

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Agendas and Minutes

2007

Faculty Senate Minutes-2007

Georgia Southern University

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



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

Recommended Citation

"Faculty Senate Minutes-2007" (2007). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 19.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/19>

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

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
Faculty Senate Minutes
February 15, 2007
4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Russell Union

2006-2007 Senate Executive Committee: Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair; Ron MacKinnon (CIT); Maggie LaMontagne (COE); Donna Saye (COST); Sonya Shepherd (LIB); Clara Krug (CLASS); Senate Secretary; Marilyn Bruce (President's Office), Senate Liaison.

Voting Members in Attendance: Frank Atuahene, (Greg Chamblee for Scott Beck), (Adam Jonathan Con for Marc Cyr), Terry Diamanduros, (Bob Jackson for Godfrey Gibbison), Tim Giles, Mary Hadley, Ming Fang He, Ellen Hendrix, Patricia Humphrey, James Klein, Clara Krug, Margaret LaMontagne, Ron MacKinnon, Bruce McLean, (Mark Mohr for Kent Murray), Patrick Novotny, Onyile Onyile, David Robinson, Donna Saye, Norman Schmidt, (Kari Fitzmorris for Alison Scott), Sonya Shepherd, Brenda Talley, Mark Welford, Patrick Wheaton, JimWhitworth, Jerry Wilson, Mark Yanochik.

Voting Members Absent: Barry Balleck, Steve Damelin, Nirmal Das, Les Furr, Beverly Graham, Michele Davis McGibony, Mary Marwitz, John Nauright, Michael Nielsen, Constantin Ogloblin, Broderick Oluyede, Michael Reksulak, Candy Schille, Charles Skewis, T. Maria Smith, Diana Sturges, Robert Vogel, Patricia Walker, Bill Wells.

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, Linda Bleicken, Teresa Thompson, Billy Griffis, Marilyn Bruce, Jane Rhoades Hudak, Sandra Nettles, Brett Danilowicz, Gary Means.

Senate Parliamentarian: Bob Cook.

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman.

SPC Representative: Jerry Wilson.

SPC Apprentice: Norman Schmidt.

Visitors: Lee Davis, Legal Affairs; Mike Deal, Registrar; Marcia Jones, Institutional Compliance; Ron Stalnaker, IT Services.

Senate Moderator Patricia Humphrey called the meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 4:00 p.m. She called senators' attention to the attendance sheets on the table next to their name plates and asked that each alternate sign the attendance sheet next to the name of the senator for whom he/she was substituting. She asked that all speakers identify themselves and their college affiliation before speaking.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the 20 February 15, 2007, Meeting, Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator: Humphrey asked for a motion to approve the agenda. Maggie LaMontagne (COE)

made that motion; it was seconded. The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of the November 27, 2006 Minutes, Clara Krug (CLASS), Senate Secretary: Krug moved for approval of the November 27, 2006 Senate minutes. Her motion was seconded. The minutes of the November 27, 2006 meeting were approved.

3. The Librarian's Report of February 8, 2007, Godfrey Gibbison (COBA), Senate Librarian: Gibbison was not present. In his absence, there was a motion to approve the Librarian's Report. The motion was seconded.

Clara Krug (CLASS) had a question about the report of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). At their meeting the previous week, members of the Senate Executive Committee had expressed concern about the number of denials in committee that are later approved beyond the committee level. She wondered if senators should be concerned about these approvals.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, asked Mark Yanochik, the ASC chair, to address this concern. Yanochik responded that members are discussing concerns about the number of approvals beyond the committee level.

There was no additional discussion. Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, reminded senators that approval of the content and form of the Librarian's Report did not constitute approval of actions of the various committees. The Librarian's Report was approved.

a. Report from the Undergraduate Committee, Donna Saye (COST), Chair: Saye reported that the Undergraduate Committee had met on January 20. Members had approved both program and course revisions from COBA, CLASS, COST, and CIT. The committee had also approved new courses in COE, CLASS, CIT, CHHS, and COST. Revisions from COBA concerning the grade-point average (GPA) to enter the Pre-Business major and from CLASS concerning grades to enter the Broadcasting Program await approval from the Enrollment Management Council before being approved by the Undergraduate Committee.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, reminded senators that, as a committee recommendation, this does not require a second. She asked if there were any discussion.

Clara Krug (CLASS) had a question about procedure (page 20). The Department of Communication Arts' revised program item was mentioned as having to be approved by Enrollment Management before it could be approved by the Undergraduate Committee. She asked why prior approval is necessary.

Donna Saye (COST) responded that every time that something comes before the Undergraduate Committee that has to do with GPA or granting students permission to enter a program, it must first be approved by the Enrollment Management Council.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, reminded senators that approval of the Undergraduate Committee report means that the Faculty Senate approves all courses and curriculum changes recommended by the committee. These recommendations will then be forwarded to the Provost and President for final approval. The Undergraduate Committee Report was approved.

b. Report from the Graduate Committee, Ron MacKinnon (CIT), Chair: MacKinnon reported

that, at its October 24th meeting, the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies had led a 15-minute discussion of graduate enrollment. The committee had approved:

- A program revision in the M.Ed. in Secondary Education and P-12 Education to add a track in Foreign Language Education;
- A program revision to the MS in Kinesiology Online Coaching Education Study Concentration;
- Revisions to agenda deadlines and to procedures for submitting agenda items to the Graduate Committee.

The committee had tabled a proposal from the School of Accountancy concerning a concentration in Forensic Accounting because no representative from the School of Accountancy had attended the meeting. The Graduate Committee was also informed of general changes in the Graduate Record Exam (GRE).

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, reminded senators that, since this is a committee recommendation, the report does not require a second. There was no discussion. Humphrey reminded senators that approval would mean that the Faculty Senate endorses all recommendations and that these recommendations will be forwarded to the Provost and the President for final approval. The Report of the Graduate Committee was approved.

4. President's Report, Dr. Bruce Grube:

Annual Wild Game Supper:

The annual Wild Game Supper was held in Atlanta. Each year, representatives of Georgia Southern, the Statesboro-Bulloch County Chamber of Commerce, the City of Statesboro, and Bulloch County invite elected officials to a wild game dinner and interact with them to push for local agenda items. This year, Governor Perdue, Lieutenant Governor Cagle, and all of the major committee chairs in both the Senate and the House attended.

A meeting of the Foundation Board preceded the dinner. As a result, our Foundation Trustees were also available to mingle with elected officials. Lieutenant Governor Casey Cagle addressed the Foundation Board members. Although Cagle did not graduate from Georgia Southern, he did attend college here. Grube added that, whatever one's political views, it "certainly suits politically at the moment ... having a Lieutenant Governor attached to you..."

Campus:

The administration plans to replace buildings across from the University Store with new student housing. The potential name for the complex is Centennial Place. It would replace Winburn, Johnson, and Olliff Halls; the ROTC building; and Building 805.

RAC:

Grube announced that, with the exception of the outdoor swimming pool, the RAC is open. He anticipated that the pool would open in a few weeks. He stated that Vice President Teresa Thompson's

(Student Affairs & Enrollment Management) staff had tracked the students who use the RAC. Preliminary data shows that we retain students who use the RAC regularly at approximately a 12% higher level than we retain those students who do not.

Board of Regents:

In mid-April 2007, the Board of Regents (BOR) will meet at Georgia Southern for the first time in 20 years. Most members have never visited our campus. Those who have visited have been impressed. The BOR will meet in the Nessmith-Lane Building.

Foy Building Renovation:

While renovation continues, the Music Department will occupy space in Hendricks Hall. Dr. Grube anticipates that faculty will move into Foy again in Fall 2008. When they leave Hendricks, that hall will be remodeled as office space.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS):

The SACS Commission on Colleges accepted our final report. He thanked Provost Linda Bleicken and her team for “ushering us through this.” Georgia Southern is reaccredited for ten years.

Crane Metamarketing:

President Grube reported that, as the Senate was meeting, a group from Crane MetaMarketing, a professional marketing firm, was on campus as part of an effort to supplement our current marketing strategies. Georgia Southern has changed a great deal over recent years, and we need to consider how, in fact, we project ourselves into the student marketplace. This effort is primarily aimed at attracting students to Georgia Southern. We need to figure out whether there are some things that we have not been paying attention to that we need to pay attention to. He mentioned that there are differences among the current millennium generation, the x-ers, and the boomers. Georgia Southern will work with this firm to get our message to certain segments of the student population.

Dr. Grube alluded to our competition with other academic institutions for the same students. He referred specifically to a Georgia State University billboard near Statesboro. He added that, as the quality of our students has improved, “it has become a more competitive marketplace for us.” The marketing group is working primarily with admissions and recruiting staff. In addition, “several faculty are being pulled into focus groups, and [so are] some of our students and others.”

Athletics:

Now that the RAC is open, we will close the pool in Hanner. The pool area will become space for instruction, research, and offices in the College of Health & Human Sciences (CHHS). There are three gyms in the Hanner complex. The old Hanner gym will become a venue for our women’s volleyball team. This will allow the team to practice without competing with the basketball team in scheduling. Another gym, which is currently occupied by CHHS researchers, will then become classroom space and a multipurpose activity area for our students. We intend, too, to raze the women’s softball building, which is in very, very bad shape. Improvements will address issues related to the building, restrooms, the announcers’ area, the stands, and drainage.

Paulson Stadium:

Work on the concourse areas of Paulson will begin soon. The concourse on the home side of the field will be renovated first. If cost allows, renovation will also begin on the visitors' concourse.

Georgia Southern's Baseball Team:

Dr. Grube announced that, the previous weekend, the GSU baseball team had "whupped up on" Georgia Tech twice for the first time in a long time. He asked that Chris Geyerman (NCAA Athletic Representative) pass his congratulations on to Sam Baker (Director of Athletics) and the University Athletics Committee.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, asked if there were questions for Dr. Grube. There were none.

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

Requests for Information (RFI):

- One from Trent Maurer asked about making faculty salaries more competitive at the doctoral/research university level. Humphrey explained that, while Carnegie may say that GSU is a doctoral/research university, the Board of Regents still says that GSU is a regional comprehensive university. It is the BOR that allocates money. GSU administrators "are working very diligently on trying to convince the Board of Regents that we do desire and need and deserve more money, but we'll have to wait for the end of the legislative session [for] that." She reported that the faculty salary survey is still in progress; Dr. Bleicken anticipated a report in a couple of weeks.

Bruce Grube (President) commented that, "Once you subtract out the research universities, we look really pretty good. But I would really like to see those salaries go up as well as you would." He reported that "the University has actually added into the percentage that has been allocated to us each year on the faculty side, and we will do that again this year, too. So while the paper may say this was the average, that won't be the average actually here at Georgia Southern." He added that the administration does not make big announcements generally about this sort of information.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee, added that, in regard to salary, Dr. Grube and certain deans have been trying to as they can "bump people up somewhat."

- Another RFI from Steve Damelin asked about involvement with ScienceDirect. According to information from Sonya Shepherd and the Library Committee, this is a major budget item. Getting ScienceDirect would cost roughly an additional \$65,000 a year for current Elsevier subscriptions to journals. Subscribing to all titles would cost approximately \$115,000 a year. Shepherd reminded senators that Henderson Library has added Web of Science and SciFinder Scholar finder databases.
- A Request for Information and a motion from David Robinson addressed the new University web-site design. Humphrey reported that the design had been presented to

the Strategic Planning Council, Enrollment Management Council, and so on. Marketing & Communications really drives this web-site design; the goal is attracting students to it. She reported that Stephen Ward (Director of Marketing and Communications) would talk with the Enrollment Management Council about the possibility of a web council to advise them about design of the web pages. However, such a council would involve only a small number of faculty members. Humphrey announced that Ward planned to attend this meeting of the Faculty Senate.

- Robert Costomiris asked about grade reporting within 48 hours. Humphrey reported that both Connie Murphey of Financial Aid and Mike Deal, the Registrar, are rather lax about enforcing that 48 hours after each exam rule until it comes to 48 hours after the last exam, at which point grade processing begins in earnest. Staff in the Office of the Registrar try to double-check grades as they are entered during the week of final examinations, so that they can hopefully contact a professor who may have missed submitting a grade for any student(s).
- One from Kathleen Comerford asked why faculty are paid at the end of the month except in May and December and why they are not paid over a twelve-month pay cycle instead of a ten-paycheck cycle. Humphrey responded on behalf of Vice President for Business and Finance Joe Franklin that the ten-month pay cycle is not policy. However, it has been practiced since 1998, when GSU converted to the semester system. He added:
 1. Some faculty leave Statesboro in early December and early May after the end of final examinations, and they would like to receive their paycheck before they go.
 2. Franklin prefers paying people on a twelve-month cycle because he gets to hold out part of their paycheck each month. He plans to discuss this request at a meeting of the Chief Business Officers.
- Richard Flynn asked about the report of the Ad Hoc Committee for Student Evaluations. That report has been posted.

Agenda Item Requests:

Humphrey announced three Requests for Agenda Items:

- One from David Robinson of CLASS requested restoring a link to the library on the main Georgia Southern web page. The SEC had placed this item on the agenda; however, the SEC had decided to limit debate on the motion to fifteen minutes.
- One requested dissolution of the Ad Hoc committee on Student Evaluations and transfer of all matters currently before that committee to the Faculty Welfare Committee.
- A motion requested improving or changing the academic calendar to make the last weeks of the Fall Semester more academically viable.

At this point, Humphrey reminded senators that, very shortly, they would be approached by their college elections committees about trying to encourage colleagues to participate in shared governance

by running for various committees and for the Faculty Senate for next year. She recommended specifically that current senators talk to their colleagues about the need for senators and alternates. She offered the example of CLASS, which has 15 senators, but only two alternates. She reminded senators that, between three-year terms, they may not serve on the Senate for a year. Instead, she suggested that current senators who will rotate off the Senate consider placing their names in nomination for committees.

Humphrey asked if there were any questions about the SEC report.

David Robinson (CLASS) thought that the response presented on behalf of Stephen Ward raised more questions than it answered about the new web-site design. Specifically, the examples of opportunities for faculty input were the Strategic Planning Council (SPC), the Enrollment Management Council, the Marketing and Communications Council, and the President's Cabinet. He wondered how many total faculty members, without administrative posts, are involved in all those committees together. He asked if any senators "fed into that web-site design."

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, stated that there had been significant discussion in the SPC.

Jerry Wilson (COBA and SPC) reported that Ward had made a presentation about the new web design. He added that SPC members had "spent a good bit of time in a two-hour session asking [Ward] questions and making recommendations, and about half the makeup of the SPC is faculty, so I would consider that faculty input."

David Robinson (CLASS) expressed his concern that, on the web site, "there is no item that actually represents the academic interests of the faculty and the actual user community within the university here." He did not understand why the Senate would not have the responsibility ultimately to oversee issues such as this and added that, in general, we really need to reassess how these decisions are made: "Marketing has its prerogatives, and that's wonderful, but it's perfectly possible to balance those against the academic mission and the usability by people here in the university community."

Clara Krug (CLASS) reminded senators of an e-mail message related to David Robinson's RFI from Candy Schille (CLASS and SPC) on the Senate Listserv on February 8, 2007, 10:28 a.m. It stated, "I was at the SPC meeting where this was presented. I say presented, rather than discussed, since (like so many matters brought before the SEC, at least in my opinion) the revision of the website(s) seemed to be handled as an information item, rather than a matter on which our input was requested." Jerry Wilson (COBA and SPC) responded that that email from Schille elicited a flurry between him and Schille. After reviewing Jayne Perkins Brown's minutes of that particular meeting, he had decided that "there were a number of parts of that discussion that both Candy and I forgot." He reminded senators that minutes of SPC meetings are available on the web site. He encouraged senators to read the SPC minutes to find out what that group does. He added that there had been "a great deal of discussion about the web site."

Norman Schmidt (COST and SPC) agreed with Wilson that there was discussion. Whether Marketing and Communications was there just to present the web site to the SPC and how much they were there looking for input, he couldn't say.

Ming Fang He (COE and SPC) remembered that, when the plan for the web site design was presented to the SPC, "We did have a very heated discussion, and we had some suggestions for the changes, and

I did see some change occur afterwards. Still, I guess, it's a work in progress, and I appreciate that they make the effort to do some changes." She specified "two big issues" about the web site:

1. The "modification aspect" of the web site. Do you want to make education really become business mo-jo?
2. The lack of ethnic diversity. The first time that they (Marketing and Communications) presented it to the SPC, most of the pictures featured on the web site were white teachers/ white professors teaching students. It was very mono-ethnic. At that time, He mentioned this concern and emphasized that GSU is not supposed to advocate segregation. She noted that this aspect of the web site has now changed in some respects. He continued: "I would like to advocate for more attention to that aspect because, when people across the world access our web site, this is the first image they are going to see about Georgia Southern." She added that it has a lot to do with our ideology level, about how much attention we want to pay to recruiting a diverse student body, faculty, and staff.

David Robinson (CLASS) advocated inclusiveness in designing or revising the design of a web site. He added that some colleagues have strong objections to the aesthetic qualities of the site. He recommended that Marketing and Communications staff have focus groups that include not only "the three-quarters of people who by their statistics are outsiders accessing the site, but also ... the one-quarter who are people inside the university community using that site. There shouldn't just be focus groups looking at students out there who are actually fictitious students ... prospective students. There should also be focus groups and usability studies for people inside the university using this site. This is a working site. It is not a billboard. It can be both, but, at this point, I think that there's been a lapse in understanding the full importance of the site to the community here."

There was no additional discussion.

6. Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Geyerman distributed a handout that included the Fall 2006 Grade Point Average (GPA) Report for student athletes and a Summary of the Graduation Success Rate Report (1996-1999) for student athletes. In one column, the GPA Report included the average by sport. For comparison purposes, in a column to the right, it included the average by sport for the fall of 2005, and then the difference in the averages, expressed in terms of plus or minus the number of decimal points. Almost all of GSU's team averages have improved from the fall of 2005. The exceptions are men's basketball (-0.17) and men's soccer (-0.12). The overall GPA for the women (2.99) is, for all practical purposes, a B average. For the men, it is 2.47. He congratulated the women tennis players, whose team average was 3.45.

GSU has nominated Heather Reynolds for a Southern Conference Graduate Scholarship. She earned her bachelors degree in three years with a 3.97 GPA. She is in her fourth year of eligibility right now, while studying for a master's degree in business administration and earning an A average. GSU will learn more the about the results when the committee meets during the Southern Conference basketball tournament.

There were no questions about the GPA information. Geyerman proceeded to the Graduation Success Rate (GSR) data, which included both GSU's rate and the federal rate. These rates are calculated by

different percentages. He explained that, if a student leaves one institution after a couple of years (for example, the University of GA) and transfers (for example, to GSU), it hurts the first institution's (UGA) federal rate. However, it doesn't hurt the GSR rate. Information on the handout included the GSR's and the federal rates for both men and women in sports that we play. He added the following information, which did not appear on the handout. Overall, the 1999-2000 GSR for all students was 41%; for student-athletes it was 54%. The four-class average for that cohort was 38% for all students and 52% for student-athletes. The student-athlete GSR for GSU this past time was 72%, which places GSU at "the top of the list last year." There were no questions for Geyerman.

7. Report from Norman Schmidt (COST), SPC Representative: Schmidt reported that, currently, the SPC is updating wording of the Level I plan. The focus of the Level I plan will be unchanged: "GSU is committed to becoming a nationally recognized university." The SPC is meeting with the various vice presidents to see how the implementation of the Level II plan is occurring within each of their areas. Discussions are underway regarding how our change in status to a doctoral university will affect Level II plans. SPC members are considering setting up a web page to help inform faculty of what it means to be a doctoral institution. There were no questions for Schmidt.

Jerry Wilson (COBA and SPC) thanked Schmidt for serving as SPC apprentice. He then stated that he would like the Senate to reconsider the term length of the SPC representative. The current three-year term means that only a first-year senator may serve. He suggested a one-year term, which would allow more faculty members to become involved in the SPC. He added that serving on the SPC involves quite a time commitment: meeting for two hours twice a month, reading and studying volumes of material between meetings.

8. Motion, Dissolution of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Evaluations, Ron MacKinnon (CIT) for Leslie Furr (CHHS), Attachment: Senate Ad-Hoc Committee Minutes of April 24, 2006 Meeting: MacKinnon moved that the Ad Hoc Committee for Student Evaluations be dissolved. Prior to the dissolution, he suggested that all matters currently before the Ad Hoc Committee be transferred to the Faculty Welfare Committee for resolution. The motion was seconded. Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, asked if there were any discussion.

David Robinson (CLASS) who was serving on the ad hoc committee, requested background information.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator replied that, in November 2006, when the SEC met, members determined that oversight of student evaluations is in the purview of the Faculty Welfare Committee, which has not had to conduct much business for the last year-and-a-half or so. The ad hoc committee was formed for the primary purpose of investigating proposed on-line student evaluations. Apparently, on-line evaluations are no longer used. Members were also going to conduct focus group sessions on uses and understanding of the current instrument for student evaluations. No focus groups met. So, the ad hoc committee has served its purpose. The SEC would like to refer the matter to the standing committee that has student evaluations in its purview.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, asked if there were additional discussion. There was none. The motion was approved.

9. Motion, Improving the GSU Academic Calendar, Maggie LaMontagne (COE) for Lorne Wolfe (COST): LaMontagne read the following motion, which the SEC had amended for clarity: "I

move that we modify the GSU academic calendar to make the end of the fall semester more effective by giving two full weeks of class after Thanksgiving and moving spring semester back one week. This effectively moves the entire calendar back one week from what is currently proposed.” The motion was seconded.

