And so to look back to try to figure out how do you rectify that situation, honestly, Marc, I do not know how to rectify that situation. In our college, we have a great finance department, so I could ask our finance faculty to try to go back several years and figure out how we can discount forward and compound the amount of merit pay that has been given, but that really was not our task. It was not a question that we were trying to disenfranchise those full professors promoted or recently promoted, or even those assistant professors who just got promoted to associate, but it was simply to take a look at those break figures and try to come up with something that was a little bit better.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Candy Schille.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Dr. Shiffler, I really think, if I understand your language at all, that you already answered my question. But I was just wondering if the task force had kicked around the idea of making this all retroactive in keeping in mind things like interest, and how things would have worked up, over the years, etc. I do not even know if budgetarily the university could afford compensating us all who have been here since dinosaurs roamed the earth, but if you want to think about the idea of making this retroactive that might be a fairness issue. Thank you.

Ron Shiffler (Dean, COBA): I agree. Trying to figure out the university's liability to pay everyone who has recently been promoted is a doable problem. It is just a difficult problem with everyone at different salary levels and with varying lengths of times since being promoted, but it is a task that could be done. I hope that you had a chance to read the third recommendation, which was that we would like to make this immediate, because the budget hearings at the state level are occurring now, and the university has

to get their budget together right now. So, had we continued to deliberate on issues such as that, I think we would have been at least another year getting it in to the budgeting cycle before anything could have happened. Now that is not to say that someone could not suggest a new task force. I would like to say that our task force feels that we have completed our job and would like to retire at this point from that responsibility.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Mike

Mike Nielsen (CLASS): Maybe a compromise would be that we could all just take whatever the average CIT salary would be for our grade. Those of us in CLASS would see that as a bump up. I guess I have several thoughts on the issue. I appreciate that the task force did this work and came up with what seems to me to be a good plan. It seems like it is starting to solve the problem by beginning in the middle instead of in the beginning, as far as dealing with compression, I agree with those who assert that it is more likely to exacerbate it, rather than help it. At least, if you look at the issue as long as most of us are going to be here at the university maybe it helps someone later, but for those of us here now, it does not help the compression issue. It maybe deals better with other things. I think that I would like to see also a little bit more time for us to digest the information. I know all we do is advise, but just in the few hours since I received this in my email this morning, I have already had three full professors talk to me and express their concerns, and it is not like I go out looking for people. I think that the issue is really an important one, and I would like to see whatever recommendation we make on their recommendation or whatever discussion we have happen after we have had time to give it more serious thought than just a few hours between classes.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Yes, Michael, and I do apologize. Actually, I thought that this had been posted to the web, because we did post the agenda item last week, and I apologize. I did not realize until this morning that the document itself was not out there. So as soon as I realized that, we did post it, and so that is certainly my error. I do want to reiterate though Dean Shiffler's comment that we see this train moving as far as the opportunity to put this in this year's budget. And clearly there is not going to be another Senate meeting before the budget has to go forward. That was very much one of the concerns that we had. And, once again it is important to understand, I think, that this is a budget issue. It certainly is something that I think is meant to make this a better place, as Dr. He mentioned, a more competitive place than it perhaps might have been, and I certainly would like to say that we are not going to be able to do all of it in one year. That just is not going to be the case, but I think if you heard Dr. Grube last time, and you are hearing me now, we truly are looking at the issue of salary compression. As you can imagine, this took a while to get on the table. Looking at salary compression and then putting together a plan to move forward is going to be an even bigger project, and so it is not all going to happen at once, but truly this is something that is on our plate.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Virginia

Virginia Richards (CHHS): Guys, do you know how salaries at the top get better? You cannot get salaries at the top better by keeping the people at the top higher always than the than the new faculty that are coming in. You will always have lower salaries in your

colleges if you always make sure that the full professors are paid better than the new people that are coming in.

Mark Welford (COST): Given the nature that this is a budgetary constraint in the sense that we would like to run this through, if we do not run it through now, then you are liable to create a situation where the people who were grandfathered in for last year are not going to be grandfathered in after all, and they are going to lose out. I think it would be imperative that this go forward now, so that we do not lose a year. I think we should go ahead. I think it is an excellent recommendation.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Marc

Marc Cyr (CLASS): If we do put this forward, is this going to put added stress on our personnel budget that would hold us back from doing alleviation of salary compression or can we go forward with this, and also proceed forward with an attempt at salary compression?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I am going to pass this question back to Ron Shiffler, and you can remember, I think, the numbers per year of full professors and associates who are promoted.

Ron Shiffler (Dean, COBA): I would have to look it up. I have it, but I am going to guess that in the last five years we have had about 100 promotions from assistant to associate, and we have had about 50 promotions from associate to full.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is that total for five years?

