

2006

Faculty Senate Minutes-2006

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-2006" (2006). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 18.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/18>

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 13, 2006
4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Barry Balleck, Jean-Paul Carton, Ken Clark, Don Fausett, Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Leslie Furr, Godfrey Gibbison, Tim Giles, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Ming Fang He, Pat Humphrey, Clara Krug, Gautam Kundu, Margaret LaMontagne, Mary Marwitz, Bruce McLean, Michael Moore, Kent Murray, John Nauright, Michael Nielsen, Constantin Ogloblin, Broderick Oluyede, Laura Regassa, Maria Smith for Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Donna Saye, Candy Schille, Sonya Shepherd, Caren Town, Pat Walker, Jianping Wang, Jerry Wilson, Bill Yang

Voting Members Absent: Kathy Albertson, David Alley, Spyros Andreou, Nirmal Das, Beverly Graham, Ron MacKinnon, Michele Davis McGibony, Marla Morris, Robert Vogel, Mark Welford, and Bill Wells

Senate Officers in Attendance: Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee, and Moderator, Faculty Senate; John Nauright (CHHS); 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; Jim Bradford (CIT); Jane Rhoades Hudak (CLASS)

Senate Parliamentarian: Bob Cook (CIT)

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

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

Student Government Representative: Mary Ann Rogers for Laurie Markle, Vice President for Academic Affairs

Visitors: Mike Deal, Registrar; Nancy Schumaker, AVPAA; Amy Heaston, Associate Provost; Candace Griffith, Assistant to the Provost; Bret Danilowicz, Associate Dean, COST; Patrick Novotny, CLASS; Luke Hearn, SGA; Dick Diebolt, COGS

****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.**



The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 4:00 p.m. on February 13, 2006, in the Russell Union Ballroom by Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator.

- 1. Approval of the Agenda for the February 13, 2006, 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 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 [November 14, 2005, Minutes](#):** Donna Saye (COST) Senate Secretary announced that she received word of one correction that needs to be made in the minutes. On page 19, the last paragraph, the word "waive" is spelled wrong. It should be w-a-v-e. With that correction, Donna made a motion that the minutes of the November 14, 2005, meeting be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.
- 3. Librarian's Report of [February 6, 2006](#):** Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS), Senate Librarian made a motion that the Librarian's Report of February 6, 2006 be approved. Clara Krug (CLASS) stated that she would like to ask some questions about the Undergraduate and Graduate Committee reports. Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator stated that she should wait until those reports were on the floor for discussion to ask questions on those reports. The motion that the Librarian's Report of February 6, 2006 be approved was seconded and approved by voice vote.
 - a. Report from the Undergraduate Committee Chair:** Donna Saye (COST) made the following announcement: When the Undergraduate Committee met we approved the deletion of B.S.E.D. initial certification preparation programs in the secondary teaching fields, art and foreign languages which will become part of the new M.A.T. in the Fall of 2006, based on the approval of the M.A.T. by the Board of Regents. We approved numerous course revisions and deletions, and the Undergraduate Committee voted not to have the responsibility to keep up with course fee changes. We also voted to strictly enforce and adhere to the deadlines for when agenda items are due to the committee. She moved that the report be approved.

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

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked how many credits would be earned in the Teaching Internship in GSU 1220. She said that she did not see that included in the class description.

Mike Deal (Registrar) stated that the course carries one credit hour.

Clara Krug (CLASS) replied "Thank you very much."

Clara Krug (CLASS): May I continue, please? On page 101, under the New or Revised Programs, B.S. Information Technology, and Information Technology Second Concentrations, the justifications are given, mentioning the changes corresponding with the program name change, but I do not see any revisions to be justified there. Were they supposed to be?

Donna Saye (COST) stated that, since neither of the appropriate Deans was there, she would find the answer to Clara's question for the next meeting.

Clara Krug (CLASS) replied, "Thank you, Donna."

Hearing no further discussion, 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 Committee report was seconded and approved.

- b. Report from the Graduate Committee Chair:** Richard Flynn (CLASS) arrived late for the meeting, so Candy Schille (CLASS) moved that the Graduate Committee Report be approved.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there any discussion or are there any questions for members of the Graduate Committee?

Clara Krug (CLASS): On page 16, there is change in title. Should that not read *Trends in Middle and Secondary Social Sciences* instead of *Science*?

Candy Schille (CLASS): How does it currently read, Dr. Krug?

Clara Krug (CLASS): It currently reads: *Change to: Trends in Middle and Secondary Social Science. Change from: Trends in Middle and Secondary Social Studies.* So I am assuming that it is supposed to be *Social Science*.

Candy Schille (CLASS): I am sure that your change is appropriate.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay. I would think it would be *Social Science*, rather than *Science*.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Yes, I would suggest that there should be an amendment to the report to say *Social Science*.

Clara Krug (CLASS): And then I have another question. On page 29, under Program Revisions for the MBH, I do not see any course descriptions for the two courses: MGNT 6330 and MGNT 7331. It says there is a change in the course description for MGNT 6330 and for MGNT 7331, but I do not see any course descriptions for those two courses. I see a list of courses that are required. Was it intended that that not be program revision, but just a name change? Or was it supposed to be a name change and a course description change? That confused me.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Dr. Krug, I cannot really answer your question, but what I could do is check with the recording secretary and get back to you via email or by our next meeting.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay. Thank you.

Ming Fang He (COE): I was on the Graduate Committee. I remember our report was more than 180-something pages. I think there is probably something missing there.

Clara Krug (CLASS): yes.

Ming Fang He (COE): I cannot remember what you are discussing exactly, but when we went through that the agenda, it was very much detailed. We discussed everything, so I believe it was accurate; however, perhaps when the secretary of the Graduate Committee transferred those reports to the Librarian's Report something was missing.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: With those clarifications, and pending answers to those questions, shall we vote to approve the Graduate Committee's Report and send those recommendations to the Provost and President? The Graduate Committee report was then seconded and approved.

Clara Krug (CLASS): May I ask a question?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Yes.

Clara Krug (CLASS): At what point is it appropriate to ask a question about the Senate-Approved Evaluations Ad Hoc Committee report? That is something new. I have not seen an ad hoc committee report before in the Librarian's Report, so I am just asking when it is appropriate to ask a question about the ad hoc committee report. Is that under unfinished business since that is an ad hoc committee that has been mentioned before at the Senate or is it appropriate to ask it within the Librarian's Report after the Undergraduate and Graduate Committee reports?

Mary Hazeldine (COBA): Clara, I was asked by Jean-Paul about it, and I do not think I have ever seen an ad hoc committee's minutes in a Librarian's Report, but I went ahead and submitted them to Jean-Paul.

Clara Krug (CLASS): So is it okay to ask now or should I wait? Because either one is fine with me.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: According to our Parliamentarian, that should be listed as an information item until the committee finishes, but I suppose now would be an appropriate time to ask your question.

Clara Krug (CLASS): On Page 134, then of the Librarian's Report, under the ad hoc committee report, I had a question about how one of the problems could have been. Under "Current State of Evaluations Processes," committee members reported on the evaluation processes in their colleges. The instructions varied from none given to a variety of other instructions for administering face-to-face evaluations. How is it possible that none are given when we are required to give student evaluations? I think it varies, maybe, from department to department, but my understanding is at least once a year all faculty are required to give evaluations. So I am somewhat stunned. Is it that the evaluations are not given, or is it the instructions are not given?

Mary Hazeldine (COBA): No, it is that the instructions were not placed on the packets. The evaluations were administered, but instructions were not placed on the packets.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay. And then I had a question about the focus groups in February. How does this all dovetail with Lisa Spence's report which is given on page 135?

Mary Hazeldine (COBA): Doug Johnson and Abby Lynes received a grant from the University System of Georgia to conduct reliability and validity studies on the current instrument that we have. And, generally, when you do reliability/validity studies, you conduct some qualitative research first with faculty and administrators--just to get a feel for how it is going on the campus. I believe they may also be gathering information from a couple of other campuses, and they will be doing their focus groups at the end of February or early March.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay. And then how does that dovetail with Lisa Spence's report on page 135?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I do not believe it does.

Clara Krug (CLASS): It does not dovetail at all?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: No, it is two different situations.

Clara Krug (CLASS): So, what you are doing and what Lisa Spence is doing is about the same evaluations? Is that correct?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Lisa Spence is, as I understand it, solely looking at the issue of possibly implementing electronic evaluations.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay. So yours is separate.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Mary's committee's charge is somewhat broader--to look at how they are administered and what they measure.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay, so it may be that they are not administered at all in the future, except by web, if that is what happens. Correct?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: That is possible, yes.

Clara Krug (CLASS): So your end product may be archived, but not implemented. Is that correct?

Mary Hazeldine (COBA): We will ultimately put forth a number of recommendations about processes toward face-to-face and online evaluations, but our work is really just not finished yet. We meet once a month, but we are just getting into it, and so I am not exactly sure how it will evolve. We want to come up with a set of good recommendations about processes, as well as online administration.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Sure. I thank you, because I know there has been a fair amount of discussion about this on the Faculty Senate listserv, and among faculty members in the hallways, so I appreciate the information. Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Are there any other questions at this time about the Librarian's Report? There were none.

4. President's Report: Provost Linda Bleicken for Bruce Grube,
President: Good afternoon. I wanted to share with you a few items that have transpired since we last met in November.

SACS

On December 4th, at the general meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Georgia Southern was reaffirmed as an institution as it relates to SACS accreditation guidelines. That is really good news. We later learned, by way of a letter that arrived in January that we have been reaffirmed; however, there will be a monitoring report that will be due to SACS in September of this year. And that monitoring report is looking specifically at three recommendations that the visiting team made to us. This news was not something that we did not expect. Let me share with you briefly what those recommendations were, and what we are doing about them, so that we will be ready to respond in September. Let me read to you what the letter said:

- Recommendation on 3.3.1: The committee recommends that the University document the use of analyses of outcome assessments in decision-making for improvements made in its educational programs and its administrative and education support services. (In other words, what is the evidence that demonstrates that we are effective in what we teach and in the services that we provide?)
- Recommendation 3.4.1: The committee recommends that the University be consistent in establishing learning outcomes across all educational programs, and in developing and implementing assessments to evaluate these outcomes. (This should not be news to us either; although we were able to demonstrate in some of our programs that we do that very well. In many of our programs the evidence simply is not there. If you have been hearing about evidence-based decision making, better known as EBDM, this is what that is about. This is really an attempt for us to close the loop; to show the evidence that it worked. We must show whether the things that we do actually result in what we said that they would do. EBDM is a means for providing evidence.)
- Recommendation on 3.5.1: The committee recommends that the University expand its evaluation system to assess all stated general education core competencies in order to provide evidence that graduates have attained these competencies. (In essence, what our SACS review team was able to see is that the only real good assessment that we have is the Regents' Test which assesses the competency of our students in writing and in reading. In many of the other General Education courses that we teach, we simply are not able to demonstrate as well as we should that students are in fact achieving what we say that they are achieving. So, when your Chairs and your Deans are talking to you about evidence-based decision making, please do not think that this is simply an attempt for them to get you to do more work. It is really an attempt for us to be able to link up and close that missing assessment loop. It is not that we are not doing some very valuable things in the courses that we teach and in the services we provide. Please understand I do know that valuable things are being done, but the fact is that in the documentation that we are able to provide we simply have not been as effective as we need to be. This is not anything that is unusual; this is happening across the country. If you look in almost any higher education document lately this is something that is being asked for. Not only is it being asked for in higher education circles, but if you just listen to our legislators, if you listen to our new Chancellor, you will hear it loudly and clearly. We will be focusing on EBDM in the coming years, so please, when you are called on, do not hesitate to step forward.)

Are there questions that I might address before we move on?

Candy Schille (CLASS): I am concerned about the Regents' Exam being just about the only measurable thing that we have. I seem to recall that we do have a number of things that I do not know how one would measure them. People are supposed to be something like culturally tolerant of some things, so how would we measure some of these things?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Thank you for raising that issue, because one of the things that we have done this year is to make a concerted effort to begin conversations within departments about what we want our graduates to look like. What are the characteristics that we want to see in the graduates of our programs as they are leaving here? That is a really important question to ask. Only when we know what we are hoping to see as our students are leaving us, do we really know how to backtrack and say, "What are the experiences that we are putting in place to assure that those things are actually happening?" I see some of you nodding your heads, so apparently those conversations have taken place in several departments, and that is important. It is going to be important to have the input of faculty to know what it is that you think are the skills or the knowledge that students have. It is important to know whether graduating students have obtained skills, knowledge, or whether we are seeing simply dispositions that students have. And what you are talking about really is a disposition. In getting at that, there is at least one person sitting in here who was a member of a focus group that met back in September. The focus group was composed of individuals who were members of a fairly exclusive club, and I say that because they are people who have won the research, the scholarship, or the service award here at the University. And they were asked to come up with a list of characteristics that we want to see in our graduates, and they did. That list was shared with our Deans. Subsequent to that particular meeting, I had a meeting with a similarly-sized group of students, and I asked them that same question, and you would be surprised at the parallelism that exists among the two groups' responses. That piece of feedback was shared with both Deans and Chairs, and I will be happy to share it with the Senate. I think it provides a basis for us to begin. Then, as you are going and you are looking at your individual departments, it is going to be very important to think about what that means. What are the outcomes that we expect from the students in our own departments? That is certainly a beginning point, but obviously we are going to move forward and build in the experiences (if they are not already there) that not only help us to achieve the desired characteristics, but that we can measure on the back end. And I agree with you, some of these are very difficult to measure. But some of them will be measurable, and those we will try to track.

Michael Moore (COE): I am somewhat surprised on the 3.5.1 recommendation on General Education courses, since I remember a broad-based campus committee generating General Education outcomes. Afterward there were forums on campus, and then the outcomes were approved by the entire campus at one time. I thought that we might be in good shape on that one.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I understand what you are saying. I think that one of the things that is important to know though is that we do not have those student learning outcomes to actually demonstrate. If there is one college I think that probably has been at the forefront of helping us to understand what student learning outcomes are and how to measure them it has been the College of Education, which has been going through and preparing for its NCATE visit for the last two-and-a-half years. I believe the College of Education has completed the establishment of student learning outcomes for each of its courses and a way of tracking those. So there is some of that out there, but the fact is that it has got to be across the board. Having it in one college or certain departments is really not going to be enough for us.

Ming Fang He (COE): It is great to hear that we have been asked to provide evidence. I have no problem about that, but I do have a question for you. Are you going to allow each discipline in the different colleges to evaluate using different formats, because different disciplines have different ways to measure and different ways to evaluate? Or, are you going to use a uniform kind evaluation format and force every college to use the same database?

Linda Bleciken (Provost): I think that it is going to be an iterative process in which the outcomes that are identified and then the measures proposed will be looked at in a way that helps us to understand how to do that. I am not sure that I totally understand your question, because clearly different colleges and different departments are going to have different outcomes that they do measure. It would stand to reason that we would measure them in different ways. I do not know if I have addressed your question though.

Ming Fang He (COE): Maybe I can make it more specific. For example, in the College of Education, when we evaluate the performance outcomes for the undergraduates, it can be very different from the way we evaluate doctoral students. Their outcomes will be related to how many publications they have done for one thing. Performance outcomes for undergraduates will not include that. So there are different ways to measure different outcomes, and sometimes some outcomes are very difficult to measure.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Right.

Ming Fang He (COE): So, you said that our College of Education is very successful, using their format, at measuring desired outcomes. Are you going to ask other colleges to follow the College of Education's format?

Linda Bleciken (Provost): No, the measurement has to fit the outcome. Certainly, some of the outcomes that you would have for graduate students would be different from outcomes that would be expected for undergraduates.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): When SACS came through and made these recommendations, (and I understand that there were some specifics that they looked at) were there colleges or universities out there saying, "Okay this is the way we do it; this is a good model for you to use."? I would like to have a model as to what we are supposed to do, and we could use that model as a template for what we should be doing within our departments, within our colleges, and across the University. Is there such a template out there? Or, are we a test case in this instance? Are there other universities who are doing this better than we are, and if so, who are they, and how do we look at those educational outcomes that they have been using to sort of give us a better guide as to how we should be implementing these?

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Actually, there are some institutions that have been engaged in this effort for quite while, and one of them that was quite a distance ahead of us was Texas A & M. We took a team out even before we received this news in December. We took a team out there in July, and then in September Marilee Bresciani, who is their

Assistant Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness, came and met with every administrator here on campus. In that meeting, which included the Deans as well as the other Vice Presidents and their directors, we looked at a way of tracking a model that we could use. We are actually implementing the Texas A & M model to a degree. I will not say that it is exactly the template that Texas A & M uses, because we are not Texas A & M.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): Is that template available to us?

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Yes.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): Okay.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Your Chairs have it, and it should be something that is very easily accessible to you. I appreciate the discussion, because this is going to be interesting work. It is going to be very valuable work, I think, because it will help us to be confident that what we do is making a difference in our students' lives. I think *we* know that our work makes a difference in our students' lives, but we have to be able to demonstrate that truth to others.

Carnegie Classifications

Since we last met we have had the Carnegie Classifications. The new guidelines from Carnegie came out in November. We were then given an opportunity to respond to the feedback from Carnegie, and it became official in December. What you see in front of you is a brief synopsis of the new classifications guidelines, and we can thank Dr. Jayne Perkins Brown and her staff in the Office of Strategic Research and Analysis for putting this together. The purpose of this document is to help us make sense of something that is pretty interesting. On the front end you see a bit of a news release, and I just want to walk you through a few things. We have moved from something that was relatively simple, where we had things like research, extensive research, intensive research, intensive, comprehensive, etc., to something that is not so simple. You see in the middle paragraph, President Shulman of the Carnegie Foundation says, "And we have felt that attempting to shoehorn all institutions into a single classification has introduced avoidable distortions, inaccuracies, and obscurities." So, they have looked at institutions and provided a whole range of spots into which we might fit. The next paragraph says, "We hope to de-emphasize the improper use of the classification as informal quality touchstone," and so the "five new Carnegie Classifications are organized around three key questions: What is taught? To whom? In what setting?" Then, if we look at *Part A. Site Information*, you will see Georgia Southern's Classification under the new criteria. We are included in the section "Prof+A&S/SGS," which means "Professions plus arts & sciences, some graduate coexistence." It does not give you a whole lot of information, but tells us that Georgia Southern is professional plus arts and sciences, some graduate. You will note that they do not put us in the high graduate category, because according to them we have graduate degrees in some, but less than half of our undergraduate fields. In the graduate area, and we went back and forth with them on this for quite a while, we have a single doctoral degree in Education, and basically they said that our two doctoral programs are in Curriculum and Instruction and Educational

Leadership and Administration. They count those as an aggregated one doctoral program, which is a bit of a surprise because we thought we had two, but that is the way the new classification reads. We talked to them at length about this issue. This gives you a bit of an overview as to what our classification is now: very high undergraduate, the graduate program is somewhat less than we might have thought. I think that we have to think now about not only who we are according to Carnegie, but where is it that we are trying to move, and I would point you in that direction. One of the things that we know is that we have a program which is right now under consideration at the Board of Regents, and it is probably under the most serious consideration that it has been in the last seven years. It is the PsyD, and we have very great hope that it will see its way clear to becoming a reality during the Spring Semester. I cannot guarantee it, because I am not on the Board, but that is what we are hoping for. If we look beyond that, our new College of Public Health is preparing a doctoral proposal for what we call the DRPH, and that is the Doctor of Public Health. Both of these are very applied doctoral degrees, but they are going to move us down the road to some yet unknown Carnegie Classification, I believe. Perhaps we will be the “comprehensive with no medical.” It is quite an interesting time! All institutions are subject to Carnegie Classifications, and most of them are dealing with exactly what we are dealing with. They are dealing with something that they have known that has now become something that is less well known. So, the bad news is that it is not as clear; the good news is that it gives us some degrees of flexibility to move that we did not have before. This is a very brief way of saying that we do not know exactly what this means for us, but we think we have interpreted it as best we know how at this point. This document has been shared with the Deans and the Chairs; it also was shared last week with the Strategic Planning Council. Sharing with these groups elicited a concern as to whether this information is really well known by the faculty, and my assumption is *no*. So you now know that we have had a Carnegie Classification change, and this gives you some idea of what that change means for us and where we stand with classification right now.

Legislature

The legislature is in session, and this year it looks like there are some bright spots for us, and I say that because the early news on the budget is good. I think probably none of you missed Governor Perdue’s announcement that he is recommending a 4% salary increase. Now that is very good news. That will be the best salary increase that we have experienced in the higher education system here in Georgia for quite a number of years. Beyond that, the other piece of really good news is that we have full formula funding, and I think that is so important for you to understand because that makes the difference between how much we can or cannot do. Remember that during these years of downtime or downturns we have given up \$14 million in our budget. That is a huge chunk and we are probably not ever going to see that money come back to us. The money we gave up we are never going see again. So, getting a full formula funding gets us about back to parity to where we were in FY 02, and that is not so bad, because we have been in worse shape, and we have kept the doors open and kept everybody running and kept things working. Having full formula funding means that we can actually in the coming year continue to add back faculty positions, which we have been doing even in bad budget times for the last two years. I think that it is important to understand that the formula is funded not on student headcount, but it is funded on credit hours

produced, and those credit hours get a different weight if they are graduate versus undergraduate. The more graduate credit hours we have, the more money we get. Now I am not suggesting that we throw out all of our undergraduate students, so please understand that. But if you hear in the coming years a push to try to enhance the graduate programs, it is not just to get more money, obviously, but that does have that added affect for us. Right now the University System of Georgia accounts for 11.5% of what the state budget is, and you might say well that does not seem like very much in a state where we know that education is not so great to start with, but I will tell you that the Governor and the legislators are continually under pressure from other constituencies to get a bigger piece of that pie, and so we are happier with 11.5% than we might be with 10.5%. We are happy with what we have for this year, but always pushing for more. One of the things that I think is important for us to think about though is a signal that has been sent to us by the Governor, and if you do not think that his endorsement of our new Chancellor was a signal, then think again, because our new Chancellor is very much in the mode of accountability and showing that we are worth the money that we are given. Those of us in this University System are very much on notice to show accountability, so what I said to you earlier about looking at student outcomes and showing that we do what we say we do is very important. In addition, the Governor has also signaled that all state agencies will be scrutinized regarding customer service. I know when this was said in a recent meeting, one Vice President (not me) said, "I think we are already doing that at Georgia Southern." Well, I think we are, too, but the main thing is we are just going to have to *demonstrate* that we actually do provide great customer service. And now I am going to pause for a minute and ask Joe Franklin if he has anything to add.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): Thank you, Dr. Bleicken. Yes I would like to reiterate what you said about next year being the best budget year we have had in quite some time, and from somebody who has to find a dollar here and there sometimes to spread it around, that will certainly make it a lot easier to do that. I would like to point out that we also got the Governor's recommendation of \$68.2 million for MRR funds, and that is money that is allocated for repair and rehabilitation of our buildings. Usually, for projects of less than a million dollars, we will get perhaps \$2.5 million there for our buildings that we can work with. That \$68.2 million is very positive; it is a lot more than it has been in the last few years. Also note that concerning the capital project lists, major and minor, we are not on either list. We had hoped to get the Fine Arts Phase IV on that list, but it was not on the Governor's recommendation. However, we are working behind the scenes to see if we cannot get that added to the list. If anybody really studies the Governor's recommendations, they will notice that there is an adjustment for payback projects for Georgia Southern. That has to do with the RAC. In the old RAC, they took away \$677,000 from our budget in order to pay the bonds back. What we have done is basically paid off those bonds, and the money that they took out of our budget has been put back into our budget, so that is really just a technical move and it does not really affect our money one way or the other. Thank you.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Great. Well back on campus! We have a lot of progress going on. You know I think sometimes we spend too much time just kind of motoring around our own campus, and we forget how really great it is! And sometimes it is awfully good

to look at us through other people's eyes. We had a recent Deans and Chairs workshop where we had a couple of people who were observers from off-campus locations. We talked very openly and very candidly with them about the good, the bad, and the ugly here at Georgia Southern, and at the end of that day-and-a-half, these two observers made the comment that we have great things going on at Georgia Southern. This is a great place! I hope you appreciate what you are doing now, and continue to really work on the things that are strong points for you. I think that very often we look at ourselves, but we do not see ourselves through others eyes. It was very important I think that day to hear that great things are going on at Georgia Southern. In fact, there was a gentleman today here on campus from Valdosta, who is here for an NCATE pre-visit, and he said to me, "I don't know whose arm you have twisted in the state legislature, but you have more stuff going on at this campus than we could dream of." I think sometimes we see it everyday, and we forget how much we really do have going on and how terrific some of the projects are, and I will just note some of these.

- The continued progress on the Library. It is very much on track and it looks like Phase I will be completed by May of '06, and that is going to allow us to move into a piece of the library that has actually finished construction.
- Fine Arts Phase III. This is the art galleries, black box theater that is being bid right now.
- The RAC is progressing. If you have been by there lately, my goodness! A 135,000 square foot addition to the current building; more than doubling the size that it is currently. Students paid for it, so do not worry. They are footing the bill on this, but that one appears to be on track for finishing in December of '06.
- Veazey. To house our colleagues in Communication Arts, and some others. That is proceeding along. I think that we are about ready to bid that as well, right, Joe?

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): Not quite yet.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Okay.

- Cone Hall. That is one of those residence halls that is over on Herty Drive. It is sitting vacant right now. There is a plan to renovate that, and it will house several groups to include our new College of Public Health, the Academic Success Center, the Regents Center for Learning Disabilities, and the Student Disability Resource Center, and a few others. So, we are using the resources that we have on campus. We are not only building new buildings, but we are actually renovating in a very systematic way the old ones.
- And we are continuing to move toward the elimination of our most unsightly temporary structures! So, when you see folks moving out of that Communication Arts trailer, I think we might have a party, Chris.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS): I would vote for a demolition, bonfire, hot dog roast.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): I think that sounds like a very worthy thing!

David Robinson (CLASS): I have a syllogism for you.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I am afraid to hear it.

David Robinson (CLASS): The customer is always right.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Oh, yes.

David Robinson (CLASS): However, our students are not always right. Therefore, our students are not customers. They are students. They are not patients or clients. They are just students, and it sort of a category unto itself. Should we take the Chancellor's rhetoric, which I guess is intended for the legislature, primarily, as something more than an occasion for eye rolling or does it have some real impact on what we do?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Please understand this did not come from the Chancellor; it came from the Governor.

David Robinson (CLASS): Worse yet.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Yes, the Chancellor has not used the "C" word. Anyway, I take your point very well. Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Other questions?

Ming Fang He (COE): Could I ask you a question about the budget, and, meanwhile, I do want to say that our campus is getting prettier. My question is about the budget; about faculty. Could you update us about what is going on with the salary bumping task force? I talked with some of the faculty in my college, and, for example, one of the faculty just got promoted from Associate to Full. Usually when you are promoted from Associate to Full Professor, you got at least a \$2,500 raise. She said that she only got \$2,000. So, what is the update?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): This is partly a question for Pat and partly for me. One of the things that we agreed to do was to actually hire an outside consulting firm to come in and do a review of the salaries on this campus. There are a couple of firms that we are talking with right now. One of the things that we had to do was to figure out who not only could look at salaries in a legitimate way, but who was able to look at salaries of faculty. There are lots of firms out there that do salary studies. There are not as many that look at higher education salaries, but we are in conversation with two. One is MGT and the other one is Huron Consulting. MGT actually is working with Dalton State. We will have conversations with both of them, and we will have a competitive bid to get that to happen.

Ming Fang He (COE): So, if I remember right, the last time we talked about a salary bumping task force, we had a report with recommendations that discussed the salary raise for moving from each rank. As I remember you were going to submit it to Board of Regents for approval. I just wonder about what has happened to the task force?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The report that was approved by the Senate last November was also approved by Dr. Grube. If somebody was promoted last year, which was effective in August of '05, they would have gotten the old bump. The new bumps are effective for people being promoted right now--promotions effective in August of '06.

Ming Fang He (COE): Okay.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Sorry, I made that more complex than it was. I hope that provided some additional information, though.

Ming Fang He (COE): It is too bad for those folks that got promoted this year; they did not get the new salary raise. I feel bad for them.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I am in that boat.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Just a little brief personal grumbling. With all of our having to show that our students do learn what we want them to learn, etc., since we are spending so much money on the RAC, or the students are, are we measuring their *buffness* in any way?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I believe Physical Fitness was one of the things we wanted our students to espouse.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Actually, it is interesting, and I am sorry that somebody from there is not here, but they have actually done some looking at students who use the RAC on a regular basis. It turns out that they actually have higher GPAs and are likely to be retained at a higher level--for whatever that is worth. It is a kind of interesting thing. I am not sure that we measure student's *buffness* though.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Are there any other questions for Dr. Bleicken?

Ming Fang He (COE): First of all, I do not like that new Carnegie Classification. I do not get it. And second of all, it may be hard to determine what this means to us. But, my question is, does this matter? And, what are we moving toward?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Actually, I would like to address that question, because I think it does tell us where we are. Does it make it as clear what we are moving toward? Perhaps not. But what I tried to do was outline some areas in which we are pursuing doctoral programs that are very likely to come to fruition, which will move us into a next category, and one of those may be the comprehensive non-medical category. I think that it is a classification system that has been out since December, and we are all trying to grapple with it.

5. Report from Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee: Since the last Senate meeting, there was one information request from

Michael Nielsen regarding faculty tampering with student evaluations of instruction, and that request was responded to by Dr. Bleicken, who stated that she was aware of only one instance last year, but that the potential was there. She also responded that that was not the primary impetus for looking at online evaluations. There was one agenda request from Nancy Shumaker to inform the Senate and faculty that students who did not attend the first day of class would be automatically dropped, so students on a wait list could be accommodated. The SEC met to discuss that, and we had many questions on implementation, and placed the item as an information/discussion item listed as #8 on the agenda. After the agenda setting meeting, I received an e-mail from Bill Yang, Chairman of the Faculty Development Committee, and he questioned whether temporary faculty were eligible to receive funding. After reviewing the web pages for the various grant competitions, I found that temporary faculty were specifically included for research grants, but no mention was made of them for either service or faculty development grants. And even though the FDC has finished this cycle, the Service Committee is still working on evaluating requests for funding. Therefore, I wanted to get the views of the Senate, so I placed an agenda item request as #9 on today's agenda. I should state I have no investment in the way that the motion was worded, but I thought that we should make it positive rather than negative. In other business, I was requested by Bob Chambers to find two faculty members for the Parking and Transportation Committee, since through an oversight, both faculty members had rotated off in December. And I must say I was overwhelmed by the response. I had eleven people volunteer, and ultimately the SEC decided to name Cynthia Frost from the Library to a two-year term, and Stephanie Davis of Health and Human Sciences to a one-year term, and after this, hopefully, they will keep up with the rotation cycle. I want to thank everybody who volunteered; it was great to see people willing to work on a committee. The Student Evaluation Committee has been working; you have heard about that a little bit from Mary. Some of their minutes were at the end of the Librarian's report. Doug Johnson and a student, Abby Lynes, will be conducting focus groups on the process beginning this month. What do we see? We see the good points, bad points, and indifferent points of the current evaluation system, so I would urge anyone who is contacted to please cooperate and take the time to invest in the process of investigating the current state of the system and where do we want it to go. I think everybody is aware that shared sick leave was discussed on the Senate Listserv, in response to an inquiry received by Marc Cyr. Just to clarify things for everybody, he is working on a new version and should have something simpler soon. Joe, would you like to mention anything about that at this point?

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): Not at this time, I would not, thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Okay. The physical master plan is going to be revised starting this semester. As Senate Moderator, I am on the Physical Planning Committee, so I will be helping work with that. Regarding the salary compression issue, this is what Linda was referring to earlier when she was talking about looking for consultants. If you recall in the November meeting, we voted to form a committee to look at and address some sort of mechanism for dealing with salary compression. Unfortunately, if you read the *Bylaws* and the *Statutes of the University*, and the Senate, if we pass something, it must still be approved by the President, and forming a

committee was not approved by the President. He stated he would prefer hiring a consultant, so they are looking at doing that. I assure you it is an issue that is near and dear to my heart. I am currently on a Search Committee. I am eleven years post-Ph.D. and I have been promoted. I have been talking to somebody who has not even finished her Ph.D., and is asking for more money than I make. She has already received an offer for that much elsewhere! Are there any questions about the Senate Executive Committee report?

Clara Krug (CLASS): When do you anticipate that you might hire the firm and is there a time frame for anything beyond the hiring?

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Given that we have not hired them, I do not know what the time frame would be at this point. Right now we are engaged in conversation. It took a while to come up with firms that could actually do this sort of work in a higher education environment.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Would you anticipate hiring them before graduation 2006?

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Yes.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: In discussing the issues with Dr. Grube, I might clarify a little further. He believes it is one thing to put out a mechanism for addressing that issue; it is another thing to a) find the dollars, and b) know exactly whether we are really underpaid relative to whom, and if so, by how much. A good comprehensive kind of salary survey regarding how we stack up against other like institutions in similar kinds of environments is one of the big keys in terms of looking at this issue. That is why the outside firm is being looked at.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I would just like to thank you for doing something eminently rather than non-eminently.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Are there any other questions? There were none.

6. Report from Jerry Wilson (COBA), SPC Representative: The SPC has met twice since the last Senate meeting, and, since Dr. Bleicken covered about half of my report, it will not take long to finish. The full report will be a part of the minutes, so please take a look at it if you get a chance. At the November 30th meeting, Dr. Jayne Perkins Brown discussed our position with respect to RPG, retention, progression, graduation--what we were doing to meet University, USG initiatives there. At the February 8th meeting, Trey Denton, co-chair of the SPC, began by telling us that we had received a letter from SACS reaffirming our accreditation, and then Dr. Perkins Brown again presented the Carnegie classification, and, just like here, there was a great deal of discussion about it and what it might mean, and I guess the consensus there was that it is too early to tell what it will mean. And then the next topic at that second meeting was about the recent administrative retreat held for Deans, Directors, and Department

Chairs, and Trey Denton, one of the attendees, summarized some of the key discussion areas at the retreat which were:

- Expansion of collaborative efforts across campus
- Progress with respect to institutional effectiveness and assessment
- Faculty roles and rewards, and then,
- Capturing the essence of Georgia Southern, or how to succinctly describe the institution in a way that is consistent with the mission and themes, which is something we are going to be working on very soon in the SPC.

That meeting concluded with discussion on how to best promote the Strategic Plan to various campus constituents with the particular emphasis on new administrators, staff, faculty, and students. That concludes my report.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Thank you. Are there any questions for Jerry? There were none.

7. Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: I have started to send around the room some handouts for us. There are three separate documents in the handout. The first one is the Graduation Success Rate Report for the 1995-1998 Cohorts at Georgia Southern University. Those rates are expressed by sport under the column GSR. The numbers under the column GSR are percentages. I did not put the percentage sign in there, so, for example, you can see for the first one, baseball under men's sports, the graduation success rate is 35%, for basketball 50%, football 65%, and so forth, on through all of the sports. Georgia Southern's student-athlete GSR overall is 72%, which I have heard is the highest in the system. The only place I have seen that in writing was in *Sound Off* and I was a tad hesitant to cite *Sound Off* as a source. The number of student-athletes that exhausted their eligibility for that cohort was 289, and the graduation rate from those 289 students was 91%. The question that I am typically asked when people see this is what is up with men's baseball at 35%? One of the reasons baseball is particularly low in terms of graduation success rate is that it is the one sport with the vast minor league system where a number of student-athletes on each team have the opportunity to sign a professional contract and leave before their eligibility has expired, so I think that probably accounts for a good bit of that. Are there any questions on the GSR percentages?

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): These are percentages of graduating in eight semesters or ten semesters?

Chris Geyerman (CLASS): Let me rephrase your question and tell me if I get it Godfrey. Is your question, how long does it take these folks to graduate?

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Right, or does it mean they graduate at all.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS): No, it means for those cohorts the GSR runs on a six-year cycle.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Okay.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS): That is why we are up to the '98 cohort, right now. Next year when I make this presentation it will go through the '99 cohort, because we will be another year advanced. They go back and track it. It is the cohort that ended in '98, and incidentally, the 95-96-97-98 data will be removed next year when I make this report. This started in '95, and it is my understanding that the NCAA kept the first two classes in there to give a better representation in terms of data. Any other questions on GSR? (There were none.)

Okay, the next three pages deal with the Academic Progress Rate. I will be the first one to say that I do not have a grasp of the intricacies of the statistical formulas that the NCAA uses to derive these numbers. The first page gives you the sports categorized in terms of gender. The "squad-size adjustment number" is a number that the NCAA has computed. This is the second year of data for the APR. After four years all of that squad-size adjustment will be gone for every sport. Teams with a multiyear APR below 925, including application of the appropriate squad-size adjustment, are subject to contemporaneous penalties. In the next column, you have the academic progress rate by sport for 2003-2004, and in the next column you have the academic progress rate for 2004-2005, and then you have the multi-year rate, the two-year rate. This is the first year contemporaneous penalties have kicked in--which I will get to in a minute. You can see that, like with baseball for example, for 2003-2004, their APR was pretty low, 833. They brought it up to 912. That is a basically what those what those numbers are.

Now the next page is the more kind of comprehensive version of this. It lists all of the sports. It gives you the multi-year rate. The number in parentheses on the multi-year rate is the number of athletes that have gone through. The multi-year rate upper confidence boundary is explained down at the bottom in a footnote. Then it gives the numbers for 2004. APR is determined by two factors: eligibility/graduation and retention. Each student-athlete for each semester they are in school is eligible to get one point for eligibility or graduation and one point for retention. At the end of that year, if student-athletes do all of that, they are considered what they call a "four-four," so they did not lose any ground. And as I mentioned a moment ago, the cutoff is going to be 925 in two more years as of right now. That may or may not change.

The third page is what most of us will probably be interested in. That is a report for the contemporaneous penalties imposed by the NCAA on Georgia Southern University as a result of the first two years of data for the academic progress rate. We were penalized in the sports of men's baseball and men's football. The multi-year average in baseball was 873, and that did not make the 925 cut. It is an equivalency sport, so the initial counters and total countable aid are not applicable there, but we ended up losing .46 of a scholarship. Baseball is an equivalency sport in the NCAA with a maximum of 11.7 full ride scholarships. So, Georgia Southern deducts .46 from 11.7 and our baseball team now has 11.24 full scholarships to spread out amongst its players as opposed to 11.7. In men's football, the multi-year APR was 880. Football is a little bit different. In the column entitled "Value of Overall Financial Aid Penalty," that nine denotes that we were penalized for nine people in this data. The total value of those nine student-athlete scholarships was 5.43 scholarships spread amongst those nine players. In football, you

are allowed to have 85 student-athletes at a maximum on scholarship at Division I-AA, and you can only give 63 total scholarships. So you have 63 to spread out among 85. And what has happened is that, of those 85 on scholarship, we have to deduct the nine, the value of the overall financial aid penalty, which means that this year we can give scholarship money to 76 players as opposed to 85 players. We had 63 scholarships to spread around those 85. When you deduct 5.3 scholarships from that 63, that means that we have 57.57 scholarships to spread around 76 players. That is the brief version of the APR. If you have questions feel free to ask them. I will answer them if I can. (There were none.)

The third document is just a summary of fall GPA for all of the student-athletes. The highest one is in bold for women's and men's sports. The combined GPA for women's sports was 2.71; for all GSU female undergraduates the combined GPA was 2.80. The combined GPA for men's sports was 2.23; for all GSU male undergraduates the combined GPA was 2.52. For everybody the athletes are a little bit lower. The combined GPA for all sports was 2.42; for all GSU undergraduates the combined GPA was 2.66. That concludes my report. Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Thank you. The next item on the agenda is an information and discussion item, which was initially submitted by Dr. Nancy Shumaker, on dropping students who do not attend the first day of class. I do not know if Nancy is aware of the implementation schedule. I did get a copy of it this morning, and I forwarded that on to all the Senators in the interest of informing the Senate.

8. Information/Discussion Item: Dropping Students who do not attend first class: Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): We have hard copies that we will distribute.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I guess I will open the questioning or discussion of this item. Where did the idea of a "required first day attendance policy" come from, and when was it enacted?

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): My understanding is that this has been something that has been under discussion for actually several years, and that it was something that actually was approved by Enrollment Management. I think Mike Deal has the history for us. He can recount it better than I can.