Tim Giles (CLASS) did not see this motion as addressing the problem with Fall Semester. He thinks that the problem is not having a break about half way through. He stated that, at Thanksgiving, GSU has one more day off compared to other states where he has lived and taught. He asked about the possibility of a Monday or Tuesday off about half way through semester.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, answered that, last year, members of the Calendar Committee had discussed that option; however, they were told that it was not possible.

Mary Hadley (CLASS) spoke in favor of a longer Thanksgiving Break. She stated that she has no difficulty preparing for final exams, etc., when we come back from Thanksgiving. Every year, some students tell her that she is the only teacher “holding classes on those days” (the Monday and Tuesday of Thanksgiving Week). Those who travel during Thanksgiving Week could avoid expensive airfares. She did not understand why people would advocate pushing back [the end of Fall Semester] a whole week.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, mentioned the concern that Thanksgiving Week has two days of class, and then, the way the calendar has been shaped lately, the next week we have four days of class, not a full week, because we have Friday off as a study day. So, in some cases, it effectively means that a faculty member needs to be through teaching material before Thanksgiving. There is also a question about how many of our students actually use that Friday as a study day before final exams.

Norman Schmidt (COST and SPC) recalled when GSU cancelled classes because of Hurricane Floyd and then, two or three weeks later, had a fall break over Thursday and Friday. And then later in the semester we had cancelled Thursday and Friday classes again for Thanksgiving break. Any classes that were like laboratories that met only on Thursday and Friday were totally disrupted. He could see some value to taking a full week off at Thanksgiving. However, he believes that we need two full weeks of classes after Thanksgiving so that students don't forget everything they have learned and then return for final exams.

Mary Hadley (CLASS) responded that, if GSU had a full week off at Thanksgiving, she would have no problem coming back for two weeks in December and then coming back maybe a week later in January.

Clara Krug (CLASS) advocated that, if GSU does have a full week off at Thanksgiving, then, in order to help with another issue, the 48-hour reporting period after final exams, we somehow change final exam week. She reminded senators that, before we converted to semesters in 1998, we had a five-day exam week, and faculty taught a maximum of three classes. So faculty had five days in which to give three exams. Now that some faculty, at least, have four classes, we have 33 1/3% more students, but we have only four days of exams. So we have more exams in fewer days. That makes it more difficult to complete grading of the exams and the entire course for all students within a 48-hour period.

Ellen Hendrix (CLASS) spoke in support of a one-week Thanksgiving break. She remembered that, the year we had the fall break scheduled in October, it accomplished absolutely nothing. Students who

lived far away couldn't plan a trip home. That is also one of the problems that they face now with Thanksgiving. A longer break at Thanksgiving might also give faculty some time to start averaging grades before coming back for two weeks.

Bruce Grube (President) asked if taking the full week of Thanksgiving off was part of the motion.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, answered that this option was in the rationale; however, it wasn't in the motion per se.

Bruce Grube (President) asked if the calendar is currently mapped out so that we could all see what we are talking about.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, presented a time line for Fall Semester 2007: The academic year begins August 6th, classes begin August 13th, August 13th through 16 is drop/add, September 3rd is Labor Day, November 21st- 23rd is Thanksgiving break, November 29th is the last day of classes, November 30th is reading day, and December 3rd through 6th is final exams. December 7th is commencement. The proposal stated would be to move the whole schedule back a week. She stated that someone might amend the motion to include the full week of Thanksgiving as a break.

Norman Schmidt (COST) reminded senators that the rationale discusses a full week off during Thanksgiving, but that the amendment by the SEC does not reflect it.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, responded that the full week off was not reflected in the original motion.

Ellen Hendrix (CLASS) had a question. If we do have the whole week of Thanksgiving off, is a reading day necessary, or might we move to a five-day exam period to help us out when it does come to averaging grades and submitting those grades within the 48 hours?

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, reminded everybody that the Registrar's Office says they are lenient until it comes to 48 hours after the last final exam.

Clara Krug (CLASS) offered that, if you have four final exams at the very end of the week, you are still grading the first two when you give the last two on the last day.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS and NCAA) said that he was not making a statement about this motion in particular, but he does think it applies to a lot of motions: He would like to see evidence that a problem actually exists before we try to solve it. He had not seen anything other than anecdotal evidence, someone saying that it makes it hard at the end of the semester from a faculty point of view. What do students think about it? He had not seen any evidence that a problem exists.

Mary Hadley (CLASS) agreed with Geyerman. She added that she would like to change the motion to put forward that we have the whole week of Thanksgiving off and, "if the powers that be" feel that for whatever reason the students do need a bit more time, that instead of finishing around December 7th, we would finish a week later. .

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, asked if Hadley offered that as an amendment.

Mary Hadley (CLASS) responded that she did.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, requested a second to the amendment. There was a second. She asked Hadley to state her amendment clearly. Hadley asked Humphrey to repeat the original motion. Humphrey did: "I move that we modify the GSU academic calendar to make the end of the fall semester more effective by giving two full weeks of class after Thanksgiving and moving spring semester back one week. This effectively moves the entire calendar back one week from what is currently proposed."

Mary Hadley (CLASS) amended the motion to include "two full weeks of class after Thanksgiving, but that we would have the entire week of Thanksgiving." Humphrey asked "a full week of Thanksgiving break?" Hadley concurred.

Maggie LaMontagne (COE), who had offered the original motion read the amended motion: "That we modify the GSU academic calendar to make the end of the fall semester more effective by giving two full weeks of class after a full week of Thanksgiving break and moving spring semester back one week." The amended motion was seconded.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS and NCAA) mentioned a sentence that he had heard at a recent NCAA Convention in relation to some legislation proposed without thinking it through: "Oh, those were the unintended consequences." He referred to the current amended motion. If we change Fall Semester, it is going to affect how Spring Semester is changed in 2008. Then that is going to affect summer of 2008, which is going to affect fall of 2008, which is going to affect spring 2009. He would prefer actually seeing what such a calendar would look like.

Bruce Grube (President) had two comments:

1. How would moving the Spring Semester back one week make for a more effective Fall Semester?
2. For those of you who were out in Paulson Stadium later in May, the first time we had commencement, you may want to think about the fact that commencement being in early May is a good thing. And if Spring Semester gets pushed back, "a lot of you are going to look like hot dogs before we are through."

Clara Krug (CLASS) had assumed that, if any change took place, it would take place in 2008, academic year, not 2007 because we already advertised on our web site our dates are for fall. She thought that it was too late to change the 2007 calendar.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator asked if the Senate should refer the proposed revision to the Calendar Committee.

Norman Schmidt (COST) made a motion to table the amended motion.

Clara Krug (CLASS) spoke against referring the proposed revision to the Calendar Committee. As a former member of that committee, she stated that then-Provost Vandergrift had approved a template for the calendar that was to last for a number of years, with only adjustments for dates. She expressed concern that, if the proposal was referred to the committee, there would not be true shared governance as stated in the Faculty Handbook in deciding whether or not to approve and implement it: "Shared governance involves faculty and administration participating mutually in the development of policies

at the departmental, college, and University levels” (p. 19). She emphasized the word “mutually.” She thought that faculty would be invited to discuss, but the deal would already be done, a *fait accompli*. Faculty might then wait another ten years to hear about calendar revisions again. She suggested that, at some point, we get the proposal back to the faculty.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) stated that this hurt her feelings because, just as faculty have some concerns about the lives of students and what happens with students at the end of the semester, she does, too. And so when this proposal came from Lorne Wolfe, she talked with him about it, and she thought that it wasn't a bad idea. She asked that no one assume that she would dismiss the idea because it had come from a faculty member.

Clara Krug (CLASS) interjected that she had not said that it would be dismissed because it came from a faculty member.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) stated, “You came close.”

Clara Krug (CLASS) repeated that she had not.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) continued: “Anyway, but the point is I think that we really do try to consider the needs, not only of the faculty, when we look at the calendar, but the students as well. And this is one that really does, if I recall the spirit in which Lorne proposed this, ... really had primarily to do with the students and their learning process and what happens to them at the end of the semester. So, in that spirit ... I would think that the Calendar Committee would consider this very seriously. Thank you.”

Bruce Grube (President) reminded Krug that, in 1999-2000, one of the things that she had said to him was that the Calendar Committee consisted of about 19 people, 16 of whom were administrators. He told her that, as a result, administrators had restructured that committee so that there would be good faculty representation on it.

Clara Krug (CLASS): “Great. I am glad to hear that.”

Bruce Grube (President) asked Krug if she could explain how moving back the spring semester for one week helps us to have a more effective fall semester.

Clara Krug (CLASS) responded that she had not proposed that. She did not know if she would vote in favor of a calendar that would start later and go longer into the spring. What she had proposed was that, regardless of what we might decide, we have a longer time to decide it, meaning that we would think in terms of 2008, instead of 2007, and that faculty would be involved. Alluding to reconfiguration of the Calendar Committee, she stated that she was really glad that there is greater representation of faculty. In regard to this proposal, faculty ought to be really “mutually” involved in a decision (as on page 19 of the Faculty Handbook).

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, reminded senators that there was a motion on the floor to table this motion. She asked if there were additional discussion.

One senator asked when the Faculty Senate might reconsider the motion if it were tabled.

Bob Cook (CIT), Senate Parliamentarian, that it would be tabled until someone moved to take it off the

table.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, asked if there were further discussion. There was none. The motion passed with one objection. The amended motion was table.

10. Motion, Restoring a visible link to the library on www.georgiasouthern.edu, David Robinson, (CLASS): Robinson read his motion: “That the Senate petition the university Web master to restore a prominent, visible hyperlink to the Henderson Library on the university home page, www.georgiasouthern.edu.” Stephen Ward had told Robinson that models were referred to in removing or what seems to be hiding the library link. Robinson had then checked a number of college/university web sites at random to see if they have top-level links to the library: Harvard, Berkeley, Chicago, UGA, Appalachian State, George Mason, UCLA, University of Washington, and Armstrong Atlantic. They all have prominent, top-level, unburied library links, which reinforced his thinking that it is appropriate to have a link to the central academic library, both symbol and tool, at the university on the main page.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, reminded Robinson that someone needed to second his motion before discussion began. The motion was seconded.

David Robinson (CLASS) continued that he had tried to use the library through the web site, but that he couldn't find it. It was hidden under a couple of layers, and it was ambiguously named on the left-hand sidebar. On the top bar under the logo, there are links to My.GeorgiaSouthern, Campus Tour, Directory, News & Events, Majors, Calendar, Human Resources, and University Store. The University Store is there because the university wants to make money, but it certainly is not justified as a recruitment tool for students. That could easily be down on the left-hand side. So there are one or two links that could be removed, and one academically oriented one could be added on the top bar.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, invited discussion.

Ellen Hendrix (CLASS) agreed wholeheartedly. She would also like to see the Office of the Registrar featured.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, asked for additional discussion. There was none. The motion passed.

Onyile Onyile (CLASS) asked what would happen as a result of the motion.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, replied that the Senate has asked the Web master to put a link to the library on the home page.

Onyile Onyile (CLASS) added that, aesthetically, the web page needs a lot of help.

David Robinson (CLASS) agreed and suggested that the Senate might propose another motion to set up a process for reviewing the site from a faculty perspective and include aesthetics.

11. Unfinished Business

None.

12. New Business

None.

13. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Linda Bleicken (Provost) agreed with President Grube that it is nice to hear that our SACS Reaffirmation is “over.” However, between now and our next SACS reaffirmation, we need to tend to the “Quality Enhancement Plan.” SACS will be coming back about 2009-2010 to review our progress on that. She suggested that senators visit the SACS web site to find out details. One of the centerpieces really is our First-Year Experience, and for that reason GSU has spent a fair amount of time this year with the “First-Year Experience Task Force,” which is made up totally of faculty. And one of the resolutions that Bleicken has made is that, for the next chair of a SACS Reaffirmation, we really have positioned the university in such a way that we have evidence that shows the quality of everything we do. It is one thing for us to say that we have quality programs, which we do; it is another thing to adequately show that quality. She thanked those present who had worked very hard on the SACS Reaffirmation. This was a campus-wide effort that involved many faculty, and also many of our personnel from other divisions as well.

Bleicken said, too, that we need to acknowledge the fact that our Doctor of Public Health degree was approved by the Board of Regents in January and that is a great step forward in the accreditation process of the Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health.

Patricia Humphrey (COST), Senate Moderator, asked if there were questions for Dr. Bleicken. There were none. There were no announcements from other Vice Presidents.

14. Announcements from the Floor

None.

15. Adjournment: 5:19 p.m.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be held March 28, 2007, 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., in the Russell Union Ballroom, and will reconvene, if necessary, March 29, 2007, 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., in the Russell Union Ballroom.



**Georgia Southern University
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
March 28, 2007
4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Russell Union Ballroom**

REVISED

9:34 am, Nov 13, 2008

2006-2007 Senate Executive Committee: Patricia Humphrey (COST), Chair; Ron MacKinnon (CIT), Marc Cyr (CLASS), Bill Wells (COBA), Donna Saye (COST), Robert Vogel (JPHCOPH), Sonya Shepherd (LIB), Marilyn Bruce (President's Office) Senate Liaison, Clara Krug (CLASS) Senate Secretary,

Voting Members in Attendance: Frank Atuahene, Barry Balleck, Scott Beck, Marc Cyr, Nirmal Das, Tim Giles, Mary Hadley, Ming Fang He, Ellen Hendrix, Patricia Humphrey, James Klein, Clara Krug, Ron MacKinnon, (Lisa Yocco for Bruce McLean), Mary Marwitz, Kent Murray, Michael Nielsen, Patrick Novotny, Constantin Ogloblin, Michael Reksulak, Donna Saye, Candy Schille, Norman Schmidt, Alison Scott, Sonya Shepherd, Diana Sturges, Brenda Talley, Robert Vogel, Mark Welford, Bill Wells, Jerry Wilson, (Bob Jackson for Mark Yanochik).

Voting Members Absent: Steve Damelin, Les Furr, Terry Diamanduros, Godfrey Gibbison, Beverly Graham, Margaret LaMontagne, Michele Davis McGibony, John Nauright, Broderick Oluyede, Onyile Onyile, David Robinson, Charles Skewis, T. Maria Smith, Patricia Walker, Patrick Wheaton, Jim Whitworth,

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube, President; Linda Bleicken, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Joe Franklin, Vice President for Business and Finance; Teresa Thompson, Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management; Billy Griffis, Vice President for University Advancement; Marilyn Bruce, Executive Assistant to the President; Jane Rhoades Hudak (CLASS), Sandra Nettles (COGS); Bret Danilowicz (COST); Bede Mitchell (LIB); Gary Means (CE&PS).

Senate Parliamentarian: Bob Cook.

SPC Representative: Jerry Wilson.

SPC Apprentice: Norman Schmidt.

SGA Representative: Kelsey Grubbs.

Visitors: Candace Griffith, Mike Deal, Amy Heaston, Dick Diebolt.

Senate Moderator Patricia Humphrey called the meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 4:00 p.m. She called senators' attention to the attendance sheets on the table next to their name plates

and asked that each alternate sign the attendance sheet next to the name of the senator for whom he/she was substituting. She asked that all speakers identify themselves and their college affiliation before speaking.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the March 28, 2007, Meeting: Patricia Humphrey (COST)

Senate Moderator: Humphrey announced that there were two corrections to the agenda. Chris Geyerman would not be presenting an NCAA report, nor would there be a Strategic Planning Council report. Humphrey requested a motion to approve the revised agenda. It was moved and seconded. *The revised agenda was approved unanimously.*

2. Approval of the [February 15, 2007](#), Minutes: Clara Krug (CLASS) Senate Secretary:

Krug moved that the minutes be approved. Her motion was seconded. *The minutes were approved unanimously.*

3. Librarian's Report of [March 23, 2007](#): Bill Wells for Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) Senate Librarian:

Wells moved that the report be approved. His motion was seconded. Humphrey reminded senators that, by accepting the report, they were accepting the record of the various meetings.

Clara Krug (CLASS) had a question about page 21, the report of the Academic Advisory Council meeting of February 27, the enrollment report made by Mike Deal, the final sentence: "Students are being encouraged to see their instructors and advisors before they make decisions about dropping classes." Krug wondered what the procedure is for encouraging them, and then what the procedure is for determining the success of the procedures of encouragement.

Amy Heaston (Provost's office) responded for the administration: "There was some common language drafted so that our academic advisors out of the Advisement Centers can share that with students, if they are considering withdrawing from a course. The reason for that is many of our students withdraw from classes, and they have not carefully considered all the information to make that decision. And we felt that it was important that they take that opportunity to talk first with their instructor who has the most information and then as a backup their academic advisor. What we're doing right now, since we've just started with the common language, is the advisement centers are tracking the number of students who are actually withdrawing from courses, and to see what types of things they've done before they've taken that step."

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: There were no additional questions. *The Librarian's Report was approved unanimously.*

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Donna Saye (COST): At the February 20th meeting, the Undergraduate Committee approved new courses, some revisions and deletions, and program changes for the College of Education. All changes were necessary to meet the Georgia Department of Education's Certification Requirements, as well as the Board of Regents' requirements. The committee also approved courses and some revisions for the Physics Department in the College of Science and Technology.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked if there any questions or discussion of the Undergraduate Committee's recommendations. There were none. She reminded everyone that approval of the Undergraduate Committee report means that we approve all course and curriculum changes recommended by the Committee and are forwarding those recommendations to the Provost and President for further approval. *The Undergraduate Report was approved unanimously.*

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Ming Fang He (COE) reported a request from the College of Business Administration to withdraw the Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) proposal from the agenda. The first portion of the meeting on February 22, 2007, had been a half-hour discussion of Graduate Education at Georgia Southern University:

- The Fall Semester graduate enrollment data over a three-year period by college and degree programs was presented to the committee, and a graph of applications received per month for each admission term from 2002-2007 was presented at the meeting.
- The Carnegie classification of Georgia Southern's new status was distributed because a lot of people didn't know what it was about. Concerns about administrative support, funding, and academic standards in relation to this new classification were raised at the meeting.
- Concerns about how grants should help faculty members to make the promotion from associate to full professor were raised. The committee also decided to set aside a one-hour session each time to discuss ways to help elevate the status of the university.
- The committee also approved changes in seven CIT courses.
- The committee also approved changes in the M.Ed. in Counselor Education Program.
- The campus interview schedules for the candidates for the Dean of the College of Graduate Studies were distributed to the committee. The committee members were invited to attend the meetings and forums and ask questions.
- It was announced at the Graduate Committee meeting that Graduate Student Appreciation Week would start the week of April 2. There are a lot of details about Graduate Student Appreciation Week. They are available at the Graduate School's web site.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked if there were questions.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked a procedural question. She wondered about the use of passive voice.

Ming Fang He (COE) Co-Chair, Graduate Committee, stated that, because this is an abbreviated report, it is brief; but in the minutes, there is information about those who raised the issue.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked if there is information about actual names related to remarks.

Ming Fang He (COE) responded that such information exists.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked if this information is posted.

Ming Fang He (COE) responded that they are not posted in this Senate report.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked if they are posted on the University Web Site.

Ming Fang He (COE) answered that details of who raised what issues are available on the web site of the Graduate School. The minutes are also there.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked about page 4, the first bullet, “A Carnegie classification of Georgia Southern's new status was distributed. Concerns about administrative support, funding, and academic standards in relation to this new classification were raised.” She wondered what concerns, specifically, were raised.

Ming Fang He (COE) responded that there are a lot of concerns. At each meeting, members will spend time to discuss one issue only, for example, faculty promotion, facilities, financial support.

Clara Krug (CLASS) requested follow-up. She asked if He was saying that, in subsequent sets of minutes of the Graduate Committee meetings, there would be, in a sort of itemized fashion, indications of what the discussion was about — promotion, given the new status; facilities; strengths; the graduate assistants, and financial support. Ming Fang He (COE) responded in the affirmative.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked about bullet #2, on the same page, page 4: “Concerns about how grants would help faculty make the promotion from associate to full professor were raised. The committee decided to set aside a one-hour session to discuss ways to help elevate the status of the university.” She had a question about elevating the status of the university and its relationship to the grants.

Ming Fang He (COE) stated that the committee is trying to think about moving up to a doctoral research institution.

Clara Krug (CLASS) reiterated that her question was about the relationship of the elevation of the status and grants. She was trying to see the connection between that specific point — concerns about how the grants would help, and then helping elevate the status — how that was associated with the grants, specifically, because it had come up at a subsequent meeting also of the Graduate Committee, on page 5, the final paragraph, about the grants and the promotions.

Mary Hadley (CLASS) offered that she serves on the Graduate Committee. She remembered that one consideration of the new classification was for promotion, how much weight would be given to writing a grant, and whether this [grant writing] is going to be something that we need to do more of with the new classification. The Graduate Committee is going to look at comparable universities to find out the money amount of grants that we would be expected to raise.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Krug asked if the wording meant that elevating the status of the university would mean that, in order to be among the upper echelon of our peer and aspirant institutions, we would need to generate a certain amount of extramural funding. Ming Fang HE (COE) stated that she sees the connection. Mary Marwitz (CLASS) offered that the question is the relationship between promotion of faculty and the status of the university, and how those intersect, or whether they do. That grants might affect promotional procedure status, and maybe that grants might also affect the institution's status.

Mike Nielsen (CLASS) suggested that, if that discussion continues in earnest, the Senate should solicit campus-wide opinion. He is sure that such a session would be one of the more heavily attended ones ever seen on campus, if we're going to be expected to earn, well, there's the implication, earn so much money for the university in order to get whatever the next rank and promotion might be."