Ron Shiffler: That is total for the five-year period.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I have already talked with Joe Franklin about this. We have calculated what this would mean this year. In comparison, that amount when you compare it to what you might see in salary compression in only one college is pretty insignificant. We will begin the process this year, but I do not think you are going to see a huge difference this year. I think what we will see this year is the development of a plan that will then begin to move us forward. One of the things that I think that we all need to think about is that this is not anyone's fault. Remember that up until last year we were dismantling, slowly but surely, the number of personnel that we could hire in this university. Think about the positions that we gave up that we are now adding back, so we are really in a process quite frankly of rebuilding. We are putting back positions that we lost in budget cuts. Remember we lost 19% of our budget over those years. So we are putting that back, and we are beginning the process, but you will not see the ultimate outcome of everybody getting up to speed in a year. It is going to be a multi-year process.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: David

David Robinson (CLASS): Is the Senate being asked to take an action on this discussion

item?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: It is a discussion item. We are giving our feedback to Linda.

David Robinson (CLASS): That is what I thought. From the way some people are talking there seemed to be some urgency about us taking action, not taking action, but there is not. Thank you for that clarification.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): I do words much better than numbers. But my question is this: What I remember from the early discussion is that the funds that would make this bump increase possible will come from the total that is available for merit raises across the university, and if that is the case, then it will certainly exacerbate the problem. If we are taking away possible merit raises across the board for this bump, then it reduces the amount of the 2% that is possible for us.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): No. The salary raise pool is separate from this. This is a one-time item, if you will, that comes forward and that is why talking to Joe Franklin at this point was very important. The merit raise pool is not what we use for promotions, so the merit raise pool is not affected by promotions. These are separate expense items. So, please do not fear that somehow your merit raise or the total amount that you might have for a merit raise is going to be affected by this action.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Godfrey

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Just to say quickly that the bulk of discussion, so far, has not been in the affirmative and I wanted to say that I like it. I am an assistant professor and I like it, and I think a lot of my colleagues of similar rank would probably say the same.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: David

David Robinson (CLASS): I am a full professor and I would like to endorse what Godfrey just said.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there any other discussion?

(Unidentified) Just endorsing the endorsements. I am one of those people who got my full professorship this year, so it is very near and dear to my heart, and I would just hope that we would have a kind of altruistic spirit about this, and we would think about our colleagues and not simply about our own raises in this, and try to do the right thing for faculty that are coming up.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Mary.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): I am all in favor of everybody getting as much money as they can, so if this will improve and increase our promotions then here, here.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Anyone else? Thank you, Dean Shiffler.

10. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

11. New Business

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I would like to make a motion that the Senate pass a resolution endorsing this plan that we have just been discussing. The motion was seconded and discussion began on the motion to endorse the raise plan for promotions.

Candy Schille (CLASS): I do not really have a big problem, but I would like to think about it before I do some kind of formal endorsement, since nothing is being asked of us in that way. So I am going to vote against your motion, Richard.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Michael

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): For similar reasons, I agree with Candy. We have had very little time, we have had some discussion, but we have not had time to really look at the numbers, and things. And if all we do is give advice, we should give good advice.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Ron

Ron Shiffler (Dean, COBA): As you are discussing this with your colleagues, I would like to point out two things to you. The first is the integrity of the data. There is an old saying that generals like to talk to generals. So what we did was work through the Provost's office who worked through the Provost's office of every one of those other universities. You may see a school down there (xyz university), and you say well, I know that they get \$4,000 in a salary raise, but this table says it is only \$3,000. Well, rather than have the task force members try to collect this data, we used the Provost's office and Candace Griffith was excellent at this. So all of the data came through her by her requesting similar information from those universities. If you have an argument with a data discrepancy, it was not that we fudged the numbers. And secondly, as I think we said in there, you may disagree with our comparison sets, and that is certainly your prerogative, and I think any group of two or three or five would find a different comparison set. That is the best comparison set that we felt that we could come up with. Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked for other discussion. Hearing none, she reminded everyone that the motion from Richard Flynn was an endorsement from the Faculty Senate of the Promotion Raise Task Force Report. A vote was taken and the motion was approved by voice vote.