Mike Deal (Registrar): This idea actually did come up a couple of years ago, maybe as long as three or four years ago, and I think it actually originally came from faculty looking at ways to try to improve the management of the class seat. It came up again, I believe, last fall at the beginning of fall term of 2005. Again it came from a faculty member in CLASS, I believe, and it was brought to the Deans' Council for discussion in September, and then on to the Enrollment Management Council in September. And both of those groups did endorse it, and it went forward then to the President's Cabinet, and was approved at that point.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): I was wondering in the spirit of shared governance, and in the Senate's role of helping, as the handbook puts it, "participating mutually in the

development of policies at the departmental, college and university levels,” and “the academic affairs of the University which concern the Faculty Senate and which it shall be responsible in formulating policies and reviewing procedures include academic activities, general educational policies of the University, the welfare of the faculty, other matters that promote the interest of the faculty and the university.” I was wondering if it occurred to anyone else that this seems like the faculty and the Faculty Senate are pretty much left out of the loop, and it is just a decision made by the administration without any real effort to involve the faculty or Senate?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: As a point of information, the first I knew about it was when I saw the posting from Nancy Shumaker.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): And from my perspective, I found out about it a few hours ago in an email. Hardly a shared governance kind of thing to do it seems to me. I guess maybe it is not so much a question as a comment.

Candy Schille (CLASS): I can understand your point real well. It looks to me though as if this is it; this is our discussion time. If we have something to say about this, we better say it loud and clear.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I understand the process and so forth, but I am a bit troubled that the people that are most affected by this, of course, are the students, and as I am reading through the proposed timeline implementation, the students are not even going to know about this until March. It is almost like a *fait accompli*--here it is, take it or leave it. I do not think our students are lazy. I do not think our students purposely miss classes. Maybe some do, but I do not think that is the majority of students. My experience has been that most students want to get there the first day of class to see the syllabus to decide whether or not they are going to drop the class. I think that there are some very detrimental affects that we can see on students. Particularly international students may have trouble flying back from a long vacation or getting back in the summer and those sorts of things. One of the biggest problems I think we all face is trying to get our students to read their GSU email account or look at their GSU email account or look at their GSU mail boxes. I do not understand how we are going to be able to notify students and implement this system-wide for over 16,000 students. And as I said, to me it seems that since the students are directly involved in this, they should have been up at the top of this timeline rather than near the middle of it. And I was just wondering what the process for that was.

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): If I could address that, the Academic Advisement Council has already met and discussed this, and we have asked the advisors in the different advisement centers as well as the advisors who work in the Academic Advisement Center, to begin advising students that this is going to happen in the fall. So all of the students who go through those advisement centers are going to be told about this when they go in for advisement. The other thing is that the committee is working very hard to determine how we can take care of those exceptions. I, of course, raised the issue about international students, and I think the committee is very anxious to make sure that we do have some kind of an escape valve in the sense that we have some way the students

can let us know that they are not going to be able to be back for that first day, so that they do not get dropped from the class. We are finding that the classes that we are having difficulty with are not necessarily those freshman classes, but the classes that are needed for students as they progress toward their major. And we are running into difficulties when we get some of those classes that will be full when they show up on WINGS, but then that first day of class we have students who do not show up and we do not know whether those students actually intend to be in the class or not. That prevents other students who need that class to proceed with their major from taking the class, and sometimes delays them in the process of moving forward, and this is one effort to try to help those students get the classes when they need them.

Kent Murray (CLASS): This appears to produce a kind of a domino effect in that if I am on a reserve list, and somebody does not show, they get dropped; so now I can get into this class, am I going to drop another one to get into this one. Then that opens up a seat there. Then it keeps dominoing all the way through the system, and for what justifiable reasons will we establish for an excuse on day one?

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): We are trying to establish a list of what we would call justifiable excuses, for example, if someone is in the military and is not able to come back, if someone is an international student and is not able to get back, if there is an accident or there is a family emergency, there is a medical emergency; we are coming up with a list of what we would call rational excuses that we would be able to verify.

Michael Moore (COE): What kind of provision is there for online classes? The College of Education is teaching a lot of online classes. I cannot see us validating or verifying enrollment on the first night of an online course.

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): That is one of the issues that we are trying to determine right now. What would we do about an online course, because that is a different kind of course and we are not really sure if that is the same kind of problem that we have with the available seats in a classroom that we have on campus?

Michael Moore (COE): And it also treats students differently. It may mean that students would think, "Why go through all this when I can just simply choose online?" I also share Michael's concern about process, too, and I make that point.

Mary Ann Rogers (SGA): Just a question. It seems like we are almost penalizing the students who went through advisement, registered on time, and got their classes. And, in a sense, as a peer advisor also we are always encouraging early advisement. Also, sometimes what I might consider a valid excuse for me being absent might not be on a professor's prepared list of valid excuses. If your excuse is not on the list, you are dropped from the class.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: As a point of information, we had this system at my prior institution, and to make life even more difficult, they typically started classes on Thursday. The implementation there was that the students had to communicate directly with their instructors, and it was up to the instructor and the student to try and

decide whether or not it was a valid reason. And it worked pretty well. I only had maybe four or five a semester out of about 250 students who had problems with it.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): You know it seems to me that it introduces so much hassle, that I am not sure that it achieves so much benefit as to justify the hassle. A hot list of exceptions and talk to your instructor; it just does not seem like that there is enough benefit to be achieved to make it really worthwhile.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): In the third bullet of your handout it says "Waitlisted students will be registered for a class as seats become available." I interpret that to mean that as a student is not verified and a spot becomes available, the next person on the queue becomes registered, and that student is notified that she is in the class. If she somehow misses that notification and then misses that class that she did not know she was in, she will be dropped for it, and it rolls on. And it is possible that she would miss her opportunity for a class that she needed or wanted because she did not know that she was in it. Part of this bullet says that students will be registered as seats become available. The next part says they will be given permission to register. I am asking for clarification on that bulleted part of the process.

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): The wording on that is difficult. Actually they will be notified that they can register for the class. Students are on a waitlist because they have put themselves on there saying they want that class, and they are notified ahead of time that if the class opens up, they have a chance of getting an email that will give them permission to get into that class. So those students we would assume would be watching their email, hoping they got one saying, "Yes, there is a seat in this class available and you have the opportunity to register." We are asking the students if they feel like they really need a seat in a class, to put themselves on a waitlist for it, and then you watch and see if a seat opens up, and they will get an email telling them that it has opened up and to register for it.

Leslie Furr (CHHS): We were just discussing that in California we always had this rule that if you did not show up for the first class, and at least by the first two classes, the professors just dropped you from the class. And basically, that is what you are setting up here now, because all that professors have to do if they want to keep you in the class is just check that you were actually attending the class. They could lie, right?

Don Fausett (COST): Seems like this has implications related to our attendance verification pertaining to financial aid also. If we say someone is there in order for them not to get dropped, we are also certifying their attendance to be eligible for financial aid, as of a certain date, which may have federal statutes pertaining to falsehoods related to it.

Jerry Wilson (COBA): I think I agree totally with Godfrey; it seems like we are creating a new infrastructure to deal with something that we are not entirely sure is broken completely, in the first place, and whether or not it will fix it. Concerning the waitlist, how do I get on it? You mentioned that sometimes majors cannot get into a class because it fills up. So, if my name is next on the list, and I am not a major in that

particular area, do I still get a slot in that class? What about the folks that are thinking they may want to major in that subject, so they want to take this class, which is the first in the series and if they really like that, then they will change their major, but they are not a major now? Is some process in place that we keep them from being at the front of the waitlist?

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): We have not talked about prioritizing students. We had talked about students putting themselves on the waitlist, and we had not talked about there being any criteria as to whether they were a major or not. I am just saying that is an instance of where we are showing some difficulties as our retention rates go up and we have sophomores and juniors and the numbers of those students growing that we are seeing the crunch happen in those classes those students need. But we were not talking about letting some students put themselves on a waitlist and others not. We are saying if the student really wants to take a class and the class is full, they can put themselves on a waitlist.

Clara Krug (CLASS): If I may, I would like to ask Senator Rogers a question. Ms. Rogers, at what point did the Student Government Association become aware of the “deleting classes first day for non-attendance”?

Mary Ann Rogers (SGA): A student happened to overhear a conversation in the fall, and that was it. We have not been made aware.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Happened to overhear a conversation?

Mary Ann Rogers (SGA): That is all I am aware of. It was brought to us in the fall, and a Senator said, “You know we have heard this might be going on.”

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay, so a Senator heard this, and at what point did the Enrollment Management Council come to the SGA and ask for your discussion of this?

Mary Ann Rogers (SGA): We can check the records; I’m not aware of that.

Clara Krug (CLASS): As far as you know. . .

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: If you look at the schedule it is not due to happen until next month.

Mary Ann Rogers (SGA): Yes.

Clara Krug (CLASS): It did not occur, so that did not occur.

Mary Ann Rogers (SGA): I apologize. As of right now, I do not even know that they are even on the calendar for March to talk to us.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I'd like to ask a point of order, I guess, parliamentary. This is for information and discussion; we are not to have action; is it possible to propose a resolution?

Bob Cook (Senate Parliamentarian): We have had this happen before, where we had a discussion item and then people would say if we are going to keep discussing it, we might as well wait until new business and have a motion. We can terminate the discussion anytime, and then under new business anyone can propose a resolution.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay, so we could propose a resolution not to endorse this policy? That would be doable. Thank you.

David Robinson (CLASS): As shared governance goes, this is a joke. Plenty of people have brought up the specific potential problems that this could create. It strikes me just in general, in principle, that you have got sort of a "gotcha" here at the core of this, which is just obnoxious. I am a fairly disorganized person. I have missed classes, as a student, as a teacher. Once I missed the first day of class completely because I thought it was in a different building, and that was a long time ago. I will not do it again. I think that the rule should be humane; they should not try to aspire toward a sort of mechanical perfection, which ejects the student from the seat that he is not in on the first day of class. It seems to me that this is a much more effective way of quietly boosting our real class enrollments above our predicted class enrollments. I am not sure it helps the student very much though. Another thing, what is the expected involvement of instructors going to be in the situation? Are you expecting us, say if I have got 100, 150 students, which is not too odd, if I've a full load, with a lot of core classes, let alone people who teach large classes like in History and so on, how many times during that first week am I supposed to be checking my roll, checking attendance and then cross-checking that with an online form to make sure? I already have to go through this routine for enrollment verification. I propose that I have better things to do than do it two or three more times for several classes.

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): I think the intention is that you check attendance the first day that you hold the class, and then, if there are students who enroll in that class either that day or the next, because they were on a waitlist and have had a chance to enroll, that they would then request that you verify their attendance and you would go in and verify their attendance.

David Robinson (CLASS): So, Nancy, this means approximately a doubling of our work the first week with respect to enrollment and reporting to the Registrar.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): So it is up to the student to go to the professor and say, "I have just added this class; will you verify my attendance this day?"

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): Right, and what we have talked about doing, for example, is, if we have a student who cannot make it the first day and has an excuse, there will be a code that will show that the student should not be dropped, and if a student comes in and registers that day for the class, the student should notify you and ask to have the

attendance verified. There would be a code put on the student so they could not be inadvertently dropped until they have had a chance to do that.

Kent Murray (CLASS): The students love to have an optimum schedule with alternate courses. How many waiting lists can a student be on at one time which congests the whole system there? Plus, what about some special situations where the instructor wants to give an override on the limit in their class, is this taken away from them? Or if a student has a prerequisite which the instructor wants to override to put them in a class, is this now out of their hands because we are playing numbers only?

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): I do not think this has anything to do with overrides. I think this has to do with the fact that there are a given number of seats usually in the class. I think it is, however, the college or department that handles the override situation. I think this has to do with those classes that are on WINGS that are available through the registration system for the students.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): I think from all the discussion we have had so far that we have probably more than adequately demonstrated the number of problems that could emerge in the first week or so of class with this in place, and so the question is, again, the number of people who are going to be benefited or affected by this, does it really justify this?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): From what I am hearing, there are significant questions about this. And I am not here representing the Enrollment Management Council, by any degree, but one of the pieces that concerns me a great deal, is a pledge that I actually made to students a few years ago, that to the best of my ability, I would not be responsible for implementing something that affected them without at least letting them know in advance. Of all the things that concern me, that I think concerns me the most. I think we need to take this back and take a look at, not only the basis for it, but also the implementation questions that we are hearing.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): This discussion reminds me of a situation that I have had in one of my classes in particular. About five years ago a student failed, or he might have gotten a "D" in my class. Now every fall when I teach that class, I see him there sometime during the first week, and I do not see him until the next fall. And I do not know what kind of financial aid program he is trying to scam. I am a lot more concerned about that kind of person taking a seat that could be much more beneficially used. Maybe that is something that the Enrollment Management Council could look at. I do not know of any mechanism that I could use to report that.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Actually, I think there are mechanisms in place to keep those students from actually gaining credit for a class. I would like to tell you, from my standpoint in recollecting how this all started, I think one of the biggest problems that we have had is in the Sciences and in classes where we have a seat number that is limited by the equipment that is actually there to be able to conduct the class. This might occur in a Writing and Linguistics class where we have a limited number of computers and in some Broadcasting classes where the equipment is limited. In those

cases, it really is important to know how many students are in the class. because, if in fact you have 25, and at day five you actually have attrition that knocks that back to 19, there are 6 students that I assure you wish they could have had that class who will not get that class and will not be able to be in that class. It is not the case that that happens in every class, but it is a real factor in some of the classes where we have limited resources to be able to deliver instruction.

Pat Walker (CLASS): Just to go along with what Mike Nielsen was saying, I am teaching Art, where we have limited resources, and we have to limit the number of students we have in class according to the number of easels we have or whatever. Sometimes it is a problem when somebody signs up and then does not show up the first day, but more often recently the problem has been with attendance verification. The way that runs for the students to get their financial aid, I get several students in a class that show up, who are there to be verified and as soon as the verification period goes, I suddenly do not see them. They do not get credit for the class, but they never intended to get credit for the class. They just do not come back, so somebody else who may have wanted to take that class cannot take it. That is more of a problem in our department, I think.

Clara Krug (CLASS): So what happens now? Do you withdraw this proposal, so that we have something written that states that this is not going to be adopted until there is some further discussion that would include the Faculty Senate and the Student Government Association? I guess I want to put in writing what will transpire after this afternoon's discussion, so we know for certain.

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): I will be glad to take this back to the Enrollment Management Council, and to tell them about this discussion, and to ask them if perhaps what we should do is begin to engage the Student Government Association in a discussion and also faculty members in a discussion about the policy, if that is what seems to be the best way for us to proceed at this point.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Thanks.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I would just add that some member of the Enrollment Management also needs to get on the SGA agenda in the next week or two.

9. Motion: Faculty Development Committee motion to clarify “full-time faculty.”

Bill Yang (COBA): We have received several requests from temporary instructors regarding whether they are eligible to apply for the travel grant and some faculty development related grant. In the application the guidance only says “all full-time faculty are eligible to apply.” In the very last case, we approved one request from a temporary instructor. In the last meeting, I was asked by the committee to bring this issue to the Senate. However, when I checked the record last year, I also found that a request from another temporary instructor about a summer award had been rejected by the same committee for the concern that we were not sure the temporary instructor would be back after summer or not. And similarly, we have the third round of travel

grants, which are now for travel to be after July 1, which is next fiscal year. And then the same question would need to be addressed as to whether the temporary instructor will be back next year when we give the money for travel. So, we are not quite sure which way to go. The majority of the committee members believe that we should allow the temporary instructors also to be eligible to apply for the travel grant, but this concern has not been answered yet. Also, if someone is not back, then should we give the money or not? When I say approval, that does not actually mean approve the proposal itself, but rather, should this proposal be reviewed or not?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Okay, I think you listed the rationale first, I'll read the motion that was submitted. The motion reads "The definition of "full-time faculty" eligible to apply for Faculty Development and/or Faculty Service grant money be explicitly expanded to include full-time temporary faculty, as long as their appointment coincides with the project period." That is the wording that is used in the Faculty Research grant competition, in terms of defining eligibility. The motion was seconded.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): I am definitely in favor of this, but the complication is that temporary full-time instructors do not get their appointments until just before the beginning of the year, so they cannot verify that they will be employed even though the chances are that they will.

Bill Yang (COBA): That is true. I realize that.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Could there not be a codicil that would indicate that if the temporary faculty member was unable to avail himself or herself of the funding because of non-appointment there be the person who was the next on the list in rank of his or her proposal receive the funding?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: That could get to be an administrative nightmare. I think.

Clara Krug (CLASS): But I mean, you would have to wait until the next year but that would mean that the person whom you thought had the most meritorious proposal could avail himself or herself with the funds if actually appointed. But then if that person was not appointed the next person on the list would receive the funding. You are talking about summer travel only?

Bill Yang (COBA): No, it could be next fall.

Clara Krug (CLASS): So it could be in the regular academic year between August and May, or not?

Bill Yang (COBA): No, basically from summer to fall.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Then I withdraw what I said.

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

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): I guess I am looking for some way to protect those people who fall in that grey area. The condition is that they verify that they are eligible for the next year.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: They cannot, and that is the problem.

Joe Franklin (B&F): Pardon me for getting out of my field, but after some date would the temporary employee no longer be considered an employee of Georgia Southern University? And how would you apply funding or a grant to someone who is not an employee? And whether they could travel or not may be an issue for the legal team of the University to look at as opposed to just something we would vote on.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Could I make a motion that we table this?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Yes, you may make a motion to table it. The motion was made and seconded, and the motion carried. We will table the discussion and refer it to Legal. Thank you, Joe.

10. Unfinished Business

None.

11. New Business

None.

12. Announcements: Vice Presidents

None.

13. Announcements from the floor

None.

14. Adjournment

The Faculty Senate meeting was adjourned at 5:58 p.m. by Pat Humphrey. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be **March 27, 2006** in the Russell Union Ballroom.

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
March 27, 2006
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: Jorge W. Suazo for Kathy Albertson, David Alley, Barry Balleck, Jean-Paul Carton, Ken Clark, Nirmal Das, Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Godfrey Gibbison, Mark Mohr for Tim Giles, Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Pat Humphrey, Clara Krug, Ron MacKinnon, Mary Marwitz, Bruce McLean, Michael Moore, Kent Murray, Michael Nielsen, Constantin Ogloblin, Norman Schmidt for Laura Regassa, Virginia Richards, Lisa Yocco for Donna Saye, Candy Schille, Sonya Shepherd, Caren Town, Robert Vogel, Patricia Walker, Mark Welford, Bill Wells, Jerry Wilson

Voting Members Absent: Spyros Andreou, Donald Fausett, Leslie Furr, Beverly Graham, Ming Fang He, Gautam Kundu, Maggie LaMontagne, Michele D. McGibony, Marla Morris, John Nauright, Broderick Oluyede, David Robinson, Jianping Wang, Bill Yang

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

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, President; Linda Bleicken, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Jim Bradford (CIT); Cindi Chance (COE); Charlie Hardy (CEPH); Bede Mitchell (LIB)

Senate Parliamentarian: Bob Cook

Senate Liaison: Marilyn Bruce

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

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

Student Government Representative: Lauren Markle, Vice President for Academic Affairs


Visitors: Candace Griffith, Provost's Office; Amy Heaston, Provost's Office; Nancy

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 2 of 27

Shumaker, Provost's Office; Lee Davis, Office of Legal Affairs; Joe Murray, Office of Legal Affairs; Patrick Novotny (CLASS); Jon Simpson, SGA; Matt Jones, SGA; Jonathan Buckner, SGA; Danielle Powell, SGA

1. Approval of the Agenda for the March 27, 2006 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 March 27, 2006 be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote. 

2. Approval of the February 13, 2006, Minutes: Donna Saye (COST), Senate Secretary (Mary Hazeldine, COBA, standing in for Donna): Regarding the Faculty Senate minutes for February 13, 2006, there are two corrections: First, on page 4, the fourth line should say "revisions for the MBA," rather than "MBH." Second, on page 17, just before item 6, on the agenda, the words "eminently and non-eminently" are spelled incorrectly. They should be spelled: "imminently" and "non-imminently." With these two corrections to the minutes, I move that the minutes for the February 13, 2006, Faculty Senate meeting be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

3. Librarian's Report of March 17, 2006 Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS), Senate Librarian: Jean-Paul Carton made a motion that the Librarian's Report of March 17, 2006, be approved. The motion was seconded. Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked for discussion.

Michael Moore (COE): On page three of the Librarian's Report, under the report from the Faculty Research Committee "further discussion of applications," I think these can all be made available through open records, but I do not see the need for them to be in the Librarian's Report. These seem to be the deliberations of the committee, and I think if these are to be published, it will discourage people from applying for Faculty Research monies.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I understand, and as a point of information, I have asked Ginger to delete that section from the Librarian's Report as posted.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Is it appropriate now to ask a favor of the Faculty Development Committee? Or do I need to wait to do that under new business? It involves updating their web page so that all of the members are listed.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: That should be under new business, according to the Parliamentarian.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Since the Librarian's Report has been published with the information that we want excised do we need to amend the Report and approve it as

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 3 of 27

amended?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Someone needs to move to delete it.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Okay, I move that we delete the candidates' specific information from the Faculty Research portion of the Librarian's Report.

The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: With that change being made to the Librarian's Report, the report was approved by voice vote.

Pat Humphrey (COST): Senate Moderator: The next item of business is the Undergraduate Committee Report, and Mary Hazeldine again will be standing in for Donna Saye.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Donna Saye (Mary Hazeldine, COBA, standing in for Donna Saye): At the February 13th Faculty Senate Meeting, Clara Krug asked a question about the Undergraduate Committee Report. Since I was unable to answer the question at that time, I told her I would have the answer to the question at this meeting. Her question was: On Page 101, under the New or Revised Programs, B.S. Information Technology and Information Technology Second Concentrations, the justifications are given, mentioning the changes corresponding with the program name change, but I do not see any revisions to be justified here. Were there supposed to be revisions to be justified? My answer to Clara's question: The revisions were all due to the changes in the program name for Printing Management. It has been changed to Graphic Communications Management, so all the courses in the degree that had to do with Graphic Communications Management were given new names. For example: TCPM 5332 in the BS degree in Information Technology has been changed to GCM 5332. Those were the only changes, and both degrees have been revised to reflect those changes.

At the February 21st meeting of the Undergraduate Committee:

- a new course was approved for the College of Public Health
- a program revision was approved for the College of Health and Human Sciences
- CLASS made a selected topics announcement
- Discussion of a course revision and a program revision from CIT was tabled
- Dr. Sonya Shepherd asked for a revision to item 7, (the University Resource Statement) on the New Course Form to include identification of Library resources

I move that the report from the Undergraduate Committee be approved.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Since this is a committee report, it does not require a second. Is there any discussion of the Undergraduate Committee Report?

Clara Krug (CLASS): I have a question about page 8 of the Program Revision for the B.S. in Recreation. There is a justification stating: "The following changes will enable the Recreation program, etc.," but I did not find any changes that were presented. Where

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 4 of 27

are the changes?

Mary Hazeldine (COBA): I will have to look at the actual Curriculum Form, Clara, before I can answer that.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay, thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Hearing no other discussion, Pat reminded the Senate that the approval of the Undergraduate Committee Report means that the Senate is approving and endorsing all course and curriculum changes recommended by the committee and is asking to forward those for approval by the President. The Undergraduate Committee report was approved.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Richard Flynn (CLASS): We do not have a set of minutes for approval for this meeting, but there was an item in the minutes of the last meeting that I was not able to address due to my tardiness. Clara Krug asked about two courses from the MBA program: Management 6330, and Management 7331. She said that she was not able to find the changes on page 29; however, all the catalog revisions and prerequisite changes were contained in the Librarian's Report of the last meeting on pages 26-28. So that information was indeed in the report. That is my report.

4. President's Report: Bruce Grube, President: Good afternoon, everybody. There are three items that I wanted to discuss with you briefly today.

Revision of the Alcohol Ordinance

The first item is the issue concerning the city's latest revision of the Alcohol Ordinance, and, as you may recall, as a result of activity last year, there were several changes to city ordinances. One of which was a clarification of an existing ordinance that essentially said that any establishment serving alcohol had to be a certain distance from a campus. The issue there was that it was not exactly clear how that distance was measured. The University had insisted it was from the property line. We had some interpretation by the city attorney saying, no, it is actually from the corner of the nearest instructional building. Last fall the council cleared that up, and they voted that if wine or alcohol were being served, the distance was to be a straight line 100 yards from the campus property line to the nearest corner of the establishment. If hard liquor were being served, the distance was to be a straight line 200 yards to the nearest corner of the establishment from the campus property line. About 2 weeks ago, we were apprised of a revision to that ordinance which essentially declared that streets of four lanes with a median were buffer enough and there was no need for a 100 or 200 yard separation. Needless to say, this raised considerable concern. Those who have been active in working with issues of substance abuse and alcohol and college students understand that proximity in fact is an issue. And solving these issues generally has to be a partnership between universities and the community. In other words, education on this campus by itself will not take care of the issue that we see students grappling with. The revision would mean, in practical terms, the following would no longer be subject to this proximity rule:

- anything to the north of Tillman (which is the avenue that runs near our athletic

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 5 of 27

practice fields);

- anything on the opposite side of South Main, Highway 301;
- anything on the other side of the Memorial Parkway, Bypass; and
- anything on the other side of Fair Road, Highway 67

For those of you who have driven along Highway 301, when classes are changing or about to change, you have seen students running across the road playing dodge ball with cars. Some students tend to park over at the BP station, and nearly 500 students live on that side of 301 (many in the Woodlands development), and those students must walk across that road. Since there are no traffic controls on that section of 301, we have some considerable concern that sooner or later somebody will be seriously injured on that highway. [Now, I would say as an aside, that the city does not have complete control over that thoroughfare, because that is a state highway. The Department of Transportation is, therefore, involved, and we are in consultation with the DOT]. The intersection of Old Register Road and the Bypass is also a dangerous intersection. One of our students was, in fact, killed there last year. We have concern about these intersections, and continue to work on these issues.

As a result of all of this coming about, however, many of us attended the Alcohol Control Board meeting, where there was a preliminary discussion of this ordinance, and voiced our displeasure with it. That effort, of course, got me front page coverage in the *Statesboro Herald*. The good news about all of this is that in the meantime we have had further conversations with the city, and I believe we are well on our way to getting a modification of that ordinance that in fact will work for us. The motivation for the city was fairly straightforward, and that simply was that they would like to attract businesses to Statesboro, and notably, they would like to attract some better restaurants. As an example, I do not think people on this campus have a problem with having a restaurant like Olive Garden located on the corner of Tillman and Fair Road (and my apologies to Ralph Andrews, but Klean Korner is not the most beautiful building we have ever seen in our lives). However, we worry about other kinds of places that might be located on that corner because of the problems they would cause for us. Long story short, we are having some very good conversations with the city, and I think we have a solution that will work well all the way around. I will keep you apprised of the situation. We need to let our city officials know that simply taking all restrictions off of what can pass for restaurants needs to be more carefully considered.

Admissions Requirements

As you know, we began raising admissions requirements, and we began to see some interesting results starting as early as 2001, but I do not know if I have ever put that in historical perspective for you. I would like to do that now, because I have something else that is related, that I would like to draw to your attention when I finish this. If you go back to the freshmen class for Fall 1989, the average SAT score was 966. In 1996, that average was 967. In Fall 1999, it was 987. By Fall 2000, we had cracked the 1000 barrier for the first time in our history--the average was 1008. Putting that in context with the other institutions within the University System of Georgia, that placed us at number ten in rank. Those ahead of us, as you would expect, were the three Research Universities, of course, Valdosta State, Armstrong Atlantic, Georgia College, Kennesaw, North Georgia, and Southern Poly. The following fall, 2001, we jumped to seventh. Those ahead of us

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 6 of 27

were, again, the three Research Universities, and now Georgia College, North Georgia, and Southern Poly. [By the way, Southern Poly may be the only university in the System where the men's basketball team does have to pass calculus, so I doubt that they will lose scholarships.] Fall 2002, we remained in seventh place; Fall 2003, we remained in seventh place; Fall 2004, we tied for number six. Those ahead of us, again, the three Research Universities, and Southern Poly and Georgia College, but now, we are in a tie with North Georgia. And, by the way, I would say North Georgia's had a fairly decent academic reputation for a number of years, so that was not bad company to be in. Even though the University System of Georgia has not published their 2005 data, Jayne Perkins Brown, Institutional Research, has found that there are now only two of the Research Universities who have a higher entering average SAT score: Georgia Tech and the University of Georgia. Georgia State is at 1085, and we came in at 1098. Georgia College is at 1120 and Southern Poly is at 1124. We are rapidly coming up to where we really would like to be, which is niched in behind Georgia Tech and the University of Georgia in terms of our academic profile.

The reason I mention that to you is some of you have seen the March 3rd addition of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. The Chronicle reports that the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Education has adjusted their categories a few times over the past several years. Formerly, there was a classification for universities called *research extensive universities*, and these were universities with a variety of doctoral programs. There was a second classification called *research intensive universities*. These were universities with fewer programs, but programs which were graduating a certain number of people in those programs each year. I was pretty well convinced that we were probably going to be moved up to that research intensive group. Just recently, however, Carnegie once again changed their categories. In their new classification system, Carnegie has listed Georgia Southern as a *doctoral/research institution*. We are no longer listed as a *masters' one institution*. If you are curious as to what kinds of institutions may be in each of the new categories, if you look at the first one, the very high research activity institutions, none of you will be surprised to know that Cal-Berkeley, Texas-Austin, North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Georgia Tech, University of Georgia, all fall into this category. The second level category, the Georgia school we find falling into that category is Georgia State, along with Auburn, University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa, University of Mississippi-the main campus there, and like institutions. In the third group, there is of course now, Georgia Southern, East Carolina, UNC-Charlotte, and The University of Massachusetts-Boston, just to give you kind of an idea. If you are curious about who has moved where and the comprehensive list of institutions that are in each of these categories, then the March 3rd edition of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* would be the publication you would want to look at.

PsyD Degree

We are still shepherding our PsyD degree through the Regents, and we are prepared to submit another degree or two in the near future. We are awaiting the Regents decision on what would be our newest doctoral program, which we hope will come sometime this spring, although I think if you went back into the senate minutes you would see that I was hopeful about this two years ago. Let me pause and ask if there were any questions

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 7 of 27

at all on any of this.

Clara Krug (CLASS): There already has been a fatality on 301. The student was a Bell Honors Program student. I wish I could remember her name; it seems to me her name was Amy. She was a German student, and she took classes in our department. It has been a few years back, but perhaps in the archives you could find information about that. She was just going from a convenience store back to what was then the Bell Honors house. So it would have happened when the Bell Honors house was still there.

Dr. Grube: Yes, thank you, Clara. It is that convenience store which I think is the BP station, and we currently have students who are parking at that station and walking across 301. We also have students who park in those big parking lots where Harvey's is located and walk across Fair Road. However, the parking that is near the area where the scene shop used to be, that is all free parking now. All a student has to do is go get a free permit from Parking and Transportation, and they can park there for free. Likewise, all of the parking over by the football office complex, and where the old Nursing trailers still are, that is all free parking, too. So we are very confused as to why students would park across the street. We think the answer is they have unpaid tickets and they know if they check in with Parking and Transportation, somebody's going to say, yes, you can have your free permit as soon as you pay these fines. That is the closest explanation we can come to, but we are trying to herd as many of these students across the street and into the buses as we can. Thank you Clara; I had not realized that we had a fatality there already.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): As far as I know, there are two bars that are very close to campus near the cafeteria and the bookstore. How does the distance ordinance affect those two bars?

Dr. Grube: It does not affect existing businesses; in fact, the alcohol licenses are grandfathered in. So, for example, those businesses were in business before these things came into play. However, for example, suppose that Dingus Magee's went out of business. As long as another business comes back into that place and starts a similar business they have 12 months to do that before it would be impossible for them to acquire a permit under the new ordinance. The Pizza Inn is another example where there is grandfather clause. That is no longer the Pizza Inn. I am not sure what its name is now. If somebody comes in and occupies that and starts a similar business then that alcohol license may be applied for again by that new business. But if they are out of business for more than 12 months, then that will be an issue because the 100 yard and the 200 yard straight line provision still applies within that area that is described by Fair Road, the bypass, 301, and Tillman. So anything inside of there follows the old ordinance. Does that help Godfrey?

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Yes, it does, but I do have one small concern about the proximity issue which is the following: When I was a graduate student, I happened to live along that straight line from the bar, so I did not have to go off campus. In other words, a bar near my dorm meant I did not have to go off campus, so I would get hit. I mean, if the bar is far away the temptation is that people are going to go to the bars, get

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 8 of 27

in their car and drive, because people are very bad at judging how intoxicated they are. Therefore, they are going to get in their car and drive onto campus. I think that is probably more dangerous than if you are able to just walk to your dorm or wherever you live.

Dr. Grube: Well, we could probably have a lengthy discussion on that. I think our Student Affairs people would not disagree with the part that drinking and driving is risky, but I think they would very much disagree that proximity is not a major factor in poor behavior when it comes to alcohol on college campuses. Most of the national research, in fact, will show that. But you are right. The students are trying to start a service that would take students from bars later in the evening to prevent them from walking or driving, or at least to encourage them not to walk or drive.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Godfrey pretty much addressed my issue, but, when you have time, perhaps you could work for some public transit in this town. That might help.

Dr. Grube: Well, we have encouraged public transit in this town, but the University's not in a financial position to take on public transit. However, it is a real need for a significant portion of our population. We will continue to encourage that whenever we can. For what it is worth, every time we add a bus to our transit system, you can count on (I wish Joe Franklin were here because I am about to get this number wrong) a significant number somewhere between \$100 to \$200, 000 to add a single bus for a year. You may recall back in 1999, the city decided they were going to put a transit system in place, and then they took a look at what it was going to cost and it went away in a hurry. We have been approached by the mall to run a bus to the mall, at our expense, not theirs. We decided that was an excellent idea and the mall should contract with the bus company that we are using to do that. I have worked on campuses that had transit systems that started out with kind of a core service and then branched out. We will see.

Dr. Grube: Well, thank you everybody.

5. Report from Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee: Since the last Senate meeting, there have been three information requests.

Information Requests

The first information request came from Patrick Novotny concerning advising students about the proposed policy on deleting students who did not attend class the first day. Nancy Shumaker responded to the request with a change in the proposed timetable, which has been revised to possibly implement the new policy next Spring rather than in Fall, after allowing for student and faculty input. They are working on a web-based survey which I had the opportunity to review last week. I think I gave them more feedback than the length of the survey. The survey was basically five questions.

- 1) Is the policy needed? Yes or no? With a block for comments.
- 2) What would be the advantages? With a block for comments.
- 3) What would be the disadvantages? With a block for comments.

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 9 of 27

- 4) Who should be in charge of handling it--individual instructors or the Registrar's office? With a block for comments.
- 5) Do you have any more comments?

So, as I said, I gave them back plenty of comments, and speaking as a statistician, to get any information that is usable out of their questions would be either a) extremely time consuming, or b) impossible, at the rate everybody writes all their comments. So they are supposedly going back to the drawing board on that one.

The other two requests were both from Clara Krug. The first concerned the procedures the Faculty Development Committee uses to decide who is awarded money. I consulted with Bill Yang, the chair of the committee, in formulating a response. Basically, the method is that all proposals are scored in a blind process. Each portion of the proposal has a possible number of points attached to it which is listed on a proposal format page. There is also a rubric which is posted as well, as part of the application, and serves as a set of guidelines for the committee members in scoring the proposals. Once the proposals have all been scored independently, the committee then meets to review the top scoring ones and basically the top proposals are awarded funds until the available funds are exhausted. In this last January round, all funded proposals were given full funding. In the past, there have been some top proposals which received full funding and others in a second tier who received partial funding. A follow-up question asked if people could find out their scores as help in revising or making better submissions in the future. Bill Yang was going to consult with the committee about this, but he felt it really would *not* be beneficial as future competitions would involve different proposals, and even former members of the committee who thought they knew what it took to get funding had had non-winning proposals.

Clara's second request concerned excusing student absences for field trips, etc. The basic answer to this question is that Section 309 of the *Faculty Handbook* gives each faculty member the right and the responsibility of creating their own attendance policies. Whether an absence is excused or not is not up to the sponsoring instructor; it is up to the instructor whose class would be missed. So, if you are asked to excuse an absence, it is up to you to deal with it in terms of the framework of your own individual attendance policy. I would ask faculty members to try to cooperate with others, but in the end the decision is your own.

Agenda Requests

There were two agenda requests. The first came from Clara Krug. The opinion of the SEC on her request was that we are basically looking at a civility issue of giving Senators and colleagues an opportunity to review any additional material relevant to a motion or discussion before the Senate meeting, and her motion appears as item number 8 on today's agenda. Michael Moore submitted an agenda request for a motion relating to the student technology fee committee's membership and procedures. That is item number 10 on today's agenda. You might recall at last month's Senate meeting that the motion on temporary faculty eligibility for Faculty Development and Service funding was tabled for legal input. After the meeting, I conferred with University Attorney Lee Davis. It was his opinion that there would be no limitation on temporary faculty receiving funding as

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 10 of 27

long as it did not constitute an implied extension of a contract. With that in mind, we decided that temporary faculty could be eligible for Fall and early Spring rounds as long as the activity was completed by commencement in May; therefore, not implicitly extending their contracts. Still wanting to get the views of the Senate that motion is back to be taken off the table as item number 9 on today's agenda.

I have an important announcement, but first, Mary Hazeldine, who is chairing the ad hoc committee on Student Evaluations, wants to give the Senate some information on that.

Mary Hazeldine (COBA): The committee met this morning and one of the items on the agenda was the audio conference I attended on March 9, 2006. Dr. Raoul Arreola from the University of Tennessee Health Sciences Center conducted the conference. Interesting information came from the audio conference attended by many universities, such as Texas A&M, University of Pittsburgh, University of Connecticut., Claremont Colleges-Harvey Mudd, University of Wisconsin, and small to large colleges and junior colleges.

- The national response rate for on-line student rating forms is 30%.
- Ratings should be given in the last third of the semester to get away from ratings fatigue when rating forms are usually given out at the last two weeks of the semester.
- Student rating forms should be given out in the teaching/learning environment where it occurs. For example, if the class is face-to-face all semester, then the rating form should be given out face-to-face. If the class is all on-line, then the rating form should be administered on-line.
- Faculty should be evaluated against only their co-hort group; for example, Mathematics faculty with other Mathematics faculty.

There were many other ideas and findings in the literature, such as freshman/sophomores are harsher in their ratings (larger classes, left brain classes, etc.) than juniors/seniors.

I would like to thank Provost Bleicken for paying the \$198 audio conference fee. I would also like to thank the Provost's office, particularly Candace Griffith, Assistant to the Provost, for putting together a packet of information about the University System of Georgia as well as our peer and aspirant institutions regarding their student evaluation of instruction practices.

Pat Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee: Thank you, Mary.

Important Announcement

It is that time of the year again. At the April meeting, we will be electing the Senate Secretary and Librarian for the 2006-2007 term. Please consider getting involved by running for one of these positions. Both are non-voting members of the SEC, which, hopefully, if it works out this year, means you get free breakfast with the Provost once a month. Self-nominations are fine. I would appreciate receiving nominations by April 11th (one week before our next meeting) via email, phone, or in person. We will accept nominations from the floor, but I think it is really best to have Senators know in advance

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 11 of 27

who is interested so they may carefully consider their choices. Elections of this type are, in my opinion, too important to be done on the fly, so please consider running if you have a year left of eligibility as a Senator, for either Librarian or Secretary, for next year. The Secretary takes the minutes as transcribed verbatim from Ginger, and digests them into a readable form. The Secretary also attends, as an ex-officio non-voting member, the Elections Committee. The Librarian's job is to assemble all the reports from the different committees into the one-document Librarian's Report, and also to participate in the Provost's Academic Advisory Committee. If you have questions, or want to know more about the job, ask Jean-Paul, or ask Donna, who is not here today. Please consider running. Are there any questions about the SEC report?

Clara Krug (CLASS): About my request for information, I just wonder how we could get additional information. The report provided by Professor Yang mentions, for example, that there is a "final round" at which scores are tallied, so I do not know how many so called rounds there are. Number two, the final sentence of his information report states "all decisions are made in the committee meetings by all members vote;" however, in the previous paragraph he states that in the last round, "reviewer number 6 scored only nine of 41 proposals and reviewer number 3 did not score six."

Pat Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee: I asked him about that, and he said he did not know why reviewer number 3 did not score six.