Ming Fang He (COE) stated that she would bring that to all the committee members. She thanked colleagues for their suggestions.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked if there was any other discussion of the Graduate Committee report. She reminded everyone that approval of the Graduate Committee's report means the Senate recommends all curriculum changes to move forward to the Provost and President for approval. *The Graduate Committee Report was approved.*

4. President's Report: Dr. Bruce Grube

Dr. Grube mentioned that he had distributed centennial pins and offered to give one to anyone who had not received one.

Board of Regents' Meeting on Campus

He reminded senators that the Board of Regents will meet in the Nessmith-Lane Building on April 17 and 18.

Library

He announced that the construction crew is putting the bricks on the older section of the Library that's being renovated. And, for the first time, you can kind of get a little bit of a glimpse of what this thing's going to look like when it's finished.

Art Department

Grube suggested that anyone near the Art Department take a look at the Fine Arts Building going up there. For the first time, you can get really a pretty clear picture of what the architecture of that building's going to look like.

Centennial Celebration

He reminded senators of the Centennial Celebration the following Friday on Sweetheart Circle. He stated that it would be a real family occasion and that everything would be free of charge: food, drinks, things for kids to do. A lot of departments planned to have exhibits, and at 8:00 or darkness, there would be a terrific fire works show.

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

Humphrey announced that, since the last meeting, the President had approved all motions passed at the last meeting.

In regard to the University web page, the Technology Advisory Group that used to exist will be reconstituted during the upcoming academic year. This group last acted during 2004-2005, was comprised of faculty from across the campus, and was chaired by former Chief Information Officer Lisa Spence. And during that year, the group evaluated approaches or suggested improvements in a number of important areas, including WINGS, the Wireless Master Plan, Spam/anti-virus software, etc. The group will act as an advisory panel to the University Web page in the future.

Requests for Information/Agenda Item Request

She presented three requests for information and one agenda item request.

Clara Krug requested that the Senate endorse requiring that all students receive a flu shot during Fall Semester. Basically, the idea was that, if they get the shot, they won't get the flu. The SEC declined to schedule that request for an agenda item because the Director of Health Services indicated that, among other things, the flu immunization is not required by the state. Since it's not required, we most likely couldn't require it. In addition, in cases where there are vaccine shortages, such as a couple of years ago, our students are specifically seen in the group that is most unlikely to be seriously affected by the flu. We also recognize that GSU does currently encourage students to get the flu shot when it's available, either at the Fall Wellness Fair or through Health Services.

- There was a request for information from Kathleen Comerford about whether the list of peer and aspirational institutions has been updated. Jayne Perkins Brown is looking into the list, and she will be reporting back to us later.
- There was a request from Clara Krug, somewhat in response to some miscommunication about a proposed policy for deleting students who don't attend the first day of class, which has come back to us. It was discussed in Deans' Council as a draft, which, according to Dr. Bleicken, was also intended to come before the Senate before

implementation. There are still a lot of questions about the proposed policy to be answered, and the SEC decided to place this as a discussion item on today's agenda. We may then make a motion to endorse it, to say we don't endorse it, whatever. The SEC declined to make a motion one way or another. Humphrey stated that she and Mike Deal (Registrar) had discussed the policy the previous Monday and that they had discussed questions raised during a prior SEC meeting. She presented the following information regarding the waitlist:

- Individual departments will be the ones who decide what classes may have a waitlist or may not, and how many seats might exist on the waitlist, if it does exist.
- When a class is full, students will register for a waitlist in the same way they currently register for a regular class. They won't be allowed to register for a waitlist for a class in which they're already registered for a different section, or for a class that has a time conflict.

Furthermore, students who are not waitlisted will not be allowed to register for a course that has people on a waitlist.

- Students with legitimate reasons for missing the first day of class will be filling out a form on **My.GeorgiaSouthern** on or before the first day of class to try to signal that, yes, they are planning on coming. Mike Deal did confirm that trying to substantiate some reasons could become a problem. For example, what if the student says that he/she is sick, but doesn't submit the documentation?
 - Furthermore, the process to delete students will run only the first scheduled day for class, not every night. A proposed draft that was circulated with the agenda mentioned the twenty-four hour time limit for students to act on that notification.
 - In large classes signing in at WebCT would probably at least signal students' intent to participate in the class.
 - For large classes, the Registrar's Office has been investigating using scanners to scan IDs as students enter or leave a class. They would merely swipe their ID, and it would interact with the Attendance Verification form. So instructors of large classes wouldn't have to deal with attendance. The Registrar's Office will be working on further testing that this summer.
 - Humphrey and Deal also discussed the possibility, once initial Attendance Verification has been done, of changing the form online so that only the names of those students who hadn't yet been verified would show.
- The SEC received a request again from Kathleen Comerford about a follow-up after the fire in the Forest Drive Building on Monday, February 19th. She wanted to know when the last inspection was and why it was not online. Humphrey answered that she had

talked to both Dr. Song and Mr. Seel from the Occupational Health and Safety Office about it. It's the responsibility of the state, not Georgia Southern, to get buildings inspected for fire safety, and the state as per usual is behind because of staffing problems. The last full inspection was done on June 12, 2005, and at that time inspectors noted two problems. One was improper placement of some recycle bins, and one was a loose sprinkler escutcheon. The report also indicated that there was a follow-up inspection scheduled for 60 days later, which never happened. The last inspection report according to Dr. Song was removed from the Environmental Safety website because it was out-of-date, older than a year old. They are working with the state office to get back up to speed with inspections as required, and would be happy to talk with any faculty member or anyone having any questions or concerns about fire safety and environmental safety. On a related issue, Dr. Comerford asked about fire drills in the building. Dr. Song noted that he would love to have fire drills in academic buildings, but that it was at the request of the faculty years ago that those were suspended because faculty didn't want to have their classes interrupted. They are carried out regularly, however, in administrative buildings and the dorms.

Faculty Research Committee

John Nauright, Chair of the Faculty Research Committee, had contacted Humphrey by e-mail to let her know that the committee had met during the week to award the faculty research grants. Letters will be going out shortly. Members have also recommended the recipients of Awards for Excellence in Research and Scholarship, which Provost Linda Bleicken has accepted. In awarding research grants, they had many excellent applications, and unfortunately, not enough money to fund everyone. They had \$265,000 requested, and only \$100,000 available. There will be a full report in next month's Librarian's Report.



Humphrey asked if there were questions about the report.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked about the fire in the Forest Drive Building. He wondered if the Forest Drive Building has "gone beyond its freshness day" and if it is past the date when we should be using it.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator referred the question to Joe Franklin.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance) responded that, from what he could recall of the fire, it was not in the wiring of the building. It was a vent fan that had a problem. The wiring of the building itself is something that will be good for many, many years to come. It's done to a high standard. Things attached to that may or may not be. For example, a vent fan or a portable heater you might have in your office may not be up to a standard that the building wiring would be. He stated that, "We would be glad to look at that building for safety purposes, and it is looked at for safety purposes. The wiring, of course, is inside of a sleeve and you can't tell when it's going bad necessarily. But we'd be glad to have our Environmental Safety and our Physical Plant people to look at that building for safety reasons in general, and try to correct any deficiencies that are there, or [determine] if the building was indeed in fact not safe."

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator followed up by saying that she had heard some reports from different people that indicate that the roof really needs to be replaced and can't be.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance) was not aware of that. He stated that the university has replaced roofs on temporary buildings before, and that the Forest Drive Building is one of those temporary buildings that's probably going to be here for a while. He said that it is certainly better than some of our other temporary buildings, which are scheduled for demolition.

Clara Krug (CLASS) offered information about the roof. There are certain rooms that have accumulations of water and mold after any heavy rainfall, and those faculty who teach in those rooms have requested of Physical Plant that the roof be repaired. Faculty have been told that every time it rains, they need to report if there are panels that are holding water and showing mold because the roof cannot be repaired. There is something about the "pitch" of the roof in certain rooms, so the roof cannot be repaired. There are now places in the hallways that are apparently in the same situation. There are now trash cans, apparently donated from faculty offices because they are not the huge trash cans for recycling or garbage. When we have heavy rains, there is water going into the trash cans, rather than as when the first rain occurred having it form stains on the carpet which then retains mold as well. The long-term problem is that, if the insulation is not replaced at the same time as the tiles in the ceiling, the insulation retains the mold anyway. So anybody with an allergy to mold, and, apparently, there are many in Southeast Georgia, is affected by spending time in the Forest Drive Building.

Kent Murray (CLASS) added that, from his experience in a temporary building in Communication Arts, it may not be the roof, but the condensation drain lines in the air conditioning that clog up and create the humidity inside. However, the roof was replaced, and it helped.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance) offered to check into that problem and to try to come up with a solution for it.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if he would do that. Franklin responded, "Yes, we will."

There were no additional questions about the SEC Report.

6. Discussion Item: [Deleting Classes First Day for Non-Attendance, Attachment](#) **Dr. Linda Bleicken, Provost:** Bleicken distributed a handout that senators would need to use as a reference.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) corrected a statement that Humphrey had made earlier in the meeting. The report was that the policy was a draft, and, in fact, the policy has been on the table since it came to the Senate in February 2006. What was a draft was the implementation plan. And that was an implementation plan that was actually distributed at Deans' Council. That may have been inadvertently where some of the issue [about implementation] began because the draft implementation plan was apparently discussed in a couple of colleges, and it was mistakenly referred to as, in at least one case, as having been approved by Faculty Senate. Bleicken apologized if that was said because senators know that that was not in fact the case.

What Bleicken had distributed was the implementation plan. She stated that, in fact, in February 2006, the policy itself had been brought to Faculty Senate for a discussion, actually as an information item. She reminded senators that, in February of that year, “we had a very lively discussion about this policy, and, as a result of that discussion, the policy was sent back to the Enrollment Management Council, with a recommendation to do at least a couple of things.” One was to gather further input from both students and from faculty. To do that, a survey was developed and placed on WINGS. Faculty were invited to respond as well as students. Data were collected, and that data, the survey results, were made available to Pat Humphrey as Faculty Senate Moderator, to Bleicken, to the Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, to the President, and so forth. This policy came forward to the President’s Cabinet, was recommended for approval at that time, and was approved in June 2006. In 2006, at that June meeting, it was understood that the implementation plan “still had a lot of needs,” and so at that point, Mike Deal, Registrar, was asked to chair a committee that would look at how to prepare a smooth implementation plan. That particular committee was one that was “very operational in nature,” and that included people from Financial Aid, from the Business Office, the Dean of Students, a representative from the Provost’s office, and also a representative from Information Technology Services.

Mike Deal and his committee developed this implementation plan. It was presented to the Deans’ Council, and it was still in draft stage. Since Deal had been the one chairing this effort to develop a smooth implementation plan, Bleicken called upon him to speak. She mentioned that he had also been available in Tuesday’s Academic Advisory Council meeting, and that he had spoken about this plan there, too.

Mike Deal (Registrar) made the following presentation about the implementation plan. He reported that it is still very fluid; they were making changes day-by-day based on suggestions from various groups. Some of what he wanted to share had to do with the questions that have been asked thus far. Pat Humphrey had covered a lot of this in her initial remarks, so he indicated that some of his presentation might be repetitive. He added that he might refer to the handout that had already been distributed and that he would note that as he spoke. The following “bullets” are direct quotations as recorded during his presentation:

- First of all, there have been a number of questions of how this policy impacts the Attendance Verification, and what will faculty be doing differently. In the past, faculty have been asked to verify attendance during that first week. With this change in policy, faculty will be asked to verify on the first day of classes. However, you will not need to verify again later in the week except for those students who may be adding the class after the first day, after you do your Attendance Verification. And as Pat mentioned, one of the things that we’re trying to do in order to make that process easier, is once faculty have verified the attendance for a class, then those students that have already been verified will be removed from your Attendance Verification form, and only those students who have added the class, have not been verified, will show up on that roster. So that will be one of the things that will be a change there.
- The next question that’s come up a number of times has been the question about what can we do to help with the Attendance Verification in these larger classes, and Pat did

mention some of the things we were working on with that. We do have a process that's already been developed that will take the scanning of the ID card information for the students, or if the student doesn't have their ID card, their ID # can be entered by the keypad. We'll take that information and load it into the Attendance Verification information, so that it would not require you to do anything as an instructor in those classes. We have done that successfully using a PC or a laptop with the mag stripe readers for the ID cards. We're also looking now at using some other technology using broadband and wireless technology with maybe some handheld devices, so we'll be actually experimenting with that in the summer with some of our larger classrooms.... You can use the laptop or the PC in those classrooms that are already wired, but the issue there is that you need more stations for doing the scanning, so that's where the benefit of being able to use a wireless part or the broadband would be helpful there. So you can have the multiple stations. We also are looking at, along with the palms, that are the handheld devices, some of the clickers that are being used in some of the classrooms already to find out if that might be another way of capturing that attendance information for the student.

- An additional question has to do with students who have legitimate reasons for missing the first day of class, and I guess that is one of the big concerns that we've had. Trying to make that process as easy as possible for the student who really does have a genuine issue with being able to attend that first day. So, the ideas that have come to surface is that there would be the ability for the student who knows they're going to have to miss that first day to provide information as to why they need to miss that first day, and, of course, along with that having it on a web form would be one way to make it available to them. Or they would be able to call the WINGS helpline to provide that information or even talk to the instructor if that's possible. Once that information is received and that will trigger a flagging of that student's record so that the student would not be dropped from the class. It would require though that the student furnish documentable information as to an excuse that is what we consider valid. And you'll notice here in the handout that there is a draft of a statement that again is still in the works as to what will be considered valid. But basically it would be a medical problem, or maybe a death in the family, things that can be documented. There would be an email sent to the instructor if we receive the information via the web form, or through a phone call to the WINGS line, so that we would be sharing that information with the faculty member. Part of the information that will be asked for also is when will the student or when does the student believe that he/she would be able to attend the class because we know in some classes that that might be an issue if the student's not going to be able to attend for a week or two weeks or whatever. So with that information, hopefully, we can make good decisions about what needs to happen with that student.
- How often will the process be run to drop students from class? Initially, when we first discussed this, the idea was it would be run once a day. But in order to make the objective of making more seats available to students, once attendance has been verified, there will be a process run to do the dropping of the students from the class. So this process will run routinely. At this point it's planned to run every fifteen minutes.

- Will the process to drop classes be run each day the class meets? And the answer to that is, no, it'll just be run on the first day that the class meets. So we wouldn't be running it every day for every class.
- Questions about the waitlist. Again, Pat covered most of this, I think, but a couple of things. First of all, if the class is full, the student can register through WINGS for the waitlist. So it will be a part of the registration process that the student will already be doing as they're trying to get into the class. The same restrictions apply for the waitlisting as does for registration. So a student could not be waitlisted for a class that they're already registered for another section of [and] couldn't waitlist for a class that has a time conflict with another class. Students that are registering for the waitlist would be given a priority on a first come, first serve basis. So the first ones on the waitlist would be the first ones that would be eligible for a seat as seats become available. Students that are eligible for a seat that has become available and who are on the waitlist will get a message on their My.GeorgiaSouthern login page when the seat has become available. And the instruction there will be for them then to register for the class if they still want it. As Pat said, we have been discussing the timeframe in which the class will be made available for them. Right now we are looking at making it available for 10 hours. Now there may be some issues with classes that are verified late in the day, and it may not be reasonable to have a student find out that there is a seat available for the class at 9:00 in the evening, and then be registered for it within the [next] 10 hours. So we'll be looking at that. There might be a more reasonable timeframe to establish for those.
- Another thing that we discussed more recently and I mentioned that this is a constant change in the implementation here, and that is the waitlisting for classes. And in the discussion yesterday with the Deans, it was decided that a waitlist would be established for all classes. So that will help in gauging course demand for classes, too. So there will be a waitlist established for all classes. Some of the ways of publicizing the fact that this policy is going into effect for summer term you see listed there in the handout. That's on the last page, page 5 of the handout, and most of these activities will take place beginning in the month of April. So beginning next week. All right, are there other questions that I might address?

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator had a question. How is the waitlist going to work before classes start? The class was full, but then someone drops the class for fall. Now the class has a seat available, and people are on the waitlist.

Mike Deal (Registrar) responded that it would work exactly the same way as it would once classes start. If there are seats that become available and there are students already on the waitlist, those students would be eligible for those seats on, again, a first come, first serve basis.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator offered that this could be a little problematical if students are on vacation and don't get the email, and they miss their slot.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS) asked if a student can be on a waitlist for more than one section of a class. For example, if someone wants to get into an 1102 class, and she is on a waitlist for this

section and nothing comes up, but then there are openings in other sections. In other words, can a student be on the waitlist for more than one?

Mike Deal (Registrar) answered that a student could be on the waitlist for more than one section of a class, but that the student would have to register for multiple sections of a waitlist.

Mike Nielsen (CLASS) distributed a government scholarship information page just because it seemed to him that this is the sort of opportunity we would want our students to be involved in. It funds various programs. They all have very definite requirements in terms of participating the entire length of the programs, and there are 34 programs this year for the scholarship. Our students would only definitely be able to participate in four of those because of the dates. Our Fall Semester starts a little bit sooner than many of the programs end. He wondered if participating in one of these programs would be an acceptable reason for missing the first day of class, but it's not listed. He would like to have academic reasons acceptable for missing class

Nielsen added that, earlier that day while he was getting ready for this meeting, he found a one-page handout regarding this issue. He printed it. Then, on his way to this meeting, he found a four- or five-page document in his office mailbox. At the meeting, he has now received this one, which has changed yet again. He remembered that a year and a half ago or during his previous term on the Senate, we talked about the sort of collegiality of having enough advance time to think about these sorts of issues. On the one hand, he was glad to have information; on the other, he was disappointed to find out he must have been sleeping when faculty were alerted to the fact that last June this policy was approved. He stated that "maybe I'm falling down on my job as a Senator, but, on the other hand, maybe someone else is falling down on the job in terms of letting faculty be more involved in these kinds of issues."

Linda Bleicken (Provost) responded that, in February 2006, following the conversation that we had then at Faculty Senate, there was a request for information that Nancy Shumaker responded to. Basically it was a point-by-point response that laid out what was going to happen with this policy. And it laid out at that time that an implementation plan would be developed, that there would be information or feedback gathered from faculty and from students, which did happen, and, that when these things had happened, it would come forward to the President's Cabinet for approval. This is what happened. At that time, it was also stated that this would not be implemented before summer 2007. "Now, the response or the acknowledgement from President's Cabinet that this had been passed, I don't know that that wouldn't have been a good idea to let you know that, but nevertheless, that piece of it didn't happen. But the progression of events before that ... was actually well publicized to the Faculty Senate."

Michael Nielsen (CLASS) remembered that he had helped with some of the survey questions. He added that approval of the policy might have been mentioned in the minutes and that he had forgotten.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator stated that the survey had gone forward and that she had reported on the results of the survey at last June's Senate meeting. However, she had not heard anything about it since then. Until faculty received copies of it [the implementation

procedure] in their boxes and gave her negative feedback at that time, she had “sort of thought it went back under the woodwork.”

Barry Balleck (CLASS) added that what troubles him the most on this is the communication issue. Since the implementation date of May 17 appears in big, bold letters, he assumed that the policy is going to be implemented. He asked if it would be possible to just write “draft” on the pages of something like this so that people know that this is a draft, that this is something that is fluid. He echoed what Mike Deal had said about fluidity. When Balleck printed the original handout at 11:00 a.m., there was one page. Someone else had gotten a six-page policy, and then at the meeting, we have received a five-page policy. “So I would say that is extremely fluid.”

His second concern is that the people that are most affected by this are the students. And the week before spring break, when he first found out about this implementation plan and he asked the students about this at the Student Government Association (SGA) meeting, the SGA Executive Board did not know a thing about this. The Dean of Students was at that SGA meeting, and when Balleck asked him what he knew about this policy, he was not exactly sure what was happening, and he certainly didn’t know that things were going to be happening on the first day of summer classes. And in talking to and being an advisor and talking to advisors, Balleck had asked advisors if they were putting students on waitlists, if they were advising their students that this was going to be happening on the first day of summer classes and into fall classes. We have already done advisement for summer and fall classes, and nobody was aware of this implementation plan.

Balleck asked Mike Deal whether, if we have a class that is not full, we still drop students who don’t show up on the first day. If we have a class that still has seats available and a student doesn’t show up, does the policy then cover him/her as well?

Mike Deal (Registrar) stated that the dropping of classes for students who do not attend will apply to any class, whether it has seats available or not.

Candy Schille (CLASS) suggested that perhaps senators were being invited to offer some fine tuning, so she made some suggestions. It seemed to her that a lot of the language in the implementation plan is very, very fluid. For instance, on exceptions to first day class attendance policy, she was not sure what “serious illness” means, how that is defined. Nor was she sure what an “immediate family member” is. And in regard to swiping an Eagle ID, “The whole thing about swiping your Eagle ID cards, anybody can swipe anybody’s card.” She added that she is not sure that the policy as written is all that workable whether or not it’s necessary.

Kelsey Grubbs (Vice President of Academic Affairs, SGA) echoed Balleck’s statements earlier. SGA became aware of the implementation plan right before spring break. She recalled hearing about it at the June 2006 Senate meeting, and she has spoken to a lot of students about it recently. A lot of students didn’t even know what she was talking about, much less that it was going to be implemented.

Clara Krug (CLASS) stated that, like Mike Nielsen (CLASS), she and Mary Marwitz (CLASS) had been discussing their concern that a previous Senate had voted that any documents, any

written documents, be provided to Senators two working days in advance of a meeting, so that senators may have time to review them. She felt certain we could find in the archives exactly the date. [Approved by the Senate 3-27-2006; Approved by the President 4-20-2006]. She agreed with Mike Nielsen that receiving this document about an implementation plan as we start to discuss it is not the optimum time for anyone to receive anything, even if the person agrees with it. She stated that she hoped that, in the future any faculty member/staff member/administrator would at least respect the fact that the Senate did vote that we are to receive any written documents two working days in advance of any meeting, which would have meant that we should have received this by 4:00 p.m. on Monday, March 26th.