(Unidentified): Motion for a roll call vote.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked Donna Saye for the roll, and a roll call vote was taken. The voting results were as follows:

Kathy Albertson (no)
David Alley (yes)
Barry Balleck (no)
Jean-Paul Carton (yes)
(doesn't matter)
Ken Clark (yes)
Nirmal Das (yes)
Don Fausett (yes)
Bob Fernekes (I guess he's left.)
Richard Flynn (aye)
Leslie Furr (yes)
Godfrey Gibbison (yes)
Bev Graham (oops, she's gone)
Alice Hall (yes)
Mary Hazeldine (yes)
Ming Fang He (yes)
Marc Cyr (for Clara Krug) (no)
Gautam Kundu (no)
Margaret LaMontagne (yes)
Mary Marwitz (yes)
Ron MacKinnon (yes)
Michele McGibony is gone.
Bruce McLean (yes)
Judi Robbins for Michael Moore (yes)
Kent Murray (yes)
Michael Nielsen (no)
Constantin Ogloblin (yes)
Broderick Oluyede (yes)
Norman Schmidt for Laura Regassa (yes)
Virginia Richards (yes)
David Robinson (you bet ya)
Donna Saye (yes)
Candy Schille (no)
Sonya Shepherd (yes)
Caren Town (yes)
Robert Vogel (yes)
Pat Walker (no)
Jianping Wang (yes)
Mark Welford (yes)
Linda Mullen for Jerry Wilson (yes)
Bill Yang (and I think Bill Yang has left)

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked if there was any other Senator who had come in whose name she did not call. Someone asked about a vote from the SGA representative. It was noted that the SGA representative should vote.

Jonathan Buckner voting for Laurie Markle (no).

The vote results were announced: 29 yes, 8 nos. Therefore, the report was endorsed.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator then asked if there was any other new business.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): Given the discussion, I think the sentiment around the table here is that a second task force is appropriate to address this question of salary compression. Dr. Bleicken noted that one college has done a study of salary compression. I am wondering why the others have not and wondering what that college is and so forth, and why this is not something that is being addressed perhaps university-wide. I agree with my colleague, Michael Nielsen, who said I think that we should have had more time to be able to discuss this with our colleagues. But I also think that the larger issue of salary compression has been noted in this report, which might exacerbate actually the problem that we already see and should be studied more in depth, and there should be ways to address this, in connection with the Provost's office, and so forth. So I move that we have a formation of a second task force to study salary compression.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: All right, the motion is having another task force to study salary compression. Is there any discussion on that motion?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I do not think that is a bad idea. The thing that I would suggest to you once again is that the issue, as it was relating to raises for promotion, is a fairly complex one. This one is even more so. We are going to have to be very careful about who actually serves on the task force. It would certainly not just require someone from my office, but rather this has much broader budget implications, and it would have to also involve Joe Franklin's office, certainly. This is also a President's Cabinet's type of issue, and so certainly having a body that is interested in it and involved in it is very important. I just caution you that this has broad implications for the budget, and so the problem here can become one of raising expectations to a point that, if they are not within the realm of reality, could be problematic. As we went forward with this set of recommendations, I was very careful to be certain that this project was something that could be done. In my mind it would be horrible to put forward a recommendation that went out generally, and then find out that budgetarily we could not do it. I just put that caution before you.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I understand that, and I think I am not talking about something that we can accomplish in a month or two months or even a semester. Perhaps this is something that takes place over the course of the next several months or even a couple of years. But I think the discussion needs to take place, and there needs to be a broad range of representation from every college, from the Provost's office, from the President's office, from the Student Government perhaps--allowing them some input on how they feel their quality of education is impacted, and so forth. But I believe that we should at least discuss this. We have been talking about this for years, since I have been on this campus, and yet, there has not been the collective voice of the Senate being heard at this point. So I would hope that we would all support this.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Pat Walker

Pat Walker (CLASS): I would like to second some of what Barry Balleck is saying. I think that the recommendations made are very good, and my *no* vote had nothing to do with disagreeing with the recommendations that were being made. It is rather that I think that full professors need to have the feeling that something concrete is being done, and I understand that it is something that is going to be very involved and take a long time, and I understand that there is a great deal of concern at the top, and the desire to do something. But I do think that full faculty, full professors, need to know that there is something concrete--that people are looking at the problems that they have with their compressed salaries, and not just have it be sort of a wish list.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Don Fausett

Don Fausett (COST): I understand the concern about funding for any such equity adjustments in terms of salary compression, and to that view I would recommend that the task force that be established communicate, and as much as possible, coordinate with the Georgia Southern Foundation to see if any supplementary support might be available for that purpose.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Marc

Marc Cyr (CLASS): A couple of issues here. I think a task force needs to be put together. I do not know if the Senate is the proper body to put that task force together for the reasons that Linda raised and that Ron Shiffler mentioned earlier--about how they gathered the data for the report on salary increases. And it is a very complex issue, and it is going to take a long time, but I do not think there will be sufficient pressure to move forward with it if faculty are not involved in a big way, whether it is via a Senate task force or some other way. As Barry said, I have been hearing about this for 20 years, and I think there has to be a faculty presence that can push to move this forward so that we are not talking about it still 20 years from now.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Norm