Clara Krug (CLASS): No, that is not my question; if I might continue. "If a reviewer did not score a proposal, the missing score is ignored in computing the average." What I do not understand is how he could report that the committee decisions are made by "all members' vote" when in the previous paragraph, he has stated that reviewer number 6, in fact, reviewed only 22%. So, all members did not vote, apparently, and the committee member number 3, scored 85% of the proposals. And then my final question is the following, and it really connects somewhat to Olivia Edenfield's concerns. I do not know so much about exact numbers, but about comments on reviewers' proposals, I do not think that the committee can assume that an applicant will not submit again the same proposal. Just as those of us in the Humanities acquainted with the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Georgia Humanities Council, are accustomed to receiving comments that will help resubmit as the Humanities Council calls this second application for the same proposal, so might people here resubmit. At the moment, the final sentence of a typical letter of rejection reads "and the committee looks forward to considering proposals from you in the future." So, I would imagine that a person would then want to know how his or her proposal might be improved, keeping the names of the reviewers anonymous, keeping the exact numbers anonymous, but letting people know how they might improve. Just as we tell our students, those of us who give multiple draft compositions, how they might improve before the final draft. So I do not see any of that information here. Do I need to submit another request for that information? I do not find this to be thorough. I apologize for bringing this up, but since we do have so little travel money now, and people would like to have additional money, and this is a source for the money, it would also be helpful if we knew how much total money there is for the academic year.

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 12 of 27

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: Basically, you can submit information requests, as I understand it, ad infinitum.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: If they are different.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: If it is the same information request, then presumably normally the answer would be the same. The other alternative would be to have a motion saying that it is the sense of the Senate that such and such should happen or that a committee should conduct its business in a particular way. And then another alternative would be to aspire to run that committee. I think those are all the alternatives.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): It was my understanding that all of these funding committees are supposed to give some sort of feedback upon rejection of a proposal, and that this was settled some years ago.

Candy Schille (CLASS): If it is not in the *Bylaws*, it is not required. And if it is not in the *Bylaws* and we want it to be there, then we ought to ask for a revision of the *Bylaws* that these committees will provide feedback.

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: The other alternative is that the Senate can charge a committee to operate in a particular way as part of its charge. I do not know what the specific charge of this committee says, but that would be another avenue.

David Alley (CLASS): You may remember last year when I was chair of the Faculty Research Committee, such a charge was in fact made to us to have an appeal mechanism for any candidate who's proposal was not accepted at full funding. So the Senate did in fact instruct that committee to amend its procedures.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I do not know if this is the appropriate forum, but I wanted to ask Mary a question about the audio conference. Regarding the 30% that was noted for response for completing online evaluations, where does that fit? Is that good? Is that bad?

Mary Hazeldine (COBA): That is bad.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): That is bad?

Mary Hazeldine (COBA): If I did my evaluations, for instance, in my face-to-face classes they would be there, and they would do those evaluations. Regarding an on-line class, students are not face-to-face in the room with you, and one of the problems with on-line evaluations is that students forget. They have to be reminded. You cannot punish them. In other words, you cannot say that in order for you to get your grade, you must fill out

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 13 of 27

an on-line evaluation. You would have to provide two buttons for the on-line evaluations. One button would be for the students to say I am going to take this evaluation, and the other button would be for the students to say I do not want to do this evaluation. When the student is on-line, the student would then be reminded to do the evaluations.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): So, do we have a sense of where this on-line evaluation process is headed here at Georgia Southern? Are we still looking at it? What is our University-wide response rate regarding on-line evaluations?

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Barry, without looking at the data, I do not know off the top of my head what the University response rate is. The fact of the matter is that we began looking at this as a way to emulate a "best practices" that was noted in the System--a way to actually help us to avoid the excessive use of paper because the evaluation process takes a lot of paper, and it also takes a lot of time. The reason that we now have an ad hoc committee looking at this issue is to more fully understand the on-line process--the good and the bad. We are waiting to hear what that committee comes forward with.

Clara Krug (CLASS): At our February meeting we were told that Johnson and Lynes would be conducting focus groups in February and March. What is the status? Has anyone here been in a focus group, or is it students only? Who was in the focus groups?

Mary Hazeldine (COBA): Doug Johnson has been ill, but he said that he will be running the focus groups probably the first of April. And from those focus groups he will construct a survey to go out to faculty, administrators, and students. I do not know that he would have a report ready by the end of this semester.

Clara Krug (CLASS): When would the administration of on-line evaluations be implemented? They would not be administered in the Fall if the Senate had not had a chance to consider them by the end of the semester, would they?

Mary Hazeldine (COBA): I really do not think so. In fact, our committee will be meeting the last time the end of April, and we will then put forth a number of recommendations about student rating forms in general, and I do not think there is any way that the University would be doing on-line evaluations either Fall or Spring of next year.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay. Thanks.

Clara Krug (CLASS): About the information item concerning receiving a request to excuse students for faculty colleagues' field trips. I read the section that you mentioned in the *Handbook*, and it seems to me to apply more to what I expect of my students myself in the classes. What would need to happen for there to be included in the *Handbook* some statement about what faculty should expect their colleagues to do when faculty ask us to excuse their students? This has happened to me multiple times this semester, and continues to happen since I submitted this information item.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): I am going to ask Dr. Heaston or Candace Griffith to address this question. I am not certain about the current status of the assembly of the new

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 14 of 27

Faculty Handbook, because I do not know exactly where we are in that process, Clara.

Amy Heaston: It is not in the final format yet. We are still in the draft stages, and we still have a short window of time to make any changes, so if Senate wants to recommend and endorse any changes it would need to be done before the end of the semester.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Thanks.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Chair, Senate Executive Committee: So, apparently, there would be time to make a motion to amend that section.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Next time; thank you.

6. Report from Jerry Wilson (COBA), SPC Representative: At the February 22nd meeting of the SPC, Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Teresa Thompson briefed the committee on changes in student government composition, student body composition, several aspects of the enrollment management plan, and some of the important goals for her division.

Some changes in student body composition that she mentioned include:

- that the student body has moved from the bottom of 25% to the top 25% in the state for SAT scores, mirroring what the President said;
- Georgia Southern is recognized by many as one of the top three universities in the state now, along with the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech; and
- The number of students in learning support has dropped from a high of 1660, and I am not sure exactly of the time frame for this, to approximately 100.

Concerning certain goals of the Enrollment Management Plan:

- To continue to improve the quality of true freshmen. The average SAT of this group is now 1,098;
- Stabilize true freshman enrollment; and
- Continue to build graduate enrollment.

Some important goals that she sees for the Division of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management:

- To provide higher quality students with higher quality programs both in and out of the classroom;
- To increase Student Activity Funds for student travel, lecture series, and internships;
- To increase efforts to secure grant monies for student activities;
- To develop strong leadership programs; and
- She even mentioned the need to secure funding for a new student union. I really had no idea how far behind we are in terms of the student body we serve now with that facility compared to what it was built for, and I am sure that if Joe Franklin was here he could fill us in really well on that.

At the March 8th meeting, Council members discussed the development of a series of position papers that we are in the process of beginning to write, designed to generate campus attention and conversation regarding the University Mission and Strategic plan elements. The following list of topics was identified during this discussion that hopefully will lead to some position papers, white papers, or the like:

- Student literacy across campus;
- Educating campus groups about the Strategic Plan and Mission;
- Instituting a culture of engagement across the campus, more of an integrating of that culture of engagement across campus;
- The value of a residential campus;
- The role of graduate programs on campus;
- Staff retention and development issues;
- Faculty, staff, and student core values; and
- Methods for Implementing EBDM.

That concludes my report.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Could you explain what EBDM is to me?

Jerry Wilson (COBA): Ah, Richard I cannot believe you have forgotten that one so quickly. Evidence-Based Decision Making.

7. Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: I have just one item to report. The institution has nominated three student-athletes for Southern Conference Graduate Fellowships. They will be announced at the Southern Conference Spring meeting in late May. Those students are:

- Carolyn Chin, a softball player and a Chemistry major with a 3.94 GPA who has already been accepted to graduate programs in Chemistry at Ohio State and Syracuse, among others.
- David Willingham, football player, 3.60 GPA. He is a Math Education Major. Still looking around for graduate programs, and
- Heather Reynolds. She is on the women's tennis team. She is a Business major with a 3.97 GPA, who will graduate in three years and get the first year of her masters' degree under her belt here at Georgia Southern during her final year of eligibility.

I would also like to thank my colleagues for their, not just willingness, but excitement to write letters for these three student-athletes that I needed to turn in with their packets to the Southern Conference on quite short turnaround time. They were very enthusiastic and if you know any of these students, congratulate them on their institutional nomination and wish them luck in the Southern Conference competition. That concludes my report.

8. Motion: Timely Provision of Agenda Materials, Clara Krug (CLASS): Does everyone have a copy of the motion at the meeting, or should I read it again? It is

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 16 of 27

brief, and, I hope, succinct. The motion: That Faculty Senators receive in writing any item intended for notification, discussion, or action at least 48 work hours in advance of the Senate meeting at which said item will appear on the agenda and that senators receive copies of any documents related to said agenda item at least 48 work hours in advance of that Senate meeting. For purposes of this motion, we shall define the work week as 8:00 a.m. on Monday until 5:00 p.m. on Friday when classes are in session.

The motion was seconded.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I think this is a good idea, but I believe that it requires a *Bylaws* revision, which would involve putting it on the agenda in advance and would need a two-thirds vote of the Senate. There are, for instance, already requirements for when the Librarian's Report and the minutes appear a certain number of working days before the Senate meeting, so, though I believe this motion is laudable, I think it does require a *Bylaws* revision.

Bob Cook (CIT) Senate Parliamentarian: That would require normally two readings.

Clara Krug (CLASS): So this would be the first reading?

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: Yes, and it is also important that it not cover new business.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Right.

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: We would not want to require that everything be prepared in advance.

Clara Krug (CLASS): If this is considered the first reading, then the next Senate meeting could be the second reading, and at that time we could vote on it, and it would require a two-thirds majority. Am I understanding that?

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: Right

Clara Krug (CLASS): Do my colleagues in the Senate think that this is something that is potentially helpful to us? I have heard from Richard.

Pat Walker (CLASS): I would find it very helpful.

Candy Schille (CLASS): I understand the principle behind this, and that makes very good sense to me. I guess that I am sort of with our Parliamentarian here in not wanting to put anything in writing. I remember discussion that we had at the last Senate meeting, where something was kind of dropped on us, and I cannot exactly remember right now what that issue was. I do not want us to put anything in writing that will hamper free discussion that can be used by people to prevent or delay information given to us in a timely fashion. The discussion I am remembering was that we thought it should not have been an information item; it should have been something the Senate

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 17 of 27

would vote on or at least have some input into. So I am not sure that that your motion as written is addressing my concerns as I understand them, but I am not going to vote against you.

Clara Krug (CLASS): So new business might be something that would be deleted if I were to present this again? Okay. Thank you for that suggestion. I am taking notes.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I would like to say that a timely publication of the agenda and all attachments would be of benefit to us, and since there are requirements for the other documents that we need to look at before coming to the meeting that they be published in a certain timeframe then I would welcome a change in the *Bylaws* that allowed us to see the agenda within 48 hours of the meeting. That makes sense to me.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Again, when we were on the quarter system the Faculty Senate did have something set. I do not know if it was in the *Bylaws*, but it was followed. That was a period of time when we had classes five days a week so everybody pretty much was on campus or looking at his/her computer for items for the agenda on a 24-hour basis, and the guideline then was 24 hours in advance you needed to have whatever was going to be posted for the Senate meeting available for people either by hard copy or by computer, so I am just sort of following up on this, which sort of dropped by the wayside in the conversion to the semester system.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Taking this as the first reading of a *Bylaws* change, I would ask all in favor please say aye. The motion passed the first reading.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Okay. So Clara will be bringing that back next time.

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: And, Clara, it should be a modification of the appropriate section of the *Bylaws*, whereas now you have it stand alone.

Clara Krug (CLASS): So I will check with you if that is okay, Bob? And, Candy, too. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

9. Motion to bring off the table: Faculty Development Committee motion to clarify “full-time faculty,” Bill Yang, COBA

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The next item was supposed to be a motion to take off the table the motion we were discussing last time about whether or not temporaries should be eligible for Faculty Development and Faculty Service money. Bill Yang was supposed to make the motion, but I do not see him here.

A motion was made by Jerry Wilson (COBA) that the tabled motion regarding temporaries being eligible to seek Faculty Development and Faculty Service funding be taken off the table. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 18 of 27

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The Faculty Development Committee wanted guidance on whether they should entertain proposals for funding from full-time temporaries. If you will recall, last time as I mentioned, Faculty Research specifically includes temporary faculty, but Faculty Service and Faculty Development are moot on the issue. They just say all full-time faculty. The question came as a question of guidance. Should these temporaries be entitled or allowed to seek the funding? And as you recall, the legal opinion from Lee Davis was that they would be eligible as long as the activities were completed by the end of the current contract. Is there discussion?

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: State the motion.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The motion is that temporary faculty be eligible to seek funding from Faculty Development and Faculty Service committees, as long as it does not constitute an extension of their current contract.

Candy Schille (CLASS): I just think it makes sense. Of course, why not treat our temporaries humanely.

David Alley (CLASS): The rationale for the Faculty Research Committee when we addressed this in 2004, as I remember, included two points: 1) there was an increasing number of temporary faculty with no signs of lessening that number, and 2) a large percentage of those temporary faculty become full-time faculty. And, so, their participation in these funding opportunities often facilitates their move from temporary to full time.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Is that a bad thing or a good thing?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: It is a good thing.

David Alley (CLASS): The Research Committee voted to support it, so it is a good thing.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Okay, thank you.

Jerry Wilson (COBA): Following up on what David said (since we served on that committee together at that time), I think that the letters that we sent out to temporary awardees stated the endpoint for expenditure of funds. I do not know how it was worded, but I think there was something like that in the letter. Wasn't there?

David Alley (CLASS): Yes, to keep in line with the fact that there could not be an implicit extension of a contract; the funds would have to be expended before the temporaries' contract would end.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Quick question. What happens if the funds are not expended by the date? Are they simply yanked?

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Any funds that are not expended are rolled back in to the total

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 19 of 27

that can be expended. Essentially there is a lump sum that is established for development, research, and service, and so it funds not expended usually get taken up in some other category that was not fully funded.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there any other discussion? The motion before you is that temporary faculty would be specifically included and eligible to seek funding from the Faculty Development and Faculty Service Committees, as long as the activities were completed before the end of their current contracts, therefore not creating an implicit extension. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

10. Motion: University Student Technology Fee, Michael Moore (COE): I move that the Faculty Senate appoint an ad hoc committee composed of an SEC member as Chair, faculty, an appropriate administrator, and the SGA President and SGA Vice President for Academic Affairs to study the collection and distribution of the University Student Technology Fee in order to determine if the University Student Technology Fee Committee's membership and procedures operate in the best interest of our students, faculty, staff, and administration.

The motion was seconded.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Discussion? Michael as maker you get the first floor.

Michael Moore (COE): Okay thanks. This fee began in 1997. We were allowed to assess it, and we assessed our students \$24. Then-Provost Harry Carter modeled the Technology Committee on the Student Affairs Activity Committee, and since 1997 the Board of Regents has required that six students serve as the Tech Fee Committee. Two requests for information last fall that you may remember that I submitted to the Senate reveal that the six students are the SGA President, SGA Vice President, and four others appointed by the SGA President, and this method of student member selection does not ensure college representation. For instance, until fall of 2005, College of Education did not have a student representative. The other six non-student Technology Committee members include a Provost, Acting Chair of Information Systems, the Librarian, Head of Administrative Technology Services, a Systems Analyst, and Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. One difference between the Student Affairs Activity Budget Committee and the Student Technology Fee Committee is that the Student Affairs Activity Budget Committee has two faculty members on the committee.

Serving as an individual case, prior to 2005, the College of Education had received only 1% of the money that its majors were compelled to contribute. In the fall of 2005, the COE had its first student representative appointed to the Tech Fee Committee, and perhaps not coincidentally, the COE received \$85,000 in money to upgrade the Instructional Resource Center. Including Fall's disbursement to the College of Education, we are now at 11%.

Much has changed since 1997, however. The System has changed since December; however, a trip to the web site does not document the change. If you ask around,

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 20 of 27

proposals are no longer requested. Previously, the Technology Fee Committee functioned in the same way as the Student Activity Fee Committee, but that is not the case now. Things have changed to the extent that administrators, including chairs and staff responsible for IT, are contacted by Leann Ransbotham, and technology needs are discussed. These folks in each college are asked to fill in a spreadsheet that asks for a description, cost to implement, student learning outcomes, and the students affected per week. In previous days, in the proposals, the student learning outcomes were a big part of it; now they are simply bulleted items. A scoring guide for requests starts with life safety, whether or not the equipment's failing, whether it needs to be refreshed, upgraded, or whether in fact it is already new. This spreadsheet thing goes to the committee. So rather than reading proposals, the committee looks at the spreadsheet and can see how each request has been scored. My chair told me she had such a visit, but she did not know at the time what the information that they were discussing during this visit was about. In fact, I did not know about it and none of the faculty in my department knew anything about it. I am not sure what role, if any, that faculty have in this process, and I did not become aware of changes until I started digging around.

I think the need for such a committee is stronger now than ever. I cite the *Faculty Handbook*, in two places. On page 18, in Section 108, Part 1, "Faculty therefore have a role in developing policies including at the appropriate level, strategic planning, academic and curricular policies, and committee establishment and appointments." And it goes on, and then also I want to cite 203.02, #3, Faculty as Participants in the Shaping of University Policies. "That we have a right to criticize and to seek alteration of both academic and non-academic university regulations and policies, whether or not they are directly affected..." So I use those two as a means of making this motion.

David Alley (CLASS): Mike, what exactly would the ad hoc committee be charged with doing?

Michael Moore (COE): In the motion I asked that the committee study the collection and distribution of the University Student Technology Fee, in order to determine if the membership and procedures operate in the best interest.

David Alley (CLASS): Okay.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): There is one thing that I am not sure I totally get, which is the following: so far the College of Education has received 11.4% of the money collected. Is that money collected from College of Education students or from the overall pie?

Michael Moore (COE): That would be money generated by the majors in the College of Education.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Okay, you have so far gotten 11% of that.

Laurie Markle (SGA): I am on the Student Technology Fee Committee as a student representative to it. That is what my position does. The initiative to add greater representation on the Student Technology Fee Committee from all colleges is not an

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 21 of 27

idea that would be opposed by the Student Government Association at all. As a general rule, we like additional students on committees, but SGA does feel that issues that have been expressed do not need a committee and can be handled by a faculty member, such as Dr. Moore, by contacting myself, as well as Jonathan Buckner, who is Executive Vice President of the Student Government Association, who also oversees the Constitution, and just adding more students. Funding from the Student Technology Fee Committee does not just go straight out to colleges. It also helps students in various other areas on campus, so perhaps in addition to that 11%, the students were also benefiting from funding that went to the Library, as well as the addition of different bandwidth on campus to allow students to receive courses and class and still maintain. There is a lot of concern about students not getting enough bandwidth on campus to sustain classrooms during high peaks of the day. That being said, money gets allocated to different areas that are not even necessarily within a specific college. Also, there actually was not a College of Education Senator on the Student Technology Fee Committee meeting this last fall. She was sick and was replaced. So I personally feel as though use of the Student Government Association as the allocation of funds is pretty fair. We work hard to remain unbiased; however, if you would like to add more college representation, it would not be a lot of work to just get another student on there. I do not think putting more students on there requires an ad hoc committee.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Point of clarification. I think last fall when we talked about this committee, there was a concern about the fact that one of the people who had been initially a faculty member was appointed Acting Chair of Information Systems. The Acting Chair then became a full-time chair, and I asked whether it seemed reasonable to appoint someone who would be a full-time faculty member. I took that suggestion very seriously, and we have appointed a full-time faculty member and that person is Christine Ludowise. So there is a statement in here that is not fully correct.

Lisa Spence (Director of IT Services): I would also like to make a small correction in my title because I am not head of the Administrative Technology Services; I am head of IT Services, and a part of this committee. We support, actually, directly seven of the colleges on campus and three of my areas provide direct support only to academic areas. So we do have quite an academic focus. I would also point out that one of the things that happened in the fall with the College of Ed requests, is that they had a very strong orientation to support that was needed to prepare for the NCATE visit, so that was one of the things that really directed our attention to those particular requests in terms of their importance to the committee. Thank you.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Before you go, Lisa, are you saying that when the proposal seems to have merit it gets funded? In other words, when it has sufficient merit and weight, it gets funded?

Lisa Spence: Well, I think, we would hope so, within the bounds of the funding that we have. A couple of the items that have been mentioned that are pieces of information that we look at are the number of students that are supported and the student learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes is a direct reflection on the emphasis on the evidence-based decision making and the assessment that we have been looking at

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 22 of 27

recently. We assess whether the request is something that references the fact that a program or a piece of technology is failing; whether a piece of technology is not working; or whether there is a risk to a program because we do not have a technology. The other thing that is looked at is just the general description of the request on the form. All of those pieces of data have been available on the Technology Fee Request Form in the past. They have been translated into the spreadsheet as Dr. Moore said, but they all came across pretty much in that same format, i.e., you have the opportunity to enter those same pieces of information. The ability that we have with the spreadsheet is an efficiency improvement, because our view is that we will collect information about all technology needs on campus. We will try to highlight those with the agreement of the program that are technology fee eligible, and then we do not have to ask multiple times for technology needs. We can ask for your needs, we can basically pull out those that are technology fee eligible and we can make that all one process rather than going through multiple needs assessment or needs request processes. That is the reason we changed the process this year to work with the spreadsheet. In the future, and we are already in development on this, we are going to use a web front end to a data base that will help us do a better job of collecting and administering that information. So we are hoping that we are making gradual improvements with the process itself.

Michael Moore (COE): If you look at the motion, I am not asking you to change the committee. I am asking that a committee make recommendations and one of the recommendations that may come from the committee is that it is functioning fine-- everything seems to be working well and the current structure should be maintained. However, they may also come back with other representation, and I give a couple of suggestions that they may want to also consider, but the motion does not ask for a change in the membership; it does not ask for changes in the composition of the committee either.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The motion is to form a committee to study the process and composition of awarding student technology fee money.

The motion was approved by voice vote.

11. Unfinished Business

Clara Krug (CLASS): At this time I would like to bring up a request for an update on the policy of dropping students who do not attend the first class.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Nancy Shumaker would you like to address that?

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): As you pointed out earlier, we are trying to develop a survey, and we have taken suggestions that were made as a result of the preliminary survey that we put out. And we are going to go back and work with Dr. Jayne Perkins Brown, our IR person here at the University to develop a more specific survey that can produce actual, quantifiable data that we can then use. That will be a web-based survey that will be put out for the faculty and for the students, and we will collect the responses from that

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 23 of 27

survey. That is the next step that we're working on right now.

Clara Krug (CLASS): When will this come before the Senate for a vote, and when will it come before the Student Government Association for a vote? I think the Senators, if I heard correctly, last time, have been concerned that we are supposed to be part of a shared governance; I think Mike Nielsen used the word "loop." And we seem to be in a loop-free environment on this one. So, first, when will it come to the Student Government, because Dr. Bleicken had promised Student Government that there would be no action taken on anything involving students without involving students? And second, not if, but when this will come to the Faculty Senate for a vote?

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): My understanding was that we were to come back to the Faculty Senate and also go to the Student Government Association, and we were to share information with them about the proposal and then to get feedback from them.

Clara Krug (CLASS): My question was about a vote. Not about giving information or feedback, but a vote. I think you have had a couple of people quote today from the *Faculty Handbook* about the fact that faculty are to be involved in decisions that have an impact on instruction, so that is in the *Handbook*, and I would like to ask when there will be a vote in Student Government Association and when there will be a vote at the Faculty Senate for approval or disapproval? The Faculty Senate may always pass a resolution, which I asked about last time, which I think is why Dr. Bleicken then had this remitted to your group of people. So we could pass a resolution, but it seems that our *Faculty Handbook* indicates that we are supposed to have a vote. A voice per shared governance. Thank you.

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): Clara, I do not think that I can give you specific date, at this point, because I do not think that there has been enough information shared with either the Student Government Association or with the Faculty Senate. We need to collect information from the surveys, and bring that information back to both of those bodies, and share that with them. There cannot be a vote until there is more information about what kind of response and what kind of opinion we have from both faculty and students about this. And whether or not there is a desire to see this occur. So I cannot give you a specific date now, since I do not know when we will have all of the information from the survey.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Can you give us a semester? Would it be spring semester? Summer semester? Fall semester? Because, Nancy, your statement to the Faculty Senators in this room indicated that this is to happen in Spring Semester 2007.

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): If you will read the response that I gave to Dr. Novotny, you will notice that it says "the following spring semester," it does not say which spring semester, and that is because we want to leave enough room there for the information to be shared. I did not specify that it would be Spring Semester 2007. I said the following semester. Therefore, we need to collect this information, we need to share it, we need to get feedback, and we will then proceed from there.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Thank you.

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): You are welcome.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): May I ask one more clarifying question? Once the information has been shared, and you have decided how to proceed, you will, in fact then bring it to the two bodies for a vote. Is that correct?

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): If that is the procedure that needs to followed here.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): I think that the Senate can vote on anything it wants.

Candy Schille (CLASS): I really applaud all of the people that are trying to empower the Senate, but we need to face the wretched truth that everything that we do is advisory.

Virginia Richards (CHHS): I missed the last Senate meeting. I apologize. I did have a stand in, but I would like to applaud the Provost's office for bringing this forward. It is something that we have needed for a very long time, and in order to be able to fill up our classes, and have full classes throughout the semester, we desperately need to be able to drop students from our classes on the first day. And I applaud you all. Thank you very much for bringing it forward.

Michael Moore (COE): I think the response to Dr. Novotny is what people are reacting to. When you look at the response to his request for information, the process had the information coming back as an information item to both the Senate and to the Student Government Association, so you may want to take a look at that process again, and you may want to amend the item to come back as a vote in both the Senate and the Student Government Association instead of coming back as an information item.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Any further discussion? (There was none.) Is there any new business?

12. New Business

Clara Krug (CLASS): There was a statement from David Alley about the charge to the Faculty Development Committee like the one to the Faculty Research Committee that the Faculty Development Committee function in a manner similar to the Faculty Research Committee and give a response containing some kind of feedback to faculty who are unsuccessful in their applications for funding through that committee. I would like to make that a motion, and I would like the motion to apply to all committees to which faculty apply for funding on campus. The motion would say that all committees who award funding should give feedback to unsuccessful faculty applicants on how to improve their submissions.

The motion was seconded.

David Alley (CLASS): The problem I see with the motion is that the feedback can be

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 25 of 27

interpreted as something that has already been implemented, which is the letter that is issued from these committees to all applicants--successful, partially successful, or totally unsuccessful--and, so, in order for the motion to have some teeth, you would have to specify what that feedback has to be, and I am not sure that we want to ask that all three committees march in lockstep in terms of their type of feedback. I am not clear on what effect this motion would have.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): I am on the service committee, and it would not change my workload, because I have been doing that. It was my understanding that writers of unsuccessful applications should receive feedback, so they could improve the proposal, make it stronger, and understand what the committee's decision was. Maybe I have not done a thorough job. Maybe I have done fine. I have not really heard back from many people about it, but I have been doing it all along.

Candy Schille (CLASS): It seems like a reasonable thing to ask for some feedback, but on a practical level, I suspect that the turnover of personnel on this committee is maybe something like 1/3 of the people rotate off each year. The only thing that I guess we might want to consider is whether or not a previous body of people would be committing themselves to something that the new committee would not necessarily want to support. In other words, teacher A says if you revise the essay this way, you get an A. Teacher B says I do not know; it still looks like a C to me. So there might be some issues there. I think that the committee structure is such that the continuity is good enough to prevent that from being a big problem, but it is something to kick around.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Point of information. Half the committee rolls over each year. So every year you would have a new committee, which as Candy said, might do things differently.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Other funding agencies at the state and national levels do not even have the same people read the proposals the next time. But it is felt that there is enough expertise with any one group that they can surely give within the realm of that one proposal some kind of suggestions for improvement.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I was going to add that giving valuable feedback to applicants in grant procedures is no guarantee that you are going to get your proposal funded the next time, so I do not really see any problem with this in regard to that.

David Alley (CLASS): The statement that feedback is given from all national funding committees may not be completely correct. It seems to me that there may be something different with the sciences. Folks from the sciences and technology, is that correct?

Clara Krug (CLASS): I specifically mentioned the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Georgia Humanities Council.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: My experience with NSF funding is that they might say why you did not get funding, but they might not really give feedback in terms of how to improve.

David Alley (CLASS): That was my point.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): Someone, and I have forgotten now who, suggested that the committee might be committing funds that they would not actually be supervising because of the turnover. In one case this last cycle, the service committee had a request to basically do that because the nature of the project changed. We discussed it and decided fairly overwhelmingly that that should not happen, and so we gave feedback to the person who requested. Essentially sort of an appeal, I guess. It is not an issue that has come up often, at least in that case.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Just to be clear on the motion, is the motion to vote that you are told why you did not get funding, or is the motion to vote to give feedback for improvement? And that is a big thing for me. I will vote to say you should get feedback as to why you did not get funding. I cannot vote to say you should get feedback for improvement. I am not going to increase anybody's workload that much.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The motion is to get feedback to improve your proposal.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Okay.

Mark Welford (COST): I was just wondering within the context of this motion, should there not also be some statement about the length and expectation of the feedback, given the amount of reviews that are done. I think there has been between 40 and 60 proposals, within the Research Grant. That is an enormous amount of work. Regarding NSF, and having been rejected several times from NSF, we get a tiny little paragraph of usually three to four sentences and no more. And usually that does not give much feedback, but it is a start. However, if you have 40 to 60, and you may be rejecting significant numbers of those, that is an enormous expectation of work there.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I would just say similar to the charge that David Alley mentioned, that the Faculty Research Committee received, similar wording. Do you happen to remember what that is David?

David Alley (CLASS): No, I did not come prepared with the current guidelines for the Faculty Research Committee, but we did put a lot of time into this. As I remember, and maybe, if some of the Senators will remember, the charge that was given us last spring, was that there be an appeals process in which the unsuccessful or partially successful candidate comes forward and meets with the committee in an oral review, and it did not involve additional written paperwork, or written review, but an oral appeal. I think that is what is in place now.

Clara Krug (CLASS): At this point, I would like to withdraw my motion. I will talk with David Alley and others about how to rework it so that it fits more closely with what other faculty have shared with me about their concerns because those concerns did not involve meeting face-to-face, but simply some kind of information that would help them craft

Faculty Senate Minutes

3-27-2006

Page 27 of 27

and improve. I withdraw the motion.

13. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Linda Bleicken (Provost): On a very positive note, next week we will be celebrating the accomplishments of some of our best and brightest. Honors Day will be on Wednesday, April 5th. Hats off to the students that we will honor that day. Those of you who are planning to attend or who are already in the line of march, I know you will enjoy this. Remember, if you are not marching, your classes have been cancelled. Those first two classes of the day on Wednesday do not meet due to the Honors Day program.

And just as a note of information, so far this year we have hired 60 new faculty members. This is 60 for the following year. Since it is only the end of March, this is very good news. We have some searches still going on--about 30 of them. If all of those searches come to fruition, we will have a whole lot of new faculty members once again on our campus, and that bodes very well for us. Some of these are replacements, as you no doubt know, for people who have retired or have resigned from the institution, but there are quite a number (I think about 12) that are new positions this year. We continue to add back to our faculty ranks, and add new ones as well.

Laurie Markle (SGA): I just wanted to encourage all of you to please ask your students to vote on WINGS through this Wednesday for the SGA elections. It is supposed to be a really good turnout this year, so everyone please encourage your students to vote. We would really appreciate it. Thanks.

14. Announcements from the Floor

There were none.

15. Adjournment

The Faculty Senate meeting was adjourned at 5:42 p.m. by Pat Humphrey. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be **April 18, 2006** in the Russell Union Ballroom.

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

April 18, 2006

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, Jean-Paul Carton, Don Fausett, Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Leslie Furr, Godfrey Gibbison, Marc Cyr for Tim Giles, Bev Graham, Alice Hall, Donna Fisher for Mary Hazeldine, Ming Fang He, Pat Humphrey, Clara Krug, Gautam Kundu, Margaret LaMontagne, Ron MacKinnon, Mary Marwitz, Bruce McLean, Michael Moore, Kent Murray, Michael Nielsen, Michael Reksulak for Constantin Ogloblin, Maria Smith for Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Donna Saye, Candy Schille, Sonya Shepherd, Caren Town, Pat Walker, Jianping Wang, Mark Welford, Jerry Wilson, Bill Yang

Voting Members Absent: Spyros Andreou, Barry Balleck, Ken Clark, Nirmal Das, Michele Davis McGibony, Marla Morris, John Nauright, Broderick Oluyede, Laura Regassa, Robert Vogel, Bill Wells

Senate Officers in Attendance: Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee, and Moderator, Faculty Senate; Ron MacKinnon (CIT); Richard Flynn (CLASS); Donna Fisher for 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: Joe Franklin, Interim Vice President for Business and Finance; Billy Griffis, Vice President for University Advancement; Ron Shiffler (COBA); Jim Bradford (CIT); Cindi Chance (COE); Bede Mitchell (LIB)

Senate Parliamentarian: Bob Cook

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

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

Student Government Representative:

Visitors: Candace Griffith, Provost's Office; Nancy Shumaker, Provost's Office; Linda Carwell, (CIT); Patrick Novotny, (CLASS); Ginger Malphrus, President's Office

**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.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the April 18, 2006 Meeting. Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. on April 18, 2006 in the Russell Union Ballroom and made several announcements prior to hearing a motion for the approval of the minutes.

- She announced that alternates should sign next to the senator's name and not in the visitor's section.
- She asked senators to please identify themselves and their college affiliations clearly before speaking, for the minutes. She emphasized that when senators are recognized to speak; it sometimes takes the sound crew a few seconds to realize which microphone to turn up and encouraged everyone to be sure that their microphone was on before continuing too far with their remarks.
- She announced that Dr. Grube and Dr. Bleicken were not at the meeting because they had been notified that the PsyD degree was on the agenda for the Board of Regents for today and tomorrow. She stated that Dr. Grube had called this afternoon to tell her that the degree had passed the committee and was to go forward to the full Board tomorrow for approval.
- She announced that Dr. Ron Shiffler would be substituting for the administration during today's meeting.
- She recognized Ginger Malphrus and presented a gift to her as a small token of thanks and appreciation from the Faculty Senate.
- She then heard a motion that the agenda for April 18, 2006 be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

2. Approval of the March 27, 2006, Minutes: Donna Saye (COST) Senate Secretary: I received three corrections from the minutes from our last meeting.

- Page 12, line 1; change to: for the money, it would also be helpful if we knew how much total money there is for the academic year.
- Page 22, the last two lines currently read: Clara Krug (CLASS): At this time I would like to bring up a request for an update on the policy of dropping students who do not attend the first class. Nancy Shumaker would you like to address that? It should be changed as follows: Clara Krug (CLASS): At this time I would like to bring up a request for an update on the policy of dropping students who do not attend the first class. Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Nancy Shumaker would you like to address that?
- Page 23, second and third lines from the bottom currently read: Clara Krug (CLASS): Can you give us a semester? Would it be spring semester? Summer semester? Fall semester? Because your statement to the Faculty Senators in this

room indicates that this is to happen in Spring Semester 2007. The last sentence should be changed to: Nancy Shumaker made the statement at the February meeting that this is to happen in Spring Semester 2007.

With these corrections to the minutes, I move that the minutes for the March 27, 2006, Faculty Senate meeting be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

3. Librarian's Report of April 10, 2006: Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS), Senate Librarian: Clara Krug found a typo on page 22. We have "mangment" instead of "management." With that correction, I move that the April 10, 2006, Librarian's Report be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Donna Saye (COST): At the March 27, 2006, Faculty Senate meeting, Clara Krug had a question about the Undergraduate Committee meeting prior to the Senate meeting. Mary Hazeldine was at the Senate Meeting for me and could not answer her question. Clara's question was about the program revision for the B.S. in Recreation. She could not find the revisions. Those revisions are on pages 11 and 12 of the agenda. When the Undergraduate Committee last met, we approved a new course and its lab for COST. The course was GCM 2532. The lab has a lab fee of \$20, which is the same price as the other labs for GCM courses, and we did approve that fee along with the lab. We approved new courses in CLASS. Discussion of an honors enrichment seminar was tabled. We approved course revisions in various colleges, and two program revisions. That concludes my report for the Undergraduate Committee.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Since the Undergraduate Committee Report is a committee report, it does not require a second. Please remember that approval of the Undergraduate Committee Report means we approve all course and curriculum changes recommended by the committee and forward those recommendations to the President. The Undergraduate Committee report was unanimously approved.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Richard Flynn (CLASS): Richard Flynn (CLASS): The minutes of the February 23rd Graduate Committee meeting are lengthy minutes and are in the Librarian's Report. I move for approval of the Graduate Committee Report, which includes approving the curriculum changes.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I will remind you that approving this report means we approve all changes and recommend those to the President and Provost. The Graduate Committee report was unanimously approved.

4. President's Report: Bruce Grube, President: Ron Shiffler (COBA) in the President's Absence: Dr. Grube is out of town, and Dr. Bleicken is in Atlanta. Dean Whitt had a conflict, so I was asked to give a summary of what is going on in

Academic Affairs. So here is my perspective of what is going on in Academic Affairs with a little bit of a view towards the University as well.

Alumni Awards Banquet

Many of you might not have attended the Alumni Awards Banquet last Saturday night. The program for the banquet showcases nine of our outstanding alumni, and I think the theme of all of my remarks here today is about *pride in our university*. The first gentleman who got up to accept an award got to the microphone and said he felt like he really should be giving us an award for the good job that we did in preparing him for his career. That message was repeated many times by others who accepted alumni awards. I know that you, as faculty, do not see the impact of what you are doing in the classroom every day, but when these people graduate and return 20, 30, 40 years later with incredible accomplishments, they are very thankful for what you did for them. It really should make you feel quite proud. A young lady named Lea Anne McBride, who received the Young Alumna of the Year Award, got her degree in Communication Arts. I do not know a lot about that program, but I was super-impressed with Lea Anne. She was very poised, very polite, spoke extremely well. She is currently the press secretary for the Vice President of the United States. It is a fairly powerful position, and it is easy to see that she is in that position because of her professionalism. Again, I felt very good about her, because of what we all did as a university to prepare her. In her case it was only about ten years ago, but in other cases it was much longer ago. The alums at the banquet were very happy and very proud of what we have done for them. A statement from the editorial in yesterday's Statesboro Herald said, "We wonder how many of the class of 2006 are future alumni of the year." So, at some point, maybe some of the students that you are teaching now will be selected the alums of the year for your college. You will really feel very good about that. The Alumni Awards Banquet was impressive. It was a very good evening, and we were quite happy to be there.

Faculty Recruiting

Many of you are probably serving on search committees. I do not have an exact figure, but I believe Amy told me there were about 100 searches going on this year. Now think about that. Maybe 700 faculty represent our faculty resources, and we are hiring 100 this year. That would mean that about one-seventh of our people next fall could be new to campus. The ability and the opportunity to add new scholars, new teachers, to our university is very exciting. I know some of the searches have very limited pools, and others have extremely large pools, but we have many opportunities to hire new folks. If you talk to colleagues at other universities, I am not sure all those opportunities exist elsewhere. Fortunately, the state of Georgia is coming out of the recession a little quicker than others.

Merit Pay Recommendations

The Deans have just gone through merit pay recommendations. The state allocated a 4% merit pay this year, and we were instructed to examine our worksheets and get those

back in. That work has been done, and they are all back in. The turn-around time is fairly short on this process, because merit pay raises represent the key inputs to our budget for next year. The university's budget is made up of about 66% personnel costs, and since that much of the budget is affected by personnel, you really have to lock that in before you can figure out the degrees of freedom you have for doing other things. I believe those recommendations will go to the President this week, or maybe next week, and hopefully that process will be finalized. Letters then will come out I expect sometime in early May.

Georgia Southern Magazine

A new edition of the Georgia Southern Magazine has been published. If you have not seen it, it has a very nice feature on undergraduate research. It is a very well done publication. Here again, I mention my theme about *pride*. If you are out talking to alumni, and most of the Deans are, they have read this. Alumni really get excited about what they read in there, so spotlighting what you are doing with your students in the classroom gives alumni a lot of pride, and I think it helps us in our recruiting. If you have not seen a copy of this I encourage you to get one.

College of Education's NCATE Accreditation

I believe the College of Education got a thumbs-up on their NCATE Accreditation. I am looking for confirmation from Cindi. (Cindi Chance noted agreement with Ron and thanked everyone for their help.) To offer you a perspective apart from the College of Education, I think that you all were extremely well-prepared--almost choreographed to the point where you had everything laid out. I cannot imagine that the visiting team was not impressed, and I know that they left town feeling good about what is going on here in our College of Education. I think that now has to be ratified probably by NCATE, but that should be a done deal at this point. So, congratulations to the College of Education.