Mary Hadley (CLASS) wanted to discuss the potential problem identified by Mary Marwitz. There are many sections of English 1101 and English 1102. If a student is waitlisted because she/he wants to have a class at 9:00 a.m., she can also be on waitlists for several other sections. If a person on multiple waitlists gets into Section A, but still appears on waitlists for the other sections, what happens to all the other students who appear on waitlists for those sections? In other words, one student is kind of dominating five classes because he/she's at the head of the line.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked Mike Deal if registering for one section automatically removes a student from waitlists for the other ones.

Mike Dean (Registrar) indicated that he needs to check into this issue before responding.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS) wondered if a student on multiple waitlists for a course could decline to enroll in the first section available and wait for others to open.

Mike Deal (Registrar) responded that he would check into this issue

Ron MacKinnon (CIT) stated that implementing this policy has the potential to be a huge disaster, and he wondered if the people doing the analysis had thought up a pilot project. For example, "Take a smaller college, take a smaller school or something, try it, and see what the bugs are, work out the bugs. Because you are going to try to work out the bugs with the entire university and this is going to be potentially a major disaster." He stated, for example, that he can't register student attendance in his classes in one day. He would like to find out that somebody has tried it out, has found out what the problems are, and has worked out the problems.

Barry Balleck (CLASS) supported MacKinnon's statement. He added that the timing is really important. "We are six weeks out from May 15th, and we're still not really sure what we're going to do here." In addition, the students don't know about this plan yet, they are getting prepared for finals, they have final papers; they have projects. They have all sorts of things that they have to deal with, and to place this implementation plan on top of that would be a burden. He reiterated his concern that this policy was approved in June 2006, but that the Faculty Senate had heard nothing about it in Fall Semester 2006 or this semester.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator reminded senators that results of the survey had been presented at the June 2006 meeting. She stated that she hadn't known that it had been approved in the President's Cabinet.

Barry Balleck (CLASS) read from Provost Bleicken's handout that, on the 12th of June, President's Cabinet had approved the implementation policy for summer 2007. He agreed with Mike Nielsen that senators had not received that information before the current discussion.

Bruce Grube (President) stated that there is a policy to do first-day drop. "The discussion today is really on the implementation plan itself. Some suggestions I think are pretty helpful here, but the insinuation that somehow this is all a deep, dark secret and a conspiracy of some sort ... is a bit of a stretch. There's implementation stuff that goes on all over the campus, all of the time, and when anybody wants to know about it, I think people are more than willing to step forward and talk about it. I think that's what's happening here. But there's the policy that was settled. Now, we're in the implementation phase of it."

Barry Balleck (CLASS) agreed with Grube's statement. However, he added that, typically, when faculty members receive documents coming forward from Deans' Council, to chairs, they have "Draft" stamped on them when discussion is expected. This document does not include the word "Draft."

Kent Murray (CLASS) had a question about a statement in the plan that "a student may be asking the instructor to save them from being dropped." He wanted to know if an instructor could say that students were there in class, when really they weren't.

Mike Deal (Registrar) indicated that there will be another box to give the instructor the option of saving the student. But it does not mean the student was there, and the instructor would not be verifying attendance. The instructor would still have to verify their attendance when the students did show up.

Kent Murray (CLASS) asked about any time limit on that Mike Deal (Registrar) responded that there is none.

Patrick Novotny (CLASS) asked if there would be a box at the bottom of each class list allowing instructors to "click here to verify all." Might somebody do that for first-day drop? Would that affect federal financial aid?

Mike Deal (Registrar) stated that it would still operate the same way.

Candy Schille (CLASS) was not suggesting a conspiracy or anything like that. However, because of her impressions from the current meeting that many faculty and students do not favor this policy, she did want to know what other bodies do favor it and why and she requested their reasons.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator assumed that Enrollment Management and the President's Cabinet favor it.

Bob Jackson (COBA) spoke in favor of the policy and its implementation... It keeps people from scamming the financial aid by saying they were in class, among other things.

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA) had spoken with several students. They had problems with the exceptions to first day of class attendance policy. She also wondered why it mattered if a student missed the first day if most faculty members allow three absences. Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator stated that the attendance policy varies

Kelsey Grubbs (SGA) spoke in favor of flexibility. She didn't think that the first day of class should be any different than another class day. Being dropped on the first day of class is drastic.

Ellen Hendrix (CLASS) spoke in favor of the first-day drop. One of her "pet peeves" is students showing up the second week of class. She, too, favors a pilot project, perhaps in English 1101 and 1102 classes because those classes have smaller numbers of students. She expressed appreciation for Mike Deal and those working in his office. She stated that she doesn't think that all faculty are against first-day drop.

Candy Schille (CLASS) said that, since faculty members have the power to insist on their syllabi that students attend the first day of class, she did not understand why this policy is necessary. She asked for a response to her earlier question.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator stated that the policy has always been that we expect students to attend every period.

Candy Schille (CLASS) agreed and inquired as to whether it is up to the faculty member to decide the consequences.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator responded that it is.

Bob Jackson (COBA) likened the situation to employment: "I was just going to say, we show up the first day at work. You'd think we'd show up the first day of class."

Patrick Novotny (CLASS) offered anecdotal evidence about the performance of students who miss the first day of class. He had found that there was virtually no correlation between first-day attendance and performance in his courses during a four-semester period. "In fact, what there were, there were two big groups. There was a big group who, as you might expect, who were not there on the first day... They didn't do very well. But what I found, too, that was kind of counterintuitive was that there was a large group of students [who had missed the first day] who did extraordinarily. Some of them were some of the best performers in the class."

Mary Marwitz (CLASS) agreed with others that we want our students to be there the first day because it launches the semester and sets the tone. However, she also agreed with Grubbs that "This one day carries with it catastrophic consequences, and where a student might miss a day for her wedding later in the term, if it happens on that first day, and then she's out the door." She, too, advocated a pilot program, and she suggested a window of two days instead of one.

Tim Giles (CLASS) also favored the idea of running some type of pilot program this coming summer. He mentioned a student who had approached him about an override for a class because he needs the class to graduate. Giles had approved the override. It seems to him that, with this first-day drop policy in place, granting an override will be practically illegal.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) moved to cease debate.

Candy Schille (CLASS) supported the motion. However, she had a question: Would ceasing debate mean that the policy would be implemented this summer as it is written now.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) reminded senators that this policy had passed [the President's Cabinet] back last summer. She acknowledged that senators had discussed some very good ideas during the current meeting. She believed the policy would go forward, and she recognized that some "kinks" still need to be worked out.

Bruce Grube (President) responded that one of the ideas, a pilot program, makes a lot of sense. He thanked Ron MacKinnon for mentioning it.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator reminded senators of the motion to cease debate on the floor. The motion passed unanimously.

Barry Balleck (CLASS) moved that we institute a pilot program for summer 2007 on classes to be determined.

Bruce Grube (President) indicated that he and Bleicken would institute a pilot program.

Barry Balleck (CLASS) withdrew his motion.

7. Unfinished Business

None.

8. New Business

Mike Nielsen (CLASS) distributed the following document on behalf of the GSU Chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP): The Georgia Southern University Chapter of the AAUP's Position on the Senior to Sophomore Program.

The Georgia Southern University Chapter of the AAUP is concerned that the University is moving forward with the Senior to Sophomore Program without sufficiently considering the mutual responsibility and roles of both the University's academic administration and faculty in establishing academic policies and curriculum. The *Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook 2006-2007*, Section 105.4, Page 9, states "The faculty are responsible for regulations affecting academic activities, the general educational policy of the University, the welfare of the faculty, and related matters that maintain and promote the best interest of the faculty and of the University." Furthermore, the *Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook 2006-2007*,

Section 110.01, Page 19 states, “The faculty and administration of Georgia Southern University affirm their belief in the process of shared governance both as a principle and an animating spirit of our institution. Shared governance involves faculty and administration participating mutually in the development of policies at the departmental, college, and university levels. Faculty therefore have a role in developing policies including, at the appropriate levels, strategic planning; academic and curricular policies...and faculty personnel actions including hiring and evaluation of faculty...” Because of our roles in participating mutually in the development of policies, we urge the Faculty Senate to recommend that the appropriate Senate committees participate with the University’s academic administration in the review and the development of Senior to Sophomore policies and all future changes in academic and curricular policies

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked if Nielsen would like to request a resolution.

Mike Nielsen (CLASS) responded that he would. The AAUP’s concerns come from several AAUP members, who see the program as a potential erosion of the core curriculum and loss of faculty input in terms of who teaches courses. So, because faculty are to be involved in curricular issues, they would like to see the Senate be more involved, perhaps through the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. He suggested that a resolution might be appropriate at the next meeting.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) reminded senators that they are not to consider documents that they do not receive two days in advance of a meeting.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator requested that Dr. Gary Means give senators an update on what is going on with Seniors to Sophomores.

Gary Means (CE&PS) announced pilot programs in two different disciplines, writing with a few classes and math with a few classes. They hope to solve any administrative and curricular problems. As an anecdote to the concerns that have been raised, he stated that it was his view “that, in fact, we are not changing any policies institutionally in this institution. We are following the policies of appropriate curriculum, faculty choice in that. So that I’d be happy to work with any of the committees. But as far as I know, we haven’t violated any procedures and policies within the institution.”

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator offered that as a member of Math Department, she does know that the Department has been checking vitas and transcripts of people who thought they wanted to teach in this program. Out of many that the department received, members found five that met the qualifications required. Department members are seeing that as an opportunity to provide graduate education in Mathematics. One individual in the department is talking to a few teachers in an attempt to learn if what teachers understand to be the department’s course and are trying to propose as a syllabus is in fact the department’s course. “If it’s going to be our course, we’re going to have them teach our course.”

Gary Means (CE&PS) added that this is exactly the process that is taking place in Writing and in Math with a faculty liaison who is acting in that capacity. Approximately 20 or more faculty or individual teachers at the high school level had asked to be considered. First review showed that

more than half of those would not meet our institutional criteria for faculty adjunct status, so they were not even forwarded to the appropriate department.

Mike Nielsen (CLASS) stated that he would try to present a resolution for the April meeting of the Faculty Senate

9. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Linda Bleicken (Provost) announced that the University was conducting approximately 100 faculty searches. She thanked everyone who had served on search committees or who had chaired search committees. She also announced conclusion of a major search by congratulating Dean Bret Danilowicz, who is our new Dean of the Allen E. Paulson College of Science and Technology.

10. Announcements from the Floor

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked anyone who had not already signed in as a member of the SEC, or as members of the Faculty Senate, Student Representative, or Visitorsto please do so, that he/she may be represented in the minutes of this current meeting.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator requested a motion to adjourn. It was moved and seconded. The motion passed with no opposition.

11. Adjournment 5:30 p.m.

**Georgia Southern University
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
April 24, 2007
4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Russell Union Ballroom**

2006-2007 Senate Executive Committee: Patricia Humphrey (COST) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator; Les Furr (CHHS); Ron MacKinnon (CIT); Marc Cyr (CLASS); Bill Wells (COBA); Maggie LaMontagne (COE); Robert Vogel (JPHCOPH); Sonya Shepherd (LIB); Marilyn Bruce (Senate Liaison); Clara Krug (Senate Secretary).

Voting Members in Attendance: Frank Atuahene, Barry Balleck, Marc Cyr, Clara Krug, Kent Murray, Candy Schille, Robert Vogel, Less Furr, Terry Diamanduros, (Bob Jackson for Godfrey Gibbison); Tim Giles, Beverly Graham, Mary Hadley, Patricia Humphrey, Clara Krug, (Barbara Mallory for James Klein), Margaret LaMontagne, Ron MacKinnon, Mary Marwitz, Bruce McLean, Kent Murray, Michael Nielsen, Patrick Novotny, Onyile Onyile, Michael Reksulak, David Robinson, Candy Schille, Norman Schmidt, Alison Scott, Sonya Shepherd, (Rebecca Ziegler for Charles Skewis), (Amy Boyett for T. Maria Smith), Brenda Talley, Robert Vogel, Patricia Walker, Mark Welford, Bill Wells, Patrick Wheaton, Jerry Wilson, Mark Yanochik.

Voting Members Absent: Scott Beck, Steve Damelin, Nirmal Das, Ming Fang He, Ellen Hendrix, Michele McGibony, John Nauright, Constantin Ogloblin, Broderick Oluyede, Donna Saye, Diana Sturges, Jim Whitworth.

Administrative Members in Attendance: Bruce Grube (President); Linda Bleicken (Provost, Academic Affairs), Joe Franklin (VP, Business and Finance), Teresa Thompson (VP, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management), Marilyn Bruce (Senate Liaison), Fred Whitt (CHHS), Jane Rhoades Hudak (CLASS), Cindi Chance (COE), Saundra Nettles (COGS); Bret Danilowicz (COST), Charles Hardy (JPHCOPH), Bede Mitchell (LIB), Gary Means (CE&PS).

Senate Parliamentarian: Bob Cook.

SPC Representative: Jerry Wilson.

SPC Apprentice: Norman Schmidt.

SGA Representative:

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:

Visitors: Candace Griffith, Chris Caplinger, Jessica Orvis, Wendy Chambers, Mike Deal, Lee Davis

Senate Moderator Patricia Humphrey called the meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 4:00 p.m.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the April 24, 2007, Meeting. Patricia Humphrey (Senate Moderator) requested that senators observe a minute of silence to remember faculty and students at Virginia Tech.

She announced some changes and additions to the agenda:

- a. Bill Wells would present the Librarian's Report on behalf of Godfrey Gibbison.
- b. Sonya Shepherd would present the Undergraduate Committee Report on behalf of Donna Saye.
- c. Godfrey Gibbison would arrive in time to talk about the First-Year Experience and would lead that presentation.
- d. Because of Chris Geyerman's absence, there would be no NCAA report.

She then requested a motion for approval of the agenda. The motion was seconded. *The agenda was approved.*

2. Approval of the [March 28, 2007, Minutes: Clara Krug \(CLASS\), Senate Secretary,](#) called senators' attention to a list of corrections to the Faculty Senate meeting minutes of March 28, 2007 that she had distributed. They were mainly punctuation marks. The substantive change was on page 8, the report of the Faculty Research Committee: only \$115,000, instead of \$100,000, is available. With those corrections, she moved for approval of the minutes of the March 26th meeting. Her motion was seconded. *The minutes as corrected were approved.*

Krug asked people to speak into the microphone and to identify themselves when they addressed the Senate. This helps Ginger Malphrus, who listens to the tape.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator reminded everyone that attendance sheets were on the table by the senators' name plates. She asked senators to mark beside their name, and she asked each alternate attending for a senator to write his or her name next to the senator's name and not on the visitors' attendance sheet.

3. Librarian's Report of [April 16, 2007: Bill Wells \(COBA\) for Godfrey Gibbison \(COBA\), Senate Librarian,](#) reminded senators that they were voting to acknowledge the accuracy of the report, and not in support of any actions taken by the committees. Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator requested a second to the motion to approve the Librarian's Report. It was seconded.

Clara Krug (CLASS) had a question about information on page 21, Mike Deal, the registration update, in regard to the waitlists, 2.4 line 4: "Department Chairs will have the authority to override the waitlist in order to prioritize individuals who need a class more than others." This was from a March 27, 2007, meeting, which was one day earlier than our senate meeting on March 28th. At that meeting of the senate, there was no information about the prerogative of a department chair to override the waitlist. In fact, Tim Giles of CLASS even mentioned that he

had this current time given an override to a person who needed to have a course to graduate and had assumed that it would be almost illegal, in his words, to provide an override in the future. She wondered about the accuracy of the statement on page 21.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator recognized Mike Deal (Registrar). He verified that an override could always be done in any case, just as, if the class is full, an override can be done.

Clara Krug (CLASS) wondered where this information will appear in the policies that we have received related to first-day dropping of students from classes. She had received two different sets of policies: one from Dean Jane Rhoades Hudak on the 27th of March, which predates our last senate meeting and another that is without a date, "Pilot for the Faculty Senate New Attendance Policy." Neither one of those official documents mentions the possibility of a departmental chair's override.

Mike Deal (Registrar) stated that this piece of information could be added to the questions and answers that his office is providing to the students.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if this information about overrides would definitely be added.

Mike Deal (Registrar) responded that it would. There was no additional discussion of the Librarian's Report.

Patricia Humphrey (Senate Moderator) asked for approval of the Librarian's Report. She noted that approval doesn't mean that senators are approving the actions of the committees, but merely that senators are accepting their reports of their actions. *The Librarian's Report was approved.*

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Sonya Shepherd (LIB) for Donna Saye (COST): At the March 20, 2007, meeting of the Undergraduate Committee, members approved the following:

- For COBA, a course revision for the School of Accountancy, a new course in the Department of Management, Marketing, and Logistics and revisions in the BBA programs.
- For COE, course revisions and revised programs for the Department of Teaching and Learning.
- For COST, a program revision for the Department of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering Technology.
- For CHHS, a new course in the Department of Health and Kinesiology and new courses in the Department of Hospitality, Tourism, and Family and Consumer Sciences.
- For CLASS, new courses, deletions, and revised programs for the Department of Music.

Shepherd moved for approval of this report. Since it was a committee report, it did not require a second.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked for discussion of the report. There was none. She reminded senators that approving and accepting the recommendations meant

forwarding them to the President and Provost for approval. *The Undergraduate Committee's Report was approved.*

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Ming Fang He (COE): Due to Dr. He's absence, the Graduate Committee's Report was tabled until the next meeting.

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

Annual Message

Dr. Grube reminded senators that, as we approach the end of the academic year, the last week of classes, and finals coming up, stress levels are high, not only for faculty members, but for students and for our staff, too. It's a time when we need to pay some special attention to civility and treating one another with a certain level of respect just because we're tired right about now.

Board of Regents

President Grube reported that the Board of Regents' meeting on the campus on the 17th and the 18th had gone extremely well. He specified that he thinks that it will be a very, very long time before the BOR finds a campus where things work as well for them as they did here, which is a real tribute to folks at Georgia Southern.

Service on the Faculty Senate

As an aside, Dr. Grube stated that the Provost will send a memo to Department Chairs reminding them that service on the Senate does indeed count for service when we look at promotion, tenure, and merit increases.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked if there were any questions for President Grube.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked which faculty were specifically involved in the meeting.

Bruce Grube (President) stated that the Board meeting was public and open to everybody. He recalled seeing David Dudley, Trey Denton, Mary Boyd, and several other faculty.

There were no other questions.

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

Requests for Information (RFI's)

- A. In February, Kathleen Comerford filed an RFI about our list of peer and aspirational institutions. "As I reported last month, Jayne Perkins Brown was working on a response to that, which has been provided to me by Dr. Bleicken and was posted today. Basically, the answer is that the list of peer and aspirational has not changed. The Strategic Planning Council has apparently been charged to examine the Carnegie Reclassification

during FY 07 and think about things like peer and aspirational, and it turns out that there [are] ... policies and procedures from the Board of Regents in terms of identifying peer and aspirational. So our peer and aspirational have not changed since November 2005.”

Humphrey announced that a table with some of their characteristics is an attachment to the posted response.

- B. Clara Krug, on April 12th, filed an RFI about the salary study, and what progress has been made. “The salary study was completed. It was used, and there’s a long list of institutions including Armstrong Atlantic, Augusta State, Berry College, College of Charleston, Columbus State, Fort Lewis College in Colorado, Eastern Connecticut, Kennesaw, etc., etc., that were part of that salary survey. That information was used along with information from the University of South Alabama. Their survey data, the IPEDS, or Integrated Post-Secondary Educational Data System data, etc., etc., [and] various other sources [were used] to identify appropriate salary ranges, shall we say. And then the Deans of all the colleges participated in a workshop in January during which Ron Shiffler and Fred Whitt explained to the other Deans the mechanisms they have been using to try and identify and rectify the most egregious cases of salary compression. Then the Deans of all colleges met with Department Chairs and tried to identify within their own colleges the most egregious cases of salary compression, and those were then forwarded on to Dr. Bleicken. At this point, they have approximately 80 faculty [members] who have been identified as the worst cases of salary compression to try to remedy. They have some money this year to try and address that; however, it’s only about a third of the money that was identified as necessary to try and fully correct it. But it’s a step in the right direction. And they plan on trying to continue this process every year to try and address salary compression. They make note that they will be participating ... in the College and University Personnel Action Faculty Salary Survey in future years to try and help keep getting comparison reports.”
- C. Michael Moore filed a Request for Information on the student tech fees. “He wanted to know who was on the committee. That information has been provided. Who was the faculty representative? That was Christine Ludowise from the Department of Political Science. What got funded, what didn’t? Well there were 202 proposals submitted that totaled \$5.129 million; however, we only had \$1.22 million available in funding. So obviously, not everybody got funded. There’s an attachment to the answer to the RFI in terms of how many proposals were submitted from each college, their amount requested, and their amount funded. I would point out that it has been pointed out to me that the reason why it looks like the College of Information Technology got so much money is because their labs [were] due for recycling and refreshing. And they do provide a large number of computer access labs to students now that the Library under construction doesn’t have nearly as many. ... The College of Education did get a large chunk of extra money from other sources to take care of a lot of its other lab problems.”
- D. Funding for Faculty Development Research and Service. “That was an RFI submitted by Clara Krug after the SEC decided it was premature to schedule her motion on the subject at today’s meeting. The money for the Development, Research, and Service Committees

comes out of the Provost's office budget. This year the Development Committee had a total of \$105,000 available in their budget, which after you subtract off for the Award for Excellence in Instruction is really about \$95,600. They had \$429,000 requested. Research had \$115,000 available, and \$265,000 requested. Service has \$55,000 available, half the other two, and only \$67,000 requested. So in all cases the dollars requested exceeded the dollars available and by up to 4 times. I can see why serving on one of these committees would be very frustrating because the number of applications far exceeds the amount available. I discussed this with Dr. Bleicken, and she did point out that one thing that was done this year to try and help matters in terms of faculty development was they had discovered that some departments had as little as \$200-\$250 available per faculty member for travel, and they added \$138,000 to the travel budget, so that each department should have \$600 per faculty member available for professional travel. I recognize that doesn't go very far. Almost any trip of any kind of length takes more money than that. But we also know that some faculty want to travel a lot, and some faculty don't. Another thing to recognize, too, here, at this point, is that back when we were cutting budgets for three years in a row, most departments and other things, one of the first things to go was travel funds and operational funds. We have been getting money back, but we're not back yet where we were before they started cutting budgets, and, meanwhile, costs keep going up. So one thing that Dr. Bleicken and I have discussed and that we're going to look into more carefully is how much money we have available for faculty development and how we compare with some of our peers in terms of those monies available. And once we get that information available, we'll share it with the Senate."