Norman Schmidt (COST): When I went to academia, I took a vow in poverty, and in our department, we have had faculty leave because of being able to go to higher paying jobs even outside academia, and as a full professor, I mean this is a concern for me. I would support having a task force, but I am also understanding that this is just a recommendation to the Provost, and anything we do we are at the mercy of the Provost, as far as any pay raises that we get to compensate for salary compression. And I wish there was some solution to that because I do not see any. Because we can argue and have a task force, and it goes to the Provost in saying please give us more. Sort of like Oliver, more please, more.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): The woman who obviously has all the money! I would tell you, if I could **waive** a magic wand tomorrow, I would certainly want to eliminate salary compression on this campus. That would be a great thing to do. As we have already



talked about, it is not going to happen overnight, but I assure you that the intention is there. Might I suggest that a task force certainly be put together that would include members of the senate? I do not think that is a bad idea. One of the things I think we need to be careful of, when you start talking about task forces, big is not always great. I think this would have to be a well-crafted task force that would include some expertise to get the job done. But I think that we also have to be aware that it cannot include just the world because otherwise the job will never, never get done.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Ming Fang

Ming Fang He (COE): I would like to say since I got hired by Georgia Southern, this is my seventh year, and this is the first time we had a task force like this to make something happen positively, in money terms to faculty. I really should applaud this, but I would like to listen to senior faculty, and I do understand that some of the senior faculty are close to retirement. We need to consider the senior faculty; they need to be honored. That is my first point. The second point (I do not know whether it is appropriate for me to say anything about this now), is maybe we need to order another task force. I am thinking about a money bank for our university. This task force will cost a lot of money for the university. Maybe, in the future, Dr. Bleicken can arrange another task force to consider how we might get more money for the university. For example, I know, I listen to a lot of even junior faculty and they have a lot of good ideas for collaboration with companies to get more money for our university. Otherwise, if the money is running out nobody will get money. That's my point.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Candy

Candy Schille (CLASS): I think if we are going to have another task force, may I suggest that Linda's office or somebody else run it? It ought not to be a Senate committee.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Any other discussion? We have a motion on the floor to form a Senate task force on salary compression. Our parliamentarian reminds me that because this would be our purview, it would be a Senate task force, and we do not have budget authority. A vote was taken, and the motion carried.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there any other new business? Marc Cyr.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): I am carrying on several themes with this today. Michael Moore asked me to read this question. At our last Senate meeting, under the Moderator's report, we heard the response to Michael Moore's request for information regarding the structure of the technology committee. Among our number of concerns, Michael noted that there was no College of Education representation and no faculty representation on this committee. I asked Dr. Bleicken that the technology committee discuss committee membership and committee structure representation. Has this discussion taken place, and if so, what has the committee decided? If the discussion has not taken place, when will it take place?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I am happy to report that, yes, in fact, the discussion has

taken place, and your concern about lack of faculty representation was duly noted. The individual who had initially, who was serving in a faculty role, during her time of service, became still a faculty member, but also an administrator. That conversation has occurred with the person who was in that particular position, and we have an agreement that she will step down from that role. We also have an agreement from a full time faculty member without administrative rank who will take up that position on the technology fee committee, and that will happen as of spring, because we meet twice a year. We meet in the fall, and we meet in the spring. So the individual who has faculty rank only will be joining us in the spring.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): So there is still only one faculty member on that committee?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Yes. And what I would say to you, recall this, please, this is student money. This is money that the students contribute from their fees. So the understanding here is that the vast majority of these folks who are on the committee, well certainly the overwhelming number as a group are students, and that is as it should be. The students represent a cross section of the university. The fact that this year there was not someone who was initially going to serve from the College of Education was, in fact, remedied. One of the things that happen fairly often is that someone cannot show up for a meeting. In this case it was Laurie Markle who could not make that particular meeting. She called on one of her SGA Senators who was actually a member of the College of Education, who served in that deliberation that occurred in the fall.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): How many administrators and staff members are on that committee? Any idea?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Lisa Spence, you can help me with this.

- Lisa Spence, because you say to yourself here is the CIO, this makes a lot of sense;
- Bede Mitchell, the Dean of the Library, for another obvious reason. A lot of students are served in the library with technology resources.
- I chair the committee. We have a representative that comes from the Student Affairs side, which is understandable.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): Michael Moore thanks you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there any other new business? (There was none.) Are there any announcements from the vice presidents? (There were none.) Are there any announcements from the floor? (There were none.) A motion was made and seconded and passed to adjourn.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: We stand adjourned at 5:34.