Honors Day

A couple of weeks ago we had Honors Day convocation and, if you attended, that had to make you feel proud. The young lady who gave the speech, Calvina Colquitt, did an excellent job at the microphone, and when she finished, and people were clapping, do you remember who clapped the longest? (Her Dad!) He was up in the balcony, and he just kept clapping. He was really proud of his daughter, and we too should really feel proud of the students that we recognized at this ceremony, and the students who became alumni.

Eagle Club Events

You probably do not hear much about Eagle Club events. Those are related to the Athletics side of the house, but we have got a group of people in the Alumni office, headed by Frank Hook, Theresa Hackle, Melanie Mosley, and Wendell Tompkins. They go on the road primarily in April and May, and they are out there three or four nights a week. They set up little shops in various towns around Georgia. They go to Augusta, Macon, and Jesup, and I have had an opportunity to see a couple of their events. The

Vice Presidents go, and the other Deans go, and there is always someone from the Athletics Department who goes to talk about what is going on in that program. Frank gives us a little cheat sheet for what we should talk about when the academic side of the house to be spotlighted. In terms of students, Frank gives an example of an ROTC Cadet by the name of Glory White. He also talks about our Information Technology program, the College of Education and their participation in the INet agreement, Professor Michael Kelley's trip to Antarctica, Jonathan Geisler's research team, the Chemistry Department getting a new DNA sequencer. It just goes on and on! At each of these events Frank is there singing the praises of the University and the Alumni--and these events are fairly well attended. The one in Augusta probably had about 150 people there. They come because they had a good experience at Georgia Southern. They are proud of their University, and they are happy to hear these things. I will close with just one other point of pride. I attended the event in Jesup, and I think I met our oldest living alumni: James "Sully" Sullivan. The man came to the Eagle Club event that night. He was from the class of 1932. I do not think anybody in this room was born at that time. Sully was just really glad to be a part of Georgia Southern. Obviously, he was not getting around as well as he once did, but he was very happy to be an Eagle. He made a few comments, and everybody gave him a standing ovation.

It is the time of the semester when we are all very stressed. You have papers to grade and exams to make out, but I guess I would ask you to think for a little bit about the impact you are making on current students, on alumni, and how proud everybody is of Georgia Southern University. With that, I will conclude my remarks for the administration.

Candy Schille (CLASS): I was just wondering who selects the Alumni and the Alumni of the Year, and if faculty has any input into that process?

Ron Shiffler (COBA): I will answer that by telling you the different awards presented. Each of the Colleges has an Alumnus of the Year, and each has a procedure to choose the winner of that award. In COBA, we have a committee set up of current faculty and retired faculty. There is also the Young Alumnus of the Year, and I am pretty sure that person is chosen by the Alumni Association. There is an Alumnus of the Year, and I think that the Alumni Association picks that one as well. When the College award recipient has been decided, the College Dean forwards the information to the Provost and to the Alumni Association. I do not know the procedure used in each College to choose an Alumnus of the Year, but each does have one.

Cindi Chance (COE): The COE Alumnus of the Year is chosen by the faculty.

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: Regarding the raise, will that be in January again, or normal?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I think January is normal these days.

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: Is January normal now?

Ron Shiffler (COBA): Yes, the raises will take effect January 1, 2007. They will be annualized for the coming academic year, so you will not see it until January of '07.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Is there any effort by the administration to gently exert whatever pressure is feasible to have that revert to an academic year rather than a calendar year based raise?

Ron Shiffler (COBA): I am sure the Presidents of the Universities do not like it that it does not happen until January. Our legislators have gotten themselves in a fix that is going to be hard to get out of, and until there is a lot of surplus money that they can use to backfill, I personally do not see them moving the date back any time soon. Joe, do you have any idea what the whole system's raise pool amounts to? What is 4% of the overall system salaries' structure?

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): The whole system I would guess would be in the range of \$30 million. And I agree with you that January is now the norm, and that for the date to get moved backwards, it would probably be because we went 18 months rather than move it up six months.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I have a great sense of humor, but I did not laugh at that. I just wonder what, if anything, are the Presidents of the University System units doing to try to encourage the legislature to revert to beginning the raises at the beginning of the academic year rather than at the beginning of the second semester?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Clara, if I might address that, I have spoken with Dr. Grube about it, and he has told me that the Presidents have been very loud in trying to talk to both the Board of Regents and the legislature, but they have not gotten very far.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay. Thank you.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): I can tell you that we have been very loud about this, but we have gotten nowhere with it. It causes us a lot of work, as you can imagine, having a mid-year raise as opposed to a beginning year raise. When you look at your budget you actually have three numbers in there for what your salary is. If you ask what your salary is, we have to ask which of the time periods you are talking about. And it costs us a lot of money in terms of time. If you go across the entire state, it must cost a lot of money. However, our voices are falling completely on deaf ears, and we can beat our heads against the wall trying to get them to change dates, but I do not believe it is going to happen.

Clara Krug (CLASS): When we offer a contract to incoming faculty, do they know about this paradigm? We do not apprise them of this fact, I am assuming.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Can anybody else address that? I have been on many search committees as chair and member, but I have never talked about salary with any incoming faculty.

Ron Shiffler (COBA): I will try. The faculty that we are hiring now for next year are signing a contract for next year that fixes their salary for the next 12 months. So they are not eligible to participate in any raise pools for next academic year. The year after that obviously they would be. I will say that concerning the candidates that I have talked to, I have not brought this up nor has it been asked of me.

Clara Krug (CLASS): And we do not offer that information, I am assuming. Okay, thank you.

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

- Since the last Senate meeting there have been no information requests. There were three agenda requests from Clara Krug. They were discussed by the SEC and all were somewhat modified from their original form. They pertain to two items that were discussed at last month's Senate meeting. The first is the second reading of the motion to amend the *Bylaws* for timely provision of agenda support materials. The second is an amendment for the Faculty Development Committee procedures allowing individuals to ask for and receive feedback on unsuccessful proposals. The third is an amendment to Section 309 of the *Faculty Handbook* about required participation in out-of-class activities.
- At the April 11th meeting of the SEC, we decided to open the Senate Listserv to non-Senators on an opt-in read-only basis. As of yesterday, there were 27 individuals who asked for this access.
- It has been mentioned before, and I will mention it again, that the NCATE visit was positive for accreditation for the College of Education.
- Dr. Bleicken has been moving forward on the salary study. She had been focusing on one consulting firm, but the Board of Regents said that we must entertain at least two proposals. So two firms will be coming to campus (one in May and one in June) to make presentations and be interviewed. Hopefully, a contract will be authorized shortly thereafter.
- At the last meeting, we voted to form an ad hoc committee to study the composition of the committee and procedures for awarding tech fee money. That motion has not yet been approved or denied by Dr. Grube. Yesterday, when I met with him, he indicated he would be making his final decision on that within a week or so.
- Last month, I announced that elections would take place today for secretary and librarian for next year. There was not a single individual who came forward to

volunteer. Clara Krug has agreed to stand for secretary, and Godfrey Gibbison agreed to stand for librarian. We will also be entertaining nominations from the floor.

That concludes the SEC report.

6. Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: I have three items that I want to report on.

1) Each year I am required to report on the violations of NCAA rules that we have turned in for the year. We have three since July 1st when I started doing this. They are all considered secondary:

- First, a local basketball signee shot a round with the team before a game. No coaches were on the court. That is a violation; we submitted it. We told the NCAA we thought it was an isolated incident. They agreed.
- Second, the Southern Ambassadors handed out some signs with their names on them to some football recruits when they went to a basketball game to sit with the Hanner Hooligans. That is a recruiting violation. We caught that, we reported it, and we proposed that host groups will participate in a recruiting workshop prior to recruiting. The NCAA said that was fine.
- Third, in the fall we had a swimmer participate while ineligible. One of our assistant compliance coordinators left in the middle of the semester and there was some confusion regarding lines of communication with the compliance coordinator. We caught that, forfeited the points that the student-athlete earned, withheld the student-athlete from all remaining competitions in the fall, and as an institutional penalty sat the student-athlete out for the first two meets of the spring semester. The NCAA was good with that, as well.

2) The TIAA Cref Academic All-Southern Conference Team came out. We only participated in a few of the sports. We had two student-athletes from women's basketball make that team and four from women's track.

3) This afternoon, in the final round of the Southern Conference Golf Tournament, our men's golf team won the Southern Conference Championship by twelve strokes, so if you know any those kids be sure to congratulate them. That concludes my report.

7. Election of 2006-2007 Senate Librarian and Secretary: Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: As I mentioned earlier, the SEC nominee is Clara Krug from CLASS. Are there any nominations from the floor? Hearing none, I will ask that all in favor of Clara Krug for Secretary for 2006-2007 please say aye. All opposed? Clara Krug has been unanimously elected. Congratulations Clara. The SEC nominee for Librarian is Godfrey Gibbison from COBA. Are there any nominations from the floor? Seeing none, I'll ask that all in favor of Godfrey Gibbison for 2006-2007 Librarian please say aye. All opposed? Godfrey Gibbison has been unanimously elected. Congratulations to Godfrey, even though he is not here today.

The next item of business is a motion from Clara Krug on timely provision of agenda support materials. This motion was amended as a corrective matter by the SEC. Her

initial motion cited paragraph 108.3 of the *Faculty Handbook* in the *Bylaws*. It should have been 108.03.

8. Motion: Timely Provision of Agenda Materials, Second Reading, Clara Krug (CLASS): As Pat mentioned, this is a second reading of a *Bylaws* change. When I proposed this motion, I did not realize it would be a *Bylaws* change, so I appreciate everybody's letting me know that necessity. I apologize because, as you may have realized, the time between the last Senate meeting and the date for submission of agenda items was so brief that I really did not have a lot of time to check with Candy Schille and with Bob Cook before I submitted this. I was more concerned about submitting it than I was about a final perfect draft, so again I apologize to Candy and Bob. I have subsequently though had email messages from both of them about this. I assume that you all have this in front of you. The motion is I think fairly specific. I know that last time there was some concern about what might not be discussable. I think though that I will go ahead and make this motion, and then we may discuss what sections of the agenda might or might not be affected by that. The motion was seconded.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I will read the motion. "That Section 108.03 in the *Faculty Handbook*, '*Bylaws of the Faculty Senate*,' be revised to include the following statement in Article II--Membership and Meetings, Section 3:

Senators will receive in writing any item intended for notification, discussion, or action at least 48 work hours in advance of the Senate meeting at which said item will appear on the agenda, and they will receive copies of any documents related to said agenda item at least 48 work hours in advance of the Senate meeting. For purposes of these '*Bylaws*,' the work week is defined as 8:00 a.m. on Monday until 5:00 p.m. on Friday when classes are in session.

The current Section 3 will be renumbered as Section 4, and the current Section 4 will be renumbered as Section 5."

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I would like to ask one question for clarification. When you say 48 work hours, do you mean 48 clock hours or six, as I call it, days?

Clara Krug (CLASS): I mean, for example, if this were a Monday Senate meeting, items would be due on the previous Thursday because I am assuming that we are not considering Saturday and Sunday as part of the work week, as it is defined here as 8 a.m. on Monday until 5 p.m. on Friday when classes are in session. It would also mean that if we met the first day after a break everything would have had to have been given to us 48 hours prior to the beginning of that break.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Okay, thank you.

Michael Moore (COE): So, if this were in effect currently, this piece of paper that Alice gave us earlier today would have had to have been distributed 48 hours in advance?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: No, that is not an agenda item. That is an announcement for the Family Life Center.

Michael Moore (COE): Well, it says intended for notification, in the motion--senators receive in writing any item intended for notification.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Well, intended for notification at which said item will appear on the agenda. This did not appear on the agenda.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The key word there is on the agenda.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Yes, it would be on the agenda.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I am assuming, however, that any motion made under new business could still be made under this, right? Is that correct?

Clara Krug (CLASS): As I understand it, unfinished business is already on the agenda, so items under unfinished business could be brought up

Richard Flynn (CLASS): And new business?

Clara Krug (CLASS): New business is already on the agenda. An item could be brought up, but as Parliamentarian Cook wrote to me on the 3rd of April, there are "several avenues by which the Senate can consider whatever it wishes, whenever it wishes." 1) President Grube apparently can add any agenda item he chooses; 2) Motion to suspend the rules, or suspend former process for dealing with a specific question; 3) Change or depart from the agenda immediately to take up a matter out of its proper order is also debatable and takes a two-third vote. So, there are ways in a case of an emergency. For example, if we are expecting a hurricane, and we want to know if we should consider evacuating the campus, we could consider that. That does not seem so strange anymore given Katrina and what happened to various places in New Orleans and other places. Or, if there is new business which comes up as a result of discussion at a meeting like today, we could consider that since new business is already on the agenda.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): Would you agree to say two work days, rather than 48 work hours?

Clara Krug (CLASS): That would be fine. I am just trying to make it possible for people who now do not come in five days-a-week, but come in usually on a Tuesday/Thursday or a Monday/Wednesday/Friday schedule to be able to receive in their offices two days

in advance, 48 hours in advance, of the Senate meeting what they need to be able to read and really study before the Senate meeting.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Mary, are you making a motion to amend the motion?

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): Yes.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there a second to Mary's amendment? The amendment was seconded. Is there discussion on the motion amendment?

Clara Krug (CLASS): I accept that as a friendly amendment. It is in line with what I was intending. My main goal with this, as I mentioned before, is to let Faculty Senators have time to study items before we meet.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Clara, can I assume that publishing the agenda with relevant attachments on the Senate web site constitutes in writing?

Clara Krug (CLASS): Yes, that would be in writing. Sure.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Okay.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Sure. Thank goodness for the web, because you have things published in a timely manner there.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: All right. So we have a friendly amended motion, is there any further discussion? Just so that everybody knows on what we are voting: The motion is that Section 108.03 in the *Faculty Handbook*, "*Bylaws of the Faculty Senate*" be revised to include the following statement in Article II — Membership and Meetings, Section 3:

Senators will receive in writing any item intended for notification, discussion, or action at least 2 work days in advance of the Senate meeting at which said item will appear on the agenda, and they will receive copies of any documents related to said agenda item at least 2 work days in advance of the Senate meeting. For purposes of these "*Bylaws*," the work week is defined as 8:00 a.m. on Monday until 5:00 p.m. on Friday when classes are in session.

The current Section 3 will be renumbered as Section 4, and the current Section 4, will be renumber as Section 5.

Since this is a *Bylaws* change, it does require a two-thirds vote. I will ask first for a voice vote. The motion carried.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Thank you very much.

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: Pat, I printed the *Bylaws* from the Faculty Senate web page, and they do not follow the same numbering as the *Bylaws* in the *Faculty Handbook* that Clara just amended, [editorial note: The *Bylaws* in the *Handbook* were last amended February 2004; the ones on the Senate web page were last amended June 2004.] so I guess Ginger, if you are the right person, I would be more than happy to help you, but the two need to be the same, so that when we amend something, it looks the same in both places.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: We will make sure that that happens.

Bob Cook (CIT) Senate Parliamentarian: We will go with the *Faculty Handbook*, and then, if there is a difference, we will have to go back to the minutes and see what the truth is.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay. Thank you.

Bob Cook (CIT): We will try and get them both the same.

9. Motion: Amendment of Faculty Development Committee Procedures, Clara Krug, CLASS: This is another follow-up from last month's meeting, and again, I intended to speak with Faculty Senators who had spoken to me about this either at the meeting, or afterward; specifically Godfrey Gibbison, David Alley, Mark Welford, and Jean-Paul Carton. I did speak with Jean-Paul Carton because we reside in the same structure on campus, but I did not get to speak with Godfrey or David, although we do reside in the same structure or Mark Welford until afterward. But basically I agree with the Senate Executive Committee's recast of my request, which is "if an applicant asks in writing why his or her proposal was not funded, the committee chair (or a designee) will either meet with the applicant or provide a written explanation to specify the proposal's rank among all proposals and the reason or reasons for denying funding," and I make that motion.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there a second? The motion was seconded.

Clara Krug (CLASS): This was engendered by a report of the Faculty Development Committee that the Senate received subsequent to a request for information that I filed. I had heard from several colleagues that faculty were uncertain of the procedures followed in awarding funds, and unfortunately, since, especially travel budgets are so diminished compared to what they used to be per person at the department level, it becomes incumbent upon faculty members to seek funding from other sources either internally or externally, and apparently the initial effort is to seek internal funding at the University level, specifically from the Faculty Development Committee. There is a sentence at the end of a letter of rejection which indicates that the Faculty Development

Committee hopes that the unsuccessful applicant will submit other applications. I received an email from a colleague indicating that she specifically would have liked to have known why her proposal was not funded. There seemed to be nothing in the procedure that was reported by Chairman Yang on behalf of the Faculty Development Committee that provided for that particular part of a procedure, and David Alley, former chair of the Faculty Research Committee, indicated that the Senate had given a charge to the Faculty Research Committee to provide some option for learning why a proposal had not been funded. That is why I submit this particular item. At discussion at the last Senate meeting, it became clear that colleagues on the Senate did not really find it a good idea to ask that a chair or designee on the Faculty Development Committee indicate what might improve the proposal for another effort to seek funding. That was seen as taking too much time and as giving false hope. In this proposal I was trying to do what I heard from various Senators at the last meeting, which is simply to indicate the rank among whatever number, and also the reasons for denying funding. This seems to let the person know why not, but does not seem to give any kind of a hope for the future. That did not sound too good, but I think you understand what I mean. It does not promise funding, if you fill in the blanks.

Bill Yang (COBA): First of all, I just want to let the Senate know that the Faculty Development Committee discussed this motion at its last meeting. Let me simply read the paragraph related to this issue from the minutes of our meeting: "The committee has had discussions concerning feedback from the Faculty Senate regarding proposals from applicants which did not receive funding. Given the current request from the Faculty Senator seeking clarification on this matter, there was much discussion concerning how the current blind review process makes it difficult to provide feedback, except for how the application ranked in terms of other applicants. The committee recognized the desire for such feedback, and will attempt to provide the applicants with the overall score from the existing rubric used to evaluate all proposals, as well as an average score from each of the sections of the application that include the description of the project's effect on professional development and scholarship, expected outcomes' significance to department budget, and the budget justification." That summarizes the discussion by the Faculty Development Committee. I want to reply to Dr. Krug's request from the last Faculty Senate Meeting. I was sick, so I could not attend the meeting, but I read the minutes carefully. One request from Dr. Krug was to have the Faculty Development Committee members' names listed somewhere. I just want to point out that the name of all committee members has been listed in the Senate Web Page for the last several years. Now let me address the rationale of this proposal. First of all, I believe the committee supported the idea to increase the transparency of our decision procedure--that is not a problem. The only difficulty is concerning the effectiveness of this proposal. We believe we want to have all faculty improve the quality of their proposals. Any feedback given would be helpful for anyone wanting to write again for the next round, but I would like to share a couple of facts with all the Senators about our procedure. Basically, it is just like grading on the curve. A given number itself does not mean anything. We rank from high to low based on the average of all committee members' scores. Then based on the

available rankings, a cut-off point is established, and anything above that is funded, anything below that is not funded. So the number itself is probably not very meaningful. It is the rank that matters--just like grading on a curve. If, on one exam, all the grades fall between 60 and 80, then 70 is the cut off point. The next time if everybody's grades have improved, or for some reason the grading just got easier, and everybody got a 90 and above, you still have only limited resources. So if the purpose is to try to improve or enhance the number of the proposals funded, I guess I would probably have to say that is impossible. My term in the Senate will be over this summer, and I will not be chair next year, so I am not defending anything. You have asked that the chair write feedback. I think, because the ranking is based on an average score from eight members that is difficult. For example, sometimes I found I might have given a proposal a high score when someone else gave a low score. If you want me to give feedback for that specific proposal as to why it was not funded, I probably would have nothing to say. I would have said it was a pretty good one, from my perspective. Giving feedback would be difficult, but the committee is definitely in support of increasing transparency in an effort to guarantee fairness. But this procedure itself probably cannot improve the number of the proposals funded. Thank you.

Clara Krug (CLASS): The purpose of my proposal was not to enhance the number of proposals funded. That was not the goal. It was to provide feedback to faculty so they would know why their proposals were not funded.

Bill Yang (COBA): If I remember correctly, in the minutes somewhere it was mentioned that since the source of funding has now becomes tighter, faculty might try to search other possibilities of funding. That means a faculty member might want to seek some other source of travel funding, which I understand, but that is not the committee's job.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I used as comparisons other funding agencies in the Humanities which do provide feedback as to why there was not funding. That is what I used; I did not say people would apply to them. I used that as a comparison.

Bill Yang (COBA): I support the idea of giving feedback to each specific faculty member, which might be helpful. However, who is going to write that and whose opinion is that. Let me share another factor with all the Senators here: when I signed a letter, for either acceptance (funding) or rejection, that is the only time I knew the name of the person making the proposal--after the rank or the funding had already been decided. This year two committee members who served last year applied, and only one of them got funded. Considering feedback, they should know best what is expected, because they had served on the committee for two years previously, and their proposals did not both get funded. So it is very hard to see what exactly will get funded, because all committee members have different perspectives. It might also be true that 90% or above of the proposals are very good, high quality, but our funds are limited.

Alice Hall (CHHS): I was also the chair of Faculty Service for two years, so I feel your pain, and it is hard to give feedback. I think that at the last meeting we talked about making this motion applicable to all three committees. Was that correct? This motion just says Faculty Development.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: That was a suggestion that did not come forward on this motion, so we might want to amend this motion to include the Service Committee.

Alice Hall (CHHS): I would like to amend this motion to include the Faculty Service Committee, because Research already has one in place, is that correct?

Clara Krug (CLASS): I will accept that as an amendment.

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: Parliamentary issue here. The responsibilities of the various committees are listed in the *Bylaws*, so, for example, responsibilities of the Elections Committee involve conducting apportionment calculations annually in January, so that is pretty specific. I take it that Clara's motion would be an amendment to the Senate *Bylaws* which is okay because the *Bylaws* say that subsequent revision must be included as an agenda item, and shall require two-thirds vote. It is an agenda item, and a two-thirds vote would pass it. So the first question, Clara, is whether you intend this as an amendment to the *Bylaws*, in which case it would be mandatory, I would think, for the committee. If it is not in the *Bylaws*, then it would be in the form of a recommendation to the committee. Did you have an intent one way or the other?

Clara Krug (CLASS): The intent was inline with what David Alley mentioned at the last meeting of the Faculty Senate. David, I think you said that the Senate had charged (Was that the word you used?) the Faculty Research Committee with incorporating some kind of an information delivery system, for lack of a better word, to people who asked you why they had not received funding. So I was interested in a charge; if it is more effective to make it a part of the *Bylaws*, that would be okay. I was just trying to make it a recommendation and hoping then that the written recommendation of the Senate would be accepted by a Senate standing committee.

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: Well, the difference is that if we pass something as just a recommendation of the Senate, then it is potentially not mandatory, since it is only carried forward by word-of-mouth or whatever. If someone is a new chair of a committee, the first thing they are going to do is read the *Bylaws* to see what their responsibilities are. If it is in the *Bylaws*, it becomes mandatory. Then there is also the issue of whether you want to extend this motion to the other two committees. It is unclear according to the amendment rules whether that should have been put on the agenda before we vote on it. So, I guess my feeling would be that if we are going to vote on a *Bylaws* change today, then it would be restricted to the changes with the Faculty Development Committee.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Just one point of information, or a question for David Alley. The *Bylaws* do not reflect that the Research Committee has a charge to provide feedback.

David Alley (CLASS): I would ask the current chair of the Research Committee (Gautam Kundu), who has had to implement the charge that was made to the Faculty Research Committee last year to inform us as to how this is being implemented. I support the intention to make this uniform through all the committees.

Gautam Kundu (CLASS): I was not present at the last meeting, but regarding the Faculty Research Committee, we submit on the website a summary of each reader's report on every proposal submitted along with its strengths and weaknesses. Anyone reading these summaries would know why his or her proposal was denied. That is a matter of procedure. We decided to do it, and we implemented that this year.

David Alley (CLASS): And that was, in fact, the charge of the Faculty Senate, I believe a year ago at this meeting in April. So it has been accomplished.

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: But it was not voted on as an amendment to the *Bylaws*.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Correct, it was not an amendment to the *Bylaws*.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I was wondering if we could pass this recommendation for all committees.

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: In fact, if we were going to amend the *Bylaws*, it probably would be most appropriate to just change the sentence to say "Review and evaluate and provide feedback..." and then each committee would basically be free to implement new and better ways to provide feedback as time goes by.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I would just like to point out that if a chair of the committee has a particular opinion that was contrary to the rest of the committee, that does not preclude the chair from summarizing the findings of the entire committee, so if eight people on the committee give low numbers to description, for instance, the reason given can be that the description, in the opinion of the committee was weak, and it does not matter whether the chair agrees or disagrees with that.

David Alley (CLASS): What is then the conclusion of this discussion, and what will be brought forward in the fall?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: As I understand it right now, correct me if I am wrong, the motion as we currently have it is that the Faculty Development and Service Committees will amend their procedures to include the following step as a charge from the Faculty Senate, not as a *Bylaws* change: that if an applicant asks in writing why his or her proposal was not funded, the committee chair or designee would either meet with the applicant or provide a written explanation to specify the proposal's rank among all proposals and reasons for denying funding. We have left for future action the possibility of including the idea that feedback must be granted as a *Bylaws* change.

David Alley (CLASS): Not to belabor this, but, is the intent to make the procedures consistent between all three Faculty Senate Committees? The Faculty Research Committee, as I understand it from the chair's remarks, does this as normal procedure, not just when the applicant makes the request.

Gautam Kundu (CLASS): We do it as a normal procedure. There is no question of whether someone asks or not, we just routinely do it.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): What David was just talking about in his previous remark was the idea of giving feedback using a specific method. One of the ideas pointed out earlier was to have a charge available without specifying the method. The Research Committee has a method, and the Development Committee may come up with a different method or may follow the Research Committee's suit. However, I think what you were suggesting, and correct me if I am wrong, was that this methodology that is in the current proposal be removed and simply state that the charge be that feedback be made available.

David Alley (CLASS): Yes, in fact, that it be made available as a matter of standard procedure and not subject to the request of the successful or unsuccessful applicant. I think that is my intent.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Could I request a friendly amendment to the motion?

Clara Krug (CLASS): Sure.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): To...say it again, David. I can not.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Could I try?

Richard Flynn (CLASS) Yes.

Clara Krug (CLASS): "The committee chair or designee will either meet with the applicant or provide a written explanation to specify the proposal's rank among all proposals and reasons for denying funding." Is that too specific? I withdraw my amendment to my motion.

Ming Fang He (COE): Yes, could I make it a simpler? If you ask the committee chair to meet with the applicant, that creates a lot of labor for the committee chair. We should just recommend that the committees follow the procedure of the Research Committee.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Is it in writing?

Gautam Kundu (CLASS): Clara, it is already on the web site.

Clara Krug (CLASS): It is on the web site?

Gautam Kundu (CLASS): Right. We have tried to put everything on the web site: *Faculty Research/Faculty Research Committee*. If you go to our web site, it is there. So information does not have to be solicited, it is already there.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I sort of hate to withdraw the motion completely.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Might I propose the following? That the Faculty Development and Service Committees amend their procedures to routinely provide feedback on every proposal's ranking and assets and deficiencies?

David Alley (CLASS): Strengths.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Strengths and weaknesses.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Every proposal's strengths and weaknesses. So if I may repeat: "That the Faculty and Service Committees amend their procedures to provide feedback, on every proposal's strengths and weaknesses." Is that correct?

(Call the question.)

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: We have to vote to call the question. The call to question carried. Now we can vote on the motion. Clara, would you please read the revised motion as it currently stands.

Clara Krug (CLASS): The revised motion is "That the Faculty Development and Faculty Service Committees amend their procedures to provide feedback on every proposal's strengths and weaknesses." The motion carried.

10. Motion: Required Student Participation in Class-Related Activities,

Clara Krug, CLASS: The motion is "When students are absent due to illness, representing the University in athletic events or other activities, or special situations, instructors should be informed in advance of reasons for absences, but these are not excuses." I submit that motion. The motion was seconded.

Clara Krug (CLASS): This is in response to discussion at the last Senate meeting indicating that perhaps we should include this in Section 309 of the *Faculty Handbook*. There is already information in Section 309 that specifies each faculty member's right and responsibility to determine attendance policies in his or her classes. However, it does not address concerns related to other faculty assuming that students will be able to be excused from classes for the other faculty member's class-related events or University-related events.

Don Fausett (COST): When students are absent due to illness, instructors should be informed. Who is this obligation on to inform the instructors when students are absent due to illness?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: To tell you the truth, honestly, I am not sure. That was in there to begin with. In some cases, it is up to the student to bring a doctor's note to prove that they were ill. In some cases, I have had students bring me notification ahead of time for planned surgeries and things of that nature.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Clara, as I read the motion as it is now written, it really does not specify who has the responsibility to notify the instructor, but I would assume that the responsibility would be the student's.

Clara Krug (CLASS): That is what I intend. We could add that I guess, because it would need to be the student presenting something to the faculty member in class. It might initiate with the coach or another instructor, but the student would be the person delivering it. That is typically what happens in my classes anyway.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): In the second line of the motion as written, if you put in the three words "require students to" between the words *should* and *provide* that will put the responsibility on the students. The professor can then give them a written note if he wants to, but it is up to the student to let the professors know.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Marc, are you reading from the Senate Executive Committee's action that revised the motion?

Marc Cyr (CLASS): No, I am looking at the. . . , no, I am sorry.

Clara Krug (CLASS): At the original motion?

Marc Cyr (CLASS): I am sorry.

Clara Krug (CLASS): That is okay. And, I am sorry, but would you repeat that.

Candy Schille (CLASS): I am all for making the institution primarily an academic exercise, but is it really practical to give any faculty member the power to prevent a football player from going on an away game?

Clara Krug (CLASS): I think it is just important that the person inform the faculty member in advance, so that the student will be informed of what work needs to be made up. I do not know that the basketball coach would appreciate my keeping one of his or her players away from a game, but I would like to know that the person's not going to be there so that the person may, on the bus, or the plane, do French exercise #35 on page 312. That is the main point of this. During this semester in particular, there have been egregious assumptions by some faculty members that students are going to be excused without anything in writing. I tend to want to believe my students when they tell me that they are supposed to be on a trip.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): When this issue first surfaced my understanding was that there was some collegial responsibility among faculty to say my requirement causes your student to be out of class. And for that reason, I am not sure there is a need for the illness part. That seems to me a real personal thing, and it is different when a student is sort of caught between obligations from two different University requirements.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Yes, that was inserted the Senate Executive Committee. That was not part of my original motion.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Illness was in the paragraph to begin with.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Yes, but this is what I would be comfortable with, if I may, "when students are absent because of representing the University in athletic events or other activities or special situations, instructors should be informed in writing in advance by the students, of reasons for absences. However, these are not excuses."

David Robinson (CLASS): I do not see that this changes anything at all. I mean, it says faculty should be informed, well, I guess they sort of ought to already. What happens if they are not informed? And in anticipating the answer to that, well, then we can decide whether to excuse them or not. We can already do that. So, I am not sure why we should pass something that changes nothing.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Section 309, Paragraph 2, currently reads "The University's administrative offices do not issue excuses to students for class absences. When students are absent due to illness, representing the University in athletic events or other activities, or special situations, instructors may be informed of reasons for absences, but these are not excuses." This particular policy does not include "should be informed," it does not include "in advance," it does not include "in writing," and it does not identify "the student" as the source of the information.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): The way I interpret that language is that I may get the bandleader or the football coach sending me a list of the students' games, or I may not. And that is, in a sense, the University issuing excuses, or issuing what are not excuses, rather. Sometimes I get the lists, and sometimes I do not. And even though, in my syllabus it says that I will entertain excusing people for official University business, it may be that this does not do anything. I tend to agree with Dr. Robinson.

Caren Town (CLASS): I do not entertain excuses at all of any kind for anything, so I guess I am kind of uncertain about why we would want to put all this language in about sending things in advance, and putting things in writing. It seems to constitute a situation where somebody's going to give you even more paperwork that we do not want to look at, or at least I do not want to look at it. So I guess I would say we should just leave it as it is. We may or may not get information, but when we elaborate on what might be excuses, then it seems to sort of encourage more of this process or paperwork coming from the Athletic Department or the Band, or notes from the doctor. I think each person has a policy that is different, and I really would hate to specify more paperwork that I do not want to see coming across my desk.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I think I agree with you because everybody does, according to Section 309, have the right and responsibility of having their own attendance policy. I think the germaneness of this, as I understand it, was that certain other faculty members were trying to tell their students that they should give a note to their other teachers or tell their other teachers that they were going on this field trip and it would be an excused absence. Somebody else is trying to say that you will excuse their students.

Clara Krug (CLASS): That appears more in the original motion. Faculty who require students to participate in off-campus or on-campus events on a week day when classes are in session should provide, etc. etc., and that does not necessarily constitute an excuse. That was where it emanated.

David Alley (CLASS): I just wanted to support Caren's contention that this probably is contingent on each individual instructor's attendance policy, and the situation, Pat, that you are describing seems to be a breach of the instructors prerogative to enforce that attendance policy--an instructor telling a student that my excused absence will also work in another instructor's class. That just seems to be hopefully an isolated violation.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): This is a question for information, I guess. Is it possible for faculty to require students to attend activities and events other than what is during class time? I can understand that the University would require attendance at a football game or a swim meet, or something like that, but the way this is written, it is about faculty. So, for example, if my cultural studies class is going to Augusta to the museum, I have always assumed that I cannot require that they go. I can invite them to go, and if they

choose to take an absence in another teacher's class then that is their business and the other teacher's business.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I do know that, correct me if I am wrong, GSU 1210 instructors require students to go to certain lectures and cultural activities, but not a particular one on any one set night.

Donna Saye (COST): We have a schedule of events that students can attend, and we require them to attend some of the events, but students would have several alternative time choices and should never miss a class to attend a first-year event.

Kent Murray (CLASS): If students receive their syllabus the first day of class as expected with the attendance policies in there outlining the objectives and requirements for the course, then they should know events they must attend from the beginning and be able to negotiate that with other faculty if the other faculty feel it acceptable.

Alice Hall (CHHS): Can we call the question? The call to question was seconded and carried.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Clara, would you please read the motion as we currently understand it.

Clara Krug (CLASS): The motion as currently stated is a revision of the Senate Executive Committee action motion, which reads "When students are absent because of representing the University in athletic events or other activities, or special situations, instructors should be informed in writing in advance by the students of reasons for absences. However, these are not excuses."

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The motion was defeated. I think we need to go back to Section 309 and look at our own policies and make sure students understand them. At this point I would like to recognize our newly elected Librarian for next year Godfrey Gibbison, since he came in late. Good luck, Godfrey.

11. Unfinished Business

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): I have had a few colleagues ask about the survey that is going on now for faculty to give input on the question of whether students who do not attend the first day of class are to be dropped. And I just wondered if Nancy or Ron could talk about the possibility of extending the deadline for the survey, so that we can insure that faculty who do not look at WINGS until they submit their grades will be aware of the survey.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: All faculty were sent an email yesterday to tell them that it was there.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): Right. If the deadline were extended I think that would increase the response rate. I am interested partly because of the issue, but also because they asked me to help fine-tune some questions, and I would like to see the administration get the best data they could.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Nancy, would you care to comment on that?

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): Our feeling was that if we put it out there for two weeks, and we put the email out to all faculty, we provided adequate time.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) asked what would happen with the responses.

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): At the end of the two weeks all of the data will be sent to Jayne Perkins Brown's office, and she will compile the results and report to the Senate Executive Committee.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if the email notice that Lavada Sykora sent to all faculty included the date deadline.

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): It says that it is going to be open until the end of this month, and that at that time the results will be compiled.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I think the concern earlier was that some faculty who were looking at registrations for their summer courses, came across it, and of course, filled it out, but those of us who do not teach summer courses would not normally go to WINGS until after the deadline. That is why I wanted to make sure that the deadline is specified in Lavada Sykora's email message. It is?

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): Yes, it is.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Great. Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Might I clarify things, and possibly ask Nancy to have Lavada send out a reminder to faculty a day or two before the deadline?

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): Well, I was actually going to have her resend it at the beginning of next week, so there was plenty of time for those people who are not on campus every day to see it. I can do it that time or I can wait later in the week.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): That would be great either way.

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): Okay, I would like to get a reminder out about a week before the last day, so that people have plenty of time to get on.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): My concern is even if it is a short survey, you want as many people to respond as possible. If it is more convenient, more people will respond, and if it is convenient for them to do it right around the time they are entering grades, some people would be more likely to do it then rather than take time out of whatever else they are doing. But if the reminder comes that would help.

Nancy Shumaker (AVPAA): Okay.

12. New Business



Clara Krug (CLASS): I talked with Joe Franklin, who is gone now, earlier today about a concern that arose related to chopping down trees on West Gentilly. I called, right outside the Botanical Gardens main office, because they are part of the University and because I figured they would know why the trees were coming down. I found out that they found out when the trees hit the ground and shook their building that the trees were being taken down for the widening of a road. At the same time the access to the Botanical Gardens was blocked at both ends of the access road. I am hoping that in the future when something like that is done that there can be some communication between the engineer's office and the University, and that the University can then inform people of why trees are coming down and when access roads are to be closed, so that it is a little bit more obvious.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: That would be a good point. Ginger alerted me, and I did ask Joe about this, and I learned that the trees were city-owned trees and the University cannot do anything about it. However, we should have been informed ahead of time so that we knew what was going to happen.

Clara Krug (CLASS): And so that people would know. For example, groups did not know how they were going to get in to the Botanical Gardens.

Ming Fang He (COE): I missed the last meeting, because I was attending a conference out of town. I have one remark, and I have two questions. The remark has to do with the salary-bumping task force. I have received quite a few emails, and some faculty across campus have talked with me, so on behalf of them, I would like to convey genuine thanks to Linda Bleicken and also to those people who worked on the task force, like Dean Ron Shiffler and Professor Robert Costomiris and Linda Bleicken's staff members. Those that are staffing her office worked very hard on the task force. Faculty who benefit from the salary-bumping task force are very happy about it. I have two questions: 1) Is there any task force to be organized in the future which is going to look into the salary compression issue and the equity issue among faculty salaries across campus?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: That was in my SEC report, and it has been talked about several times. The administration is trying to hire a consultant to do a complete study of salaries.

Ming Fang He (COE): Okay, so I would request that those professionals hired would get input from faculty as well as from professionals. 2), as a faculty member, I do not totally understand this Carnegie Classification, so suppose our University is promoted upscale, are there any strategic plans for our University in the future to initiate or implement any policy to reduce the teaching load and create more space for faculty development which will become compatible with the upscale of our University ranking? I believe such a move will foster the advancement of scholarship and teaching excellence and eventually the advancement of our University.

Ron Shiffler (COBA): Ming Fang, I am not aware of a task force that exists to do that. There was a letter from the previous Chancellor, Meredith, before he left, that invited several Universities to propose doctoral programs: Georgia Southern, Kennesaw, Valdosta, and West Georgia. By having doctoral programs, I think there is an expectation that you would have reduced teaching loads, you would have more graduate assistants, and you would have better funding. Now having said that, we have not put any proposals forward except the PsyD that we just heard about today that was approved. So back to your question, I do not know that there is a task force. I would assume that if we do go forward with doctoral programs that there would be some addressing of teaching loads and some addressing of resources for faculty and graduate students. But I am not aware of anything that exists now.

Ming Fang He (COE): I am just requesting, as a faculty member, that we hear more about the strategic plans from the top; about how we will handle the future of our University. If our University ranking is up, that means that our teaching load and everything else should be compatible. And we need that space to further develop ourselves.

Mark Welford (COST): I do not think our ranking went up; it went up by default, because they changed the method of evaluating universities. My understanding is that if we had wanted to change in the previous ranking, we would have had to have seen across the board reduction in teaching load, not just specific to individual places or departments that got Ph.D.s or Masters. It struck me that we were not about to do that as a University, but Princeton changed the whole method and we got slotted into a different category by default. I think there is going to have to be some serious negotiation here for us to pursue changing our teaching loads at the moment because it was simply by default.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: What Mark has said is true. They changed the methods which caused us to get a classification change. The other thing I might emphasize here is that none of the doctorates that we currently have--the EdDs, the new

PsyDs, and the soon-to-be-proposed DRPH (the Public Health doctorate)--have the three letters Ph.D. According to Dr. Grube, he believes it will be at least ten years before Georgia Southern might become a Ph.D. granting institution.

Clara Krug (CLASS): What happened with the part of the task force on workload chaired by Denise Battles? I thought that the reporting of that work was supposed to have an impact on what we would see as our workload.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: It was supposed to have an impact. I do not know what happened. I know it had an impact on our annual evaluation forms and formats, at least in the College of Science and Technology. I do not know about other units. The problem, as far as workloads, is that we are still dealing with the Board of Regents mandated fifteen hour workload. Certain units through their accrediting boards have reductions in that. Personally, Languages, Math, Language Arts, and Communication Arts do not have accrediting boards, so we are stuck with the full fifteen hour workload.