- E. Richard Flynn filed an RFI on migration of faculty personal web pages. "Why are we changing the URLs yet again? Well, the short answer is it's for security. I don't know how many of you are aware, but our University web pages have been hacked mightily in the recent past, and the solution to it is to try and separate all personal web pages from official web pages... There is a redirect which will be active for a year. The next plan, and I discussed this with David Ewing, is [that] they will be taking all of those personal web pages and physically moving them to a separate server from the University's main server to add yet another layer of security. And when they start doing that and totally divorce personal pages from University web pages, one benefit: You'll have more web space, disk space. You'll also have more freedom in terms of your content and design of your personal web pages. You won't have to try and adhere to any kind of University standard. He also noted when I talked with him that he is working on getting the Faculty Technology Advisory Committee up and running again in response to what was discussed in the February and March meetings about the web page and other technology issues on campus, and he will have that committee composition announced within a couple of weeks."
- F. "One other item germane to today's agenda, or two other items. The annual end-of-semester memo came out just this afternoon, and it states on there that faculty should enter grades no later than 48 hours after the final exam into WINGS. That is in error and will be fixed. Okay, as I have discussed and gotten approved by Linda Bleicken, and Mike Deal in the past, the current wording is, 'Faculty are encouraged to input grades

into WINGS as soon as possible after your final exam with a final deadline of 48 hours after the last final exam.’ A corrected memo will be sent out tomorrow.”

- G. “Last but not least, and I don’t have any further information about this than what’s on this memo, at the February meeting we discussed potential changes to the University calendar to try and make it more instructional-friendly after Thanksgiving. And we decided there were other issues that we had to consider. Last month, I told you that a sub-committee of the Calendar Committee, chaired by Fred Whitt, that also included Phyllis Dallas, Dorothy Battle, and Mike Deal was working on the calendar and looking at the calendar as a whole. We are going to be having a meeting of the Calendar Committee tomorrow at 11:00 a.m. in the President’s Conference Room to discuss their recommendations, and we’ll see what happens there. I don’t know if anybody wants to say anything about it at this point or not. Apparently not. When we know something, we’ll pass that on to you as well.”

Agenda Items

There were three other motion requests on the agenda that were submitted.

- A. One from Mike Nielsen, which is item #10, currently on the agenda. “A motion about referring ‘Seniors to Sophomores’ to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for oversight.”
- B. “A presentation on the First-Year Experience Task Force recommendations. The SEC voted to limit discussion on that to 20 minutes. If there are any objections to that SEC limit on discussion length, our Parliamentarian has advised me that one would need to object to that at the beginning of the discussion.”
- C. “Finally, a motion on adequate time for grading submitted by Robert Costomiris, who is asking for 96 hours after the final exam. The SEC decided that that was a little bit too long, so they wanted to amend it to 72 hours and to make that motion effective Fall 2007.”

Clara Krug (CLASS) had a question about Kathleen Comerford’s request about the peer and aspirational institutions. Given the fact that we have changed in our Carnegie status, why has it now been 16 months with no change in the peer and aspirational status?

Bruce Grube (President) reminded senators that it’s been less than a year since the Carnegie folks actually designated us as a Doctoral Research Institution. The University System of Georgia, of course, has not moved us there at all. There will come a point in time when we will come to a consensus that the timing is right to make that request of them. In the meantime, the Board of Regents provides us with a list that we’re to choose from in terms of our peer group, and we try to select institutions that we think are high quality. The second list, the aspirational list, actually is Georgia Southern’s choosing. We decided to “put that one out there” because we weren’t entirely content with the list of institutions that had been provided for us as a peer group. From the Board point of view, it’s the peer group that they’re looking at for their purposes. But

for our own internal purpose of planning and thinking about what we may want to become, and whom we wish to compare ourselves against, that aspirational list is very useful. He thinks that the SPC is doing work on that now.

Clara Krug (CLASS) had a question about the salary study. In her experience, when the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) or the *Chronicle of Higher Education* asks for salary data, it relies upon the individual institution to present its salary data. Those requesting the data don't know if, for example, among full professors, in addition to the full-time teaching faculty, administrators are included. For the salary study that we commissioned, she asked 1) who provided the data, and 2) whether administrators with faculty rank who are not full-time teaching faculty were included. She expressed her concern that inclusion of administrators with faculty rank would somewhat skew the data for the full-time faculty who are not administrators.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) responded that we participated in this survey; however, we did not commission the survey. Second, Wendy Woodrum gathers those data and she is probably more aware of faculty salary data than anybody here on campus. The administrators were separated out because it would not have been appropriate to include their salaries. It would truly have skewed data.

Pat Walker (CLASS) wanted to follow-up on the salary study. She asked if the temporary faculty were removed from the survey.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) responded that they were not removed. However, they were so identified because there was a separate category for temporary faculty. They were shown in the survey, but they were not mixed up with assistant/associate/full professors who are on tenure-track or who are tenured.

6. Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:
No report.

7. Report from Norman Schmidt (COST), SPC Representative: The Georgia Southern University Strategic Plan of 2004 states that, "Georgia Southern University will be recognized as one of the best public comprehensive universities in the country within the next 10 years."

The Strategic Planning Council (SPC) is charged with facilitating the strategic planning process by engaging in collective strategic deliberation concerning the institution.

This spring the SPC has been reviewing the Level II plans with the various Vice Presidents, and members have also been discussing the effect of GSU's being reclassified as a Carnegie Doctoral/Research University. To this end, an on-line survey is being prepared to assess the level of understanding of what this means to students, faculty and staff at the GSU campus. The survey will also be sent out to alumni.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked who is preparing the survey.

Norman Schmidt (COST) stated that various members of the SPC have been preparing it.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked about the timeframe.

Jerry Wilson (COBA) answered that it was going to be made available before summer school, after the survey by the research firm that's working on our image survey. He did not remember the exact date, but it's supposed to be available on the web.

Clara Krug (CLASS) offered that it may not be the optimum time over the summer to request that faculty complete a survey because faculty who are not on staff in the summer may not necessarily check their email daily. She asked if there would be some way to make the final deadline for submitting the survey a date when all faculty are actually expected to be here on campus, for example sometime between August 1 and May.

Norman Schmidt (COST) said that the SPC could take that into account.

8. Election of 2007-2008 Senate Librarian:

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator announced that Bill Wells (COBA) had agreed to stand for election. There were no additional nominees from the floor.

Clara Krug (CLASS) moved that senators elect Bill Wells by acclamation. Her motion was seconded. Wells was elected unanimously.

9. Election of 2007-2008 Senate Secretary

Marc Cyr (CLASS) nominated Richard Flynn (CLASS), who has been elected to the Senate for next year. There were no additional nominations.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if the Senate might elect Richard Flynn by acclamation, also. Her motion was seconded. Richard Flynn was elected unanimously.

10. Motion on Faculty Involvement in "Seniors to Sophomores," Mike Nielsen, (CLASS):

Motion: "That the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee work with the University's academic administration to review the Division of Continuing Education and Public Services' (CE&PS) 'Seniors to Sophomores' program." His motion was seconded.

Mike Nielsen, (CLASS) added that that several faculty members had come to him to express their support of this motion. "Basically, concerned about the lack of faculty involvement in the Senior to Sophomore program. I listed the majority of their concerns in the rationale that I submitted. I don't think it's really necessary for me to go into each of them, but I just want to restate the motion for the curriculum committee to work on an issue that concerns the curriculum — not necessarily to have any sort of outcome expected, just have them work with it and let us know what they recommend. And then if they make a recommendation, then we go ahead and vote."

Nielsen's *motion passed*.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Since Godfrey Gibbison had not yet arrived to lead discussion of Item #11, she requested permission to consider Item #12. This change was moved, seconded, and passed.

11. Motion on Adequate time for Grading, Maggie LaMontagne (COE) for Robert Costomiris (CLASS): Motion: “That faculty have 72 hours to submit final course grades after administering the final exam for a course.”

Patricia Humphrey (COST) added that, as amended by SEC, this would take effect fall of 2007. The motion was seconded. Humphrey reminded everyone that the end-of-semester memo received on April 24 was in error. Faculty have until 48 hours after the last final exam to submit grades.

Michael Nielsen (CLASS) asked if the SEC had contacted Costomiris about the amendment.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) responded that no one had. She had already discussed this motion with Mike Deal (Registrar), who had said that 96 hours was totally unacceptable to the Registrar’s office because, especially at times like the end of spring semester, they have to do all the grade processing and notify students of any suspensions. The Financial Aid office has to take care of financial aid matters. There’s only a week after the end of the spring semester to do all this. So it would be totally unacceptable to delay final grade processing, in essence, two days because of those Friday final exams.

Candy Schille (CLASS), who had seconded the motion, thought that Costomiris would probably support it.

Bruce Grube (President) asked Mike Deal to speak about a memorandum that Deal had created.

Mike Deal (Registrar): “I think this explanation actually is what Pat was referring to earlier in our discussion when we talked about the grade reporting deadline being changed earlier in the year, and there are a number of things that I’d like to point out. First of all, let me clarify, as Pat has already done so, that we are very lenient in enforcing the current policy which says that final grades are to be turned in within 48 hours after the final exam. We don’t really enforce until we get to 48 hours after the very last final exam which is the last day of finals. Some of the things that are affected by making the grade reporting deadline later is, of course, delays. And some of the delays we’ve already talked about, but let me just reiterate those. First of all, the delay in grade reporting to students who may need to know what their final grades are in order to make decisions about what they do in the next term. That’s especially important, as we’ve just said, at the end of spring term, but it’s also true for the other terms. There are also delays in determining academic standing for students as in their exclusion or probation, Dean’s list, President’s list. And, of course, we’re asked to report that information as soon as possible. So again, extending the deadline would delay that. There would also be delays in notifying students of their academic standing or their eligibility to return for a subsequent term, delays in determining and notifying students of continuing financial aid eligibility for subsequent terms. And then, of course, if the grades are not turned in by the deadline, then there are manual grade processes that have to come into effect at this point.”

Rebecca Zeigler (Library) asked if the 72-hour time frame is acceptable.

Mike Deal (Registrar) answered that the delays that he had just mentioned would still be affected. So, again, he was not sure that everyone would find that palatable, and especially the students.

Bruce Grube (President) suggested that senators think this through in favor of the student.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) thought that, actually, a large part of Costomiris' rationale was, in fact, erring on behalf of the student, and that he wants to have adequate time to give the students his best effort in evaluating each student's performance. So we have that pedagogical issue against the practical, logistical issues that the Registrar is having to deal with in contacting the students, making arrangements, and so forth.

Clara Krug (CLASS) spoke in favor of the motion. If faculty members want to let students have the best chance to show their proficiency, it might take a little while longer to grade their exams. Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked senators to vote on the motion. *The motion carried.*

12. Presentation of First-Year Experience Task Force Recommendations, Jessica Orvis (COST) for Donna Saye, COST). (Note: the SEC has voted to limit discussion to 20 minutes).

In the absence of Godfrey Gibbison, senators allowed Jessica Orvis and Chris Caplinger (First-Year Experience) to address the Senate.

Jessica Orvis (COST) reported on behalf of the First-Year Experience Task Force. "We've been meeting since August of 2006. We were charged by our Provost to take a substantive look at the First-Year Experience, and we came up with a series of recommendations. And let me just kind of talk about the big ones. On a curricular scale, we have talked about taking our current GSU 1210 orientation course, converting it to a 2-hour course that will be mostly an academic seminar, topic chosen by faculty. Sometimes these are called "passion courses," where you pick a freshman-level subject that really interests you and design a freshman-level course around that topic that would still have components of the orientation course — the GSU 1210 component as sort of a, we see it perhaps as a lab component to the course. We are developing some pilot sections to run in the fall. Another curricular issue involves transforming the IDS 2210 to a new course called "The Global Citizen Course." It's designed to be more interdisciplinary and topic oriented as well. Let me just say that all of the recommendations that we have come up with are designed to raise the academic tone on campus. That's kind of been our theme through all of this, and we've been hitting that component several times. Also we want to communicate academic expectations at the college level compared to the high school level. And along this level, we are developing a brochure to send to students at home before they come to campus, and then we are developing some time during Welcome Week to devote to academics. As a committee, we're interested in having more time for that, and part of what we're developing is something called "conversations with professors," which is modeled on a similar program at James Madison University. And we would take all of our incoming students, divide them up into small groups,

and talk to them about their role as learner and our role as faculty, and how all of that can fit together. We already have about 40-45 faculty who have signed up to help us with that, and if you haven't signed up, we can arrange for that before you leave today. We need some more; we want to keep these groups kind of small. We're excited about that.

We also have looked at intervention. We are talking about limiting the numbers of withdrawals that a student can receive, and we're looking at the numbers of hours rather than numbers of courses. And 14 as a lifetime limit for withdrawals for students at Georgia Southern, except, of course, for emergencies and medical withdrawals, the military, that kind of thing. We also were interested in the model of intrusive advising. If you've heard of that, that's a, it sounds horrible, but it's a model of advising where we talk to the students more about their support structure and what they need to be successful here at Georgia Southern. The new COST Advising Center is modeled on intrusive advising, and I know that CLASS is using intrusive advising as well, and we would like to encourage a larger footprint for intrusive advising on our campus. That's most of it. We have a lot of information set up on a web site and I encourage you to go look at that."

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Godfrey Gibbison had arrived. She asked if he would care to add anything in terms of some of the recommendations.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): "One of the things that I wanted to emphasize was making a case for the core. And for people who teach core classes, in particular, a case can be made for the core in the sense of the most cynical student, who might consider the core just a way for the college to 'delay my progress and suck two more years of cash out of me.' If we never really say to them, here's why this stuff is important, and sometimes there's not much obvious connection between a core course and what happens later on in your program... And so, when you walk into a core class, ECON 2105, History, or something like that, you sort of have to begin to start a semester by saying, 'Here's why we think this course fits into a liberal arts curriculum,' or 'why we think this should be a fundamental, integral part of your college program,' rather than just saying 'Welcome to History, now let's get down to business.' Because it doesn't really help the student very much to understand why they're there, and they really leave with a sort of cynical attitude about 'why I was forced to take this class that has contributed nothing to my understanding of anything at all.'"

Mark Welford (COST) had a question regarding going from one to two hours and funding. Would the recommendation be that if you have now a two-hour course that it would be taught within the department, so it would become part of the standard faculty workload? Or would it still be an overload, and you would get appropriately paid by the university, in other words, double what you are getting for the one hour?

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) reported that, at this point, the two-hour course is an overload, and faculty are going to get compensated in much the same way that they have been compensated for GSU 1210.

Mark Welford (COST): "You mean you would get just the same amount for teaching a two hour that you would for a one hour, or are you going to increase the compensation?"

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): “No, you would get two times. It is envisioned now as two times at rate. Although I think there might be some people who are teaching this as a, if somebody’s teaching the two-hour seminar and 1210 together, that might be a part of that person’s, that could be a part of that person’s schedule, just the two hour course and seminar together. And then some of us are teaching this two-hour seminar as an overload and getting compensated at two times the rate of 1210.”

Jessica Orvis (COST) added that task force members think that it’s critical that it can ultimately count in load. They would like for faculty to have the option to either count it in load or to get paid for it, or to use the current model.

Chris Caplinger (First-Year Experience): “And that’s what the proposal is. One of the, this has been vetted by Deans’ Council and later by the President’s Cabinet, and one of the observations was we need to take a much closer look at the fiscal implications....But the proposal was to allow faculty an option — working in concert of course with department chairs to make the course release work.”

Candy Schille (CLASS) had two questions: 1) Are our efforts at these sorts of classes being pursued system wide? Or are we trying harder to get people to recognize that this is a university as opposed to a high school? 2) If not, isn’t the sort of drive towards standardization in the core going to have some impact on your designs and plans here?

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) answered that this effort is not system wide. The task force spent a lot of time looking at some very successful places in terms of retention, progression, graduation, and so forth. James Madison was one such institution. He added that this initiative is probably going to distinguish us, quite frankly, from other schools within the system. He asked Schille to repeat her second question.

Candy Schille (CLASS): “My second question was just if the task force was kicking around the way that the move towards standardization of the core will impact all of your plans, and then I have one little follow up, if I may, on what you just said. Has student success, however that’s defined, been correlated with the existence of the kinds of courses that we’re offering, which aren’t offered everywhere?”

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) responded that task force members have reviewed first-year experience literature related to this initiative. Institutions studied have “phenomenal” retention and graduation rates. “Now the question about the core — I think, our understanding was that there is some room for flexibility in the core for different institutions to add ... institution-specific content within that core, as long as we keep the structure....We worried a little bit about whether we had to extend 125 hours to graduation, and I don’t quite remember how we settled that issue, but I remember us worrying quite a bit about how that would play out to the 125 hours.”

Bruce Grube (President) added that, during this academic year, he has been chairing a system-wide task force on the improvement of retention and graduation rates. The report of that task force is very close to being finished and will be reported to the University System. Without

question, he would think that a first-year experience requirement for all campuses will be in that, but that there'll be a lot of flexibility for different kinds of institutions to decide what that means for their students.

Pat Walker (CLASS) had a question on the intrusive advising. She wondered how the students having problems would be identified. Would that come through the Registrar's Office? From the students themselves? From the advisor? Is the advisor going to be expected to watch out for the students?

Jessica Orvis (COST): "I think intrusive advising starts really with all students. And the models that I've seen working there are meetings with students early in the semester where they try to identify problem areas. Of course, this is also where things like mid-term grade reports kind of dovetail. And one of the things we have been talking about is the fact that mid-term grade reports don't really seem to be working. We need to do something to try to modify that and make it work in with the system of intrusive advising, so that these intervention techniques will involve an intrusive advisor. I don't know if that answers your question much."

Pat Walker (CLASS): "So are you saying that then it would be up to the advisor to be watching out? They talk about having the intrusive advising being able to address problems that students are having, and especially students that have problems to be able to help them to cope with those problems and find structures that will give them answers. So is it up to the advisor, you're saying, to watch out, and to identify their advisees that are having more problems?"

Jessica Orvis (COST): "Well, the intrusive advisor helps to connect students to resources. We have a lot of available campus resources, but they're sort of spread out, and an intrusive advisor actually would have people from these different campus resources have hours in their intrusive advising center. That's how the one [in] COST is working, and that creates a greater connection, so that when students have trouble with their support structure somewhere the intrusive advisor can identify the professional to help them with that, and set them up right away."

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA): "Let's say you're doing mid-term grade reports or in an ideal world, for example, after the first month of class, an advisor could go to WINGS and simply type in a message that says Michael has missed six out of nine classes, and that would be a message that would go directly to Michael's advisor, or to the advising center under which Michael falls, so that when you do the mid-term grade reports, you would enter an "s" for the student and also be able to put in a note that goes along with that "s" for the student... You might go in and put a "u" for the student, but you might also be able to put in a quick message that would go out to the advisor, so that when the advisor meets with the student, they could discuss, 'I notice you have a u here, but I also notice that your instructor has a note that says, you have missed so many classes, and so let's sort of try to figure out what exactly is happening there.'"

Members of the task force hope that, before students withdraw from classes, there is some discussion with their advisor and/or their faculty member. And one of the reasons that they want to involve the faculty member, the person who was actually teaching that student that semester, is as an advisor. If you go to an advisor in the Business School about a problem with your Biology class, the advisor might just say, "Well, okay, you probably should drop the class." But

your Biology professor might be able to say, "You know, you're not doing as badly as you think," and so might be able to have a full discussion of what you need to do, how you might need to improve.

Chris Caplinger (First-Year Experience): In addition to mid-term grades, the proposal is to provide a little bit more information about attendance, an indication of whether attendance is a factor or if missing assignments is a factor in the reason for the student's poor performance in a class. The proposal is to get some of this online as early as next spring.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS) stated that, if we want to emphasize this university as a place of academic activity, to reassure students in this early academic conversation that they can be assured of an environment that promotes academic study, and to give them confidence that they are coming to a place where we take that seriously, there should be more instruction and information about alcohol use as part of that early curriculum.

Chris Caplinger (First-Year Experience) stated that the task force did not directly address alcohol in any of its specific recommendations. He mentioned that other groups on campus are doing that: Health Services is working in conjunction with Health and Kinesiology in regard to the Health 1520 class that they really want all first-year students to take; there was also some discussion of alcohol in the context of the recommendation to defer Greek Rush to the second semester.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator announced that senators had been discussing the report for 20 minutes. She asked if Caplinger would like to take 10 or 15 seconds to "wind up." Chris Caplinger (FYE) reminded senators that all of the entire report is on the web. There is a series of recommendations and also position papers supporting several of those recommendations. There is also a place for comments. There is also a place online to sign up for the "Conversations with Professors" program.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked about the role of the Senate in this program.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator responded that this had been an information and presentation session.

13. Unfinished Business

Clara Krug (CLASS) had a question about the first-day drop. Faculty members had received from Mike Deal, no date, the new attendance policy: "Deleting Classes First Day for Non-Attendance, DCFD," and it had been discussed at the SEC meeting the previous Thursday. However, faculty in Liberal Arts and Social Sciences had received a few days earlier a document with the same title dated 3-27-2007, 9:30.21 a.m. from the Registrar's office. It came from Dean Jane Rhoades Hudak, and it is a different document in terms of certain content. One of the content items is a history of the policy, 9.2.05: "A faculty member proposed that students be removed from the roll if they missed the first two days of class without having notified the professor in advance of the reason why." Mike Deal indicated that one or more faculty members had requested the first-day drop. However, apparently, there was one faculty member, and that

faculty member proposed that students be deleted if they missed the first two days of class. Krug asked how this request from one person that students be dropped on the second day somehow had changed into dropping students from class on the very first day.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: Since no one could provide an answer, she suggested that Krug file an RFI.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) wondered why an RFI would be necessary.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked if there were any other unfinished business.

Pat Walker (CLASS) asked if Joe Franklin (Business and Finance) had located information as to whether faculty could be paid over a twelve-month period, instead of a ten-month period.

Joe Franklin (VP, Business and Finance) announced that the subject would be a discussion at the Chief Business Officers (CBO) group at their June meeting. It had been discussed with the Fiscal Affairs office at the Board of Regents and also the Office of Information and Instructional Technology. There was no resolution.

Bruce Grube (President) indicated his support of a choice between the two payment schedules.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator asked Franklin when faculty would have that option, if the CBO's approve it at their June meeting.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance) did not know. It is not a policy issue; it's a practice issue. When the PeopleSoft HRMS system was set up, it was set up on ten months. It could have been set up on twelve months as easily; it was just a decision that was made several years ago.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): "I believe the origin of the ten-month versus the twelve-month [schedule] actually arose from some concerns that were expressed by faculty at Georgia State University quite a number of years ago, and it really centered around the idea that faculty were working for ten months, and yet, they were being paid over twelve months, and so, therefore, the University System was in essence holding their money and keeping it from them. And so I think that was, as I recall, the origin of shifting from the twelve months back to the ten months. So now I think we have come around and, Fred's shaking his head, because I think that is in fact what happened. So it appears that every few years this issue arises again, and I think that's where we are at this point. I don't really know that any one nefariously did this; I think it was actually done as a way to put the dollars in people's hands at the time that they earned them, in essence."

Mark Welford (COST) asked about the situation with the ORP/TRS issue.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator reported that the bills have been introduced in the House and Senate. She had sent out information on what was introduced. She reminded senators that anything that has to do with retirement is a two-year process. "Anything fiscally to do with retirement is a two-year process. They have to introduce the bills this time, and then they would

refer them to the actuaries who will work in the interim and then actually take action on the bills depending on the actuaries' report the next session.”

Mike Nielsen (CLASS) returned to the first-day drop issue. He wondered in what sense of the word “pilot” what was happening in the summer would be a pilot test. Nothing in the current plan indicates implementation in a limited framework.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): “[W]e elected to do this as a pilot in session A, I believe, is that correct, Mike?”

Mike Deal (Registrar): “Term A and Term B.”

Linda Bleicken (Provost): “Term A and Term B, to put it out in Term A and see what the issues were, rectify those, and try to resolve any lingering issues in Term B.”

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator: “I guess the question being for certain faculty the idea of a pilot means small scale, try it for maybe 25 – 30 classes, rather than all Term A classes.”

Linda Bleicken (Provost): “We looked at that, and here is the issue. Say that you are a student who is in one of the 25 or 30 classes, and your fellow students are in the other classes that are not in the pilot. How in the world do you treat one group differently from the other? In essence, how do you say to one group, we’re going to drop you on the first day if you don’t attend, and the other group gets a free pass, if you will? So it was very hard to do.”

Mike Nielsen (CLASS) countered that pilot testing in science preserves the possibility that there might be a failure and that there might be a decision to reject it. That didn’t seem to be the case with the document.

Linda Bleicken (Provost): “My guess would be that if we do this in Term A, and it’s a total disaster, that would certainly give us some information, so that from a pilot standpoint, I would say yes that’s a pilot.”

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked for an update about Joe Franklin’s visit to the Forest Drive Building to determine the status of the roof.

Joe Franklin (Business and Finance): “The roof on the Forest Drive Building is indeed in pretty poor shape. There have been ten reported leaks over the last two years, which seems pretty high to me. I have asked Physical Plant to get me an estimate of what it would cost to replace the roof. I did check to see if the roof was replaceable, and, yes, indeed you may replace the roof. It may cost money; it will cost money, but, yes, indeed, you can replace the roof, and they will report that back to me, and we’ll make a decision to see if we’re willing to spend that much money or not.”

Clara Krug (CLASS): “Follow up. So if it’s too expensive, and it could be replaced but won’t be replaced, is that an option? Would it be too expensive to consider replacing the roof?”

Joe Franklin: “Clara, I really anticipate that it’s not too expensive to replace the roof, but I don’t know what that cost estimate would be right now, so I don’t want to say. We’re going to do it. But let me wait until we get an estimate and we’ll move from there.”

Franklin continued that he had checked into the cause of a fire there. “As it turned out, the fire was not a result of the electrical system, but a result of a plastic fan blade that overheated. We have checked into the electrical systems. I have had conversations with Physical Plant people, and they are very satisfied that the electrical system in the building is safe and will be safe for many years to come.”

Candy Schille (CLASS): “I could be wrong, because the SPC minutes are frequently so very vague, but I seem to recall that, Joe, when you came to the SPC, you said that the building itself was going to be gone in two years.”

Joe Franklin: “No. I don’t believe I said that. We, in the SPC we did talk about a number of buildings that will be gone within two years. I believe there are five, and I don’t want to name each and every one of them, but I believe it was five.”

Joe Franklin: “Forest Drive and the Family and Consumer Sciences Building are both of such a size and of such use that we do not have an adequate replacement for them at this time, and I do not foresee that in the next two years.”

Marc Cyr (CLASS): “You and I were emailing back and forth a little bit, Joe, and the issue of the kind of wiring in the building came up and that apparently some of the wiring through Forest Drive is residential grade rather than commercial, and that the fire was caused by a plastic fan that malfunctioned. And I think I asked you, I can’t remember because this was some time ago, about some of the equipment and its rating, whether it is perhaps being asked to carry a load, do a job, appropriate for a commercial applications which is basically what we have here, but is, in fact, a residential quality. It’s great for residential quality, but its being run too long by too many people, too many different users, that kind of thing. Is that a concern? Is there something we can do to address that issue, without bulldozing it?”

Joe Franklin: “I think you mentioned the solution. Physical Plant is satisfied that the electrical system as it is used, the electrical system is appropriate for its use. There are some residential-type breakers in the building, but the use of those is consistent with the breaker itself. And I’m not an electrician, and don’t propose that I am, but our electricians feel very good about this building. They said now there are some other buildings that we might want to talk about, but they were very satisfied that this building was safe as far as its electrical system goes.”

14. New Business

Clara Krug (CLASS) announced that, the week of final exams, Lakeside Café would open at 7:00 a.m. instead of 7:30.

15. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Linda Bleicken (Provost) announced that we have hired a new Graduate Dean, Dr. Timothy Mack, the current Associate Dean in the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences at Virginia Tech.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked if we might thank Sandra Nettles for her service as Interim Dean.

Patricia Humphrey (COST) Senate Moderator led senators in applause.

16. Announcements from the Floor

Bruce Grube thanked Michael Braz, Sarah Hancock, and Gary Dartt and Brenda Dartt for the previous weekend's performances of "Scholar Under Siege."

17. Adjournment at 5:42 p.m.

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate is June 20, 2007, 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., in the Nessmith-Lane Continuing Education Building Ballroom, If necessary, the Senate will reconvene on June 21, 2007, 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m., in the Nessmith-Lane Continuing

Georgia Southern University
Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
6-20-2007
4:00 to 6:00 p.m.
Nessmith-Lane Multipurpose Room

(The attendance was not recorded for this meeting due to the attendance sheet being lost.)

2006-2007 Senate Executive Committee: Patricia Humphrey (COST) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator; Les Furr (CHHS); Ron MacKinnon (CIT); Marc Cyr (CLASS); Bill Wells (COBA); Maggie LaMontagne (COE); Robert Vogel (JPHCOPH); Sonya Shepherd (LIB); Marilyn Bruce (Senate Liaison); Clara Krug (Senate Secretary).

Voting Members in Attendance:

Voting Members Absent: Clara Krug

Administrative Members in Attendance:

Senate Parliamentarian:

SPC Representative: Jerry Wilson

SPC Apprentice: Norman Schmidt.

SGA Representative:

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman

Visitors:

Senate Moderator Patricia Humphrey called the meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 4:00 p.m.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the June 20, 2007, Meeting.

Moderator Patricia Humphrey (COST) brought the meeting to order and the agenda was approved.

2. Approval of the [April 24, 2007, Minutes](#): Secretary Clara Krug being absent, Marc Cyr (CLASS) moved approval of the April 24, 2007, minutes, and they were approved. (NOTE: Cyr received a late correction to those minutes; Maria Smith was present on April 24.)

3. **June 14, 2007, Librarian's Report : Godfrey Gibbison (COBA), Senate Librarian** moved acceptance of the June 14 minutes, which was erroneously identified as the April 24 report; the motion was nonetheless approved.

a. **Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Donna Saye (COST)** moved acceptance of the minutes from two Undergraduate Committee meetings on April 17 and May 15 containing program revisions from the College of Information Technology, the College of Education, the College of Business, the College of Health and Human Sciences, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, the College of Information Technology, and the College of Science and Technology; new courses for the College of Health and Human Sciences, College of Business Administration, and for College of Science and Technology; a revision in the International Trade Second Discipline; deletion of courses for the College of Education; and some course reactivations in CLASS. The UGC report and its recommendations were approved.

b. **Graduate Committee Chair: Sonya Shepherd (LIB)** called for approval of four sets of minutes for the Graduate Committee. Those dates are for January 25th, March 22nd, April 26th, and May 24th. The following was approved:

- new courses, course revisions, and program revisions for the School of Accountancy;
- a new program, the DBA in Logistics and Supply Chain Management in the College of Business Administration;
- new courses, course revisions and deletions, and program revisions and deletions for the Department of Leadership, Technology, and Human Development and Teaching and Learning, and the retention policy for all graduate educator preparation programs;
- program revisions and a change in advisement for perspective MAT students for the Department of Curriculum, Foundations, and Research in the College of Ed;
- new courses, course revisions, and a new program, the Doctor of Nursing Practice, for the Department of Nursing in the College of Health and Human Sciences;
- new courses, course revisions and deletions for the Department of Psychology in preparation for the PsyD program;
- new courses, course revisions and deletions, and program revisions for the Department of Music in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences;
- course revisions and program revisions in the Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health;
- course revisions for the Department of Biology;
- new courses, course revisions and deletions for the Department of Mathematical Sciences;
- new courses for the Department of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering Technology in the College of Science and Technology.

The committee's monthly discussions included graduate assistant stipends, graduate student recruitment, the Dean of Graduate Studies Search, graduate program funding, and online programs, and the 2006-2007 COGS vision update.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked for a quick and general rundown re: graduate recruitment.

Shepherd (LIB) noted that Dawn Lipker and Susan Davies were at those meetings and gave an update on the recruiting efforts that they were part of, including some open house sessions in the Library, and some other strategies for increasing student enrollment.

Moderator Humphrey (COST) added that she had learned that day that GSU is kicking in an extra \$1,000 for graduate stipend, plus \$350 toward their health insurance.

The Graduate Committee report was approved.

4. President's Report: Dr. Bruce Grube:

Enrollments

This summer we're running about 900 to 1,000 students higher than we did last summer; the fall is looking similarly strong.

Vice President for Information Technology

The Vice President for Information Technology has about 100 applications, and 92% of them meet minimum qualifications.

Change of Guard

In the change of guard, Bill Golden, who has been our Director of Governmental Relations for a number of years, headed up our Foundation prior to that, and is one of the Deans of Governmental Relations within the University System of Georgia, is retiring and will be greatly missed. Russell Keen, who was our Student Body President in 1998, is taking over.

Legislative Visits

President Grube has been out on the road working legislative visits, to meet people on their home turf and talk with them and stay up on their radar. All those meetings have gone exceptionally well. He noted that Georgia Southern escapes the kinds of barbs and arrows and rocks that are thrown at some of the campuses within the system. We're regarded as just a very excellent, solid campus that pays attention to educating students, such that despite the Civil War going on among the Republicans, Georgia Southern was not particularly affected by that business last year, and actually did well.

5. Moderator Humphrey (COST), Chair, Senate Executive Committee noted it has been blessedly quiet for the SEC. At the April meeting the Senate voted to ask the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee to work, in terms of oversight, on the Seniors to Sophomore Program. That motion was approved by Dr. Grube. However, the motion approved in April to give faculty 72 hours to submit final course grades after the final exam for a course was not approved by Dr. Grube, who cited concerns over the Registrar's office and Financial Aid being able to do their jobs; he also cited the change in the reporting deadline being moved from 48 hours after your

final exam to 48 hours after the last final exam, which gives faculty, depending on when the particular final exam is, up to 120 hours to submit their final grades.

RFI

There were two RFIs submitted in the interim. One was regarding DigitalMeasures, which is going to be used for faculty reporting their activities, generating annual reports, and other things that the administration needs. A faculty member wanted to know who owns DigitalMeasures. No one seems to know. They are based out of Milwaukee and likely are a privately-held company.

They were, in essence, the only viable responder to the task force that was formed by Dr. Bleicken to look into a system of this nature, a search prompted by a faculty member who complained that some of his activities got left off his department's annual report. DM have been adopted by numerous universities for faculty activity reporting. Using GOOGLE, Moderator Humphrey discovered the following re: their security measures:

- *All data collected over a 128-bit SSL-encrypted connection*
- *Servers located in a Tier-One datacenter*
- *Locked, caged server room*
- *Armed security guards on staff 24-hours per day*
- *Redundant fire suppression and climate control systems*
- *Redundant power and Internet connections*
- *Secure nightly backups to five geographically-dispersed locations*

- *They are compliant with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) legislation.*

- *They are registered with and certified by the United States Department of Commerce as compliant with the Safe Harbor Principles in effect between the European Commission and US.*

David Ewing is going to look into things a little bit more. They are working in IT Services to establish a firm policy on getting outside vendors like DigitalMeasures in terms of how they are going to have to take care of securing our data.

The administration will use the data gathered primarily for annual reports, and in relation to promotion and tenure. The system is set up so that a department chair only has access to his/her department's information. You can only access your information, and so on up the chain. A Dean can only access information from his/her own college, so on, so forth. So, anybody and everybody can't get an individual's information.

Clara Krug (CLASS) submitted an RFI about the deleting of classes for not attending the first day. The original proposal, which had been passed to CLASS faculty members from Dean Hudak, was that students be removed from the roll if they missed the first *two* days of a class without having notified the professor in advance of the reason why. It was changed when this policy, as all policies like it, was referred to Enrollment Management, who were concerned that two class days, in some cases, especially for a Tuesday/Thursday class, would require that we extend add/drop period, which would be totally unworkable because students have probably missed too much of a chunk at that point.

There were no agenda item requests.

The SEC assigned committees for next year, trying to go by the submitted Committee Preference Reports as much as possible.

Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:

Violations

We had four of them – one each for football, volleyball, women’s soccer, and women’s basketball -- all classified as minor, and no conference action was taken on any of them, and none affected eligibility status. Geyerman gave the mind-numbing and hence hilarious picayune details of each violation.

GPA

Geyerman gave a GPA handout that showed student-athletes tend to do as well or a little bit better as a general rule than the student population; Women’s tennis, once again, is on the Dean’s list basically as a squad.

APR

[NOTE: What follows challenges this temporary acting Secretary’s clarifying powers.]

Geyerman then moved to the handout of APR (Academic Progress Rate) data, which were the basis for three of our teams losing scholarships. The chart showed the third year. Next year, APR moves into its fourth year and then we’ll have a rolling average. By way of review, each student-athlete can earn a total of four points for his/her academic year.

- One point per regular semester for remaining academically eligible.
- One point per semester for being retained on the team, and if all of the students do that, then the team’s APR is 1,000. That’s perfect: everybody’s eligible and everyone’s retained.

The handout chart showed where all of our teams are: It gave the multi-year rate, the multi-year upper confidence boundary, and then what it is just for 2005-2006, and eligibility/graduation and retention, both for the multi-year rate and for 2006. Nine twenty-five is the number we want to shoot for in all of those. Depending on the sport, and how many student-athletes are involved,

when you fall below 925, you can be subjected to penalties. At its base, this data must show improvement, how athletes compare with the regular student body, all of that kind of thing. So when you look at the multi-year rate for baseball, for APR, and the multi-year rate with the upper confidence boundary, you have below 925, but for 2005-2006, it's 938, so we don't get penalized for 2005-2006. But based on the multi-year rate, baseball lost two-tenths of a scholarship.

Geyerman asked if this made sense. Candy Schille (CLASS) asked a math question. Geyerman noted she was using the wrong equation: "The total financial value of the penalty for baseball was two-tenths of one scholarship. Baseball's an equivalency sport, which means the coach can have 25 players on the team, but he might only have 11 scholarships to divvy up between those 25 players. So when you lose two-tenths of a scholarship, that means that the student-athletes that did not meet those criteria valued in at two-tenths of a scholarship. But we lose, because they're gone. And then basketball is another sport, and in that sport the value of the financial aid penalty is two scholarships. We've taken one this year, this season we already got one of those out and we'll take the other one in the fall, next season or there's a possibility that there's a waiver in place, and it may be taken into 2008-2009 season. Football gets a little bit more complicated. We have a multi-year rate of 890. [. . .] the value of the financial aid penalty is six, but that is based on, that's off of 85 scholarships [. . .] which is the full championship limit, not the football championship subdivision that we are in. We have, see, they have 85 scholarships, the big boys to give to 85 people. In our division, you have 63 scholarships to spread over 85 people. Okay. So when they get all done with the math, what that means is, rather than losing six scholarships, which would happen to a football championship size school that competed in that subdivision, they would lose six, but because our initial counter is 63 and not 85, we lose 4.66 scholarships and that penalty has already been paid. It was paid this last season. Okay, so that's the APR Report. There's a graphic comparison on the back. It gets crazy after a while [. . .]."

Mary Marwitz (CLASS) asked what an upper-confidence boundary is.

Moderator Humphrey (COST), speaking as a statistician, said "that's talking about it's going to be at most this much, with 95% confidence."

Geyerman said that was clearer than he could state it. He then commented that APR and the academic progress of the student-athletes is very much on the radar with the Athletic Department and Academic Affairs. Coaches have submitted improvement plans and there are a variety of other things that are happening, including taking an audit of study practices and study skills. We're looking with a much more critical eye and a closer monitoring of the provisionally admitted student-athletes that come in starting this fall. There are measures in place now that will hold coaches accountable in terms of signatures through the chain-of-command. At Southern Conference meetings and the NCAA meeting in January, APR has been the most talked about thing, particularly among the faculty athletic representatives and the presidents.

Sonya Shepherd (LIB) had a question related to the study skills of the student-athletes. A lot of the athletes come into the Library wanting the librarians to sign off on study hall hours. How do librarians verify that they're actually doing what they're supposed to be doing?

Geyerman did not know, but referred faculty to Julie Strickland, who is in charge of tutoring and helping with study hall. He also suggested that faculty keep in mind that head coaches have a lot of influence, and he was sure they would welcome any kind of input.

President Grube noted that the preceding had been one of the more clear explanations of APR he has ever heard. He further noted that he is chair of the Presidential Advisory Group made up of I-AA institutions for the NCAA, is on the Board of Directors for Division I of the NCAA, and is on the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors for all of the divisions of the NCAA. APR is the result of academic reform that was undertaken by the NCAA, and it's a good thing because it has put a lot of focus on being careful that we're recruiting students that can succeed, that they're supported when they are here, that they're retained, and that they're graduated. Because something significantly less than 2% of these student athletes will have professional careers in sports that amount to anything. The attitude was universities/colleges have no business bringing in students simply to use them as athletes and then disregard what was going to happen to them after their eligibility had expired, if in fact they even made it through their eligibility. So while this is causing some pain for coaches, it's a good thing. Among other things, students who do not meet the regular requirements for admission to the university, such as SAT scores, will require a vice president's signature, and a lot of discussion, before the student will be admitted, along with a plan submitted by the coach and the athletics department for how they intend to support that student and see if they succeed. Nationally, the three teams that have APR difficulty are exactly the same three teams that we're looking at here at GSU: Baseball, men's basketball, and football. However, the grade point averages of student-athletes generally are really good.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) noted that, once-upon-a-time, the students would come to faculty with a piece of paper and ask if we would write their grades on the piece of paper and note absences and so on, and lately we have been getting emails from Julie [Strickland] saying go to a website and put the grades in. Gibbison prefers the piece of paper because it gets him a talk with the student.

Geyerman (NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative) noted that this has been discussed at the meetings of the University Athletics Committee, and that he had voiced that very concern, that electronic reports would diminish the response rate because it's easy to delete. The UAC decided to try it for a year and look at the response rate versus the old one. Geyerman would, however, raise the issue again.