Mark Welford (COST): I think what has happened, if anything has happened, is that some departments and/or psychologies are able to change from actual credit hours to contact hours. That negotiation I think is actually going through the University at the moment. So, rather than just counting your simple credit hours, you can have a three-hour lecture and a lab, but meet for two hours in the lab, and it now becomes five contact hours. That negotiation is ongoing amongst department chairs. I know it because I have been part of the discussion with my boss.

Michael Moore (COE): I believe that the report from Denise was pretty clear at the end that each college was supposed to take the report and start their own load process, which we did in the College of Education. I do remember that there was a lot of discussion about what the actual load was and what it was supposed to start with. The administration seemed to think that it originally was a five-five, but no where in the Board of Regents did it say that. The only place that we actually knew it existed was in an early memo from Linda Bleicken when we converted to the semester system. However, no where else does it say that, so that has always been an issue that really has not been addressed.

13. Announcements: Vice Presidents

There were none.

14. Announcements from the Floor

Alice Hall (CHHS): I passed out a flyer for you. As part of our undergraduate training, we train our students in Early Childhood Education and Child and Family Development

to work with children. We are making some changes, and we just want to make you aware of that. We are providing childcare for 46 weeks in the year. We have only provided for 30 weeks previously for infants through 4-year olds. So, I just want you to be aware of the changes as you talk to people in the community. It is really an important part of our undergraduate education, but we are also providing a service. We do think it is the highest quality care around town, and we are accredited.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): Alice is this for students or for faculty or who are eligible?

Alice Hall (CHHS): It is for anybody. It is first come, first serve. It is a combination of grants that we received. We were providing only care for infants and toddlers of children of students, but that grant funding cycle ended, so we are combining and making some changes. Now we are open 46 weeks, 7:30 to 5:30, so we are able to serve a broader scope.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Before I entertain a motion to adjourn, I would like to recognize some of you who may be attending your last Faculty Senate meeting. I know at least one individual who will be departing here in about three weeks--Don Fausett. Don, we thank you for your service.

15. Adjournment

The Faculty Senate meeting was adjourned at 5:42 p.m. by Pat Humphrey.

The next Faculty Senate meeting will be June 21, 2006, in the Nessmith-Lane Southern Ballroom. *NOTE CHANGE IN MEETING PLACES*****

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
June 21, 2006
4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Nessmith-Lane Multipurpose Room

Voting Members in Attendance: Jean-Paul Carton, Bob Fernekes, Richard Flynn, Godfrey Gibbison, Tim Giles, Bev Graham, Teresita Maria Smith for Alice Hall, Mary Hazeldine, Ming Fang He, Pat Humphrey, Clara Krug, Mary Marwitz, Bruce McLean, Michael Moore, Kent Murray, Michael Nielsen, Greg Brock for Constantin Ogloblin, Norman E. Schmidt for Laura Regassa, Donna Saye, Marc Cyr for Candy Schille, Robert Vogel, Adam J. Con for Pat Walker, Mark Welford, Bill Wells, Jerry Wilson, M. Reksulak for Bill Yang

Voting Members Absent: Kathy Albertson, David Alley, Spyros Andreou, Barry Balleck, Ken Clark, Nirmal Das, Don Fausett, Leslie Furr, Gautam Kundu, Margaret LaMontagne, Ron MacKinnon, Michele McGibony, Marla Morris, John Nauright, Broderick Oluyede, Virginia Richards, David Robinson, Sonya Shepherd, Caren Town, Jianping Wang

Senate Officers in Attendance: Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee, and Moderator, Faculty Senate; Richard Flynn (CLASS); Mary Hazeldine (COBA); Michael Moore (COE); Donna Saye (COST); 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, Vice President for Student Affairs; Billy Griffis, Vice President for University Advancement; Jim Bradford (CIT); Jane Rhoades Hudak (CLASS); Ron Shiffler (COBA); Cindi Chance (COE); Charlie Hardy (CEPH); Sandra Nettles (COGS)

Senate Parliamentarian: Bob Cook

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:

Strategic Planning Council Representative:

Student Government Representative: Chris Ford and Kelsey Grubbs

Visitors: Georj Lewis, Amy Heaston, Nancy Shumaker, Joe Murray

1. Approval of the Agenda for the June 21, 2006 Meeting.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. on June 21, 2006 in the Nessmith-Lane Multipurpose Room and made the following announcements prior to hearing a motion for the approval of the minutes.

- She announced that alternates should sign next to the senator's name and not in the visitor's section.
- She asked senators to please identify themselves and their college affiliations clearly before speaking, for the minutes. She emphasized that when senators are recognized to speak it sometimes takes the sound crew a few seconds to realize which microphone to turn up and encouraged everyone to be sure that their microphone was on before continuing too far with their remarks.

She then heard a motion that the agenda for June 21, 2006 be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

2. Approval of the [April 18, 2006](#), Minutes: Donna Saye (COST), Senate Secretary: I received one correction to the minutes from the last meeting. On Page 25, under Item 12, New Business, the minutes should read "I talked with Joe Franklin earlier today about a concern that arose related to chopping down trees on West Gentilly, right outside the Botanical Garden's main office. I called because they are part of the University and because I figured they would know why the trees were coming down." With this correction to the minutes, I move that the minutes for the April 18, 2006, Faculty Senate meeting be approved. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

3. Librarian's Report of [June 14, 2006](#): Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS), Senate Librarian: I would like to move approval of the Librarian's Report of June 14th. I have not received any corrections. Discussion of the report began after the motion was seconded.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I have a question about the Academic Standards Committee's report, Page 1. I am very pleased to see that there is consideration of why students do not seem to be doing well. I wonder if, in addition to the fact that somebody might have begun to complete an inappropriate major, there might also be consideration of the fact that a person might be working too many hours--meaning a job that is not an academic job, maybe as a waiter/waitress, or whatever other jobs might be available to our students. Also, if another reason might not be what I would call "distractions" that seem to take up an inordinate amount of time, or is the committee thinking that the only reason that somebody might not have a 2.0 average would be an inappropriate major.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I know we have talked about many issues. Godfrey, would you like to address that?

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Sure. Yes, Clara, the reasons run the gamut. We talked about lots of reasons why that might be the case. This one, though, seems to be very high on the list. It seems to be a major reason. Working is a very big reason, as well. A lot of students say, yes, I am working 30-40 hours. I am not sure that there is much that we can do about it, in terms of helping the student. One of the things that we have talked about is just the need to have one-on-one discussions with the student, and say, if you are really a part-time student, you should be a part-time student. If you are taking 15 hours, and you are passing six, you are part-time. You really should just take six and pass six, but, you can suggest those things and students are quite free to ignore you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Yes, it is a big problem, and I know we have discussed it in Academic Standards quite a bit. We have been trying to think of ways to have an early intervention when students begin having problems; when they first hit that probation, so that they do not progress to restricted enrollment, and exclusion, and exclusion 2, and several other exclusions.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I am sorry. I was just hoping that the people at the office of Career Services who are apparently now going to have referrals who would meet these students, might in addition to the inappropriate major, also convey that perhaps the full-time job is not the wisest choice, and that that perhaps there are too many distractions beyond the classroom.

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

Clara Krug (CLASS): The Faculty Research report, on Page 3. It was my impression that we were no longer going to list the names of nominees for various awards, and, if the names of the nominees for the Excellence in Research Award could be deleted, that would perhaps be appropriate. I think Michael Moore made a similar motion about a previous Librarian's Report.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: That was in regard to the committee's comments about the individuals rather than the names of the nominees.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Well, if you have the names of the nominees and then the names of the recipients, to me I would hope that you would not have the names of the people who did not receive the award also listed, especially when there is only one person who did not receive the award. Is it possible to do that, or does anyone else think that it would be better not to have the names of the people who do not receive the award?

Ming Fang He (COE): I agree. It is not a good idea to list all the names.

Kent Murray (CLASS): For some people it is still an honor just to be nominated.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: That is my thinking also. Shall I make a motion, and we will see what the feeling of the Senators' is? A vote was held and the vote carried to oppose deleting the names of the nominees.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Could I call for hand-raises, please?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Okay. A hand vote was held, and the vote was 14 to 7 to leave the names in the report.

Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) Senate Librarian: Remember we are approving the accuracy of the report, and not the content, which we are modifying at this time.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Correct. No, we are not modifying.

Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) Senate Librarian: Well, we are trying to

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Right.

Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) Senate Moderator: We have been talking about the content, and acting on the contents of the report, but we are supposed to be voting on whether or not to accept the report.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): I have a quick question. Do we have a deputy parliamentarian? I am just concerned about what we just did. We just had a discussion and a vote regarding modification of the content of the Librarian's Report, before we even actually accepted the report, and I am not sure if that was a legal procedure right there. I think Jean-Paul has a point.

Bruce Grube (President): Just, by way of suggestion: 1) the Chair cannot make a motion, but 2) Jean-Paul is quite correct. The vote is on whether to accept the report or not; it is not for discussion of modification of the content of the report.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Okay. The June 14, 2006, Librarian's Report was then approved by voice vote.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Donna Saye (COST): The Undergraduate Committee met on May 23rd and at the meeting COBA desired to remove all of their second disciplines, however, discussion on that and voting on that was tabled, except for three second disciplines in accounting. Discussion was tabled because it was decided that there needed to be more communication between COBA, COE, and CIT. All the other new course proposals, revisions, and program revisions were approved, and can be seen in the Librarian's Report.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there any discussion of the Undergraduate Committee Report? Seeing none, please remember that approval of the Undergraduate Committee Report means that we approve all courses and curriculum changes recommended by the committee and forward those recommendations to the Provost and President. The Undergraduate Committee report was unanimously approved by voice vote.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Richard Flynn (CLASS): We have the March, April, and May minutes in the Graduate Report. They are lengthy, especially because of the Doctor of Public Health program.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Does this mean that my questions will come under new business, because they are about content, rather than about accuracy?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: At this point, if we vote to approve the Report from the Graduate Committee, we are approving all the course recommendations, curriculum changes, etc.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): You are approving the recommendations, at this point, so I think you have to ask now.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Okay, so I am allowed to ask about content?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Right.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Just to clarify. Thank you. My first question is whether we are able to discuss the Masters in Computer Science. Apparently, there was a discussion at the end of one of the sets of minutes led by Dr. Nettles stating that she needed to be sure that the proposal had been completed appropriately, so this degree program was not to be presented to the Senate. However, it has been presented in writing to the Senate in this report. What does that mean?

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Yes, it was my understanding that at Dr. Nettles' request, even though we had approved the program (Masters in Computer Science) at the March meeting, that essentially, since her name was going to go on it, and that she had not gone through all of the steps in terms of consulting with Deans/Departments, that we were going to hold off asking for approval of that program until she had a chance to do that, and at present I think she has not gone through that process.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Yes. Thank you. What happened is that January 1, Sandra Nettles became Interim Dean in the College of Graduate Studies. We do have a process that is very explicitly outlined about approving and moving forward on new programs and that particular program had not been through that process, but Dr. Nettles, because she was relatively new in her position, did not know that, and so this is a mechanism to bring that program back. It does need to have revisions and those are going on right

now. In fact, Dean Bradford and I talked about this earlier today, and he informed me that there is progress going on in that regard.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Dr. Bleicken, perhaps you could answer one question. Would it be okay to approve these minutes, since the minutes later reflect that the committee's action was put aside because of the need to go through the process? Am I correct in that?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I would think so.

Clara Krug (CLASS): My next question is in regard to Page 7 of the Graduate Committee Report, items # 8 & 9, in regard to graduate students teaching undergraduate courses at Georgia Southern. Concerning item #8, Dr. Li raised the issue of graduate math students being permitted to teach basic mathematics undergraduate courses. In item #9, others remarked about the expanded use of graduate students in teaching undergraduate courses and stated that for graduate students proposing to be future faculty members, the teaching experience would be a valuable learning experience. It was also stated that GSU should make teaching a part of the graduate experience. I was wondering what the progress is on this?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Clara, I am not sure which program you are referring to at this point.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I believe this is part of the general discussion, Dr. Bleicken.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): General discussion, under new business, at the end of the March 23rd meeting.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): There were quite a number of various issues that were brought forward.

Clara Krug (CLASS): This one issue in particular interested me, because I understood that at Georgia Southern graduate students traditionally have not taught; have not borne complete responsibility for an undergraduate class. That is why I was curious as to what had been done subsequent to this meeting of March 23rd.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): May I clarify? These two items really were just items for discussion and there was no action taken on point #8. We were actually just talking at the end of the meeting.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: My take on that, Clara, is this. Look at the preceding step as it is, among other things, thinking about creative ways to get more funding for our graduate students.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Exactly. But I was curious, since funding for graduate courses is mentioned here, and considering the Senate's deliberations at various meetings, I was wondering if anything was going to be done about it?

Richard Flynn (CLASS): My take on it is that if there were to be something done about it, it would go through the Graduate Committee, and through all of the appropriate steps and levels, and if such a change were to occur, it would actually require action going all the way up to the President.

Clara Krug (CLASS): So the answer is no? Nothing has been done subsequent to the discussion. That is all I wanted to know.

Bruce Grube (President): We could do it tomorrow, if we could determine where the funds would come from.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there any further discussion on the Graduate Committee Report?

Clara Krug (CLASS): Me, again. Page 13 of the meeting on the 27th of April. This is about Dr. Diebolt asking the Graduate Committee to set minimum admission in the TOEFL Internet based (iBT) test, which is one of three options for international students to show their proficiency in English, so that faculty at Georgia Southern have an idea of their ability to understand and to speak and to comprehend written and to write English. And since this was a request of the Graduate Committee to set standards, I wonder if anything has been done subsequent to this meeting? Following the paragraph is Jerry Wilson's comment on Page 14, and then the motion was passed. This motion is followed by the discussion of a student health insurance plan and a motion that was passed to endorse a proposal that the institution increase the Georgia stipend by an amount at least equal to the mandatory health insurance plan yearly premium. I just wonder about the implementation of these motions. Am I remembering that correctly, Richard?

Richard Flynn (CLASS): That is correct. These two motions passed the Graduate Committee and upon approval of the Graduate Committee report, then they would be passed, assuming it passes by the Senate. And then it would go on up.

Clara Krug (CLASS): And that would be for potential implementation during the 2006-2007 academic year?

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I would assume so.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Thank you.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): The first motion that you are talking about sets a minimum TOEFL score for the Internet based test. And we did not have a Graduate school minimum score for that test because it is new.

Clara Krug (CLASS): About the doctorate program in Public Health, I just had some questions about money. On page 32 is the break down of the funding. I am just wondering how the money is going to be acquired for funding faculty lines? Because there are some statements later, on about page 11, about additional faculty needed for this program.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Current faculty lines are not being diverted to fund the College of Public Health. There is new funding in formula funding that the University was fortunate to receive this year, and some of that new formula funding will go to fund these positions. Of course, we are not filling all the positions required in one year.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I have a question also regarding the Sample Program of Study from page 67. The Sample Program of Study seems to indicate that if somebody enrolls in a program, he/she will be able to complete it in eight semesters, beginning with Fall, Spring, Summer of two years, and then Fall and Spring of the third year. If the person decides to come into this program full-time, I am wondering if there will be stipends. Page 86 indicates that there will be, for lack of a better word, staggered implementation over the three years, and that there will be, it looks like a total of 31 graduate assistants. There is also a request of varying amounts of money, the total I think was for 9 existing positions, plus 9 new ones, which totals 18 positions, and \$135,000. I am wondering where that funding will be coming from, because I am assuming that at the current time that college does not have the money for the 18.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Not having studied this thoroughly before this meeting, but certainly being very cognizant of what is in this proposal, I would say that certainly there are additional graduate positions that are planned. Some of those will probably come out of the allocation that Graduate Studies has allocated students. Remember that we have some limited number of faculty who were in the College of Health and Human Sciences who now are a part of the College of Public Health, and if we have a program of this type, we will have to have some graduate assistants, so that will be forthcoming.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Any other questions about the Graduate Committee Report?

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I think I forgot to move that the Graduate Committee Report be approved, so I move that.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: All right. The vote was taken and the Graduate Committee report was unanimously approved.

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

Bishop Building

For the sports-minded community out there, if you have been by Paulson Stadium lately, you have seen the Bishop Building going up. It replaces the Lupton Building as a result of a substantial gift from Mr. Gene Bishop to the University. Also, at the scoreboard end zone, a wall has been built to enclose the field. For those of you who are very particular about what bowls look like, this is kind of a triangulated bowl. The idea of a bowl is there.

Fencing

Also, along Chandler and Lanier, there is a possibility that some new fencing may go up this year. I think it will, but Joe Franklin says he is not sure. You may want to place your bets on Joe, but we will push to get rid of the old chain link on those areas and in front of the Bishop Building. Our Landscape Architects on the campus have now got a plan for upgrading the plaza at the entrance to the stadium.

Starbucks

For the caffeinated community, Starbucks is real. A contract to remodel the game room in the Union has been let to John Lavendar, whose firm interestingly, is the same firm that is putting the Bishop Building up at the stadium. That will be open Fall Semester. For any of you who enjoy \$4 cups of coffee, this will be your opportunity.

Other Projects

- For those of you who are in Com Arts or have colleagues in that program, you will notice that the construction fence has gone up around Veazey now, and that project is starting.
- We have had a series of Fine Arts projects over many years now. Fine Arts III, of course, to remind all of you, is the building that will be put up near Pittman school (now the Arts Building). That will have a Black Box Theater, galleries, faculty offices, and so forth. Fine Arts IV is the project to remodel the Foy Building, a substantial element in that remodel includes the re-doing of the Carter Recital Hall and the entrance for it, as well as other elements in the building itself. Fine Arts V, was the re-doing and expansion of the band practice facility out back. What has been delaying all of this was that it has taken so long to sell the bonds and release the financing for Fine Arts III. Of course, construction costs went up considerably, particularly in terms of the cost of steel and cement. And so that project came in closer to \$7 million rather than the \$5 million. But what we did was, through Joe Franklin, request that the facilities through the Chancellor's office give us permission to treat Fine Arts III, IV, & V as one budget. And they have agreed to do that, without, by the way, a great deal of argument, much to our surprise, so kudos to Atlanta on this one. So we will be proceeding with Fine Arts III, and if we re-stoke, it will probably be on Fine Arts

V. But we will get all three of them done, and this is naturally good news. I should also mention that when we dive into Fine Arts IV, which is the re-model of the Foy Fine Arts Building, that is going to require getting the music faculty out of the there. I have tried to convince them to do it one floor at a time, but they did not think that was a great idea at all, so, what we intend to do at the moment is to take Hendricks Hall offline. Hendricks is one of our residence halls and is right next to Veazey. We plan to use that residence hall for a period of time to house that faculty, renovate Foy, and then get them back in there. We think it will take about a year to do Foy.

- Our Library addition is near completion. I was talking to Bede Mitchell yesterday, I believe, Joe check me on this, August 8 is the official date that it is to be turned over. That may or may not be the case, but it should be somewhere close to that, and then at that time, I know Bede will provide tours for the new addition and so forth. To remind you, that is where the automatic retrieval system will be, and that is a fairly interesting piece of technology. Related to that, of course, we will then begin to start on the old Library. And because that is going to be completely renovated, we will need to move some things, so if you are driving by the old Winn-Dixie on Gentilly and Brannen, and you see Georgia Southern trucks over there, please know that we have leased that building for a period of time to house some of the collection that is not in constant use.

Legislative Visits

This is that time of year, too, that I normally report to you on our legislative visits. To remind those of you who are new, I have found that it has always worked extremely well, after the legislative session is over, to actually visit our legislators in their home districts, in their own turf, just to talk with them about Georgia Southern and to thank them for their support. This year that was easier to do, because there was good support of the budget of the University System of Georgia. It was a little more difficult to do in years past, but these visits have typically gone extraordinarily well. We have met with all leadership of the House and Senate, and with the Regents. When I say we, it is Bill Golden, who is essentially our Governmental Relations person and myself, who go out and do this. You might imagine during the session itself, the legislative session, everybody who talks to legislators wants something, and so it is actually very refreshing for them when we go out and really all we want to do is talk with them, without asking them for anything per se. Now, I would be fibbing if I did not say there was not a subtle agenda in all of this; there is, so we really are asking for something, but not explicitly.

The one issue that seemed to recur this time, not with every single person we visited, but it was a recurring issue, was one that we raised here on the campus, and we are focused on. I tell you this to let you know that this issue is now out in our external community, and that is the issue of retention, progression, and graduation rates. This is the first time in all of the legislative visits I have ever made that I actually had legislators asking me

about this sort of thing. I think most of you understand that the University now receives or does not receive funding based on those three. I also think that most of you know that the University is already being held accountable when we receive or do not receive funding based on our performance there. And we are going to have to be ever more conscious of how we are working to build retention and graduation issues now. Georgia Southern has been very fortunate in a sense that we have been able to show a great deal of progress, and we have actually benefited from those achievements that we have made. We have raised the floor for admission (minimum standard now is 1000, I think); when I got here it was something like 920. As we have raised the minimum standard, retention rates have risen and graduate rates have slowly followed. But on the recruitment end, it has become ever more important, because we have narrowed the market of students that are available to us. So that is something that we need to work with. The whole business of enrollment management and retention and progression and graduation rates has a need to become more and more fine-tuned. So do not be surprised at all, if during the course of the year, we engage people right down to the department level in discussions about how we might do this. It takes a lot of pressure off recruiting if you can simply raise the retention rate. And so, Clara, going back to some of the earlier conversation, I believe it was you who was concerned about some of the reasons students might not succeed. And Pat, you mentioned the need for an early intervention plan. I think all of those have been talked about in the Enrollment Management Council. This is just one issue that is going to be with us for a while. I would be glad to answer any questions now.

Questions

At this point several senate members asked Dr. Grube questions, and Dr. Grube answered each of those questions. However, there were problems with Dr. Grube's microphone, and his answers could not be heard clearly on the tape. His responses to the questions are summarized below based on notes and memory.

Michael Moore (COE): I was wondering, since we have the raised the standards, how has that affected the demographics of our student population?

Dr. Grube replied that the effect on enrollment had been a concern, but that we were fortunate in that there was only a small change in the percentages in the demographics of our student population.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): You mentioned that the legislature had been good to us in regard to budgets, and I am trying to remember back three or four years, did not the legislature dip into or take part of the University System's medical fund? That was like our back-up funding for the medical system. Has that been restored? I have not heard anything about that since they took it away.

Dr. Grube asked Joe Franklin if he could address Marc's question.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): Actually, it was the Board of Regents themselves that dipped into that fund, and they did it sort of as a precautionary method to keep the state from dipping into it. They are trying to restore it, but it has not been fully restored.

Bruce Grube (President): It is important to note here that the legislature did not fully support the funding formula for the System (the formula that brings money to us, largely based on enrollment). Also, the legislature for the first time since the early 80s, has decided comprehensively to examine the funding formula. I think that when people study the funding formula, they are going to find many things out there that are not adequately funded by that formula.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): So I guess we should take it now that from here on out, or whenever it started, whenever we get a raise, it is going to be in effect in the sixth month of the academic year, and never again in August will we see a raise.

Bruce Grube (President): I think Joe Franklin ventured an answer to that at a recent Senate meeting, and my honest take on it would be just the same as Joe's. From the state's point of view, it is not easy to readjust the salary schedule in August. To every legislator that we talked to, we made the point that Georgia, including Georgia Southern, stands to lose good faculty when you cannot adjust salary at the beginning of the school year. I am not optimistic, however. Thank you.

5. Report from Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive

Committee: Well, we have been rather quiet since the end of April. There have been no information requests since the last Senate meeting. There were three agenda item requests: Clara Krug submitted a request resulting from student inquiries about when their grades were to be posted at the end of the semester in May. For everyone's information, students can currently view their grades on WINGS 24 hours after the last final. If you remember, originally grades were visible to students on WINGS as soon as the professor submitted them. A couple of years ago, the Academic Standards Committee voted to change this to 24 hours after the last exams so faculty who had complained to the Registrar's office and other places would have a chance to finish all grades and be gone for the semester before students accosted them in their offices. Clara's original motion was phrased to release the grades 24 hours after graduation, but after consultation with Clara, that motion has been amended to state that student course grades will be available on WINGS 48 hours after the last final exam is scheduled to be completed.

You will recall at the March meeting, we voted to form an ad hoc committee to study the composition of the committee on procedures for awarding tech fee money. That motion still has not been either approved or denied by Dr. Grube, but the Student Government leadership has said that they are satisfied with the current method of awarding these fees. Chris Ford, the new SGA President, submitted an agenda item request to explain their views, and that will be information item # 7 on today's agenda.

Further, Chris also submitted an agenda item requesting the Senate to endorse the SGA's plan to establish college councils. The intent is to foster communication between students, faculty, & administration. I will let them address that more in agenda item #8.

Just some other updates:

- I have spoken with Dr. Bleicken briefly and she is tentatively working with a consultant regarding the salary study issue, and among other things they are waiting to get the new salary file which came down this week, so that will begin to move hopefully soon.
- Another update on the issue of deleting students who do not attend the first day proposal: a survey was completed by 289 faculty, and a similar survey was completed by 3,543 students. Seventy percent of the faculty, but only 40 percent of the students, agree we need some sort of a policy about attending the first day. Students overwhelmingly (70 percent compared to faculty's 40 percent), do not want to be deleted if they do not attend the first day. Both groups felt the worse downfall would be inadvertent deleting of students with valid excuses. Of the students who said they did not attend one or more classes the first day of last semester, the primary reason was personal emergency followed closely by nothing important ever happens on the first day. And I guess that should give us some food for thought. Comments were voluminous, as I was somewhat worried about; 220 pages of transcribed comments from the students, and faculty was somewhat shorter. Basically, the gist of things in terms of faculty comments were, we can go along with it, a) if it be guaranteed that students would not be getting dropped inadvertently, and b) there is no extra work. To quote several students, "it sucks." In any event, in discussing this matter with Dr. Bleicken, the policy will not be implemented for Spring '07. Why? Because they are going to be installing a new BANNER software system during Christmas break, and they do not want to do anything else at that point.
- Remind people that committee assignments for next year have not been done yet. We have not been informed in the Senate Office of the results of elections in the College of Education, and the SEC members to replace those rotating off have not yet been selected or at least notified to the Senate Office. If anybody has information, please let me know. I have been trying to get in touch with David Robinson, who is not here today, to try and find out what is going on with the elections.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): He is in Seattle.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Yes, and he has not replied to my emails either. That concludes the SEC report. Are there any questions? There were none.

6. Motion: [Release of Grades on Wings](#), Clara Krug, CLASS: The motion reads as follows, "That student course grades will be available on WINGS 48 hours after the

last final exam is scheduled to be completed.” The explanation is that this change makes timing coincide with when grades are due from the professors who actually do give exams on that final day. The motion was seconded and discussion began with Clara Krug.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I had inquiries from students, as Pat Humphrey mentioned, but I also had emails from a couple of colleagues who also were giving exams, one or more exams, on the Friday of exam week, and they had received phone calls and email messages, Saturday and Sunday morning, when their grades were not even due until later on Sunday. The students could not understand why they could not see their grades for classes where exams had been given on Friday. It seems that no matter what the faculty member explains, to the members of the class the notification on WINGS that their grades will be available supersedes all of the oral and written communication from the faculty to the student.

Tim Giles (CLASS): Yes, I very much support this motion. I teach in a very large department, Writing & Linguistics, and I would say about half of those people are on some type of a temporary line, and I have heard a lot of conversation in the hall among people who are giving a Friday afternoon exam, thinking that they have to have their exams in, or the grades in by the next day. They were concerned that they were not getting the full 48 hours, and even though I reassured them they did have 48 hours, because I have been through this and called the Registrar’s office, and so forth, they seemed still not to believe me for some reason.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): I have had very similar experiences, and, in fact, I have gotten calls from the Registrar’s office way before the 48 hours are over saying that my grades were not available. So I am very much in support of this motion.

Ming Fang He (COE): I fully support this motion, too, as a graduate faculty, I think this will give us more time to grade those graduate student term papers. This is great.

Kent Murray (CLASS): One way to possibly temper this a little bit is, prior to your final exam, to go over the grades that students have already accumulated so that they have some idea of where they stand, and then perhaps they will not be in a panic mode at the end.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Some faculty do this; however, it seems to make no difference.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Call the question.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: All right, the question has been called. A vote was taken and passed to call the question. The motion being discussed to delay the release of students’ grades on WINGS until 48 hours after the last exam is scheduled to be completed was next voted on, and the motion carried.

7. Information Item: [Student Technology Fee Award Process](#), Chris Ford, SGA President: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Chris Ford, and I am the President of the Student Government Association. Today, Kelsey Grubbs, who is Vice President of Academic Affairs will be speaking on my behalf.

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA-VPAA): Good evening. This year, in March, a proposal came about an ad hoc technology fee committee. The last administration brought it to the student Senate, and the student Senate discussed it, and voted against the ad hoc committee. We feel like we have already run the committee the way we would like to run it, and it runs efficiently. We, as the new administration, are going to run the committee according to the old administration. We feel that we have a very effective process, and we do not feel like an ad hoc committee is necessary.

Michael Moore (COE): I became involved in this fee issue when faculty teaching with technology from my college came to me. Actually, all of us in the COE use some aspect of technology in our classes, and we prepare our students in the use of technology in all fields. And the faculty in our college are discouraged that their equipment is outdated, the software is old, and they want to purchase new materials. They kept applying for and not receiving funds, and asked me as a Senator to look into it. And when I did, I found that in our college we had generated over \$856,000 in fees from our college, and the College of Education had received back in monies in that college only 1 percent. That was in the fall, and in the fall we received a larger award, I think, because of accreditation purposes, but that really did not do much; it brought us up to 7 percent. Until Dr. Bleicken announced in the past spring meeting that there was a COE member now on the tech fee committee, although she did not say who it was, we had not had representation on the tech fee. When I raised this issue in the Senate, I started hearing from other faculty members in other departments that the situation was the same. And prior to my motion with no fanfare, no announcements, the process by which we award these fees suddenly and radically changed between Thanksgiving and Christmas--again, to my knowledge, without any faculty input. This is why I made this approved motion that we look at the process. My concerns still have not been eased. I still believe, as does this Senate, by their nearly unanimous vote on this issue, that the process still needs examination. I do not see the problem of an ad hoc advisory committee to give advice. The committee might come back and say well, everything looks fine, and suggest no changes. The committee may find the faculty should have a more active role in the process. I do not see a threat in this. I am glad that our students have faith in the process, but if we teach anything else in our universities, our state universities, we do teach a democratic process. And in keeping with that, I think that the vote that we had in favor of this proposal is in keeping with these democratic principles. And I urge that the wishes of the faculty be acknowledged and approved from the President's office to allow this committee to form.

Bruce Grube (President): Well, since I have a distinct feeling somebody here, some group, has just been accused of being undemocratic. I would point out the students are also part of the university community, and so their voice is important, and so to the contrary, I think democracy is what is happening right now in discussion with the students.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): I have a quick question. There is a line in the motion where it says that the SGA would like to present their procedures for reviewing and approving projects. Does that mean that they are going to give us a document to say, here are our procedures, so that we can take a look at it, and see if there are aspects with which we have in any arguments?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: It was my understanding that they were going to describe the process.

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA): I can, would you like me to?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Please.

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA): The Provost appoints a faculty member, a CIO, and a staff member. The committee also includes the Director of Information Technology, the SGA President, the Vice President of Academic Affairs (me), and four Senators from SGA. We divide requests up into categories, and fund according to a priority list. The first priority is failing equipment within a college; the second is life-safety, an improper outlet, something that might be dangerous to students; the third, and probably most important to a lot of people, is the number of students that are serviced or benefit from it; and our last is the age of the equipment, outdated equipment, and previous funding. And the reason why this priority list works so well is because none of these requirements have anything to do with a specific college. It has to do with what students need, the safety of the students, and what equipment is actually failing. That is why we feel that our process is done effectively, because we do not focus on where it is coming from; we focus on what is needed for the students.

Michael Moore (COE): Now, remember this process just originated between Thanksgiving and Christmas. Before the process was that if you were interested in new equipment, or if you were interested in software, or whatever, you had to write a proposal. Proposals went to the Student Tech Fee Committee, and that committee voted on it. And, again, I raised the issue because, to my knowledge, there are not any faculty involved in this new procedure. And we are major stakeholders in this game here, you know. We have a lot to say about this, and we have no voice in this process at all.

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA VPAA): These are student fees, and we have been given the responsibility to give out these student fees. And I agree that we might need your input, but right now we are satisfied with the way the process works.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Do you have some weights? There are four or five categories here by which you evaluate. Do you have some weights that you put on them? In other words, is there a scoring mechanism so that, if a proposal comes to the committee, does that proposal get a score based on these categories that you have?

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA VPAA): Yes. They are weighted according to priority.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Okay, and so do you have a scoring mechanism of a 100 points or something like that?

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA VPAA): Since I am a part of the new administration, I am not as familiar with the system as I should be, but when I get to the office later on . . . , are you familiar with the actual scoring mechanism (to Chris Ford)?

Chris Ford (President, SGA): Ms. Grubbs is actually fairly new to the Tech Fee Committee herself. She has been doing research on previous committees to determine what they have done and to understand the new process, but any type of question as to how they go about delivering the funds; she will probably not be able to answer at this time.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Right, so, could we get something that says: This is how the proposals are weighted; here are the weights on each piece. That might help remove some of Michael's fears.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Are you asking for a set of objective criteria?

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Yes, that is exactly what I am looking for, thank you very much. There must be some set of objective criteria out there by which proposals are evaluated; that would let each project stand on an equal footing.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Godfrey, actually when this issue was originally raised back in the fall, Lisa Spence responded to a request for information with some fairly extensive information about how the process works, and so that is in our back records. If you would like further information, certainly either I (or the students) can find that for you. Our office manages, certainly from a clerical standpoint, the decisions that the group makes. I would like to correct a misperception that was put out there--prior to the fall, there actually was a process. And that process was heavily weighted toward the number of students that are being served by a specific technology request. In addition, it was heavily weighted by the number of hours that students could actually access the technology that was placed in any given location. For that reason, a major amount of the new technology every year goes into the library, which is open almost 24 hours a day, seven days a week. It goes into labs such as the College of Business Administration and the College of Information Technology. I believe that the College of Business

Administration's lab stays open until maybe 2 or 3 in the morning, and it opens first thing in the morning prior to the start of classes. So, the number of students served, and the accessibility of the equipment used by students is top priority. As we have moved down the pathway, and more and more of you faculty have requested smart classrooms, that has become another big funding issue. So that one I think has become number two in priority--certainly the big labs, then smart classrooms. So there has been a process, and it has truly been looking at the proposals, considering the needs of students, how many students are served, and also truly the needs of the faculty because the smart classrooms have been a wish that has been expressed by the faculty.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS): I missed the first criteria you said before life-saving, what was that?

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA VPAA): The first one is failing equipment.

Greg Brock (COBA): I was also wondering if it is possible to share successful proposals from the past that people could see.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): Yes, I do not know why that would be impossible. In essence, a successful proposal is one that has many of those elements: served a lot of students, is accessible, perhaps addresses a life-safety, or failing equipment issue. And we would be happy to share those. This is not a closed process. We have a [web site](#) that you can go to for information. Remember the tech fee did not exist until, I believe 1997, so as we have gone down the pathway I feel truly that the process that has been used has become much more open, much more accessible. I would really hate for us to have to go back to the way it was in the early years. I think that we have become much more sophisticated in not only formulating a standard for these proposals, but also it incorporates student input, and that is a very important part. I truly do wish that some of our former SGA Senators could be here because they have been very active participants in this process.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): The list of criteria here seem quite good, but weights would be helpful; for example, you could have failing equipment or old equipment somewhere, but it serves only a small group of students. That particular small serving group with old equipment could get left behind for five years. That is why we want some assurance that would not happen in the process.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): May I address that? Periodically we have requests for smaller labs. One of the things that we try to do is not necessarily always fund only the big huge labs. We have had some smaller labs that have been funded. We funded an Art lab, for example, and the reason that we funded that lab was not because it served huge numbers of students, but because there were very specific needs that were required by the faculty, very specific software and hardware needs because of the graphic issues involved. The students themselves read these proposals before the meeting, and they advocate very vigorously sometimes for these things. I want you to realize also that we

have funded not just classrooms, and not just faculty issues. We have also funded labs that exist in our residence halls. In addition, we have funded the Academic Success Center computers, because these are very important. Students need to have the kinds of computers that are going to help them. So, there are criteria, and there are other considerations that come into play. But we are very happy to have people look at the process and make suggestions; that is how it has evolved over time.

Bruce Grube (President) Ms. Grubbs I think when you began talking that you invited input, which I thought was perfect. In that spirit, would the Tech Committee be willing to sit down with two or three Senators from this group, to get their input and to talk with you in that manner? Is that something that you all would be able to do?

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA VPAA): Yes, we are always open, especially this administration, seeing that we are really focusing on communication, and we just want to make that known right now with the faculty that we really are willing to get your input. We really do need your help sometimes, so we would welcome having a couple of members of the Senate sit down with us to discuss what might need a little tweaking in our process.

Bruce Grube (President): My suggestion to the Senate is that might be very a good way to proceed.

Michael Moore (COE): Two things. One, I think our motion was the same thing; that is what an ad hoc committee does. The second thing--I am confused, Dr. Bleicken, in some of your comments. My understanding was that in the last funding cycle there were no proposals; that actually someone from the Tech Fee came around, according to the administrators in my college, and asked what the needs were in the college. I understood that the system had been scrapped, and in its place we were going from college to college in terms of trying to keep up with the needs that all colleges and departments have in terms of equipment. So am I confused, or is it still a proposal system? Can individual faculty actually access the web site and write proposals, because my standing was that that had changed?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): There is a very specific format. One of the reasons that we went to the format and asked for people to provide input via the format was so that we would have proposals that were more easily comparable. And by that I am saying if you have similar information on each proposal, it is a much easier and a much more streamlined way to review proposals and to compare them. If we do not have that sort of mechanism, Michael, we cannot do that. Just so that you know, the big proposal review happened in the fall semester. We get funding for one year; it comes from the student technology fee. We estimate what that amount of funding will be, but in the fall semester we do the biggest award. In the spring semester typically we have many more proposals that are left over from the fall that were not funded, so many times spring is when we re-look at some of those that were not funded in the fall cycle.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): I would just like to reiterate something Michael Moore just said. President Grube suggested that members of the Senate talk with the SGA. You said you were open for communication. As Mike pointed out, this is what his motion, which the Senate approved, basically asks for, with an ad hoc committee. I am not sure then what the opposition to the ad hoc committee is, since apparently you like the idea, President Grube likes the idea, I know Mike just loves it, so I am just trying to figure out what is going on--we have the thing approved. You seem to object to the committee, but you want a conversation. I am thinking that the ad hoc committee is a dandy way. I just do not understand the opposition to it.

Bruce Grube (President): My apologies. I have tried really, as you know, historically not to get engaged in these debates, but rather to listen. I think there is a huge difference between an ad hoc committee recommended by the Senate and formally sanctioned by the President of the University with a charge, than, on the other hand, informally sitting down with a group of people where you think you have an issue and trying to work out what that issue is before you carry it on up into what is really a quasi-legal kind of environment. Thank you.

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA VPAA): That is exactly what I was going to say. As students, we like to sit down and discuss suggestions, but in the format that we have and the process that we have. We would like to take suggestions, but I feel like an ad hoc committee would almost make it an environment that would demand that we accept those suggestions, whereas in a little bit more casual environment, it would be a lot easier to discuss, to discuss and say I agree with you here, but I do not necessarily agree with you here.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): Personally, it sounds like a waste of time to me. The ad hoc committee seems to me would be conversation with a point, and with the possibility of effect, and otherwise it is just discussion. Thank God, we will have Starbucks, you can have \$4 coffee while you are having your discussion, but I am in favor of the ad hoc committee. If I recall correctly, I voted for it, as did the majority of Senators.

Kent Murray (CLASS): The door seems to be open. The next thing is somebody needs to set an agenda time as to when the groups can get together to see if the informal starts to work, and run with it from there, so could somebody, either from students or from Faculty Senate, propose a date and a location.