Moderator Humphrey (COST) noted that the paper reports were requested about every two weeks or so, but nowadays it's more like once a semester you get the email, so they're not checking up that often.

Geyerman said those decisions are done team-by-team by the head coach, but he would happily carry that concern back to the UAC.

7. Report from Norman Schmidt (COST), SPC Representative: No report from SPC.

8. Unfinished Business

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) asked for an update on how the experimental round of first day drop went.

Registrar Mike Deal was not present, and Provost Linda Bleicken noted that she did not have full information, but said “107 students were able to get into classes that they would not have had otherwise. I do think that it went fairly smoothly, according to what I heard, so that’s what I can tell you.”

Moderator Humphrey (COST) asked VP for Business and Finance Joe Franklin the choice between the ten and twelve month pay periods.

Franklin had just come back from the meeting of system VP’s in which there was not much support for any change. They didn’t have a real strong concern about changing it, but they did have some concern about having an either/or. They were kind of dismissive of this. Franklin urged them to continue discussion because there was a strong feeling among the faculty that they wanted something to be done about that, but that’s where the issue was left.

Moderator Humphrey (COST) then asked for news on the Forest Drive Building roof.

Franklin (VP for Business & Finance) replied that they had a company study the roof: “It’s kind of like [. . .] an inner tube, where you poke a hole in it, you can seal it up, but then you poke another hole in it, and it needs sealing up again.” We have an estimate of the cost to replace the roof, and no decision has yet been made as to whether to replace it or not: “It won’t be in this year-end cycle, because it’s a little late for that, but it’s something that we could consider for next year, but we have looked it, got somebody to come up there with a, I think its one of those roofs that you would kind of spray on and it expands and seals all cracks, but we’re looking at that, yes.”

Onyile Onyile (CLASS) asked if we can expect hearing something about this twelve month/ten month business again.

Joe Franklin (Business & Finance) noted he had brought the issue to the attention of the Chief Fiscal Affairs Officer of the Board of Regents, and also to the Director of the Office of Information & Instructional Technology. The Office of Instructional Technology would be the office that would have to make the technological change that would make that possible: “I don’t think I have a lot more that I can really exert there. I did encourage them strongly to talk with other people who I felt were very interested in the issue.”

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked if his suggestions to them were in writing, or only verbal.

Franklin replied, “It was verbal. However, it is on audio tape. Because we do take minutes, and at some point in the next six months we’ll have a transcript.”

9. **New Business:** None

10. **Announcements: Vice Presidents:** None

11. **Announcements from the Floor**

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) noted that, after serving as moderator for two consecutive years, Pat Humphrey is rotating off senate, and called for a round of applause for her hard work as moderator.

President Grube, “this responsibility she has taken on for the last two years is one which does require a lot of time and a lot of energy, and that she’s done it with dedication and done it well.” He then presented here with a plaque honoring her service.

Moderator Humphrey (COST) then passed the gavel to incoming Moderator Marc Cyr (CLASS).

12. **Adjournment** 4:48 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Marc Cyr (CLASS).

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 19, 2007
4:00 TO 6:00 P.M.
RUSSELL UNION BALLROOM

2007-2008 Senate Executive Committee: Dr. Marc Cyr (CLASS); Dr. Les Furr (CHHS); Dr. Jim Whitworth (CIT); Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS); Dr. Michael Reksulak (COBA); Dr. Michael Moore (COE); Dr. Bruce McLean (COST); Dr. Alison Scott (JPHCOPH); Dr. Charles Skewis (LIB); Ms. Marilyn Bruce (Senate Liaison)

Voting Members in Attendance:, Dr. Frank Atuahene, Dr. John Averett, Dr. Barry Balleck, Dr. Scott Beck, Mr. Jim Braselton, Dr. Jean-Paul Carton, Dr. Jonathan Copeland, Dr. Marc Cyr, Dr. Nirmal Das, Dr. Terry Diamanduros, Dr. Alison Dobson, Dr. Richard Flynn, Dr. Les Furr, Dr. Tim Giles, Dr. Mary Hadley, Dr. Greg Harwood, Ms. Ellen Hendrix, Dr. Clara Krug, Mr. Alain Lawo-Sukam, Dr. Jill Lockwood, Dr. Bruce McLean, Dr. Ron MacKinnon, Amy Boyett (alternate for Dr. Jim McMillan), Dr. Mary Marwitz, Mr. Mark Mohr, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Patrick Novotny, Dr. Constantine Oglobin, Dr. Broderick Oluyede, Dr. Onyile Onyile, Dr. Michael Reksulak, Dr. David Rostal, Dr. Norman Schmidt, Dr. Alison Scott, Mr. Charles Skewis, Mr. Fred Smith, Dr. T. Maria Smith, Dr. Diana Sturges, Dr. Brenda Talley, Dr. Patrick Wheaton, Dr. Jim Whitworth, Dr. LeVon Wilson, Dr. Mark Yanochik

Voting Members Absent: Dr. Ahmed Adu-Oppong, Dr. John Averett, Dr. Maggie LaMontagne, Dr. Lowell Mooney, Dr. Broderick Oluyede, Dr. David Robinson

Administrative Members in Attendance: Dr. Bruce Grube, President, Dr. Linda Bleicken, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs, Dr. Teresa Thompson, Vice President, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, Mr. Billy Griffis, Vice President, University Advancement, Ms. Marilyn Bruce, Executive to the President, Dr. Jim Bradford, Dean, CIT, Dr. Jane Rhoades Hudak, Dean, CLASS, Dr. Cindi Chance, Dean, COE, Dr. Bret Danilowicz, Dean, COST, Dr. Bede Mitchell, Dean, University Library, Dr. Timothy Mack, Dean, COGS, Dr. Gary Means, Dean, CEPS, Dr. Fred Whitt, Dean, CHHS

Senate Parliamentarian: Bob Cook (CIT)

SPC Representative: Norman Schmidt (COST)

SGA Representative: Mr. Tedrick Kelly (SGA)

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

Visitors: Doralina Martínez Conde, Amy Heaston, Candace Griffith, Sonya Huber-Humes

Senate Moderator Marc Cyr called the meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 4:00 p.m.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the September 19, 2007, Meeting. Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator proposed that the agenda be amended to allow for the addition of item # 2, the

election of the Parliamentarian, and to reverse the order of the two motions from the Faculty Development Committee. The agenda as amended was approved.

2. Election of Parliamentarian.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator called for nomination of the SEC's candidate for Parliamentarian, Bob Cook. Michael Moore (COE) nominated Bob Cook, and Clara Krug (CLASS) seconded.

Cook was elected unanimously.

3. Approval of the [June 20, 2007](#), Minutes: Richard Flynn (CLASS), Senate Secretary moved that the minutes of the meeting of June 20, 2007 be accepted. Krug (CLASS) seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.

4. Librarian's Report of [September 19, 2007](#): Michael Moore (COE), Senate Librarian moved acceptance of the Librarian's Report, reminding Senators that accepting the minutes does not constitute approval of the committees' actions; rather, it means the Senate accepts the minutes as being accurate. The motion was seconded and the Librarian's Report was accepted unanimously.

Committee Reports.

a. Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Michael Moore (COE): No report.

b. Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Ron MacKinnon (CIT) 2006-2007 chair reporting: No report.

5. President's Report:

President Grube called on Vice President Billy Griffis to report on the "very successful" Day for Southern.

Billy Griffis (Vice President for University Advancement): reported a record day of support from the community and the University. The total announced at the victory celebration, \$1,314,000, exceeded the internal goal of 1.3 million dollars. Vice President Griffis noted that the faculty and staff and the retirees contributed \$330,248 which is over, slightly over 25 percent of the total Day for Southern, with 75 percent of faculty and staff making a gift to Georgia Southern through the Day for Southern. He thanked the faculty on behalf of the University Advancement, the Georgia Southern Foundation, and Southern Boosters.

President Grube then offered kudos to the Faculty Senate, whose participation rate was 82 percent.

The President announced the move of the Communication Arts faculty to Veazey Hall. He visited the new offices and noted everybody seemed very happy to be in a freshly-renovated building.

He then noted that the Theatre/Arts Project was near completion. The building will have faculty offices, art galleries, and a black box theatre, which will be another occasion for celebration for the theatre section of Communication Arts, and the Art Department.

The President announced that we are in the planning stages for Centennial Place, a new student housing development on the site of Winburn, Olliff, Johnson Hall, ROTC, and Building 805. If all goes well and if the finances come together we would expect to begin demolishing buildings on that site sometime after commencement next year.

Dr. Grube then discussed his meetings with new faculty members in small breakfast groups. He praised the high quality of these recent hires, saying, “We are getting a lot of very fine new colleagues joining us here.”

The President introduced Gary Gawell, the new Director of Diversity Services, noting that he is the most highly qualified person in this position that we’ve had at Georgia Southern.

Finally, the President ended “on a high note,” reporting that that so far this year he is no longer responsible for football scores.

6. Marc Cyr (CLASS), Chair, Senate Executive Committee reported that the SEC received three agenda item requests. One of them, Mary Marwitz’s request that we look into a University policy for responding to a death in the University community was referred to the Welfare Community. The other two agenda items from the Faculty Development Committee were split into three, so that we now have two motions and one discussion item on today’s agenda. The SEC has also charged both the Welfare and Service committee to work jointly on looking into how service is valued and evaluated around campus. Finally, the SEC is also in the early stages of looking into issues concerning senate participation and the electoral process.
7. Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative
Professor Geyerman reported that the Student Athlete Advisory Board had had its first meeting. The students on the board are involved in several community service projects that will benefit several organizations.
8. Report from Norman Schmidt (COST), SPC Representative: The GSU Strategic Plan of 2004 states that “Georgia Southern University will be recognized as one of the best public comprehensive universities in the country within the next ten years.” The SPC is charged with looking at the Strategic Plan and advising the President regarding the

progress GSU is making toward achieving this goal. While we are making some progress because GSU has been recognized as a Carnegie Doctoral Research University. GSU faculty, staff, and alumni unfortunately don't really understand what this means. Therefore, the SPC conducted a survey of faculty, staff, and alumni last May, in May 2007. The results of the survey are still being analyzed, however, to improve knowledge of the Carnegie reclassification the SPC is currently planning a series of focus groups to discuss this reclassification with faculty and staff. Later in the year, the SPC is planning to review the Level II plan and to see what changes, if any, need to be made. We will then meet with the Vice Presidents to discuss the Level II plans in the spring.

9. Election of Faculty Senate Librarian.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator announced that the Librarian we elected, last spring, Bill Wells, has moved into administration and stepped down as Librarian. Mike Moore has been serving as interim Librarian, and we need to elect him if we wish him to continue. Moderator Cyr called for nominations. Richard Flynn (CLASS) nominated Michael Moore. The nomination was seconded. Moore was unanimously elected.

10. Confirmation of Barry Balleck (CLASS) as SGA Liaison

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator called for a vote to confirm Barry Balleck as the Senate Liaison with the Student Government Association. Balleck was unanimously confirmed.

11. Motion: [That college level review committees for Education Leave applications be comprised of at least three faculty members with two-thirds or more of their workload in teaching.](#)

Clara Krug (CLASS) Chair, Faculty Development Committee noted that it did not seem that college-level committees were being used to evaluate Educational Leave applications across the University. Since the Educational Leave Policy specifies such a committee, the Faculty Development committee unanimously recommended that such committees be composed of [the secretary wishes to avoid replicating the motion's usage error "comprised of"] full-time faculty, defined as faculty with two-thirds or more of their workload in teaching (using the same terminology that applies to the Faculty Grievance Committee).

After some discussion and Provost Bleicken's reassurance that the Provost and Deans very much support the current policy which calls for college level committees, the motion passed unanimously.

12. Motion: [That the Faculty Development Committee be removed from the Educational Leave Process.](#)

Clara Krug (CLASS) Chair, Faculty Development Committee moved that the committee be removed from the Educational Leave process for the following reasons:

1. The Committee has no budget for such leaves.

2. The Committee's recommendations are not binding
3. The Committee's participation delays funding decisions by several weeks

She noted the committee's confusion about why it is involved in the process.

The motion was seconded.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) noted that the committee is appointed by the Provost, and that the Educational Leave Policy does not specify that the Faculty Development Committee serve as the University-level committee. He questioned the need for the motion, and asked if we were being asked to revise the Educational Leave Policy to remove the review committee appointed by the Provost.

Clara Krug (CLASS) replied that the Faculty Development Committee wished to be removed from the process for the reasons stated: "having no budget, making it a longer time frame for the applicant, not having any of our recommendations or non-recommendations be binding."

Michael Moore (COE) asked how many applications we have every year. Clara Krug (CLASS) responded that in the two semesters in which she has been involved, they had twelve in the spring and seven in the fall.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) pointed out that when a department chair and dean sign off, they are taking responsibility for the budgetary issues that are involved

Clara Krug (CLASS) agreed, saying it is more appropriate that the committee of faculty lie at the college-level because that is where the budgetary wherewithal exists.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator asked if Krug was saying that we should have a faculty committee review only at the college-level, not at the university-level, that the applications should go directly from the college committees to the Provost.

Clara Krug (CLASS) noted that the Educational Leave Policy doesn't permit eliminating the university-level review committee, but noted the difficulty of faculty from different disciplines understanding the applications.

President Grube asked whether Krug was talking about abolishing the university-wide committee or whether the Development committee wished to be relieved of that duty. He asked whether the concept of the university committee still remains even if the Faculty Development Committee, for whatever reason, wishes to withdraw from the Educational Leave process.

Clara Krug (CLASS) answered that this would have to be the case because of the policies that were approved on October 25, 2005 by the Faculty Senate.

Michael Moore (COE) said he opposed the motion because it reduces faculty involvement in the process.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) noted that the Senate didn't appoint the Faculty Development Committee as the committee in this process. The best the Senate can do is recommend to the President and the Provost that the Faculty Development Committee no longer be involved.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said that what we had was an informal arrangement in which the committee was on loan to the Provost, and that the motion asks us to call in that loan.

President Grube noted that having an elected or appointed university-level committee separate from the Senate for the purpose of reviewing leave is not an unusual arrangement.

Mary Marwitz (CLASS) said that the present policy became operational only in the spring of '07, and that the new layer of committee review by the Faculty Development seemed redundant.

Moderator Marc Cyr (CLASS) called for a vote on the motion that the Faculty Development Committee requests that it be removed from the educational leave process and no longer serve as a review committee appointed by the Provost, and university level committee reviewing applications.

The motion passed with 22 in favor and 9 opposed.

13. Discussion Only: [Changing the timeline/dates for submitting applications for Educational Leave.](#)

Clara Krug (CLASS) discussed a proposed change in application deadlines for Educational leave applications, noting that decisions for such leaves

1. Often occurs after class schedules have been set.
2. Notifications occur too late for the applicant to know whether he or she has the time off to use faculty research grant awards for such activity as travel to collections.
3. The present timeline is such that applicants have not been informed of the status of their applications by graduation day.

The committee proposed the following deadline:

For fall semester 2009: Application to the Chair would be September 15, 2008; notification by the Provost would be December 10, 2008. That would let the

applicant who was successful have plenty of time to make an application for a research grant.

For spring semester 2010, so again, the 2009-2010 Academic Year: Application to the Chair would be September 15, notification by the Provost on December 10.

The committee did not ask for a motion on this because we thought there might be a lot of discussion that would ensue and maybe the Deans' Council would want to talk about this also.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) said that he didn't like the idea of there being only one time per year to apply.

Moderator Cyr (CLASS) asked Senators to send suggestions to the Provost and to Clara Krug, so that they can be discussed in other venues before coming to the Senate.

14. Unfinished Business

Barry Balleck (CLASS) inquired on behalf of Michael Nielsen about the reasoning behind a 10-month pay period for regular faculty as opposed to twelve months. At the time VP of Business & Finance Joe Franklin had indicated that it was Regents' policy. But Nielsen forwarded a piece from the UGA *Columns* dated February 6, 2006, which is entitled "[New Policy Allows Faculty to Receive Paychecks Year-Round](#)" and asked for some clarification on from Vice President Franklin.

In Joe Franklin's absence, Provost Bleicken noted that Franklin has had communication with the Chief Business Officer at the system level, inquiring whether a 12-month [ay period option can happen at Georgia Southern if it can happen at Georgia, but she didn't know whether he had received a response.

Bruce Grube (President) said that "everybody is on the same page" regarding this issue, and that he saw no reason we shouldn't have the same option faculty have at Georgia.

Clara Krug (CLASS) Thanked Provost Linda Bleicken on behalf of the Faculty Development Committee for providing an additional \$10,500 for professional travel to the committee's budget. The committee has tentatively decided to divide the funds among the three professional travel funding cycles, so each one will have about \$3,500 in additional dollars.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked for a progress report on the repair of the Forest Drive roof. President Grube replied that the roof will be replaced.

15. New Business

No new business.

16. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Linda Bleicken (Provost) introduced the new Dean of the College of Graduate Studies, Tim Mack, who comes to Georgia Southern from Virginia Tech.

She then thanked all those who participated in the Inaugural Conversations with Professors that we did the day before class started. The response from the faculty who participated was 92 percent positive, and the students were well served.

Provost Bleicken then discussed the system-level initiative on the core curriculum, chaired by President Dorothy Leland from Georgia College and State University. Three committees are being formed, or rather, one committee, the steering committee has been formed and two are in the process of being formed. Dr. Bleicken has been named a member of the steering committee. Several nominees from the campus were being forwarded on Friday, September 21. The other two committees are the core curriculum competencies committee and the core curriculum design committee. There are two musts that have been laid in front of the committees: one is that this core will be a competency-based one. And the second of course is that it will be transferable among all 35 institutions.

17. Announcements from the Floor

JoEllen Broome (LIB) extended, on behalf of Dean Mitchell, an invitation to attend the “Scholarly Communication in the 21st Century: Trends and Issues” presentation, 7:00 p.m., October 4th, here in the Russell Ballroom.

18. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 29, 2007
4:00 TO 6:00 P.M.
RUSSELL UNION BALLROOM

2007-2008 Senate Executive Committee: Dr. Marc Cyr (CLASS); Dr. Les Furr (CHHS); Dr. Jim Whitworth (CIT); Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS); Dr. Michael Reksulak (COBA); Dr. Michael Moore (COE); Dr. Bruce McLean (COST); Dr. Alison Scott (JPHCOPH); Dr. Charles Skewis (LIB); Ms. Marilyn Bruce (Senate Liaison)

Voting Members in Attendance: Dr. Ahmed Adu-Oppong, Dr. Frank Atuahene, Dr. John Averett, Mr. Jim Braselton, Dr. Jean-Paul Carton, Dr. Marc Cyr, Dr. Terry Diamanduros, Dr. Alison Dobson, Dr. Richard Flynn, Dr. Tim Giles, Dr. Mary Hadley, Dr. Greg Harwood, Ms. Ellen Hendrix, Dr. Clara Krug, Dr. Maggie LaMontagne, Mr. Alain Lawo-Sukam, Dr. Jill Lockwood, Dr. Bruce McLean, Amy Boyett (alternate for Dr. Jim McMillan), Dr. Lowell Mooney, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Patrick Novotny, Dr. Onyile Onyile, Dr. Michael Reksulak, Dr. Norman Schmidt, Dr. Alison Scott, Mr. Charles Skewis, Mr. Fred Smith, Dr. T. Maria Smith, Dr. Diana Sturges, Dr. Brenda Talley, Dr. Patrick Wheaton, Dr. Jerry Wilson (alternate for Dr. LeVon Wilson), Dr. Mark Yanochik

Voting Members Absent: Dr. Barry Balleck, Dr. Scott Beck, Dr. Jonathan Copeland, Dr. Nirmal Das, Dr. Les Furr, Dr. Ron MacKinnon, Dr. Mary Marwitz, Mr. Mark Mohr, Dr. Constantine Oglobin, Dr. Broderick Oluyede, Dr. David Robinson, Dr. David Rostal, Dr. Jim Whitworth

Administrative Members in Attendance: Dr. Linda Bleicken, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs, Mr. Steve Burrell, Vice President, Information Technology; Mr. Joe Franklin, Vice President, Business & Finance, Dr. Teresa Thompson, Vice President, Student Affairs and Enrollment Management, Ms. Marilyn Bruce, Executive to the President, Dr. Gary Means, Dean, CEPS, Dr. Jane Rhoades Hudak, Dean, CLASS, Dr. Timothy Mack, Dean, COGS, Dr. Bret Danilowicz, Dean, COST

Senate Parliamentarian: Dr. Bob Cook (CIT)

SPC Representative: Dr. Norman Schmidt (COST)

SGA Representative: Brandon Cook for Jonathan Simpson

NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:

Visitors: Candace Griffith, Judi Repman, Dr. Lisa Schule

Senate Moderator Marc Cyr called the meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 4:01 p.m.

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the October 29, 2007 Meeting.** The motion that the agenda be approved was seconded and passed.
2. **Approval of the [September 19, 2007](#), Minutes: Richard Flynn (CLASS), Senate Secretary** noted that Moderator Cyr had a few minor, non-substantive corrections to the minutes and moved that the minutes be approved. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved.
3. **Librarian's Report of [October 22, 2007](#): Michael Moore (COE), Senate Librarian** moved acceptance of the Librarian's Report.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator reminded the Senate that accepting the Librarian's Report meant accepting the accuracy of the minutes reported by the committees, and not the actions taken by any of the committees.

The motion was seconded and the Librarian's Report was accepted.

- a. **Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Michael Moore (COE)** moved we acceptance of the Undergraduate Committee minutes included in Librarian's Report.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator reminded the Senate that accepting the Undergraduate Committee minutes meant accepting their recommendations.