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA VPAA): We do not want to come across that we do not want to hear suggestions, we do, but we are satisfied with the way that it works now. If it were in the ad hoc committee, it really would be very formal and mandated. If a suggestion is made that would really clearly improve our system then of course we are going to take it, and I do not think that is a waste of time.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I see this situation, and I wonder what the reversal would be if the students wanted an ad hoc committee for our Senate and wanted to make comments

on our procedures in our classroom. As I understand it, this is the purview of the Student Government Association. They have been given the charge over these funds. That is their responsibility, and if the administration sitting on that committee feels that it is proceeding correctly, then I think the input idea is fine. I think it would be great to have a Senator or two or three come and sit in on this meeting. The students feel that this is their responsibility. This is the charge that they have been given, and I think that what I have seen here is that we want to dip our fingers into a responsibility which is largely a student responsibility. They are looking at, as Dr. Bleicken said, the needs of the students. They are not telling us how to run our classrooms, but we are trying to tell them how to allocate this money, which has been designed to be allocated by the students. If they are willing to take our suggestions, and our proposals, and so forth that is great. But I do not think they are under any obligation to implement those.

Michael Moore (COE): First, I would not mind a student ad hoc committee talking to me about my classes. That is fine. Second, my reading of the Board of Regents' Procedures, in terms of this committee says the number of students that are supposed to be on the committee. I did not see anywhere in there that responsibilities for the fee was with the students. It seems that there are a certain number of students that had to be on the committee. My understanding was that there is also the same number of administrators, and/or faculty, who would be on the other side with them in this. So I am not seeing where there is a Board of Regents' Mandate that this student fee is the responsibility of the students.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): Well, as I understand it, Michael, for the last several years the students who are the Student Government Senators from the College of Education, are allowed to request which committees they want to be on, and none of the students from the College of Education have requested to be on this committee. And so if you want input from the College of Education, on this committee, go to your Senators from the Student Government Association and ask them to get on the Student Technology Committee, and find out where these monies are going so that you can have an input. If we are concerned about College of Education, then the College of Education Senators have to be the ones sitting on that committee. They have not requested that. It is largely a situation where senators are asked which committees they would like to be on, and for the last two or three years, as I understand it from the previous administration, no one from the College of Education has come forward and said they want to sit on that committee. So there has been no input from a student senator from the College of Education on that committee.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I would like to make a suggestion that I get together with Ms. Grubbs and Mr. Ford and see what we can do in terms of setting up a communication meeting.

Michael Moore (COE): So what happens to our motion?

Bruce Grube (President): There is no motion on the floor is there?

Michael Moore (COE): No, I am talking about the motion that was passed by a majority of the Senators, about forming of an ad hoc committee. What happened to it? It has yet to be approved by the President, and right now it is in limbo, and now you are talking about forming another kind of informal committee. I am just wondering what happened to our motion to form an ad hoc committee. Why are we not talking about forming an ad hoc committee?

Bruce Grube (President): My response, I think, was pretty clear. It was in light of student comments, in light of the student responsibility, in light of the fact that we would not even have a tech fee on this campus if the students had not voted to support it--in light of those things, my response to the recommendation from the Senate was that we pause to hear the students before I formally respond to that.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): I think your suggestion to meet with Ms. Grubbs and Mr. Ford is excellent.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: All right, shall I move on to the item from Mr. Ford about council for the college level? And, he can explain to us what he is actually looking for, and, yes, and I believe he is asking for an approval or a motion of support from the Senate.

8. Motion from SGA on [College Councils](#), Chris Ford, SGA President: Once again, Kelsey Grubbs, who is Vice President for Academic Affairs, will explain this motion.

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA VPAA): We want to propose a council system, in which every college has a council. Each council will consist of a Dean or the Associate Dean or some form of faculty from each college. We want to have five students from different departments in each college to represent the colleges. And they will meet once a month and our five Senators that represent that college will also meet with them. That would allow more people involvement in SGA, and we would have more people representing different departments within the University. We would have a little more interaction with the Deans. If something is going wrong in a college, they are going to have the Dean sitting with them to say, hey you know this is a problem, and if it turns out to be something that SGA can help them with, they would come to us, and tell us to take a stand on it. We would like to get faculty involved, and that is why we are bringing this to you today. We are still working on it, but we want to know if you have any suggestions and what you think of the idea.

Clara Krug (CLASS): The motion reads that "Each council is to consist of SGA reps, Faculty Senate reps, Administration, and additional students." And in the list you just

mentioned, you included the Dean or Associate Dean, plus five students, plus five SGA Senators. Did you mean five faculty instead of five SGA Senators, because you did not mention faculty at all in your comments?

Chris Ford (SGA President): That is the breakdown of the proposed council. We will have five Senators or six Senators from SGA; excuse me, the Faculty Senate members, which represent their college; five representatives from within the college, which represent departments within the college; the Dean or Associate Dean or designee from the Dean, which represents the administration of the college; and that is the breakdown proposed for the council. That way we open the lines of communication between all the different entities on the campus or within a college; that way everyone will know what is going on.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): So, for instance, in CLASS, where I think there are about thirteen Faculty Senators, all thirteen of those Senators would be on this committee?

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA VPAA): We just want people that want to come. You are welcome to come to the meeting. If you have any input about it, you can come in and out as you please. This is something just for the students. This is not something that is just about big plans. We just want to know what is going on in the school, what is going on in the colleges, and we want the Faculty Senate to be there as well, just so they have a little bit of knowledge behind what is going on.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): May I follow up? So, in CLASS where you have ten departments, you have five student representatives, how do you decide which department gets represented?

Chris Ford (SGA President): There are five or six Senators from each college on SGA. To get a better view of different departments within the college, we try to get representatives from within the college that are not represented by Student Government Association. That way we have a full understanding of what is going on within the college. This is simply a discussion or recommendation board; therefore, it would address concerns within the individual majors in departments in the college. The purpose of the council will be to open the lines of communication between the different councils of the University and to address the specific issues concerning the different colleges.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Why can the SGA reps not meet with the Dean of the college, and also I want to know if the Deans have any thoughts about this proposal?

Dean Jane Rhoades Hudak (CLASS): Great idea. We are already doing it. The College of Liberal Arts & Sciences has been doing this already for three years. We have the Student Government Association people coming, and they meet every month with the Associate Dean and a representative from each department in CLASS. Thank you.

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA VPAA): The point of having extra members, from outside of SGA, is so we can include more students. We want the students to feel like they are a part of SGA, because we are trying to get out there and say, hey, we are the voices that you need to go through. We are your voice, and this is the way for them to have their voice heard. So this plan involves more people than just the five or six SGA Senators that represent that college. It is a way for more students to have a voice.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I really appreciate the idea and your enthusiasm. It sounds to me like this is a caucus, and we have had a Senate caucus in various colleges in the past. We do not right at the moment. And I know that in our college, Dean Hudak has been working on this quite diligently for the past couple of years. However, I wonder how the results of any deliberation will get to the faculty? I do not know, for example, of the various outcome of any specific meeting. I think you realize from the Librarian's Report that I really do tend to read what comes in on email and in hard copy. I really pay close attention especially to anything that looks like it comes from a caucus, because I am a firm believer in shared governance. But I do not know how anybody, as a Faculty Senator or a faculty member who is not a Senator, is going to find out any results of any meetings and then be able to provide additional ideas.

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA VPAA): We see this plan as kind of expanding SGA. And how SGA works right now, we feel like we have senators that come to you and tell you what is going on as a faculty, and I think you are in the know about what is going on with SGA. And that is how we want this council system to work. The council system will work like SGA, in that the faculty is always in the know, the faculty will always know what is going on, and that way everybody can have that open line of communication.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): I am wondering if we are getting into a boundary-crossing issue here with the Faculty Senate, because Faculty Senate needs to deal with University-wide issues, with issues that hit two or more colleges. It seems to me that to some extent this is not within the purview of the Faculty Senate. This has to do with the individual colleges, and their councils.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I hear the goal, which is to share information; I still have not heard how you are going to accomplish that goal, so that people who are not at the meeting actually know what was done. How will you accomplish your goals so that faculty and students not at the meeting know what has transpired?

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I totally agree with Clara. I think that it is necessary here for the SGA to make sure that if something like this occurs, that it is not just people getting together and talking. There has got to be structure. There has got to be an agenda. There has got to be somebody taking notes. There has got to be a record of minutes being kept. SGA has a web site, it would be wonderful if you had these meetings for each of our colleges and then those minutes from those meetings were posted on the SGA web site

that faculty members could then go to. And that would necessitate then that somebody, one of those permanent members and maybe even an SGA Senator, is responsible for taking notes at that meeting and posting those to the web site so that interested faculty can then go and look and see what has actually occurred in there, and then can comment on those ideas.

Chris Ford (SGA President): Faculty Senate also has a web site, correct?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Right.

Chris Ford (SGA President): So this is another means for us, once we have met on the committee, we post the minutes of the meeting on the SGA website and on the Faculty Senate website as well. And then also, not only is the information going to the Faculty Senate and the SGA, it is also going to the student body at the college. The Dean will also know then what is going on within the Faculty Senate and the SGA.

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA VPAA): I would like to remind all of you it is not something that we want to do today; we were just coming here to get your input, your thoughts about the idea, and we appreciate all the suggestions that you had.

Clara Krug (CLASS): But it is presented here as a motion.

Chris Ford (SGA): Actually, it is a motion. We apologize for the misunderstanding. The purpose of today was actually to present the council system which we are proposing, and to say that we would like Faculty Senate members to sit on the council. That is the purpose of today. And the motion on the table is whether or not you all will support or not support the council system.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I agree again with Barry Balleck. Mr. Balleck has served this year as advisor to the SGA, is that correct? And I know you have a lot of experience with previous SGA administrations, and we have had cooperation with various administrations. What I would like to do is to indicate before I make the motion that I am going to make in a minute, that 1) there be something in writing, 2) whatever is put in writing for this group, for the Faculty Senate, be put in writing and be able to be on the web site as other writings are (I think it is 10 days in advance of our next meeting, and all of our meetings are on the web site, and they are available to students as well as faculty), and 3) whatever you present in writing that everything be detailed that as far as membership, as far as goals, that is what I would like to see. Now, having said that, I now move to table this until the fall meeting.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Point of order. There is no motion on the floor to be tabled, as far as I know.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Then, may I change that motion to table to a suggestion that that occur?

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): And while that is being done to support what Clara just suggested, I have been on the Senate for two years, and for the two years, I have always been very reluctant to vote for anything where there is not a clear problem and a clear improvement over what has been in place before. Now someone needs to show me that communication has broken down up to this point in the colleges. I have nothing that shows me that communication has broken down. In fact, the last students I talked to were more concerned that nobody told them when Lakeside was going to reopen, than whatever any of the college was doing. So unless somebody shows me a clear problem and an improvement upon that, then I will have to either vote no whenever this comes up, or abstain. But I need to see some clear benefit of this before I can support it and make a vote on it.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): One of my questions is how this proposed council would differ from bodies that are already in place, as Dr. Hudak said, CLASS already has such a body, so what are you thinking about that would make this different?

Chris Ford (SGA): A lot of times there are misunderstandings between the colleges and the student body as a whole and the Student Government, as well, because we just do not communicate sometimes, or there are misunderstandings about procedures. This is a means for us to open up dialogue between the various bodies on campus. I believe that this is very necessary if we are trying to move towards being more student-centered and moving toward national distinction; communication must be improved.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): Godfrey, I do not think anything is broken necessarily. I think the problem is disengagement on the part of faculty and the students, and I think that is what SGA is trying to do. They are trying to have more people engaged. We are engaged, we are sitting here on a, you know, 95 degree June afternoon, but where are the rest of our faculty members. We have maybe 10 sitting behind us. Out of all of our faculty members why are our faculty not engaged? If you go to a Student Government Association meeting, you have maybe 10 or 15 students in the gallery there. I think what the SGA is trying to accomplish here is to reengage people or hopefully open those lines that they feel are lacking at this point. I do not necessarily think that our communication is broken, but they are trying to re-engage people and get the lines back to where they should be.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): On the issue of engagement--where are the faculty? One of the reasons I think we were elected was so that they would not have to come here this afternoon. We are here for that job. I would like to back what Clara said, the easiest idea here is that the motion just needs to be taken away and written up with greater detail, and all you have to do, since it has not been put on the floor, is simply pull it back, bring

it forward in writing, and then next time out I think it will be clearer communication. It will be very nice.

Chris Ford (SGA): The reason why we did not bring it in writing here is because we wanted to make sure that you all would agree or buy into it. We wanted it not to be just an SGA idea, but to be a Faculty Senate and Georgia Southern University idea. We want to make sure the faculty has as just as much interest in it as we do.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I move that the representatives of the SGA bring to the first fall Faculty Senate meeting, Fall 2006, in writing detailed information about the membership of, the goals of, and the means of communication of a proposed council system. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

9. Unfinished Business

There was none.

10. New Business

Clara Krug (CLASS): Just a question as to when we will find out what our salaries are?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I have already gotten mine.

Clara Krug (CLASS): You found out?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Yes.

Clara Krug (CLASS): In today's mail? Okay, all right. Thank you. I will be in touch if I do not find anything in my box.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): A number of faculty in COBA have been asking me when we are going to have a faculty club, and somebody said that at some point the President had spoken of some renovation that was going to incorporate a faculty club. But the folks in COBA, especially unmarried folks in COBA, are very concerned about this issue and have asked me to ask about it.

Bruce Grube (President): When the idea of a club came up, a singles club did not really occur to me, but you make a very good point. One of the original thoughts was that when we get the new alumni house built, the current alumni house might become a venue for some sort of place where faculty could go to find meals and meet and talk, and so forth and so on. The issue that has hung itself a little bit as we started talking about the legal ramifications of that had to do with the service of alcohol, as an ongoing enterprise in such a venue. We are kind of struggling with that at the minute, Godfrey. Another solution which I have mentioned to Pat would be that there are some people on campus

who were members of the former faculty club. And there is somewhere slightly in excess of, I think, \$100,000, that sits out there, so another solution would simply be to convene that group of people to see if they could come up with a structure and turn that account over in the event that a venue that can serve alcohol might exist, but that would have to exist off campus. That is my best summary for the moment.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Dr. Grube, is it possible to have a locker system, at a place like this, where people go and get their own alcohol and serve themselves? Does that present the same problems? Excuse me; I am one of the dinosaurs that used to belong to the faculty club, so I remember that it was barely off campus, in a structure that has now been demolished. But we had lockers, and people would keep whatever they wanted in their lockers. So is that not a possibility?

Bruce Grube (President): I think the key distinction that you have made yourself was on campus or off campus. You will notice that there are a lot of questions I do not ask of individuals on this campus.

Ming Fang He (COE): I want to reiterate something and thank both of you(the two students from SGA) for being brave enough to come to the Senate to voice your concerns. I just want you to remember that we are very careful about any motion voted on and passed, because it will become official. So we have to be very careful about every motion; everything in paper and print. Thank you for coming.

11. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Linda Bleciken (Provost): One kind of neat thing. Get ready because we will have 78 new colleagues on campus. They will be coming to campus in the fall--78 new tenure-track faculty members have been hired and will be arriving here in August or before, so once again we will have a very nice infusion of very talented people.

12. Announcements from the Floor

There were none.

13. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:46 p.m.

The next Faculty Senate meeting will be September 21, 2006, in the Russell Union Ballroom.

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
September 21, 2006
4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Nessmith-Lane Multipurpose Room

Voting Members in Attendance: Frank Atuahene, Barry Balleck, Marc Cyr, Nirmal Das, Leslie Furr, Terry Diamanduros, Godfrey Gibbison, Tim Giles, Beverly Graham, Mary Hadley, Ming Fang He, Ellen Hendrix, Patricia Humphrey, Clara Krug, James Klein, Margaret LaMontagne, Ron MacKinnon, Mary Marwitz, Bruce McLean, Kent Murray, Mark Mohr for Michael Nielsen, Patrick Novotny, Constantin Ogloblin, Broderick Oluyede, Michael Reksulak, Donna Saye, Candy Schille, Norman Schmidt, Alison Scott, Sonya Shepherd, Rebecca Ziegler for Charles Skewis, T. Maria Smith, Diana Sturges, Brenda Talley, Kari Fitzmorris for Robert Vogel, Mark Welford, Bill Wells, Patrick Wheaton, Jim Whitworth, Bob Jackson for Jerry Wilson, Mark Yanochik.

Voting Members Absent: Steve Damelin, Michele Davis McGibony, John Nauright, Onyile Onyile, David Robinson, Patricia Walker.

Senate Officers in Attendance: Patricia Humphrey, Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senator Moderator; Clara Krug, Senate Secretary; Godfrey Gibbison, Senate Librarian; Marilyn Bruce, Senate Liaison.

Senate Executive Committee: Les Furr, Patricia Humphrey, Ron MacKinnon, Maggie LaMontagne, Donna Saye, Sonya Shepherd, Bill Wells.

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, President; Linda Bleicken, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Joe Franklin, Vice President for Business and Finance; Billy Griffis, Vice President for University Advancement, Sandra Nettles, Acting Dean, Jack N. Averitt, College of Graduate Studies; Jane Rhoades Hudak, Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences; Bret Danilowicz, Acting Dean, Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology.

Senate Parliamentarian: Bob Cook.

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman.

Student Government Representative: Kelsey Grubbs.

Visitors: Candace Griffith, Amy Heaston, Bernard Ford, Jasmine Stinson, Maria Gates, Jered A. Martinez, Jennifer Thompson.

**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.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the September 21, 2006, Meeting. Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: First of all, if you're an alternate, please sign next to the Senator's name on the "Faculty Senate Attendance Sheet" and not in the visitor's section. If recognized to speak, please identify yourself and your college clearly for the minutes.

Before I move for approval of the agenda, I have one correction to it. Jerry Wilson will not be here today, so there will be no Strategic Planning Council report. So with that correction, may I have a motion to approve the agenda? (It was moved and seconded. There was no discussion. The agenda was approved.)

The next item of business is approval of the June minutes, former secretary Donna Saye will make the motion.

2. Approval of the [June 21, 2006, Minutes: Donna Saye \(COST\), Senate Secretary: Senators should write a check in the box next to their names on the "Faculty Senate Attendance Sheet", and alternates should sign their names next to the names of the senators for whom they are substituting.](#) There was one correction to the June 21 minutes, and that was a spelling on page 7, 3rd paragraph. Clara Krug was speaking, and the word "implementation" is spelled wrong. Now I move that the minutes with that change be approved. (It was seconded. There was no discussion. The minutes were approved.)

Clara Krug (CLASS): I'm going to now circulate the various sign-up sheets for you to sign. Please make sure I get them back or I'll track you down.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The next item of business is the Librarian's Report.

3. Librarian's Report of [September 15, 2006: Godfrey Gibbison \(COBA\), Senate Librarian:](#) I have no corrections to the report, so I'm going to move that we accept the Librarian's Report with the caveat that we're accepting a report of the discussions that took place in the committees, and not necessarily accepting the recommendations of the committees. (It was seconded. There was no discussion. The report was approved.)

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair Donna Saye (COST): The Undergraduate Committee met Tuesday, September 19th. The agenda was very short. I was re-elected chair of the committee. We approved two course revisions, and two selected topics/announcements were made.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: That will be covered in the next Librarian's Report, I guess?

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair Ron MacKinnon (CIT):

The Graduate Committee met on September 14, 2006. Ron MacKinnon will serve as chair for the fall term and Ming Fang He for the spring term. The minutes of the meeting will be available online next week we hope. Two items of business: a motion to set the minimum number of credit hours at seven for graduate assistants in the Master of Music program was approved. There was a proposal for Master of Science and Kinesiology on-line coaching education study concentration. This proposal was discussed extensively and was tabled so that modifications to the proposal to incorporate concerns raised could be presented at a future meeting. As a result of the discussions on on-line programs, the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies agreed to prepare guidelines for on-line program proposals.

There were questions raised on a variety of topics including: the vision of graduate studies at Georgia Southern. It was agreed that a portion of each meeting before courses or programs were presented would be spent discussing one topic per week. Ming Fang He agreed to work with the graduate deans to produce a list of topics to be discussed. If it's possible, the Strategic Planning Council would like to receive a presentation of the graduate vision from the College of Graduate Studies. If any Senator has a topic he/she would like the Graduate Committee to discuss please contact the Graduate Committee representative from your college.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: I trust your minutes will be in the next Librarian's Report. The next item of business is the President's Report, Dr. Grube.

4. President's Report: Bruce Grube, President:

A Day for Southern

First of all, I think most of you have seen the newspaper story on A Day for Southern. We set a new record this year at \$1.271 million. We owe a lot of thanks to Billy Griffis and the people who work in University Advancement, as well as to folks in this room, who helped with A Day for Southern generally. But a particular note would be thanks to Michael Braz, who helped co-chair A Day for Southern on campus campaign, and Georj Lewis, Dean of Students, who shared that co-chairship with Michael. And on campus the contributions went up 37.6% over last year. So it was a huge year on campus, and thank you to everybody who was a participant. As you know, most of the funds that are collected do go into scholarships, and they go into support for various departments and programs as well as some of the athletics, so extremely pleased here.

Library

The Library folks will move on the first weekend in October, which means they will have to shut the Library down, very unusual for them. The Library people have been just incredible through this whole process. The following Monday, hopefully, the addition will be open to the public, and I encourage you to go and see it. I think you are all going to very very pleasantly surprised. The downside to this project, of course, is that the old

side of the Library will now be shut down for its renovations, and there'll be another two years of hammering and havoc.

Academic Club

On another very positive note, I have had a couple of meetings with people over the former academic club, and we were able to put together a list of people who were recorded contributors to that club. I called them together because inasmuch as the University and, in fact, the Foundation has become the keeper of the funds from that enterprise, there was certainly a responsibility on our part that, if we were to turn that money loose, it should be turned over in a way that made some sense. Legally, we felt that that was to meet with the group who essentially were the people who were recorded contributors, who were still employees actively on the campus. And so I won't bore you with the long story here, except to tell you that that transaction is complete.

The academic club, although I don't know if that will be its new name or not, that will be up to the group that's organizing. Clara Krug will be the primary signator on that on that account. David Stone, who many of you know from Math, will be the second signator. I expect everybody will be hearing soon from that group about membership and how to organize and how to become involved and so forth. So, Clara, my thanks to you. Rebecca [Ziegler], my thanks to you. Clara and Rebecca were in the initial meeting, and then we were able to expand and include quite a few others, too.

Annual Meetings with New Tenure-Track Faculty

I have begun my annual meetings with brand new tenure-track faculty. Once again, we've got some pretty impressive people who are coming to us. I've just had my first one [meeting]. I have about seven or eight more to go. We not only are attracting international faculty, but just some very, very talented people to Georgia Southern, so my congratulations to those of you in the departments who were involved in hiring last year. You've done well.

Football Games

If you've been to our football games, and you've noticed the television production that's going on in-house now, we have Kent Murray to thank for that. We have leased a production truck, and Kent brings his students together, and they're beginning to produce these programs on our campus. Now when they go out look for work after they graduate, students have something in the portfolio that they can actually show people. So it's a great hands-on experience, plus they're high quality programs.

Strategic Planning Council

And then, lastly, just a brief note for your information, I have filled the remaining faculty vacancy on the Strategic Planning Council with Dan Czech of the College of Health and Human Sciences. So he'll be joining Ming Fang and some other people on that committee. Thank you. Any questions? Thanks, Pat. Excuse me, Les,

Les Furr (CHHS): Are we still planning to use the Alumni House as a venue for the Academic Club?

Dr. Grube: No, what we ran into on that was, as a campus, we can't set up a permanent bar. It appeared as though the service of alcohol was an important element in the recreation of faculty and staff on this campus.

But what we are going to look at with the old Alumni House (because as I think all of you realize we're about to begin to build a new Alumni House down in the RAC area) is the possibility of turning it into a dining venue for faculty and staff only to give you a bit of different kind of ambience than Talon's Grille and some other places you can eat. But that's all very fuzzy right now. But at one point, Leslie Furr, we were thinking maybe that Alumni House could become a faculty club, but no longer. Thanks.

5. Report from Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee: There've been six requests for information (RFI) and two agenda item requests.

- a. The first request for information came from Kathleen Comerford. It basically was asking about the rationale in terms of Dr. Grube vetoing the 48-hour period for grades not to be available to students after the final exam [passed on June 21]. Dr. Bleicken responded that it's part of our student-centered mission to try to do as much for students as we can. There is also the chance that students actually being able to see their grades before grade processing is done can get grades corrected. An additional note that was provided is that, supposedly, the Academic Advisory Council approved the 24-hour limit in January 2003. I know I was on the Academic Standards Committee during that period of time, and it didn't come before us until March 30, 2004, at which point we approved the 24 hour period after final exams. One final note: I just heard from Dr. Bleicken today, a few minutes ago, that she has been working with Mike Deal on this question. Students don't get a message saying "grade not reported" in this interim period; what they get is no grade for a class. The Registrar's office is amenable to posting some sort of message above the grades for students saying that, if less than 48 hours have passed since a final exam, the professor is probably still working on grades. So we'll get together with the Registrar and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and propose some sort of wording about that message.
- b. The second RFI came from Clara Krug asking about people who terminate employment and who have had their health premiums withheld from all ten paychecks, but who are not going to have health coverage after May 31st. The answer provided from Joe Franklin is that GSU had been doing it wrong [providing coverage after May 31] all these years and was told by the Board of Regents (BOR) that we y had to "clean up our act." When a person terminates employment, benefits terminate at the end of the month he/she last worked. So if someone terminates it in May, benefits terminate the end of May. If someone teaches in short term A, benefits end at the end of June. If he/she teaches term B or long term, benefits would end at the end of July.

That's the first part of it. In terms of when faculty are notified that this is going to happen, they get notified as soon as their personnel action form (PAF) gets sent to Human Resources. So, depending on when that happens, they may have quite a bit of time to prepare for this switch in health insurance, or they might not have much time. It's all up to the department and the dean.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): One of the things that I have talked with the deans and chairs about, and specific to the deans, is the importance of submitting that PAF in a timely manner. What that does is not only start that notification process, but also allow that individual to apply for COBRA, if in fact, he/she needs extended coverage.

- c. Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The next RFI concerns Zenworks and Remote Management Software. Question being: Is it being used for covert surveillance of faculty. The answer is, no, it was primarily purchased so they [Computer Services] could push updates from IT to the individual computers. It does have that remote capability [of surveillance]; however, it's not enabled. In the pas, it has been enabled in some certain circumstances, periodically, on rare occasions, when other outside evidence showed that it was warranted. Just a reminder: Your computers are University property; they should be used for University business.
- d. From Jim Braselton, an RFI concerning the proposed reduction in the Optional Retirement Plan (ORP) contributions from 9.66% to 8.13%. Where's the excess money going to go? That money does actually come to the campus, as an appropriation, as a line item in the budget, and, according to Joe Franklin (Vice President for Business and Finance), they write checks on that every month with the payroll. They have not been informed what to do with any excess monies at this point. There are still lots of questions about that one going on.
- e. The next RFI from Jim asked about status of the search for a dean for COST. The committee was formed and charged on September 8th, so that search is proceeding.
- f. The last one from Jim was entitled "Contractual Obligations of the Employer." It was again concerning the changes in ORP contributions—employer contributions. He doesn't understand why the benefit was lowered after he signed a contract. Well, first of all, our contract says "Subject to the laws of the State, the Statutes of the University, Bylaws and Policies of the Board of Regents, etc." It says nothing in our contract about whether or not we have a retirement system, or how much the contributions are going to be. What state law does say is that the contributions get set annually, and actuarially. That said, the state law also provides that the ORP contributions be equal to the Teachers' Retirement System (TRS) normal contributions. And the last TRS contribution, normal contribution was set at their meeting May 17th. Minutes

are not posted anywhere. I have requested copies of those minutes from TRS, but I have not yet received them.

The whole issue of ORP vs. TRS is subject of a motion to be presented later by Godfrey Gibbison. Just a couple of other points of fact. If you need a URL to click on, the latest May 2006 TRS actuarial study, which gives some background into how they set their rates (if you haven't seen the [Chancellor's memo](#).) and that details all the different contribution rates for about the last ten years is available on the web, with the URL in my reply. The Chancellor did state in his memo, just to reiterate, that he intends to ask state policymakers to review the ORP statute in general and a study of the employer contribution rate in particular, to eliminate similar situations from going forward. However, there are still a couple of interesting questions that remain. One of which is that TRS notified the Board of Regents [about changes] in a memo dated May 26th that the Board of Regents received May 31st. I don't know why it took Bill Wallace (BOR) two months to notify the campuses of the change. The other question is why the two plans operate on different fiscal years. ORP operates on a calendar year basis; TRS operates on a fiscal year basis. The proposed change in ORP is supposed to take effect January 1, which is the new fiscal year for ORP. However, the TRS contribution—normal contribution—won't change until July 1. I finally got in touch with Bill Wallace at the Board of Regents this afternoon, and asked him why we are changing before the normal contribution to TRS changes, and he says, "Um, where did you get that information from?" "TRS Annual Report and Actuarial Study." "Oh, well, I'll have to look into it and get back to you." So we'll see what he replies to me.

- g. Finally, there were two agenda item requests: One from Jim Braselton, which is basically to ask the Senate to ask the President to ask the Chancellor to ask the legislature to allow a one time switch between ORP and TRS. In discussing it, the SEC thought it would be more appropriate and more beneficial to ORP participants as a whole if our Faculty Senate were to adopt a resolution or a motion encouraging participation among all the University System of Georgia (USG) campuses so that we could speak with, hopefully, one voice, which would also get more attention from legislatures and the Governor and the Chancellor. So Clara and Godfrey have drafted a revised motion, which was posted Tuesday afternoon, which Godfrey will make as # 10 on today's agenda.
- h. Last but not least, another request for agenda item came from Linda [Rohrer] Paige. She wanted to know about students taking too many hours during Summer Session short term or long term. First of all, I don't know where she got her original idea that there is a maximum of 5 credit hours per short term. That's never been the policy. The policy has been that, unless there is an exception, a student may enroll for 7 credit hours per short term and 12 for the summer as a whole. In getting some follow-up information Mike Deal provided the following information that, last summer, 119 students or 1.52 %

of those enrolled took more than 12 hours, and out of those 119, 109 students were taking 3 or fewer hours more than the 12 hour limit; 306 students or 3.91% enrolled for more than 7 hours in a short term and 272 of those were for only one or two hours over the 7 hour limit. There is a field in BANNER that indicates the maximum credit hours for any student. I asked who has the authority to override that? And, basically, the answer is that anyone who has registration authority as an advisor can override the max hours. So can the Registrar's office. So he could not tell me why any of those overrides were given.

- i. Last but not least, I also solicited candidates for our representative to the Strategic Planning Council. Norman Schmidt stepped forward and agreed to be the SEC candidate. We'll also be taking nominations from the floor. Are there any questions on the SEC report so far?
- j. Clara Krug (CLASS): To get back to Kathleen Comerford's request for information, as I understand it, the current policy remains that faculty have 48 hours after the end of each and every final examination by which time they must submit final grades.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Correct.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The message about grade not reported only appears after final grade processing, which is typically the Monday following finals, which is more than 48 hours.

Clara Krug (CLASS): About the benefits termination, that still concerns me: The need to submit the Personnel Action Form in a "timely manner" so that our colleagues who are going to be leaving may apply for COBRA benefits. COBRA benefits may take a while to get. I'm wondering why, when they sign their temporary contract, or when they come in as a tenure-track faculty member, there could not be some kind of an indication in writing in whatever Human Resources shares with our incoming colleagues that indicates that, when they leave the university for whatever reason, their health benefits will terminate and then indicate in a timeline when that would take effect. I'm thinking that, when faculty get terminated, there's a lot of stress. They don't always think immediately of contacting somebody about insurance. They have other concerns, especially if they have family. I'm thinking they have had quite a bit deducted from their pay check [for health care benefits], and they are going to have to have quite a bit paid in to cover that family. I'm assuming this applies to people who leave for another job, as well. They are not covered in the interim. So if they are leaving us, and they don't start until mid-September, which still occurs at some institutions, they would then have no coverage for June, July, August, and half of September. Or I guess maybe they would pick up September 1 at their new institution, so June, July, and August. So that's a quarter of the year with no benefits if you're not really swift.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Dr. Bleicken would you like to address that?

Linda Bleciken (Provost): This is, this is really not my area. I think this is more Joe Franklin's, so I would defer to Joe.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): To the point of notifying employees of what might happen upon termination, I wouldn't have any issue with the University finding an appropriate way to let them know that, whether it's in their contract, which may not be the proper place for it, or whether it's in the training program, or in the training materials that they receive upon their hiring, that would be fine. I would engage with the Legal Affairs Office and Provost's Office to determine what is the proper place to inform them that when you leave, when you terminate the University, your benefits cease, and you will need to take action if you want to continue your health insurance while you are unemployed.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I understand that completely. I think our colleagues understand that. I think that perhaps there is some difference of opinion or different level of comprehension of at what point the benefits cease, since they have already paid for benefits from every paycheck. I think maybe some of our colleagues, since they've not been told this in advance, believe that they're covered through the summer.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): Okay, well, the benefits cease upon your termination date. Generally a faculty contract, I believe, is for 10 months, which would be August 1st through May 30th or 31st, so it would be through the end of May. But in any, in almost any instance, when an employee leaves a place of employment, their benefits cease at that time, unless it's upon retirement.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I understand, and I understand that as very typical of UPS, Bethlehem Steel, when it was still Bethlehem Steel, and other places, but in academe you typically get covered over the summer.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): Yes, all right, and that has been our practice for many years. However, the Board of Regents wrote a new contract with the insurance carrier, and in that contract they wrote that it would cease upon termination. So we are merely following the contract we have with the insurance carrier. Clara Krug (CLASS): I'm just requesting that we share that information and that sort of trickle-down effect with the people whom it really does affect the most, which are people who are going to have no health benefits if they don't find out soon enough.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): I think that your suggestion is a good suggestion, and that we will find an appropriate way to inform people at the time of hiring.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Thanks. I appreciate it.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): Rather than inform them at the time of hiring, it might be an idea to inform them at the time of termination or non-renewal. If it's done in writing, then there's some kind of little handout that is given to them at that time, when perhaps their hands are full of a lot of other things reminding them that, at that point, when "you go bye-bye," so do your benefits, and that you need to take care of it now.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): I think that's a good idea, and I think that's easily implemented, so thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Are there any other questions? Okay, for those of you who were around last year you know that we formed a committee to look at student evaluations both the method and the meat of the issue. Mary Hazeldine was the chair of the committee last year. However, she rotated off Senate and is now in administration. Leslie Furr has agreed to step in as chair of the committee, and he and Bob Cook, who's also a member of the committee, I believe, have a short report to tell what they have been up to.

- a. **Report from the Ad hoc Committee on Student Evaluations: Leslie Furr (CHHS):** We met several times last year and discussed a number of issues that are tied into the issue of the student evaluations. And it's kind of a bigger thing. I think one of the questions that generated the topic of evaluations last year was whether or not we do student evaluations on computers or on paper. What the committee members would like to do is, between now and the next meeting, introduce you guys to our comments and suggestions. One suggestion is having a standing committee on student evaluations, instead of having this ad hoc committee. That might be a good idea because we have found out no one does anything the same among all the colleges, or even within the colleges. So we thought that that might be a good discussion topic. If you agree, for next meeting, we'll share our minutes with you. And the minutes are a kind of a summary of what we came up with last year.

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian: My suggestion would be to put these recommendations for a standing committee in the form of a motion, so that people could debate it and discuss the merits pro and con. But the basic idea was that assessment requires that you not only collect information, but that the faculty review it and take action. And by having an assessment committee that at the minimum looked at evaluations on a continuing basis, we could fulfill that role in assessment as well as keep the faculty hand on what was happening with evaluations across different colleges and departments in some nonpartisan way.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Are there any questions right now for Bob or Les awaiting their full report? All right then the next item of business is the NCAA Report from Chris Geyerman.

6. Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: First, the Student Athlete Advisory Board had its first meeting in September, and they're doing a lot of good things again this year: Holiday Helpers are going to go into elementary schools and read to kids, and they'll be active in Relay for Life among other events.

The next thing I want to announce is that the institution submitted its Academic Progress Report (APR) data. When that gets confirmed, I'll make a report to the Senate.

The institutions have a chance to make corrections on the data that is entered incorrectly, so when that gets finalized, I'll share that. I would like you all to encourage your colleagues to respond to the email that they get from Julie Strickland. Julie is helping monitor grades for our student-athletes. When you get that email, you just click on a link, type in the student's name, and type in the number of absences. The whole process takes literally less than a minute. It's very effective.

Now, everyone should have the GPA Summary [circulated during the meeting]. What's included there is 2005, which I reported on last year, fall of 2005, but spring of 2006, is new to this group, and it's in the right hand column. You can see, for women's sports and for men's sports. A couple of points that I would like you to make note of: If you look at the combined GPA for women's sports, it's above the combined GPA for GSU female undergraduates, and it was behind that in the fall. So they're making some progress there. The same thing applies to male athletes. Their GPA is a tenth of a point, a little more than that, higher than that of male undergraduates. The biggest jump is in football. Last fall, their GPA was 2.0, right at a C, and we're talking over a hundred people here, folks. And in the spring their GPA was 2.68. That's really quite a significant jump. Hopefully, they will keep that up, and you can see that the combined GPA for all sports is 2.74, and the combined GPA for all GSU undergraduates is 2.63. So our student-athletes, unlike in the fall, out performed the overall student body in terms of grades.

Bruce Grube (President): Just so you all know that your emails back about attendance are taken very very seriously. There are two football players that will not be going to the game at the University of Chattanooga because they had missed class too many times. So I think the data that Chris is providing on the football team is very instructive as to the attitude of the coaches that have these kids. They're determined that they [student-athletes] need to succeed in school and that they need to graduate so that they can go out and do things, if they're not going to be professional athletes. So we're pleased with what we're seeing.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): Is the "up tick" between fall and spring unusual, or is that something that is a common occurrence? The up tick in GPA. Football is a fall sport, and so during spring term, when they are not playing football, I was just wondering if this is a regular pattern.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) Faculty Athletic Rep: I don't know that it's a regular pattern. I would expect probably football to be a bit higher, maybe in the spring. But when you're talking over a half of a grade point above, I think that reflects an attitude that took hold in January., and it hasn't changed much in the interim. It will be interesting to see next year, and there are a lot of spring sports that improved too. It really starts when we have a sportsmanship meeting every fall and Dr. Grube addresses all of the student-athletes and, even though it's a sportsmanship meeting, grades are stressed. And then, Mr. Baker, Sam Baker, you see him stress the importance of grades, and I think it's trickling down quite nicely right now.

Mark Yanochik (COBA): I just have a question. Do we have a means of making comparisons between our own student-athletes and those in other conferences or peer institutions in terms of grade point average?

Chris Geyerman (CLASS): That is a very interesting question. I do not know the answer to that right now, however, I will make a note and find out.

Mark Yanochik (COBA): That's fine.

Bruce Grube (President): I don't know about the grade point average either, but the [graduation success rates](#) and the [academic progress rates](#) are out there for every Division I school in the country. And the nice thing about Georgia Southern was that last year, when they published the graduation success rates, ours was up in the 70% range, and we had Georgia, Georgia Tech, significantly lower than that. So we are pleased with what we see, but we need to have progress on the academic progress rate, and that's one we are working on. We actually lost 5 ½ football scholarships off the football team under the predecessor coach, which is one reason Chris is so pleased to see that grade point average coming back up.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Any other questions for Chris?

Michael Reksulak (COBA): I would caution against making statements such as the combined GPA for all sports is higher than the combined GPA for all GSU undergrads, because I don't see that that's a significant difference. Let's just say significant; we wouldn't say statistically significant.

Chris Geyerman (Faculty Athletic Rep): If I said statistically significant that was certainly misspoken on my part. I think I just said higher.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: As a statistician, I would say if we had data for all athletes and all Georgia Southern students, we don't need any statistics. The numbers bigger; it's significant. It's meaningful.

7. Election of SPC Representative. The SEC nominee is Norman Schmidt (COST). Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The next item on the agenda is the election of the 2007-2009 Strategic Planning Committee [Council] Representative from the Senate. We are electing this individual now because this individual serves the rest of the year as an apprentice under our current representative, Jerry Wilson. As I mentioned earlier, the SEC nominee is Norman Schmidt from COST, Department of Chemistry. Are there any nominations from the floor? Seeing none, I would ask all those in favor of Norman Schmidt as the SPC Representative please say aye. All opposed? Congratulations, Norman.

8. Election of Senate Parliamentarian. The SEC nominee is Bob Cook (CIT). Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The next item on the agenda is an election of a 2006-2007 Parliamentarian, as is provided for in our *Bylaws*. We have to elect one every year. The SEC nominee is Bob Cook, who has kindly agreed to serve

again. Are there any other nominations from the floor? Seeing none, all those in favor of Bob Cook remaining Senate Parliamentarian please say aye. All opposed please say nay. Bob has it again.

The next item of business is the motion from Godfrey Gibbison, which was drafted in concert with Clara Krug, on ORP vs. TRS Retirement Systems.

9. Motion on allowing faculty to change from ORP to TRS: Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Our motion is simply for the Officers of the Faculty Senate, for the Senate Executive Committee, to contact officers of Faculty Senate in other USG institutions to determine the level of interest of the faculty who are enrolled in the ORP in converting to TRS, and to also contact legislators [Jon] Burns, [Jack] Hill, [Bob] Lane, & [Butch] Parrish to inquire into the feasibility of such a one-time conversion. Basically the rationale is that we're hoping that if we can show that there is a statewide interest in such a one-time conversion, that we would have a lot more success in probably persuading the legislature or whoever to allow such a conversion.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there a second to the motion? (The motion was seconded.) Godfrey as maker of the motion you get to discuss it first.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): I've gotten a number of emails over the last week and had a lot of hallway conversation with faculty who basically have said over the years since the formation of the ORP possibility for retirement that a number of decisions have been made by the TRS Board, most of which have been prejudicial towards the participants in the ORP. Now, I think everybody is quite aware that you make that choice when you come in on the very first day. I got a packet of information, and I was told, to select pretty soon which of these two retirement plans to go into, and then once you're in you're in. That's it. However, it seems that the changes that have been made over the years have always been sort of more favorable to TRS than ORP. And I'm not sure I need to make a lot of argument about this in the sense that I think a lot of you are aware of the changes that have been made over a number of years. For example, just to point one of them...for somebody who could spend 30 or 40 years at Georgia Southern. I never get sick. So by the time I retire from here, I could have 2 years of annual sick leave, none of which will be any good to me. But if I were in TRS, it would; it could be quite a huge benefit. And to convert that to numbers, it could be a huge financial benefit. Les Furr (CHHS): I'd like to speak against this motion because I don't think that we should couch it in terms of changing in mid-stream from one plan to another. I don't think it makes any legal sense for us to talk about it. I think that we may be able to talk about it in terms of reducing the number of years it takes before you become vested. Ten is kind of a large figure. It was five when I was in California. So maybe if we talk about a decision-making period of time early on deciding whether or not you want to go into one or the other. But I don't see putting in a motion of any kind the fact that you want to have a one-time change.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Do I understand you correctly that the reason you oppose it is that you think we ought to be trying to change the basically the ORP System, the way TRS and ORP are set up rather than making us choose between two options?

Les Furr (CHHS): No company that builds everything on actuarial numbers is going to let you switch from one to another. They're not going to let you go back and forth. I just don't see it happening. I think there are some other things that we can try to do. I noticed that when the University of Georgia put together their little thing, they only had one action item way at the bottom. It was like "Why don't you contact your local representatives?". They didn't really have anything to say except that 900 and some people were affected by it.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Just as a point of information for, I've sent some of these items on to the SEC, but the rest of the Senate may not have seen them. Southern Poly has already in their Faculty Senate passed a resolution that basically says they're concerned over what's going on in the cut and says that they hope that the Board of Regents will revisit the decision. Again, they're concerned with the ability to recruit and retain highly qualified individuals. The Faculty Senate at the University of Georgia will be meeting October 4th. Their SEC is actually meeting today. They have a benefits committee, and their benefits committee drafted a resolution for their Faculty Senate that asks the legislature and the Regents to take two actions:

1. That the earlier recommendations from the UGA University Council that an ORP committee or advisory group separate from that of TRS be established at the Board of Regents.
2. That we recommend that the administration of these programs be separated. ORP should be managed by its own entity, and not TRS, in recognition of the fundamental differences, with respect to their different financial models. Further, calculations relating to employer contributions should either be uncoupled entirely or reformulated for equal employer contribution in both programs (adhering to the precept of equal pay for equal work), and they also ask for a one-time enrollment for all USG faculty presently in ORP.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): For those who came in on temporary lines to be sitting there and be asked to make a distinction between well, the portability of ORP versus ten years of service under TRS, that's a difficult distinction to make when you don't know if you're even going to be here next year. To have some statement that, once you are on a tenure-track line, that perhaps you have to make that distinction, but to come in on a temporary line and to be asked to make that distinction, that's a very difficult decision for a new faculty member. Once you have attained a tenure-track line, then you have a little bit better sense of what's going on.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Well, even if you come here on a tenure-track line, it takes six years to get tenure.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): That's exactly right.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Are you going to get it?

Barry Balleck (CLASS): That's exactly right, but at least you are a little bit more committed to the institution than perhaps you might be just on a temporary line.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): Not everybody has always loved me, and I was on a tenure-track line, and there were a number of my senior colleagues who wanted to wave me goodbye down the road, and so I went for the ORP, because of the vesting issue. But the issue of being able to switch to go TRS at a point in time where you are capable of making an informed decision is a very good point. An extremely good point.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I'm one of the TRS people. And I understand from colleagues and friends who have spoken with me about the ORP option, even before this started to be an issue, in this current Senate, and the Senate docket, that in their perception the information about ORP that was given to them at the time at which they were to choose was not thorough. And it has turned out to be misleading in their estimate. I can't say what that information was, because I did not read it. I had an option, and I had been here a certain number of years, and I decided I was going to stay with TRS. AAUP and the state of Georgia has always emphasized to its members that TRS has been a very safe retirement fund. That being said, AAUP began in the mid 90s to receive complaints from people across the state of Georgia about the fact that there needs to be some kind of parity. That has not happened, and in my own estimate, as somebody on the outside looking in, hearing my colleagues make these statements, it has gotten worse. So I'm hearing people here say today that, if they had an option to look at, again, the benefits of the two systems, perhaps some people might opt to stay in ORP. Perhaps some people might opt to switch to TRS. I do know that those of us in TRS have an option to get additional retirement monies and to have a portfolio through VALIC and through other options, so you could still have what to me is sort of like a ORP off to the side, and not be in ORP. I would like to see my colleagues, who for lack of better wording, feel like they were led down a garden path to some extent, have an option to go back up the trail to where they started and look again at the information in writing. I think it is so important to have everything in writing. I just really think it is important we give our colleagues an option to change on a one-time basis.

Mark Welford (COST): I think I might be one of the few people that have actually contacted their legislators over this, both for myself, and, Terry did this last year. We contact Jack Hill over this very issue. And he was, he looked into and got back to us and simply said that at this point it is up to the Board of Regents to make a recommendation to the Governor at the point then things could change, but they were not interested in any individual or even university-wide the way it was phrased which it would have to be a joint thing, so I quite like what you're trying to do here and I, and the mathematics when I went through and tried to calculate to get averages. I mean I'll be here when I'm 76, 77. I don't want to be doing that. So I think this is a good thing.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): To clarify the motion we're suggesting a recommendation to garner support for a request for this change, rather than a request to make the change, is that correct? And according to what Pat has shared with us, like Georgia and Kennesaw,

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Southern Poly

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): Southern Poly has already indicated, I mean, they've already made the request for a change.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Southern Poly has. UGA will be. Actually, UGA's Faculty Senate will be acting on it the 4th of October.

Bruce Grube (President): A clarification on Southern Poly. They sent their letter forward when the situation seemed to be that the contribution rates were different. That's what they were reacting to. They were not reacting to whether a person ought to be able to switch plans or not.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Just to follow up with what Dr. Grube just said. In the communication with Southern Poly, they seemed very clear that their big concern is the different ways in which the two programs have been treated (side 1 ends here)

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: (side 2 begins here) 3 percent is scheduled or slated to take effect for ORP people in January. Six months prior.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): I guess I have a couple of problems with the motion as its put forward. In point #1, the issue really seems to be that people might want to change to TRS, because the two systems are being unfairly, inequitably, treated by the Board of Regents and by the state. So that there's the preexisting condition is a lack of fairness, a lack of equality. And it seems to me that we really should be asking somebody to address that prior to talking about switching from one to the other. But the other point about switching from one system to the other, as Barry pointed out, if you do a one-time only, which is what this asks for, we're covered. We can make that if we've got tenure. We're covered. We can make that decision. What about future people coming in? They're still going to be in the same boat. Are we going to keep coming back every four or five years asking for a one-time only for the people who may be in an inequitable position five, six, seven, eight years from now. I don't think we should do that. I think we need to be requesting also a much more thought-through system of signing on and off these things so that do not have to come back for a one-shot deal over and over and over again. So I like the impulse behind this, and especially the business about all of those sick days that we aren't able to benefit from on ORP, that we aren't able to benefit from in any way, shape, or form. But I just don't think the terms of this motion address the issues that I think are needed to be addressed.

Bruce Grube (President): I'm on ORP myself, and I remember sitting in front of Susan Lovett, who is (was) the benefits officer, and she had provided me with the ORP plan, the state plan. I looked at these, talked about it, I'll take ORP. She said you mean you're not going to be here at least ten years? I said, presidents don't have tenure and it certainly is life in the fast lane, give me the ORP. So I think many decisions are made on that basis, too, and I have to admit being forced into making that decision for the possibility of movement to other places. I think the difference between the way sick leave is treated really ought to be addressed. That's a huge difference, and the majority of the faculty on this campus are in the ORP. What may surprise you is a large number

of student affairs, academic affairs, and administration are also on the ORP. One thing I do think we need to be careful about is this is not, even though we have said it in conversation a couple of times, this is not Board of Regents' policy. This policy is formed by the TRS board. The University System of Georgia, I believe, has a single representative that sits on that board, so I think what needs to happen is to marshal perhaps several universities to get some pressure at a point where it's going to do some good. Now the Chancellor is committed to taking a look at this, and I don't think it would hurt the Chancellor at all to know the opinion of various Senates across the state. But we do need to be careful. This is not a Regents program.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: One thing I might want to say, also to clarify things with this matter, is both the UGA draft resolution and the one passed by Southern Poly did clearly identify the concerns of inequities between the two plans. UGA one also goes further addressing the idea that Marc was saying about people coming in in the future. Their draft resolution does go on to request that Human Resources division take two actions: 1) that all incoming faculty be given clear, concise, information regarding the difference between the two programs, and, furthermore, that all faculty presently enrolled in ORP be informed of their expected dollar loss in retirement benefits for the academic year and provided with necessary information to increase individual contributions to 401 plans offered through UGA if so desired. So they are trying to say anybody coming in after this should be given clear information as to what's the difference.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I know this is a different program, and, so forth, but I remember when I first came in I was told that, if I wanted the dental plan, that was a one-time shot, and I had to get the dental plan right then and there. Well, two years ago the dental plan was offered again. Anybody who wanted to pick up dental coverage was able to do that. I know these are completely different, but I don't think it's unprecedented that these sorts of things happen in the corporate world.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I think one of the reasons that Godfrey and I drafted this motion as contacting Faculty Senates and the legislators was because we believed that we were not supposed to contact the Board of Regents directly as a Faculty Senate. So now Dr. Grube you're saying that it would be alright with you if we sent some kind of

Bruce Grube (President): Let me try that one again, Clara. First of all, it's not a University System of Georgia program. Secondly, the Chancellor, after the initial piece of information we got, came out with information related to ORP/TRS, and for those of you who read that document, the only conclusion I could draw from reading that was, "We did it because we could." It infuriated just about everybody who read it. We immediately expressed our concern about this. In a subsequent memorandum, the Chancellor said that he would take this issue up so what I meant to say to all of you, was that the information coming from Faculty Senates in the System would help inform him as he was coming to various recommendations. That's what I meant to say. Thanks, Clara.

Clara Krug (CLASS): He will be contact the Board of Regents? He has indicated some interest in investigating this matter?

Bruce Grube (President): Clara, I think I said it would be helpful if the Faculty Senates wanted to put something forward, and the idea that you're pursuing here-- and there's strength in numbers of governing groups on campus--is correct. Whether you've got all the elements in it you want, of course, is something I think is the debate on the floor.

Bob Cook (CIT): Typically, faculty senates draft a motion expressing the sense of the Faculty senate when they want to take a position. I think in my experience at different universities that that typically is is the kind of motion that is used to put the faculty on record with a particular sentiment and it's, I think, less common to direct what happens to that after the faculty have expressed their sentiment. The expectation being that it will percolate through the higher orders as a natural consequence of a body as large as a faculty senate having taken a position.

Candy Schille (CLASS): The first item of the motion talks about contacting officers of the faculty senate of other university systems to determine the level of interest of the faculty of these institutions were enrolled in. If I understand your point correctly, you'd like the Faculty Senate to determine the level of interest at this university, before we go further. Am I correct on that?

Bob Cook (CIT): That if you're asking somebody else to do something and you haven't expressed your faculty's position first. The two things related could be separated, or could be combined.

Candy Schille (CLASS): I can see your logic there. Nonetheless, it seems to me that what we've got here is sufficiently vague and really it seems to me sort of like an exploratory thing at a level higher than merely this university. And maybe that's not such a bad thing. So I'm going to support the motion.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): I agree with Bob that we need a stronger statement of purpose of this senate, but I don't think that does damage to the motion. I think the motion clearly indicates that we want the chair, yourself, to contact other faculty senates, which its sounds like you have already done, to sort of gauge their response.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Just a couple.

Barry Balleck (CLASS): And then, yes, but I don't see that as doing damage, but I do see that this senate needs to make a definitive statement about what our purposes are here. I think a lot of that, of course, is contained in the rationale in the original motion request.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): I agree with Marc's comments earlier that that the fundamental issues here are not whether you can change from one plan to another, but about the discrepancies and the inequities in the two funds, and it seems to me that that precedes the question of changing. The motion as it's stated talks about a one-time

conversion, but again that doesn't address the issues of current faculty and future faculty who come in. So, I'm thinking that the things that trouble us are not going to be solved by the option of changing from one system to another, but rather more basic issues.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): So, I'm hearing two sets of sentiments: One which I was going to call the question was Candy, but we have to sort of figure out today what we're going to do. Do we want to withdraw, put the motion aside, and come back with a more comprehensive statement at the next senate meeting, in which case we would have to withdraw this motion? Or are we going to vote on this motion? But I think we have sufficient comments on this, so we can figure out where people's heart is. But we have to figure out what we're going to do with this motion as it is written.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): If this motion goes forward as its worded, I will be voting against it. Whereas I do want to see these issues addressed, and dealt with and resolved in serious fashion, but the way its worded now I would have to vote no on the motion if that affects your opinion.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): So Dr. Krug if it's okay with you, we would like to withdraw the motion. Bob may do that?

Bob Cook (CIT): No objections from the body, then you can withdraw it. If there is an objection, then it would have to proceed either to a vote on withdrawing it, or to a vote on the motion itself.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there an objection to withdrawing the motion? Seeing none, I guess it's withdrawn.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): I just want to thank Godfrey and Clara for bringing this to our attention, and making us have this conversation because it clearly is something that affects all of us intimately and needs to be talked about so thank you very much.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: All right the next item is unfinished business. Is there any? Is there any new business?

10. Unfinished Business

None

11. New Business

Ming Fang He (COE): On behalf of the graduate faculty members and the graduate students in the College of Education, I would like to convey our gratitude to the School of Graduate Studies. They offered the graduate students' orientation, at the very beginning of the semester. Particularly we would like to thank the Acting Dean, Dr. Sandra Murray Nettles, and Associate Dean, Dr. John Diebolt, and their staff and graduate assistants for organizing such a good session. The session was very well attended. It helped make them feel that Georgia Southern is a place where they belong. And also they feel that this session helps to foster the cultural engagement of graduate

students at Georgia Southern and to develop a sense of community among the graduate students.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Is there any other new business? Are there any announcements from the vice presidents?

12. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Linda Bleicken (Provost): We welcomed approximately 70 new faculty members to campus this fall, and I think, as Dr. Grube has already noted, these are individuals who by any measure are bright, accomplished people. And so obviously a lot of you went to a lot of effort to bring them here, and I think it's incumbent on all of us to do the best that we can to create an environment to help them be successful. So I, we, certainly have pledged to do that. Beyond that, I guess what I would like to mention to you that we have out there right now about 90 searches that are going on this year. We don't have that many newly funded positions, but certainly, we've had retirements over the year, and some other vacancies. I think that there is sometimes a sense among all of you that, oh my heavens, the workload that we have and now to have searches piled on top of that. But I would just say your commitment to the search process is so critical because its only through your work that we actually bring to campus the kind of faculty that we are able to bring this fall. And these are people that aren't just new faculty. These are the shapers of the present, but also the future. So as we are searching, and this is really for all of us, for me included, let's really think about the significance of what we are doing. . .and the shape of the institution that will follow by the people that we bring in during this year. Thanks.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Are there any other vice president announcements? Announcements from the floor?

13. Announcements from the Floor

Clara Krug (CLASS): For Donna Saye. Donna asked me to ask you, Godfrey, if you would make an announcement about the campus wide First Year Experience Task Force that you and she are serving on this year?

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Donna Saye and I and a number of faculty on the campus are serving on the First Year Experience Task Force that Provost Heaston has put together. We are basically looking at the academic side of the First Year Experience, trying to figure out strategies to communicate expectations to freshmen students, in their first semester, devise strategies for the follow-up semester, for the second semester on campus. Currently, our only First Year Experience program in the first semester is GSU 1210. It's a one-hour or 50 minute course for one semester, and so we are trying to find other ways of getting the job done to really communicate our expectations, facilitate learning, retain freshman students in our classes, and help them succeed. So we are quite open to suggestions, discussions with the faculty, and we've already been talking to people in COBA. I know other people have started discussions in their colleges, so we're really hoping that we'll get some suggestions and some ideas from other faculty on these issues.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Any other announcements?

Clara Krug (Senate Secretary): Could I ask that you return the four sign-up sheets to me: the visitors sign-up sheet, the Senator sign-up sheet, the SEC sheet, and the fourth sheet the title of which I have forgotten. If you would bring them to me, that would be wonderful. Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: May I have a motion to adjourn? Is there a second? All in favor please say aye? Opposed? We stand adjourned at 5:29 p.m.

14. Adjournment

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
October 24, 2006
4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Nessmith-Lane Multipurpose Room

Voting Members in Attendance: Frank Atuahene, Barry Balleck, Marc Cyr, Nirmal Das, Terry Diamanduros, Leslie Furr, Godfrey Gibbison, Tim Giles, Beverly Graham, Ming Fang He, Ellen Hendrix, Patricia Humphrey, Clara Krug, James Klein, Margaret LaMontagne, Ron McKinnon, Mary Marwitz, Bruce McLean, Kent Murray, Patrick Novotny, Constantin Ogloblin, Michael Reksulak, Donna Saye, Candy Schille, Norman Schmidt, Alison Scott, Sonya Shepherd, Charles Skewis, T. Maria Smith, David Sturges, Amy Boyett for Brenda Talley, Robert Vogel, Patricia Walker, Patrick Wheaton, Jim Whitworth, Jerry Wilson, Mark Yanochik.

Voting Members Absent: Steve Damelin, Mary Hadley, Michele Davis McGibony, John Nauright, Michael Nielsen, Broderick Oluyede, Onyile Onyile, David Robinson, Mark Welford, Bill Wells.

Senate Officers in Attendance: Patricia Humphrey (COST) , Chair, Senate Executive Committee, and Moderator, Faculty Senate; Marc Cyr (CLASS); Leslie Furr (CHHS); Margaret LaMontagne (COE); Ron MacKinnon (CIT), Donna Saye (COST); Sonya Shepherd (LIB); Robert Vogel (JPHCPH); Godfrey Gibbison (COBA), Senate Librarian; Clara Krug (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

Administrative Members in Attendance: Linda Bleicken (Provost), Marilyn Bruce (Executive Assistant to the President), Cindi Chance (COE), Bret Danilowicz (COST), Joe Franklin (Business & Finance), Billy Griffis (University Advancement), Jane Rhodes Hudak (CLASS), Bede Mitchell (LIB), Sandra Nettles (COGS), Ron Shiffler (COBA), Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs & Enrollment Management).

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman.

SPC Representative: Jerry Wilson.

SPC Apprentice: Norman Schmidt.

Visitors: Lee Davis, Candace Griffith, Amy Heaston, Marcia Jones, Annemarie Seifert.

The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Senate Moderator Patricia Humphrey.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the [October 24, 2006](#), Meeting. Moderator Pat Humphrey announced a new procedure for signing in. Sign-in sheets will no longer be circulated around the seating tables, but will be on the tables holding name plates. She requested that, on the sheets, alternates sign in next to the name of the senator for whom they are substituting. She reminded senators to identify themselves, including college affiliation, when they are recognized to speak. She requested a motion to approve the agenda. There was a motion and a second. The motion to approve the agenda carried unanimously.

2. Approval of the [September 21, 2006](#), Minutes: Clara Krug (CLASS), Senate Secretary: Krug moved for approval of the minutes of September 21, 2006. She distributed one-and-a-third pages of typographical error corrections for inclusion in those minutes. Krug's motion was seconded. The minutes, with the list of corrections of typographical errors, were approved unanimously.

3. Librarian's Report of [October 16, 2006](#): Godfrey Gibbison (COBA), Senate Librarian: Gibbison moved for acceptance of the Librarian's Report. He reminded senators that accepting the minutes as presented by the various committees did not necessarily constitute acceptance of the decisions taken by those committees. Gibbison's motion was seconded. The Librarian's Report was approved unanimously.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Donna Saye (COST): Saye reminded senators that the minutes from the September 19th meeting of the Undergraduate Committee are included in the Librarian's Report. That particular meeting was the first one this year. The committee approved one course revision from the College of Information Technology and one from the College of Health and Human Sciences. There is one error in the minutes of the Undergraduate Committee. The course revision from CIT was a prerequisite change for IT3132, rather than 4790. The report was approved unanimously.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Ron MacKinnon (CIT): MacKinnon reported that there is a new feature at each meeting, a fifteen-minute discussion of an appropriate graduate topic, before dealing with other agenda items. At the most recent meeting, the Dean of Graduate Studies (Saundra Nettles) led a discussion about boosting graduate enrollment. A program revision in the M.Ed. in Secondary and P-12 Education adding a second track in Foreign Language Education was approved. A proposal from the School of Accountancy concerning Forensic Accounting Concentration was tabled because no representative from the School of Accounting attended to answer questions about the proposal. The program revision in the Master of Science in Kinesiology Online Coaching Education Study Concentration was approved. Revisions to agenda deadlines and to the procedures for submitting agenda items to the Graduate Committee were approved, and the Graduate Committee was informed of general test changes.

Moderator Humphrey (COST) reminded senators that the Graduate Committee report included in the Librarian's Report was from the September 14 meeting, which did not include the agenda described above. Humphrey asked if there were comments about the September 14 meeting. There were none. The report was approved unanimously.

4. President's Report: Linda Bleicken (Provost) for President Bruce Grube: Bleicken distributed hand-outs to accompany a "collaborative slide" presentation drawn in part from a workshop.

Administrative Workshop

Bleicken announced that the theme of the annual day-and-a-half administrative workshop (the first of October) had been "Building a Team Approach to Our RPG" (Retention, Progression, and Graduation).

Library

Bleicken encouraged senators to go by the Library and see the new addition in its current state. She reminded attendees that, although the addition is really beautiful, renovations continue.

Key Indicators

In a slide presentation, Bleicken then referred to the hand-outs that she had distributed at the beginning of her report. She shared the following information:

1. The average SAT score for entering freshmen at Georgia Southern increased again (1104).
2. Since the state average (990) is "way below that," and since the majority of our students come from Georgia, she congratulated people at GSU who "have spent some years doing a great job recruiting..."

However, she added that all is not "a bed of roses this year." Even though the SAT average has increased this year, enrollment has dropped off slightly. Why did it drop off?:

1. GSU's base-line SAT average this year is 1000.
2. Retention has declined this year. The retention rate for first-time, full-time degree seeking students, who entered in 1994 was 67%. Essentially what that means is that for every 100 students we brought in in the fall of 1994, 67 returned in the fall of 1995. As our track record of recruiting academically qualified students improved, we actually have had some pretty good success with moving that retention rate up. However, in these last two years, when our SAT average has been "out the top of the roof" as far as Georgia Southern is concerned, and as far as a lot of the state is concerned, retention has decreased. In Spring 2006, GSU had 12,782 undergraduates. 10.5% of these students graduated. 15.4% of

the remaining students chose not to reenroll in Fall 2006. 70% of these students were freshmen and sophomores. A greater percentage was males.

And contrary to popular opinion, it isn't just those students who are not academically qualified whom we're losing. Most of them, a good percentage, not the majority, had an average SAT of over 1000. Some of them, about half of that number, had an average SAT of 1100, or equal to or greater than 1100. And it isn't that they had a great SAT and they didn't have a good GPA because we actually had some students who were, in fact, in good academic standing that have left us.

What has happened?

1. A lot of our students who leave us are undeclared. Our First Year Experience effort is to get those students to declare before they finish 45 hours of coursework.
2. Some students have left because they lost HOPE, but losing HOPE isn't the only reason.

Implications:

This has some implications for credit-hour production, and student credit-hour production is where we get our funding. Much of our funding comes from "the formula." The formula is directly related to student credit hours, not head count, student credit hours. So this should give us some concern. The retention piece should matter to us. The fact that we have lost these students should matter to us this year because, when you reel out the numbers, if you look at the dollars that we now don't have going forward, that we're going to have to find, we're going to have to find them somewhere else. That's really what gives us some concern. At the time that Joe Franklin (Business & Finance) generated figures for the administrators' early October workshop, he generated it based on what he thought was going to be our retention rate. He thought we were going to have a 78% retention rate; we actually have a 76% rate. But what he's showing is the number of students that will not return: 649. The dollar value of retaining a student, just one student, is \$10,663, just in education and general funds.

Joe Franklin (Business & Finance): That total includes fees, tuition, state appropriation, student financial aid.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): That's for one year. Then you need to consider the total net revenue gained by retaining one student during the course of his/her lifetime with us. So when we see 649 students leave, that's \$27 million that Georgia Southern doesn't have that we might have had otherwise. "How do we actually bring more dollars back into the coffers? It doesn't take a whole lot to move the needle. In fact, retaining 2% of those 649 students (13 students) amounts to about \$553,000 over the course of [those students'] time with us. "

So there are some real economic issues that we should be concerned with. “But, to tell you the truth, even if the economic issues were put off the table, standing here and being here in the room with all of us together, I have to say it makes me kind of concerned that, as educators, that we might look at this and not think that there is something to be worked on.”

“So, and I think that when we’re thinking about what do we work on I’m going to point you to one of the hand-outs (previously distributed, duplicating a slide) also that is in here, because it gives us a little bit of a picture of what may be some of the things that are driving the students. If you look at this NSSE 2005 Benchmark Report (the 2005 National Survey of Student Engagement), this is a survey that has been done at Georgia Southern now for three [years]. We’ve had three administrations of it: one in 2002, 2004, and then last year in 2005. And this is very much a summary. There is much more information if you care to go on the [Office of Strategic Research and Analysis](#) web site.” Bleicken specified the following concerns:

1. Students’ perception of The *Level of Academic Challenge* (an item on the hand-out) has declined. For seniors, it has declined slightly; for freshmen, it has declined “pretty significantly.”
2. Among seniors, the level of student-faculty interaction appears to be good. However, for freshmen, “that’s tailed down just a bit.”
3. “For freshmen, especially, their perception of us as providing a supportive campus environment has really tailed off in this last administration [of this survey].”

Bleicken stated that we need to ask questions about these results.

On the positive side, students feel that the level of active and collaborative learning is going up, and they are satisfied with the level of enriching educational experiences.

The Deans’ Council has decided that, in the Strategic Plan, the Division of Academic Affairs ought to be the one that pays the most attention to academic distinction. And that encompasses retention, progression, and graduation. Discussions have also included department chairs. Bleicken is now involving faculty. “That first piece is obviously RPG, but you’ll be happy, I think, to note that we also think faculty success is [as] important at least as student success is. That graduate education is a strong piece, and we need to develop that. We need to enhance the quality of teaching and learning, and how do we do that? And finally, enhance the scholarly inquiry and creative endeavors, and [we have] some pretty substantial goals there. Once again, we feel in Academic Affairs, as the Deans’ Council and I hope you’ll agree, that it is our job to drive the agenda of academic distinction and that to keep academic distinction moving forward really is within our purview. I think it’s important that, if I were to stand up here and say oh, woe is us, and life is terrible, ... that would be very sad because actually some very good things are going on, and they interface very much with some goals that we have out there.”

NSF Grant

GSU has received a \$1 million grant from the National Science Foundation (NSF). The principal investigator (PI) is Mary Boyd, Chair of the Chemistry Department. That grant is designed to enhance instruction and student performance in the math and science areas. So that \$1 million is actually being used for supplemental instruction and to provide better advisement for those students.

Funding

GSU received some funding last spring, as part of our appropriation from the Board of Regents, specifically to drive the retention, progression, and graduation initiative (RPG). Those dollars, of course, were given to us contingent on showing results. This year's lower retention rate is not helpful. However, in the Department of Mathematics, where we have one of the higher failure rates, substantive work is going on. Some work is also going on in Writing & Linguistics and History, where we also have fairly high rates of failure. "I would point out to you that we have some excellent people here at the University who are doing some good things. "

John Neff Award

Dr. Susie Lanier (Department of Mathematics) has received the John Neff Award in Georgia Mathematics from the Georgia Mathematics Conference. This is the second year in a row that a faculty member from Georgia Southern has been recognized in this way. Last year it was Dr. David Stone.

First Year Experience Task Force

Bleicken announced that this group of very committed people met for a whole day last Saturday and that they would present some of their ideas for enhancing the performance and continuance rate for our freshmen in two forums that week on Thursday and Friday.

Center for Excellence in Teaching

Bleicken also congratulated those faculty participating in the Center for Excellence in Teaching's faculty learning communities.

Challenge

Bleicken asked that faculty, staff, and administrators think every day about how we work with our students to help them be successful.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked if there were questions for Dr. Bleicken.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Krug recalled the Senate Executive Committee's meeting with Bleicken the previous week. Although one topic of discussion had focused on students, it wasn't framed in the context of retention. And it had not focused on faculty. She

perceived that the current presentation about retention focused on faculty. She also recalled a recent conversation with Dean Rhoades Hudak (CLASS) about how faculty invite students to come to their offices to discuss tests, but they don't accept the invitation. Faculty invite them to repeat homework, but they don't accept that invitation either. And some students enroll in a certain level class and then drop it to enroll in a lower level class because they, or a parent, or someone else, perhaps another student, has told them that it will help them get a better grade. Students who enroll in a lower level class might not feel challenged because they have made it difficult for themselves to feel challenged by enrolling in a course for which they have already studied the course content. She also cited potential student psychological difficulties that faculty are not trained to address. She stated that she believes that there is a limit as to what faculty members can do to help certain students. The situation is compounded by the fact that our students now may get their RAN numbers without ever talking to an adviser. Krug stated that she hoped that faculty had been involved in producing the report presented at the Senate meeting. She added that, at some point, she would like to see written documentation indicating that students bear some responsibility for their actions, their decisions, and their departure.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Bleicken responded that no one is pointing fingers, in fact, but that administrators are concerned that "we have a mystery here that we're not quite certain we know how to solve." She added that members of the Faculty Senate are just as skilled—perhaps more skilled—than the group of administrators that had met in early October in trying to help figure out a solution. The conversation at the Faculty Senate Executive Committee breakfast had centered around the other piece of this puzzle, which is the students themselves, and the different types of characteristics that they have. Bleicken had shared information about a presentation that distinguished among the generation y's, the generation x's, and the baby boomers. If we assume that what motivates us also motivates gen y's, we are probably wrong. We need to figure out how it is that we interact with them that works and how it is that we interact with them that sometimes doesn't work.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): Marwitz wondered if, speaking of generational changes, the most dramatic shift has been in the area of supportive campus environment. She wondered what the criteria for supportive would be and whether different generations of students understand "supportive" in different ways.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Bleicken stated that the report that she had presented was a very basic summary of a lot of questions. No question asked, "Do you think this is a supportive campus?" But rather a lot of questions factored in to identify that one factor. We need to think about what these data are telling us. So the work of groups like the First Year Experience Task Force is very important. She added, "But I think if we measure ... the way that they feel, the way that they are motivated, and the things that they think are supportive, if we measure that by our yardstick, we are going to be way off base."

Pat Walker (CLASS): She wondered how we interpret "supportive campus environment." Is it that the faculty are being supportive of the students? Is the

administration being supportive of the students? Or is it that there are things to do on Friday night? Are there places to go? Music that would interest the students? Is it that students don't feel that the community at large gives them a lot of options in terms of things to do?

Linda Bleicken (Provost): Bleicken agreed. She suggested that a supportive campus environment also has to do with other services that we provide, for example, paying bills or registering. She identified this as a campus issue rather than a faculty issue alone, a Student Affairs' issue alone, a Business & Finance issue, or a University Advancement issue. It clearly affects all of us. She thanked those who are already engaged in addressing this issue.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Schille (Strategic Planning Council) stated that she has been struggling during her tenure on the SPC to understand exactly what it does. She had a couple of questions in her capacity as member of the SPC:

1. Is the Academic Affairs majors goals table with academic distinction related to Levels I and II of the strategic plan?

Bleicken said that it came from the strategic plan, that it would be inappropriate for us to invent something new.

2. Two goals on the far left (of the hand-out) are very specific. The ones on the right are much more general, such as "enhance the quality of teaching and learning outcomes"; "design a plan to celebrate teaching excellence." Every now and again we get a specific insight from the data that we have received. "Like, for instance, the fact that retention and graduation rates go up directly in correlation to teacher-to-student ratio.... I think what I'm asking here is, at what point and who may offer strategies or tactics to get these very admirable goals accomplished?"

Linda Bleicken responded about information on the left and information on the right (of the hand-out). On the left, those about student success, are the goals that are drawn from our retention, progression, and graduation (RPG) plan that we had to submit last November (2005) to the Board of Regents. While our RPG plan called for increasing graduation rates to 39.5%, in fact, the graduation rate as of spring 2006 is 42.9%. The trouble is, of course, retention. The goal at the lower left was actually a recommendation from a Research Task Force that Dr. Hardy had when he was Dean of the College of Graduate Studies. And so those are goals that they had established. The ones that are over on the right hand side are actually goals that the Deans' Council and also the chairs are working on right now.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Humphrey asked two questions:

1. Stating that some students who enroll at Georgia Southern do not intend to earn a degree here, she asked, “In terms of students who don’t come back, has anybody ever done any kind of follow-up study in terms of the reasons why they didn’t come back instead of just looking at how many [had not returned].”

Bleicken responded that we have. There are a number of reasons. Some of them are financial; some of them are personal.

Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs & Enrollment Management): Some are family related; some are work related. Thompson continued that her office had telephoned all 1,100 students who were eligible to return, but who had not, to find out their reasons. Programming was in the top six of all reasons.

2. Citing a 76% non-response rate to the NSSE survey, she asked what we can do to “tap back into those students that didn’t respond to see what their ideas might be.”

Bleicken indicated that Georgia Southern has students complete the survey online, which makes it difficult to enforce response. Thompson (Student Affairs & Enrollment Management) added that Georgia Southern had one of the highest response rates in the entire system.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Schille shared written data received by the SPC. Parents stated that there is nothing to do in town, that their son/daughter was “just drinking and partying, and I’m not going to pay for that.” Students liked the environment on the whole. They liked the teachers. Most of them said that they would come back, and so the conclusion of the SPC, was that the data was not all that meaningful.

Ming Fang He (COE): He stated that the manner of obtaining responses may affect data. There is a difference between a face-to-face interview and one on the phone. Hopefully, in the future, we will be able to do some research using face-to-face conversations rather than phone conversations. She thanked Bleicken for sharing the results of the NSSE survey and asked about goals for graduate education. Specifying one figure as “all about undergraduates,” she wondered if Bleicken thinks that there is “a difference between achieving academic distinction in undergraduate study and graduate study.” Bleicken responded that there is. In response to He’s statement that there is a big difference in retention and graduation rates between undergraduate and graduate study, Bleicken said that administrators continue to work on goals for academic distinction.

Ming Fang He (COE): She asked how, when teaching loads are getting heavier, we can increase our scholarly activity at the same time, retain the integrity and quality of programs, and also maintain retention and graduation rates.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): She responded that she understands the concern about the high levels of students that many faculty members teach. GSU is “making pretty substantive effort, in fact, this year the numbers, the number of faculty increased by about 2% from 695 to 708. And then, as you just saw, the actual number of students has

decreased, so we should be seeing as we add even more new faculty in the coming year that that continues, that we continue to close that gap...”

Marc Cyr (CLASS): Cyr requested a list of “four or five things as what students consider challenging” to help faculty address this issue. Bleicken will supply such a list.

5. Report from Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee: Since the last meeting, Humphrey had attended the state meeting of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in Milledgeville. Immediately following that meeting, representatives of various University System of Georgia campuses met to institute a University System of Georgia Council of Councils and to discuss the Teachers Retirement System (TRS) versus ORP situation. She has distributed her notes about the meeting. The Council of Councils did draft a letter that indicates a rationale for “fixing” the Optional Retirement Program (ORP) and provides some recommendations to the Governor, the Chancellor, the Board of Regents, etc. on fixing the ORP.

Information Request

There was one information request (RFI) last month. Robert Costomiris inquired about what evidence the University has to support requirements that search committees advertise in multiple venues beyond the main venue for a given field. Data from Affirmative Action/EEO Cards was compiled by the Provost’s Office. It showed that female hires remained, for about the last six years, in roughly the 40 to 45% range. Minority hires increased from roughly 8 to 14% of each year’s hires. As for the source where the applicants found out about the vacancies, overwhelmingly it’s the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and the *World Wide Web*. The latter may be professional organization web sites, and those account for about 70% of applications from those who complete the cards. Approximately 10% of applicants complete the cards. However, the big answer is that Georgia Southern is committed to building a diverse faculty. So we all need to do as much as we can to recruit applications from qualified individuals of all backgrounds. Marcia Jones (Institutional Compliance) actually compiled and distributed some other documents that she has written on building diverse applicant pools.

Agenda Requests

There were two agenda requests, which were both on the day’s agenda. Mark Yanochik submitted an agenda request for the Academic Standards Committee on eliminating the adjusted GPA for all students effective next fall semester. That appeared as #8 on the agenda. Bill Wells submitted an agenda request on behalf of the SEC for approval of a motion on the ORP versus TRS situation. However, the SEC decided last week at its meeting to replace that motion with another one asking the Senate to ratify the memo to the Governor, Chancellor, et al., drafted by the Council of Councils. This Council may continue to meet once a semester and talk about things of general interest to the System as a whole.

Humphrey reported on two more items: She asked for a volunteer to serve on the Parking & Transportation Committee. This person's two-year term will start in January. The current member has a timing conflict this semester and can't attend committee meetings. According to the *Bylaws*, at the November meeting of the Faculty Senate, we will elect the Senate Moderator and SEC Chair for the 2007-2008 year. Anyone wishing to volunteer to run for this position must be a current Senator with at least one year remaining in his/her term. With the department chair's approval, this person gets a course release for being the Senate Moderator. Humphrey encouraged people who are interested to call her.

Patrick Novotny (CLASS): Novotny had received an e-mail message from Richard Flynn (CLASS). He requested permission to read it aloud. Humphrey informed him that he should read it under New Business.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: She asked if there were any questions about the SEC Report.

Clara Krug (CLASS): In reference to the RFI, Krug stated that the fact that search committee members are not allowed to say that they are going to be meeting with people at discipline-specific international and national meetings for the purpose of interviewing them for positions creates a recruitment problem for us. She asked if that is going to change any time soon. There are many institutions in the United States, for example, that interview during the Modern Language Association (MLA) at the end of December, but Georgia Southern is not allowed to write that in the MLA's job list, which goes everywhere, and among foreign language and English faculty, too, is even more carefully read than the *Chronicle*.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Humphrey mentioned that SEC members had discussed this topic at their meeting the previous week. Subsequently, she had checked the search procedures, and she hadn't found anything about this point.

Linda Bleciken (Provost): She deferred to Dr. Marcia Jones, the office of Institutional Compliance.

Marcia Jones (Institutional Compliance): Jones made the following statements about recruiting faculty:

1. Members of search committees are not precluded from interviewing at meetings. The issue is whether or not one person can represent the committee at those meetings. If only one member of the committee is present, that is not the typical interview session. When you bring somebody to campus, you basically have a committee that meets with the individual; you schedule meetings with the dean and with other faculty members; perhaps the candidate teaches on campus.
2. What we have proposed is that, if every member of the committee is attending the conference and it's done in lieu of a telephone interview with the candidate, then that is permissible. But one person interviewing is not permissible. Simply because you have eliminated the entire interaction with the other committee

members and the other constituents on campus, and there are certain procedures that need to go through.

3. You don't go to a conference to interview applicants who have submitted an application at the conference. And all of a sudden the person has not gone through the prescreening process; he/she has not been screened more intensively by the committee members.
4. If the process is that you screen the applications as they come in, and as a committee you've elected to interview three or four or five people at a conference, then that's much different than sitting at a table or in some hotel room and interviewing applicants as they come in or attend the conference, or sign up to be interviewed by Georgia Southern.
5. So if you follow the process, and the interview at a conference is in lieu of a telephone interview with the candidate, then that's a much different structure than simply pulling whatever five people you might have time to talk with who have signed up at the MLA placement [center].

Clara Krug (CLASS): Krug made several statements about her own experience as a member of search committees at Georgia Southern:

1. She has never served on a committee when only one person conducted interviews at a conference.
2. The interviews have always been set up by the committee, not by a one-person fiat.
3. They have never been set up at the MLA Convention.

She requested that Jones tell all faculty members what she had just told members of the Senate "because there is lore about [search] interviews:

1. Search committees are not allowed to use the word "interview" when referring to a conference.
2. Committee members are not told that there is a possibility of an interview at a major meeting in lieu of a telephone interview.
3. Committee members are not told that they may interview if more than one member conducts the interview.
4. They are not told that it is fine to set up such an interview if the committee decides to do so.

Krug recalled that the policy of not using the word "interview" began in the mid 90s.

She added that it might be cost-efficient to send two people to the MLA meeting at the behest of an entire committee, and to screen candidates. She referred to Ming Fang He's earlier statement that sometimes people come across differently in person: "I just heard Ming Fang He say that she would like to have people interviewed in person rather than on the phone because that seems to be more valid to her. I think that might work here also."

Marcia Jones (Institutional Compliance): Jones thinks that the issue is at what point that interview occurs. Basically, she is aware of recruitment strategies that included recruiting at the end of meetings. Those recruitment strategies essentially were interviews, and that is not permissible. You may not recruit and interview at the same meeting because you have eliminated the on-campus intensive screening of the applicant. So a committee member may not recruit somebody and come back to campus with applications, and say, "Here are my top candidates, so I think we need to invite this person to campus." She applauded faculty members who have been doing it differently, but added that most of the other individuals have not. It has been an opportunity to both recruit and interview at the same time.

Clara Krug (CLASS): She announced plans to submit a motion for consideration at the next meeting. She would like to see written out, point-by-point, the circumstances under which search committee members may conduct interviews at conventions. Then faculty will know what they are supposed to do as faculty on search committees, and they will do it.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Schille asked if the current policy is that, unless every member of the search committee is present at the interview during the meeting, then it has no validity.

Marcia Jones (Institutional Compliance): She specified that, if it is a recruitment session, one person may recruit. "You go to a conference, you distribute flyers, you encourage people to apply, and that's fine. One person can do that. But if one person is representing the entire committee at an interview, I think that's a much different scenario, particularly if you have not already pre-screened the applications."

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: "Is there some minimum number from the committee who's acceptable to be doing this interviewing of pre-screened applications?"

Marcia Jones (Institutional Compliance): "I don't think that has ever been ironed out because some committees are seven people and some committees are three people. So I think, as we pointed out in the search chair workshops, that if you're going to do that, you need to touch bases with the office of the Provost. To specify a number would be useless since committees vary in size.

6. Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Geyerman had no report.

7. Report from Jerry Wilson (COBA), Strategic Planning Council Representative: As a point of clarification, he stated that he is not sure what the council does. There had been five meetings during the current academic year under a new chair, Dr. Jean Bartels. Dr. Trey Denton had stepped down as chair after at least nine years of service on the SPC. Bartels has outlined a number of goals for the year:

There is an analysis of the Level I Strategic Plan and looking toward making recommendations for updating things that have changed, things that might have been accomplished where the wording was archaic, outdated, etc. This does not involve changing the Level I plan, but just trying to bring it into a more modern context over time.

Second, there is a thorough discussion and review of the Level II Strategic Plans. All members of the SPC are to be looking at them and coming up with questions to ask the Vice Presidents, who are all going to be meeting with the SPC starting in January of next year.

And then the third part of the charge for the year is RPG, including analysis of relevant data, some of which was attempted with Dr. Perkins Brown at the previous week's SPC meeting. The RPG initiative has an impact on and is affected by the University Strategic Plan.

As Candy Schille had alluded to, the next meeting of the SPC was scheduled for November 8th, with Dr. Bleicken, Dr. Heaston, Dr. Thompson and Dr. Perkins Brown, to discuss the University RPG-related information and its impact on the Strategic Plan. Wilson also stated that he is happy that his replacement has been determined. He thanked Dr. Norman Schmidt for his willingness to serve. He serves as apprentice this year.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: She requested questions on the SPC report.

Candy Schille (CLASS): Schille would like the SPC to be more informative to this body. She expressed frustration, for instance, that the SPC charge this year is to update Level I and look at Level II [Strategic Plan], but that, after five meetings, the SPC has not begun to do either the update or the review. She asked Ming Fang He (COE) if she agreed with this assessment. Ming Fang He reminded Schille that the SPC is an advisory body of the President's Cabinet and may offer only advice. Schille agreed.

Ming Fang He (CLASS): She added that, since she was hired, "I think Georgia Southern has a very good reputation about our mission. The mission statement is very beautifully, powerfully written, and I just have difficulty to see the connection between those two [the mission statement and the Strategic Plan]. "

Candy Schille (CLASS): "Yes, the mission statement is a very poetic document. But at the last [SPC] meeting, for instance, when I pointed out that there might be a disconnect between the data which we [had] just spent two hours discussing and the Level I statement. I asked if it would be appropriate for the committee to talk about changing Level I. And I was told that, no, it would not be. Instead, we implement Level II, which sounds strange to me. If we have a faulty Level I, why implement the same errors in Level II? And it turns out that I read the daunting Level II (which whenever you wave that document at somebody, they just say 'good luck'), and the same errors exist in Level II. So I'm going to quit now, but what I'm saying is it seems to me that the

documents, the data, and the committee procedure are not necessarily being as much use to this university as I hoped they would be.”

Ming Fang He (COE): She agreed that SPC members need to be more informative during Faculty Senate meetings.

Jerry Wilson (COBA): Wilson stated that he has no problem with a change in the reporting style at Faculty Senate meetings. He suggested that he and Schille might all participate in making and discussing the SPC report.

8. Motion on Adjusted Grade Point Average, Mark Yanochik (COBA), Academic Standards Committee Chair: Yanochick read the following motion:

The Academic Standards Committee recommends that students who are admitted to Georgia Southern University before fall of 2007 be allowed to convert their adjusted GPA to cumulative GPA by freezing their current adjusted GPA. The current adjusted GPA will then be used as a new baseline with which to calculate students' future cumulative GPA.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: She reminded senators, that as a committee recommendation, this motion did not require a second and that, as maker of the motion, Yanochick had the floor for initial discussion.

Mark Yanochik (COBA): He presented a rationale for the motion. It resulted from a problem associated with BANNER. BANNER does not have the capability of computing GPAs for students who have different admission dates. After discussion, the Registrar's office and IT services proposed this solution. Members of the Academic Standards Committee approved it unanimously.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: She reported that Dr. Amy Heaston had discussed the motion and the subject at a recent meeting of the Student Government Association. The students had brought up some good questions, which Dean of Students Georj Lewis had forwarded to Humphrey:

- ◇ *What would be the impact on some of the honors programs?*

- All of those are currently based on cumulative GPAs, not adjusted GPAs, anyway.

- *What would be the impact on course withdrawals or course repeats?*

- Withdrawals would probably go up. But, when you think about W, D's, and F's, the overall number of course repeats probably wouldn't change at all.

Norman Schmidt (COST): He asked if we may make some exceptions and then calculate those averages by hand.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: She responded that it might be “a bookkeeping nightmare” for the Registrar’s office.

Norman Schmidt (COST): He was interested in possible exceptions for borderline cases. For example, a student might petition to replace a grade.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: She reported that members of the Academic Standards Committee had discussed that option several years ago and that the Registrar’s office said, “Absolutely not.” It would require too much manpower. There was no additional discussion. The motion passed unanimously. Humphrey reminded advisors to inform students of this change.

9. Motion on ORP: Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): Gibbison informed senators that what we were voting on was to be a motion drafted by Clara Krug, Bill Wells, and him. However, the SEC had voted to replace that motion with the motion(s) included in the letter from the ad hoc Council of Councils to the Governor, Chancellor, and the BOR. He explained that the letter is very comprehensive, that it covers all items in the original Krug/Wells/Gibbison motion, and that it includes all concerns discussed at the September Senate meeting. The motion was seconded.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Humphrey asked if there were any discussion.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): He favored the motion for two reasons: 1) All of the issues that we had raised about the previous [ORP/TRS] motion in the previous meeting have been covered; 2) it “puts us in alliance with the other universities in the System.”

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: There was no additional discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

10. Unfinished Business: None

11. New Business

Pat Walker (CLASS): She wondered if Humphrey had talked to Bill Wallace (BOR) and asked why the changes for the ORP were taking place on January 1st instead of on the TRS schedule of July 1st.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Bill Wallace retired on September 30th. However, Humphrey had asked the question at the Council of Councils meeting in Milledgeville. The Chancellor said that they’re waiting for an answer from the Attorney General on whether or not it is legal to do this.

Patrick Novotny (CLASS): Novotny read the following statement submitted to him by Richard Flynn (CLASS), who was unable to attend the meeting because of his teaching schedule:

The solicitation from the Office of Student Leadership, not a student organization, to my mind, violates the policy we were sent. As Election Day approaches, this is in quotes, “As Election Day approaches and attention turns to the political process, please remember that Georgia Southern University cannot explicitly or by implication endorse any party or candidate, and please do not use campus email or email systems for campaign and political activities. Campaign and political events are permitted on campus only when sponsored by a recognized student organization.” Please put my objections on the record today at today’s Senate meeting, which I would attend as a visitor, except that I have class.

Candy Schille (CLASS): She asked if President Bush’s visit had prompted Flynn’s message.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator and Patrick Novotny (CLASS): That was correct.

Marc Cyr (CLASS): He added that what specifically prompted it was an email sent out via Amy Heaston from Kellie Pickett, Office of Student Leadership, requesting nominations for a student to meet with President Bush as a representative of Georgia Southern and receive some kind of a service award from him. Since this would be, not just the President coming here because he likes us, but a political rally in support of an individual candidate, Richard Flynn objected that this was part of a flat-out political rally. For that reason, for GSU to send a student representative would, in fact, send a student representative to a partisan political event.

The email asking for this student solicitation came out three or four hours after the note from Legal Services telling us not to use email and so forth. And so he objected on those grounds.

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: The moderator clarified that she had received a response back from Amy Heaston saying that Heaston had specifically cleared sending out the solicitation of a student nominee with University Attorney, Lee Davis.

Mr. Lee Davis (Legal Affairs): He explained that the White House had contacted the institution asking for names of students who have been involved in community service to be recognized in conjunction with the President’s upcoming visit to Statesboro. The request came from the Freedom Corps. He added that, “We’ve not been requested to participate in the political rally that we would anticipate would occur in conjunction with his visit, nor have we been requested to take any position in terms of that political process, or that election, and we have not done so.”

Davis clarified his own message, to which Flynn had alluded: “Every two years or so, we’ll have episodes of posters and stickers and signs and stuff being strewn all around the campus; we have had it in this election cycle, too. We’ve had to clean up that mess and ask people not to do it. On occasion, we have had emails go out in the nature of ‘Vote for me,’ and we’ve asked people, ‘Please don’t do that.’ That is the kind of thing that the message is directed at. It does start out as Dr. Flynn said, ‘As Election Day

approaches and attention turns to political process, please remember that Georgia Southern University cannot explicitly or by implication endorse any party or candidate.’ What I then said was under IRS guidelines an institution that allows campaign posters to be placed on campus is deemed to endorse that activity by implication. Now, one of the reasons that this is a matter of concern to me, okay, is that this implicates our tax exempt status. If, by implication, by allowing posters to be all over the campus we endorse a candidate, we have a tax problem. That’s simply where the genesis of this is. Now, I guess you can disagree as to whether we are impliedly endorsing a candidate by sending out an email asking people to give nominations for a Freedom Corps program at which one of our students is going to be recognized for his/her service at a presidential visit. I don’t think it’s arguable that the President is here in conjunction with a political campaign. I also think it’s not arguable that the President’s presence in Statesboro is a larger event than that, and it’s probably going to mean a lot to any student who’s selected for this, so, no, in my analysis this wasn’t violating anything that I said. I certainly don’t think it’s violating any IRS policy, and the two came out within three hours of each other—granted. That’s true.”

Mary Marwitz (CLASS): She requested clarification (4 times) as to whether our offices are part of the University campus? That is, are we permitted to put posters or stickers or slogans on our door or inside our office?

Davis responded: “Well, a couple of years ago, we had a question from one of the departments wherein there was some materials placed on the door. And that same question came up, and we had to work through it. And in this particular department, it was a common practice for professors to put materials that were of an expressive nature on the doors. Okay. It was a department where you could walk down the hall, and whether it was an election year or not, you might see a political cartoon, or you might see an article from a magazine posted up there, all kinds of things. And in that context, I worked with the department chair, and we determined that, no, it doesn’t imply an endorsement because there’s expression going on all up and down that hall. Now there was another episode in an election cycle some years ago where a person put campaign posters in a window facing Sweetheart Circle. I think that’s a different question, and I think all of these questions have to be identified and taken one-by-one. I don’t think there’s just some blanket rule you can just say, and then everybody can take it like the Code of Hammurabi and just decide what the rule is. You have to look at it on a case-by-case basis, and I think that your question is a good one, but it has to be taken in the context of what’s going on in the department. “

Candy Schille (CLASS): Schille asked for information about Freedom Corps.

Lee Davis (Legal Affairs): Davis responded that it is associated with the White House. Then he deferred to Dr. Thompson, because she was involved in that [request]; however, he did offer that it is a program that involves service for students. He added that he did not have a lot of details about it.

Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs & Enrollment Management): “With our 24-hour turnaround, we were told basically that they wanted to showcase students. They called

the Boys and Girls Club here in town. They called Armstrong. They called many places where students were involved. The service that was included was Habitat for Humanity, Katrina Relief, peer mentoring of some type that they're doing something within their community to support the community, to be a part of the community, and success of the community. That's what we were told in the process of nominating someone. Is there a chance that any of our students will be selected? We have no idea, but the only other option was not to have our students have to be showcased and, Candy, not create a supportive environment for our students. "

Candy Schille (CLASS): She surmised that Freedom Corps has a political affiliation, whether or not declared.

Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs & Enrollment Management): "It did not ask us to select the Young Republicans for this group, and we did not ask the students who were nominated what their affiliations were. What we wanted to know is what kind of service had they been doing for the community over the last couple of years."

Candy Schille (CLASS): She asked what they had done.

Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs & Enrollment Management): She identified Habitat for Humanity and Katrina relief.

Candy Schille (CLASS): "So Freedom Corps is all of those good things?"

Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs & Enrollment Management): "And many, many more. "

Clara Krug (CLASS): Since Davis had mentioned the White House, she asked him if it is a White House Freedom Corps or somehow affiliated with the White House.

Lee Davis (Legal Affairs): He deferred to Thompson.

Clara Krug (CLASS): She inquired about federal campaign laws and federal laws. That is, she understood that, if someone makes such a call from the White House, the person must be involved in working at the White House. Otherwise, it may be a federal offense.

Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs): "We did not break any IRS laws. I promise. We did not. "

Clara Krug (CLASS): "What I'm concerned about also is the fact that, if we're going to have a student get an award, I would like to know that the Freedom Corps is not a Republican lobbying group, that it is not a Republican fundraising group. Hopefully, it wouldn't have anything to do with Haliburton. I would like to know where the student is receiving the award. If the student is receiving the award at the rally, regardless of what we think, if Katie Couric or whoever else is here ... and, who knows, CNN, who knows who's going to pick it up ... I would rather not see Georgia Southern affiliated with a campaign. I would like to add I already was not happy when ...our Governor

spoke [at May commencement]. I think that's fine, but that he brought a certain candidate with him, and that candidate sat at the very front of the entire stadium, and stood up. And then, although Governor Purdue waxed eloquent about how he was not there for any reason other than our graduates, he then left the stage before one degree had been awarded, and he went down and glad-handed people, in full view of everybody in that stadium, with the person whom Mr. Bush [will be here] to help unseat a person who's in Congress. Let me return to the current point. I would rather not see a student get an award if it puts us in conjunction with any party. I don't want the person to receive an award from John Kerry, either. "

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: She asked if Teresa Thompson had received more information.

Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs): "I have been told that this is an agency. I'm not sure if that means in the White House. "

Clara Krug (CLASS): "Nobody looked it up on the web? Nobody checked out to see who these people are?"

Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs): "We are not breaking any IRS laws."

Clara Krug (CLASS): "I hear that. I hear the mantra."

Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs): "That's my response to you. We're not breaking any IRS laws. None of our students have declared their affiliation with any party. It is an opportunity for our students to be showcased in a national venue for their hard work. I don't think that would endorse any candidate. It would promote our students."

Pat Walker (CLASS): "I just have a quick question for Mr. Davis. Do you have any reason to believe that this award would be given out at any venue other than the rally?"

Lee Davis (Legal Affairs): "I have no information where it would be given or in what circumstance it would be given, nor do I think that's important in terms of the analysis that I made. And the analysis that I made was strictly in terms of what I talked about, whether under IRS rules this would constitute an endorsement of a candidate. And I don't think it does, regardless of where it's given. "

Barry Balleck (CLASS): "As I understand, this convocation is taking place at Hanner Fieldhouse. Is that correct? "

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: "News to me. I hadn't heard that. "

Barry Balleck (CLASS): "Okay. I had heard it is taking place at Hanner Fieldhouse. Now I have heard also that there are tickets going to be distributed. Has there been any information regarding that, but I guess the point of clarification is I understand that, if the College Republicans are sponsoring this, ...what's the nuance of the President appearing here? I can understand the President appearing here giving a foreign policy

speech or something like that and that clearing us for our tax exempt status. But he is coming to Statesboro explicitly to endorse a candidate. How does that not translate to Georgia Southern then being associated with that candidate?”

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: “If people will recall that candidate taught here in the College of Business for many years.”

Barry Balleck (CLASS): “Is there an answer to that? Is there an answer to that question? ...Is there no association then? Is there no connection being made in the minds of the voters?”

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: “At this point, there is no connection. The fact that, when this candidate ran the first time, he was still employed as a Georgia Southern professor, there certainly was a connection made then. I know it’s been in his campaign literature.”

Barry Balleck (CLASS): “And ... how are these tickets going to be distributed that we’ve heard are going to be distributed? Because Hanner has a finite capacity, and I’m sure that there’s going to be quite a turnout.”

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: She deferred to Marilyn Bruce.

Marilyn Bruce (President’s Office): “Barry, we have no, no knowledge of that. We are referring all of the questions that we have received in the President’s Office to Max Burns’ office. They are the ones who have initiated this and are planning this. We are not giving out tickets ourselves. I have absolutely no idea how tickets are being distributed.”

Candy Schille (CLASS): “Again, not to be glib, but if everything, if the planning is being referred to Max Burns’ office, it seems kind of clear to me that this is about as partisan as it gets. I’m cool with not having my partisan people endorsed on campus. I can do fairness on both sides, but this one really does seem a little bit out of line to me. I don’t suppose we’d do anything like have a resolution on this one. All I want to do is support Dr. Flynn’s letter and some of the objections and relatively probing questions that we’ve had today.”

Clara Krug (CLASS): “Question. Excuse me. If Max Burns was a former ... faculty member, he’s no longer here. I’m assuming he’s lost his insurance because he left, so he has no standing at the University. So how is somebody with no standing at the University arranging to have a rally in the University field house?”

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: “Anybody? Billy.”

Billy Griffis (University Advancement): “I understand the request to host this rally came from the Young Republicans Club. So it is sponsored by a student organization. They have submitted a request. They submitted a request to Susan Nelson, I believe, in the Union, which all student organizations have the option to do. So Georgia Southern

University is not sponsoring the event, but the student organization can sponsor such events, and it doesn't affect the status, tax exempt status, or that the University is supporting it in any way."

Marc Cyr (CLASS): "...The real issue here starts out with Richard Flynn and was the use of email. The Republican Party was looking for a dog, and perhaps a pony, for the dog and pony show of a political election. And they asked us to point them towards the barn, and that was the problem. That they, they asked us to get involved in finding a prop for them for a political rally. Therein lies the difficulty. And we did so immediately after telling the faculty not to do exactly the same kind of thing, IRS rules or not. And this is politics. You've got fact. You've got appearance. I think that this is a problem in both areas. Dr. Flynn was quite right."

Joe Franklin (Business & Finance): "Pat, I'm feeling left out so I thought I'd throw in my little point here, too. Regardless of all this discussion, on Monday there will be a lot of traffic and parking that will be interrupted. And you will probably see an email come out from me notifying you of that point, and it will have nothing to do with the political process, but just merely my favorite subject which is parking and transportation. "

Barry Balleck (CLASS): "I have a question, too. If the College Republicans are sponsoring this, will they be paying for the increased security offered by Georgia Southern police, which is inevitably going to happen? We are going to have off-duty police officers that are probably going to have to be called in for that day. Will College Republicans be paying for that, or will the University be paying for that"?

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: "Anybody? "

Barry Balleck (CLASS): "I mean, here's the real issue. Here's the real issue. If College Republicans are sponsoring this, then they should be footing the bill for all the excess costs that's going to be associated with this, to this University. Otherwise the taxpayers of the state of Georgia are paying for this, specifically Georgia Southern is paying for this. "

Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs & Enrollment Management): "Just like any program that a student group organizes we typically pick up the cost of extra thing, whether it's athletics, whether it's anything that is happening at the Union. That is part of the student activity budget that the University picks up on some of those events. So it wouldn't be any different than anything else we do on campus."

Clara Krug (CLASS): "Do the possible Democrats among the students know that they're paying for this?"

Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs & Enrollment Management): "Well, the question is, every student pays student fees, and every student knows that their student fees go towards supplemental program on campus. If the program's accepted, then every program on campus, doesn't matter what it is, whether it be a concert, whether it be a lecture series, when we have to bring in extra lighting or whatever, any of that. So it

would be the same thing for anybody across the board. So I would assume, yes, that they would know that this program's being paid for."

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) : "My impression is that organizations are entitled to something like \$600 per semester from SGA. I can't believe that that will cover the cost of security for the President to be here for two hours."

Barry Balleck (CLASS): "Again, I don't think we're talking about a concert or a visit from somebody. We're talking about the President of the United States, who as I understand it, has never visited Statesboro. A President, a sitting President, has never visited Statesboro. I think the security requirements are going to be somewhat more stringent than they would if blink 182 came to campus or something like that. I really think there should be some discussion of this as to who's going to be paying for these Georgia Southern police that are obviously going to have to be working overtime for this. "

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator:" Does anyone here know the answer to that question?"

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): "In the last election, there were some towns that did not want a presidential or candidate visit because the cost of security was just too much for the budget of those towns." So to imply that this is just a small cost, it's not. It's not 600 bucks. "

Clara Krug (CLASS): "Is Georgia Southern getting money from the Republican Party to help pay for this? Because I would think that would affect our tax status. Would it not? If you get a direct contribution from a political party? "

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: "Not as long as they donate it to the Foundation, right, Billy?"

Clara Krug (CLASS): "That wasn't my question. My question was about paying for security, just paying for Georgia Southern University. "

Joe Franklin (Business & Finance): "I am not aware of any funds coming from any sources that would assist us in paying for security other than from student activity funds."

Candy Schille (CLASS): "Just to bring this whole thing to closure. There's now way to stop this, right? This train is going to hit us, is that correct? Is that right? So this visit is going to happen? Okay."

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: "I don't think anything we say is going to affect it. "

Clara Krug (CLASS): "Could you at least let everybody know so that, if people do want to protest, they'll know about it, and they may protest? ... Because as long as people don't

know, they go blithely along, and nobody says anything. ... Let people know. Put it in the *Statesboro Herald*; send an email because we now know we may send things about politics by email; and let people know. So that, if there are people who would like to protest, they may do so. You may even want to say, 'You must stand so many feet from where you're protesting. Your sign must be this big or this small.' If faculty want to cancel class so students may protest, they'll know. At least give people who do not agree with the decision of two or three, four, five, six, seven, how many I don't know, people on behalf of an entire University an opportunity to protest. Although it's the Young Republicans who made the request, it is on behalf of the university. It's the entire University. When they get on the news, it's going to say Georgia Southern University. It's not going to say that five people from the Young Republicans contacted the University Union, and somebody decided, okay, I'll donate for security. So I think that's what should happen. We should have a chance to protest. Just like those people in that department you didn't name [referring to earlier remarks] had a chance to put all that stuff on their doors."

Lee Davis (Legal Affairs): "I just wanted to correct a misstatement about what I had said about email. I never said that email can be used blatantly for political purposes. What I said was that..."

Clara Krug (CLASS): "I didn't say 'blatant.' Did I say 'blatant'?"

Pat Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: "You said it could be used."

Clara Krug (CLASS): "Could be used. Thank you."

Lee Davis (Legal Affairs): "Yes, and I never said that, and that wasn't in my message, and it wasn't in anything I said today. So I don't know where you got that, but you did not get that from me."

Clara Krug (CLASS): "Well, we could refer to the before-referenced email and indicate to people what the decision had been about this particular rally."

12. Announcements: Vice Presidents: No announcements.

13. Announcements from the Floor

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): He announced that, on Thursday (CIT 1005, 1:00 p.m.) and Friday (CIT, 3:30 p.m.) that week, the First Year Experience Task Force was asking for some faculty assistance with the work they have been doing.

Clara Krug (CLASS): She asked all present to sign the appropriate attendance sheet so that she might have an accurate record of those who attended the meeting.

Sonya Shepherd (LIB): She announced that, the following Friday, 11:30 to 1:00, there would be an International Coffee Hour. She requested that we invite our international

students to come to the Library in the atrium. She invited all others who have not been in the new addition to visit as well.

14. Adjournment: 5:56 p.m.

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
November 27, 2006
4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Russell Union Ballroom

2006-2007 Senate Executive Committee: Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair; Les Furr (CHHS), Ron MacKinnon (CIT), Marc Cyr (CLASS), Bill Wells (COBA), Maggie LaMontagne (COE), Donna Saye (COST), Robert Vogel (JPHCOPH), Sonya Shepherd (LIB), Clara Krug (CLASS) Senate Secretary, Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) Senate Librarian, Marilyn Bruce (President's Office) Senate Liaison

Voting Members in Attendance: Frank Atuahene, Scott Beck, Barry Balleck, Marc Cyr, Nirmal Das, Terry Diamanduros, Godfrey Gibbison, Tim Giles, Mary Hadley, Ming Fang He, Patricia Humphrey, James Klein, Clara Krug, Ron MacKinnon, Lisa Yocco for Bruce McLean, Kent Murray, Patrick Novotny, Constantin Ogloblin, Onyile Onyile, Donna Saye, Norman Schmidt, Kari Fitzmorris for Alison Scott, Sonya Shepherd, Charles Skewis, T. Maria Smith, Diana Sturges, Brenda Talley, Robert Vogel, Patricia Walker, Mark Welford, Bill Wells, Jim Whitworth, Jerry Wilson, Mark Yanochik

Voting Members Absent: Steve Damelin, Les Furr, Beverly Graham, Ellen Hendrix, Margaret LaMontagne, Mary Marwitz, Michele Davis McGibony, John Nauright, Michael Nielsen, Broderick Oluyede, Michael Reksulak, David Robinson, Candy Schille, Patrick Wheaton

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Linda Bleicken, Marilyn Bruce, Joe Franklin, Billy Griffis, Teresa Thompson, Jane Rhoades Hudak, Ron Shiffler, Gary Means, Bede Mitchell

Senate Parliamentarian: Bob Cook

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman

SPC Representative: Jerry Wilson

SPC Apprentice: Norman Schmidt

Visitors: Candace Griffith, Lee Davis, Marcia Jones

The meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Senate Moderator Patricia Humphrey.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the [November 27, 2006](#), Meeting. Patricia

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked alternates who were substituting for senators to sit with the senators, not in the visitors' section. She also asked that, when recognized to speak, senators identify themselves and their college affiliation. There was one correction to the agenda: no NCAA Report. It was moved and seconded to approve the revised agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Approval of the [October 24, 2006](#), Minutes: Clara Krug (CLASS), Senate Secretary: Krug moved that the Senate approve the minutes of the October 24, 2006, senate meeting. Her motion was seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. Librarian's Report of [November 16, 2006](#): Godfrey Gibbison (COBA), Senate Librarian: Gibbison announced one correction to information about the Faculty Service Committee on page 5 of the Librarian's Report. Six proposals for service grants had received partial funding, and nine had received full funding, for a total of fifteen funded applications. He reminded senators that approving the Librarian's Report means approving the record of the business that was conducted by the various committees, and not necessarily approving the committees' recommendations. He moved for approval of the Librarian's Report. His motion was seconded. The report was approved unanimously.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Donna Saye (COST): Saye submitted the report for approval. She stated that, at the October 17th meeting, the committee had approved some second-discipline program deletions for COBA, some course revisions for CIT, COST, and COE, some new courses for CIT and COE, and a course deletion and a program revision for COE. The committee had also heard some selected topics announcements from CLASS. Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator reminded senators that approving recommendations included in the report meant that they would be forwarded to the Provost and President for final approval. The report was approved unanimously.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Ron McKinnon (CIT): McKinnon reported that the first portion of the October 12th meeting had been a fifteen-minute discussion about boosting graduate enrollment. Currently, 12% of students are enrolled in graduate programs; 20% is the goal. The Office of Admissions has hired a full-time graduate student recruitment manager, Dawn Lipker, who will attend Graduate Committee meetings. At its October 12 meeting:

- The committee had approved a second track in the Master of Ed. in Secondary and P-12 Education in Foreign Language. The tracks now include French and Spanish.
- The committee had tabled a motion from the School of Accountancy.
- The committee had approved a masters degree in Kinesiology/Coaching.

The committee had also discussed general changes in graduate testing and had revised

its schedule of meetings

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator requested a vote of all those in favor of approving the recommendations in the Graduate Committee report and forwarding them to the Provost and President. The report was approved unanimously.

4. President's Report: Dr. Bruce Grube: Dr. Grube reported on various projects.

RAC

He announced that the new part was not completely finished; work on the pools and some fields continues. When the new portion is complete, the former RAC will be closed for renovation. He anticipated completion of all remodeling and opening of the complete complex in February 2007.

Veazey Hall

Dr. Grube announced progress on remodeling Veazey Hall.

Fine Arts Phase III

He also reported progress on the Fine Arts III project, which is next to the Department of Art, next to the old Pittman School.

Dorman Drive

At its last meeting, the Board of Regents approved renaming the street that begins directly across the street from the Hanner parking lot, continues on the back side of the parking lot behind the bookstore, and so forth, and then drops off on over to Chandler. It has been named Dorman Drive to pick up the name that we lost when we tore down Dorman Hall, so that we will continue to honor the family for whom Dorman Hall had been named. There is also a practical reason for naming this street: Public Safety people need to know street names.

Capital Campaign

President Grube stated that the capital campaign for the university would end on December 1st and that the university would announce the amount donated on that date. December 1st is the date that this county acquired the A&M school. A year-and-a-half later, the school opened with four faculty people, fifteen students, and three buildings. He announced that GSU has plans in place to keep fund-raising alive and well, obviously, but with a focus on raising dollars for student scholarships.

Holidays

Dr. Grube reminded senators that a particularly hectic period was about to begin and that being civil to each other would probably be more important than at other times. He wished senators a wonderful holiday.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator inquired about questions for Dr. Grube. There were none.

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

Requests for Information:

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator shared three Requests for Information (RIF):

- From John Nauright a request for information on the policy of faculty using credit awarded at appointment in tenure applications. Fred Whitt, the Dean of CHHS, had responded:

It seems that using credit years, which is at the discretion of the applicant, is viewed as an elective tenure application. The individual would still have another chance to apply for tenure.

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator reported that what is not clear, at least to the SEC, is whether standards for an elective tenure application are consistent with those for the “normal” application. The university does have a clear statement about early promotion applications: “Early promotions are rare requiring clearly outstanding performance in all three areas of evaluation.” However, it is not clear whether those same kinds of standards are held for elective tenure or if the standards are the same as for “normal” tenure. The SEC recommends that a statement regarding elective tenure be made as well and will draft a motion for the February meeting. Nauright has agreed to participate in that drafting.

- From Jim Braselton a request for information about why classes were not canceled for the President’s visit on October 30th and about who paid for lost time, the cost of securing Hanner, etc.

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator responded that the decision not to cancel classes had been made by Dr. Bleicken as allowed under Section 914.01 of Board of Regents Policy.

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator reported that Vice President Joe Franklin had told her that the College Republicans had been charged \$5,000 for rental for Hanner. He had determined that amount in consultation with Ken Brown (Public Safety). Setup

and takedown for the stage, lights, and so forth, had been done by the Republicans themselves with their own road crew. According to Fred Whitt, most of the PE classes during that time were scheduled for the RAC and not Hanner. So there were no class cancellations related to the President's visit in terms of classes at Hanner.

- From Marc Cyr a request for information on a proposal to teach GSU classes at high schools using high school teachers as GSU faculty. That is the proposed Senior to Sophomore program which is being initiated by Continuing Education.

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator stated that Dr. Bleicken had initially responded to Cyr's request and that she (Humphrey) had subsequently sent a more complete set of questions and answers to the Senate after meeting with Dr. Gary Means (Continuing Education) on November 9th. That information had also later been sent out to the gsfac list at the recommendation of the SEC. In addition, Dr. Means had attended the SEC breakfast with Dr. Bleicken on November 17th and had fielded many more questions and concerns.

The answer for now is that the program is very much in its infancy, possibly even its incubation stage. The plan is to have a couple of courses set up as a pilot for Spring Semester 2007 and then a more full implementation for the fall. There is indeed actually an accreditation body for this type of program, the National Alliance of Concurrent Enrollment Partnerships, or NACEP. In order to be accredited, however, a program must have been in existence for five years. NACEP does have a provisional membership, however, for institutions such as GSU who are just beginning such a program.

Agenda Item

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator shared one request for an agenda item.

- On behalf of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluations, Les Furr submitted a motion to dissolve the ad hoc committee and form a permanent standing committee on student evaluations. The ad hoc committee was originally formed primarily to address the question of on-line evaluations and then to look at the evaluation process in general. However, according to Item C of its responsibilities, the Faculty Welfare Committee has the charge to "monitor existing evaluation procedures, instruments, validity, collections and distribution of data." In light of this charge, the SEC declined to schedule the motion. Instead, the SEC will refer continued study of student evaluations to the Faculty Welfare Committee. Work will begin during Spring Semester 2007.

6. Election of 2007-2008 Senate Moderator. Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator announced that Marc Cyr had agreed to stand for election. She solicited additional nominations from the floor. There were none. It was moved and seconded that nominations be closed. Cyr was elected unanimously.

7. Unfinished Business

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked at what point it might be appropriate for the Senate, if it is interested in doing so, to make an official statement about the Senior to Sophomore program.

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator answered that, since there had not been time to submit any kind of motion prior to the deadline for this meeting, it would be most appropriate to wait and submit any kind of motion for the February meeting.

Cook (Parliamentarian) mentioned two types of motions. The two choices are to submit a statement with respect to the sentiment of the Senate (for example, “the Senate feels that such and such should have been done or should not have been done”), and then to have a motion that actually included some action or recommendation associated with it.

Krug (CLASS) asked for clarification. There would be two motions: one a statement about the sense or the sentiment of the Senate, and a second one about the actual program and whether the Senate endorsed it or not. At that time it would be appropriate to discuss this program fully. Cook said that it would.

Krug (CLASS) asked a question about an article that had appeared in the Savannah newspaper on November 2nd in which Superintendent of Schools Shearouse in Effingham County had indicated that there were already Senior to Sophomore courses planned there for spring semester. This seemed to contradict information presented to the SEC by Dr. Means on November 17th.

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator suggested that Dr. Bleicken or Dr. Means might like to update the Senate on exactly where the program stands as far as a pilot for spring.

Means (CEPS) responded that the statement in the Savannah newspaper was an erroneous interpretation.

Cyr (CLASS) asked about the two options for compensation for the GSU faculty supervisors: a course off, or \$1,000. Would GSU faculty select the option, and, if the compensation turned out to be \$1,000, would they have the option of not taking the job?

Means (CEPS) answered that the proposal is that faculty liaisons receive \$1,000 per semester or one course release per year.

Bleicken (Provost) added that this would be a voluntary assignment. This would not be one that someone would be forced to do.

Cyr (CLASS) asked what would happen if nobody volunteers.

Krug (CLASS) reminded senators that the wording says that the liaison will be “appointed.” It might prove difficult for a non-tenured person who was appointed to say no.

Bleicken (Provost) reminded senators that the current proposal is a draft. It has not reached its final form.

Mark Welford (COST) asked why anybody would even want to do this.

Bleicken (Provost) stated that there are many reasons to think about doing this, not the least of which is the fact that we currently have a great divide between our public schools and institutions of higher education. We are discussing ways to bridge this gap. One of them is to create better opportunities or more opportunities for interaction between our high school teachers and our college professors. That alone would certainly be something worthwhile.

Welford (COST) asked if this is a scenario “where everything is numbers driven.”

Bleicken (Provost) suggested that, if anyone would like to have a full and substantive discussion about this, he/she call Dr. Means who has worked in this kind of program in other school systems for details about the full picture.

8. New Business

Scott Beck (COE) asked at what point it is appropriate to ask questions about long-term policies. For example, must there be an inquiry first?

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator responded that an inquiry isn’t required. However, sometimes it helps to clarify what the real rules, regulations, and procedures are, or it is perfectly valid if you have something you feel needs addressing to propose a motion.

Beck (COE) was curious about whether the Senate has ever talked about the possible advent of plus-minus grading?

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator stated that the Senate had discussed it. However, the no plus-minus grading is mandated by the Board of Regents at this point. There may be a pilot project related to plus-minus grading at UGA and Georgia State.

Beck (COE) asked how soon we might benefit from that project.

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator did not have that information. However, she reported that, at the request of students, her prior institution had instituted plus-minus grading. After two years, they had reverted to the previous system because students hated receiving minuses.

Beck (COE) also wanted to know if the Senate had ever considered spousal hiring policies. He offered that he knows that some faculty members have left Georgia Southern because their spouses weren't able to find jobs in this area.

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked if someone would care to address the issue.

Bleicken (Provost) shared the following information: When we know that there is a professor coming to us who has a spouse who is qualified for a position that we have, that spouse is certainly welcome to apply. In fact, many times, we do help or try to help them [spouses] look at other options, if in fact there is not a position here for which they are qualified. And so there is no hard and fast rule. But, clearly, if there is a professor we would like to have, it is in our best interest to try very hard to find something [for that person's spouse], and we do have many cases where that has happened.

Beck (COE) asked if, when somebody is thinking of moving on because his/her spouse is out-of-luck finding something here, there is a normal means of communicating that information through the hierarchy of the University to find out whether there is even the possibility of creating positions. He offered the example of one of his own doctoral advisors at another institution. In order to keep her at that institution, her department created a position for her husband. He asked if there is any precedent for this type of initiative here.

Bleicken (Provost), with confirmation from Dr. Marcia Jones (Institutional Compliance Officer), stated that GSU does not typically create positions for someone. If we have a position for which someone is qualified, he/she may apply.

9. Announcements: Vice Presidents

None

10. Announcements from the Floor

Krug (CLASS) spoke on behalf of the Ad Hoc Steering Committee on Reestablishing an Academic Club. She reported that the committee had held an event on Friday, November 3rd. About 110 to 120 people had attended. She thanked those present who had attended. She announced plans to enlarge the steering committee, to divide into some sub-groups for events, facilities, and publicity. The committee received responses to its survey from 135 faculty, staff, and administrators. A significant number (82%) want there to be a social event each semester. Sixty-four percent would like to see a place on campus where faculty may go with a brown bag lunch, and about 87% would like us to find a permanent building. She had contacted Billy Griffis about a permanent building, and he promised me that, after Thanksgiving, he would share this information with people he knows that might be interested. Unfortunately, we don't have the typical amount of money necessary to purchase a place like the old Pizza Inn, which he said would sell for \$600,000.

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked for other announcements from the floor.

Krug (CLASS) reported that she had asked Tom Palfy (Food Services) if it would be possible to have Lakeside Café open at 7:00 instead of 7:30 during exam week so that students and faculty, too, could have breakfast or coffee before 7:30 exams. He agreed to do that.

Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator reminded COST senators to remain after the meeting to discuss the COST Bylaws. She then requested a motion to adjourn.

11. Adjournment

4:33 p.m.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held February 15, 2007, 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., in the Russell Union Ballroom, and will reconvene, if necessary, February 19, 2007, 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., in the Russell Union Ballroom.