The Undergraduate Committee report was accepted.

- b. **Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Jill Lockwood (COBA)** noted that she intended to make use of the three subcommittees described in the Graduate Committee's operating procedures: the Academic Standards Committee, which will look at all of the graduate programs on campus, the and admission requirements; the Program Review Assessment and Strategic Planning Committee, which will be working on the Graduate College's mission statement and vision statements; and the Curriculum Committee, which will vet all new programs, course additions, deletions, and adjustments. She noted that is not the job of the Curriculum Committee to second-guess a course in a program. But the committee will concern itself with the viability of new programs, such as adequate student demand, and with the clarity of the proposals.

Lockwood discussed the business of the committee, the proposed Master of Education and Accomplished Teaching in the College of Education. The online program, offered in conjunction with a consortium of other universities in the University System required change of admissions criteria and transfer credits. After discussion that particular proposal passed unanimously.

Also passed were several courses from the Music Department.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator called for any discussion of the Graduate Committee report.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked about an item under section VII, Dean's Update, Paragraph 5, about Bologna Degrees, 3 years bachelor's degree in Europe, which noted that GSU policy has been not to accept these degrees and suggested GSU needs to review the acceptance of students with the 3-year degrees. Dean Mack proposed sending additional information to the Graduate Committee. Krug wondered what the problem was with accepting these degrees, noting that European degrees differ from American degrees often as a result of a much more rigorous secondary school preparation.

Tim Mack, Dean (COGS) offered the clarification that the Bologna Process will actually be enacted in 2010. Forty-one nations have agreed to a common undergraduate format and experience which will produce a 3-year Bachelor's degree. Currently, Admissions does not accept 3-year degrees and because there are some from some questionable sources internationally. The Graduate Committee is discussing this with an eye toward saying yes, we do want these students.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked whether it is a GSU refusal to accept the 3-year degrees. Or was it a University System decision.

Tim Mack (COGS) noted that he wasn't sure, but according to the Council of Graduate Schools (the National Organization of Graduate Schools) more than 67 percent of the Graduate School across the country are accepting or starting to accept these 3-year degrees.

There being no further discussion, the Senate voted to accept the Graduate Committee Report.

4. **President's Report:** In Dr. Grube's absence, Dr. Linda Bleicken (Provost) delivered the President's Report. First, she recognized and welcomed Steve Burrell, the new Vice President for Information Technology.

Doctoral Research Institution

Dr. Bleicken noted she had begun a discussion with the SEC and at the general faculty meeting about the 2005 Carnegie designation of the University as a Doctoral Research Institution. She noted a need for us to grapple with what that means. "Essentially," Dr. Bleicken noted, "we were designated in that slot primarily because of the number of doctoral students that we have graduated over a period of years. There are several characteristics that define a Doctoral Research University, and that is one. Another one where we do not meet the profile is external research funding, and that is an area where we are going to obviously concentrate some effort during the coming years." Because the

designation has led to a lot of conversation on the campus and questions about what this means for Georgia Southern, Dr. Bleicken felt the need to discuss some “processes that have gone on in the last year.”

Crane Metamarketing

In February of 2007, the University engaged a company called Crane Metamarketing, to do something called a “branding” of the University, to help define for our external publics, in particular, who we are. Crane initially met with members of the administration, some faculty members, deans and chairs in a series of focus groups. From those meetings they devised the survey conducted in April 2007 to gauge our definitions of Georgia Southern and how we think of ourselves. The survey was completed by faculty members, students, alumni, parents, and staff. At about the same time, the Strategic Planning Council also did a survey looking at some questions, among them: What does being a doctoral research university mean to you? Some survey results were released a couple of weeks ago by the Crane firm at the annual administrative workshop.

Bleicken noted that the findings from the survey are interesting and offered a brief overview. Students, parents, alumni, and faculty all overwhelmingly agreed (at a rate of about 90%) that if they had the chance to choose again they would choose Georgia Southern. Some of the top reasons were that there were close connections here between students and professors; that the campus was a very warm and inclusive place; and also that it was a very beautiful and safe environment. Another question had to do with what people hoped never would change at Georgia Southern. Students, parents, alumni, all agreed that what they hoped would never change were the close bonds that they felt exist between professors and students, and that true caring that exists among the faculty and staff toward students.

When asked if you could change something, if you could wave your magic wand and change something what would that be, the faculty’s top responses on that were: place more emphasis on investment or investment in research; add more graduate programs; integrate graduate students more fully into our process; but at the other end of the spectrum, many faculty said we should get back to being a teaching first type of institution. Among the faculty, then, there was a lot of agreement about the first questions, but not as much agreement about what would we change going forward. Taking this into account, Bleicken noted a need for discussion particularly among the faculty here at Georgia Southern about our future direction in order to answer the question, how would we like this doctoral research university to look? How would we define a doctoral research university in Georgia Southern terms?

Bleicken delineated a number of questions that we need to address during these discussions including how we can retain the qualities we really cherish about the institution while going forward to increase research, build a graduate culture, increase our professionalism and sophistication, and not kill everybody in the process. She said that we need to consider how we convey our evolving identity

to stakeholders. And she emphasized the need to convey that identity in a convincing way to those who have the power to fund or not to fund us in this new classification, to recognize us in this new classification or not, such as those in the System office. Dr. Bleicken stressed that we must have a true conversation that spans the campus.

Provost Bleicken concluded by saying, “I think we see ourselves as an institution at a real pivotal point, and I think we have so much to be proud of and I think that we really need to keep thinking about how do we build on the past — one that has been one of a pretty steady progression of us from where we began and here in our year of celebrating the centennial. I think we’ve all been reminded often about some of our humbler beginnings, and some of the tough times that we had, but how do we keep progressing and how do we do that in a way that truly fits us, that fits this culture, and so I guess I put that to you as an invitation and more to come on that.”

Campus Master Planning

Dr. Bleicken announced that we have been engaged in a series of conversation with our campus physical planning people, and with multiple constituencies on campus involved in that. Marc Cyr has been on the Campus Physical Planning Committee, and when Marc couldn’t sit in, Michael Moore took his place. In the next few months we will gather a lot of data help us build a campus facility that fits our vision for the future.

Legislative Hearings

Bleicken noted we have been the site of a number of Senate and legislative hearings over the last month or so. One instance was a legislative hearing on the doctor and, in particular, the nursing shortage. Representatives came from the legislature and conducted this hearing, and our campus nursing folks did a beautiful job and represented us very well in that.

Senate Appropriations Committee

The Senate Appropriations Committee also visited Georgia Southern as the site for the presidents of 17 of the schools in the system to present their capital outlay requests. Bleicken said that it is always good if our legislators can see who we are and have a chance to have conversation with us.

Good News

Dr. Bleicken said that we have been funded by the System for the last two years and hope to be funded in a third year for RPG — Retention, Progression, Graduation, a major initiative from the System. As part of that initiative two new advisement centers were started on campus in the past year: one in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences and the other in the College of Science and Technology.

This year we also took a relatively small chunk of our RPG dollars, \$50,000, solicited proposals from the departments for improving their own retention and

progression. There were 15 proposals requesting \$160,000 total. Seven awards were made to the following departments: Mathematical Sciences, Music, Psychology, Communication Arts, Health & Kinesiology, Mechanical & Electrical Engineering Technology, and Information Systems.

In 2005, the Research Service Foundation took some dollars that we had accumulated over the years from indirect costs, and we awarded five different catalysts and SRII awards, and these were awarded to, in some cases, individual researchers for the catalyst awards, and for the other two awards, to, you know, more collaborative cross-sectional ones. Last week, at the Research Service Foundation Board meeting, the winners of these awards were invited to come in and do poster presentations. Their posters are on display in the Provost's office. Bleicken congratulated the awardees for their work:

- Lissa Leege and Michelle Zjhra, who looked at Native Plants and Sustainability in Georgia;
- Kathleen Gruben, out of the College of Business looked at Retailing Index;
- Saundra Nettles, College of Ed, and Kathy Albertson in Writing and Linguistics, looked at Building Research Capacity;
- And finally, that very broad cross-sectional one, Barry Joyner, and a number of colleagues in the College of Health and Human Sciences, looked at Health Care and Obesity, in particular.

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

Agenda Requests

The SEC had three agenda item requests, and two-and-a-half of them are on the agenda as motions from the Welfare Committee. One of the agenda requests actually contained two numbered items, and the SEC decided that the one item needed a little further exploration so we sent it back to them: that is, the part about what gets printed on Georgia Southern diplomas. The major part of that about recording majors and minors is an agenda for today.

Request for Information

We had one RFI. And this was about the +/- grading system, and Michael Moore explored this, and will explain what he found out.

Michael Moore (COE): explained that in the summer of 2006, the University of Georgia and Georgia State began a pilot program and they are now using +/- grades — 4.0, 3.7, 3.3. It is a 3-year pilot program and this will be the second year. We don't know whether or not the Board is going to allow all the System's institutions to change if the pilot is successful. He suggested that the Academic Standards Committee might want to look into it.

ORP & TRS/Pay Period

Marc Cyr (Chair, Senate Executive Committee) reported that he had asked Vice President Joe Franklin about the option of a 12 month pay period. Apparently, UGA and two or three other institutions in the System run their own pay systems, and therefore they can do whatever they want. The rest of us are on a different system and we can't do anything we want. Maybe at some point in time, in the future, we'll have the option, but it doesn't look like it's on the horizon. The other issue was about the possibility of switching back from the ORP to TRS. That doesn't look like that's on anybody's radar right now either, and certainly not applying unused sick days to early retirement. That doesn't work for ORP because of it's not a pension; it's a defined benefits system.

Elections Committee

The Elections Committee had actually proposed some changes to our Bylaws, but because they are interconnected with other changes, we are waiting to bring all bylaws changes forward in November.

Timelines

Cyr reported that he had asked Provost Bleicken if her office could work up tenure timelines for faculty to cover all eventualities so that each incoming faculty member, whether or not they have probationary credit granted, will have a timeline that clearly says when they can go up for tenure. The timeline will go into the new hire's file, so it will be clear to everybody concerned. The Provost's office is going to be looking into that.

The two motions we passed regarding the Educational Leave Process have both been approved by President Grube.

Finally, at the next meeting, the Senate will be electing a moderator for the 2008-2009 year.

6. **Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative**
No report.
7. **Report from Norman Schmidt (COST), SPC Representative:** Dr. Bleicken gave most of my report, so I don't have much to say. We're planning on having some focus groups soon to meet and discuss with faculty, staff, and students our change in status as a Carnegie institution, and more will be coming.
8. **Motion: "[Second Majors and Minors](#)"**
Jean Paul moved that we require that students officially declare minors and second majors, so that these may be recorded in BANNER, in order to make the information readily available to the appropriate administrators and faculty. The motion was seconded.

Linda Bleicken (Provost) noted that the catalogue asks that minors and second majors be declared as soon as they are known. In discussing this with the registrar, Mike Deal, she suggested that since there is already something in the catalogue that asks the students to do this, perhaps we could try to get our advisement centers to work on getting students to declare minors and second majors.

Jean Paul Carton (CLASS) noted that the purpose of the motion is to have this information recorded in BANNER for various purposes, including the evaluations of programs. There was a recent evaluation of the various programs and recommendations made by the Chancellor's office, based only on first majors. He noted that the practices of not counting second majors and minors may have some impact on the evaluation of programs.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator called for a vote and the motion passed.

9. Motion: “[Probationary Credit Toward Tenure](#)”

Jean Paul Carton (CLASS) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee moved insertion of the following language in Section 209 of the *Faculty Handbook*, Tenure Guidelines, after bullet three on probationary credit, Page 33 of the current catalog: “The decision,” so this is what we want to insert there, “The decision whether or not to use any or all probationary credit should be made by the applicant in consultation with his/her department chair and dean. When such an application is made and the individual has combined credit and Georgia Southern full-time service years to equal an "on time" application, the application shall not be viewed as early by any party involved in the process.”

The motion was seconded. There followed a lengthy discussion in which Senator Lockwood (COBA) and other expressed confusion about what constitutes early tenure. Moderator Cyr pointed out that it was just such confusion which had caused him to request the timelines from the Provost. After it was clarified that the language being proposed was designed to assure that an “on time” application would not be treated as “early,” the motion passed unanimously.

10. Motion: “[Notification of a Death in the University Community](#)”

Jean Paul Carton (CLASS) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee introduced the motion: “The Senate Faculty Welfare Committee recommends that, upon notification of a death in the University community (current employee or retiree, student),”

- an announcement of the death be issued by the President's Office, subject to the wishes of the individual and family;
- a notice of details regarding final arrangements be made to the University community should family members wish such details be made public;
- the counseling center be notified so that adequate staff may be available to help other members of the University community begin the grieving process and provide ways for emotions to be recognized and expressed;” what number, fourth

bullet

“• the individual’s department head or department representative, after issuing condolences to the family, consult with them about an appropriate form of remembrance/memorial service from the GSU community should the family so desire;

• University administrators allow family members adequate time to collect the individual’s personal belongings.”

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

11. Unfinished Business

Clara Krug (CLASS), Chair, Faculty Development Committee asked whether anyone had additional ideas or concerns or considerations about revising the deadlines for applying for educational leave.

There was no discussion forthcoming.

12. New Business

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked whether a 19-year old from Augusta who was killed at a local club was one of our students, and was informed that it was not.

13. Announcements: Vice Presidents

None

14. Announcements from the Floor

Clara Krug (CLASS) announced the 9th Annual French Week, November 2-8. She also announced the academic club function on November 9th.

15. Adjournment:

After a motion, second and unanimous vote, the meeting was adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 27, 2007
4:00 TO 6:00 P.M.
RUSSELL UNION BALLROOM

2007-2008 Senate Executive Committee: Dr. Marc Cyr (CLASS); Dr. Les Furr (CHHS); Dr. Jim Whitworth (CIT); Dr. Clara Krug (CLASS); Dr. Michael Reksulak (COBA); Dr. Michael Moore (COE); Dr. Bruce McLean (COST); Dr. Alison Scott (JPHCOPH); Dr. Charles Skewis (LIB); Ms. Marilyn Bruce (Senate Liaison)

Voting Members in Attendance: Dr. Ahmed Adu-Oppong, Dr. Frank Atuahene, Dr. Barry Balleck, Mr. Jim Braselton, Dr. Jean-Paul Carton, Dr. Jonathan Copeland, Dr. Marc Cyr, Dr. Nirmal Das, Dr. Terry Diamanduros, Dr. Richard Flynn, Dr. Les Furr, Dr. Tim Giles, Dr. Mary Hadley, Dr. Greg Harwood, Dr. Clara Krug, Mr. Alain Lawo-Sukam, Dr. Jill Lockwood, Dr. Alison Dobson Long, Dr. Ron MacKinnon, Dr. Bruce McLean, Dr. Jim McMillan, Dr. Lowell Mooney, Dr. Michael Moore, Dr. Patrick Novotny, Dr. Onyile Onyile, Dr. Michael Reksulak, Dr. David Rostal, Dr. Norman Schmidt, Dr. Alison Scott, Mr. Charles Skewis, Mr. Fred Smith, Dr. T. Maria Smith, Dr. Diana Sturges, Dr. Brenda Talley, Dr. Patrick Wheaton, Dr. LeVon Wilson, Dr. Mark Yanochik

Voting Members Absent: Dr. John Averett, Dr. Scott Beck, Ms. Ellen Hendrix, Dr. Maggie LaMontagne, Dr. Mary Marwitz, Mr. Mark Mohr, Dr. Constantine Oglobin, Dr. Broderick Oluyede, Dr. David Robinson, Dr. Jim Whitworth

Administrative Members in Attendance: Dr. Bruce Grube, President; Dr. Linda Bleicken, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs; Mr. Steve Burrell, Vice President, Information Technology; Mr. Billy Griffis, Vice President, University Advancement; Ms. Marilyn Bruce, Executive to the President; Dr. Gary Means, Dean, CEPS; Dr. Jim Bradford, Dean, CIT; Dr. Jane Rhoades Hudak, Dean, CLASS; Dr. Ron Shiffler, Dean, COBA; Dr. Cindi Chance, Dean, COE; Dr. Timothy Mack, Dean, COGS; Dr. Bret Danilowicz, Dean, COST

Senate Parliamentarian: Dr. Bob Cook (CIT)

SPC Representative: Dr. Norman Schmidt (COST)

SGA Representative: Mr. Tedrick Kelly (SGA)

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

Visitors:

Senate Moderator Marc Cyr called the meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 4:00 p.m.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 27, 2007, Meeting.

The agenda was approved.

2. **Approval of the October 29, 2007, Minutes: Richard Flynn (CLASS), Senate Secretary** moved that the minutes of the meeting of June 20, 2007 be accepted. The motion was seconded. The minutes were approved unanimously.
3. **Librarian's Report of November 27, 2007: Michael Moore (COE), Senate Librarian** moved acceptance of the Librarian's Report, reminding Senators that accepting the minutes does not constitute approval of the committees' actions; rather, it means the Senate accepts the minutes as being accurate. The motion was seconded and the Librarian's Report was accepted unanimously.
 - a. **Report from Undergraduate Committee Chair: Michael Moore** moved that the Undergraduate committee be approved (which includes approval of the committee's recommendations. As a committee recommendation the motion required no second. The minutes were approved unanimously.
 - b. **Report from Graduate Committee Chair: Diana Sturges (CHHS) for Jill Lockwood (COBA)** moved acceptance of the graduate report. Dr. Flynn (CLASS) pointed out that there was no Graduate report in the Librarian's Report. Richard Flynn (CLASS): There is no Graduate Report. After some confusion, it was pointed by the moderator out that the Graduate Report needs to be in the Librarian's report in order for the Senate to act on it.
4. **President's Report: Dr. Bruce Grube**

Feasibility Study

President Grube discussed conducting a feasibility study to see whether or not to pursue moving the football program from the Championship subdivision of Division I to the Bowl Subdivision (formerly I-AA and I-A) . He noted that there has been considerable amount of talk among our athletics Boosters as well as many others about the issue of whether Georgia Southern has matured to the point that it was ready to make this move. There are a lot of questions involved in such a move that can be answered objectively by such a study.

President Grube also noted that, at its August 9th meeting, the NCAA Division I Board of Directors placed a four-year moratorium on any movement into the Bowl Subdivision. So no move can happen during that time. The President placed two conditions on such a change. The first condition is that any money that would be required to move into the Bowl Subdivision would have to be privately raised. In other words, the money is not going to come from the E & G funds on the campus. The second condition is it the move is not going to happen on the backs of students. There will be no significant rise in student fees to facilitate such a move. Noting that "we have not contracted with anybody to do

this study yet,” President Grube fielded a number of questions from the senate floor.

Michael Moore (COE) pointed out that the Faculty Athletic Committee didn’t initiate the question of the feasibility study. Rather, the request came from the Athletic Department.

Bruce Grube (President) said “that’s absolutely the case” and proceeded to outline the probable monetary costs of such a move at “minimally about \$5 million a year.” “Now to put that in perspective,” Dr. Grube said, “our athletics program here runs on about \$9-\$9 ½ million a year for all of the athletics.” The annual athletics budget for a major program such as that at the University of Texas, apparently turns out to be \$107 million plus. Texas, doesn’t give a dime back to the academic side of the university. Dr. Grube also noted issues of Conference membership, such as the probability that there would be a significant reduction in the number of home games, and that travel and operational costs would increase as a result of greater reliance on air travel and a greatly increased number of athletic scholarships we would have to provide.

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

Motions

The principal business of the SEC since the last Senate meeting was putting together the three motions for revising our *Bylaws* that are on today’s agenda.

RFI/Crane Metamarketing

We have also, via an RFI, pursued getting a look at the Crane Marketing report that will form at least part of our discussion of our Carnegie reclassification. Dr. Bleicken just gave me a copy of what they have from Crane at the beginning of the meeting and this will be made available to faculty.

Welfare Committee Report/Faculty Service

Also on the agenda is a report from the Welfare Committee on the issue of faculty service. This was a joint charge to the Welfare Committee and the Service Committee, and Jean-Paul Carton will be delivering the report of the Welfare committee. The Service Committee gave us a report too late to make it on to the agenda, but we have the chair here, Jerry Wilson.

Motions from October meeting

I also want to report that the motions brought forward and passed at our October meeting, namely the identification in various records of student’s second majors and minors, the revision of the *Faculty Handbook* to clarify how probationary credit towards tenure is to be handled, and the adoption of the University procedures in the case of a death in the University community have all been approved by President Grube.

6. **Report from Chris Geyerman (CLASS), NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative:** I'll have a very short report for this meeting, and in February it will be a little bit longer. We have our GSR (Graduation Success Rate) data at the February meeting; I'll have the handout to give the breakdown. But to make a long handout short our student-athletes graduated at 74%, in the latest figures shown, and in a press release from Indiana, it is indicated that that GSR of 74% is "currently tops among all Division I public institutions in the state of Georgia." So, that's a positive. The APR data hit my computer this morning. I opened it up, looked at it, and closed it. I'll look at it and get a feed on to it to where I understand it, give myself a refresher course on how to explain it and bring it to the February meeting.

7. **Report from Norman Schmidt (COST), SPC Representative:** The SPC recently conducted a series of focus groups of faculty, staff, and students regarding GSU's recent reclassification as a Carnegie Doctoral Research Institution. These focus groups were fairly well attended and we are waiting to discuss results of these focus groups within the SPC. However, the SPC has not yet met to discuss them. Personally, I learned a great deal about the Carnegie Reclassification as a result of these meetings, and I'd like to comment that the SPC is still open to comments regarding the Carnegie Reclassification. Some of the main questions we are trying to determine are:

- How should we redefine the doctoral research university in GSU terms?
- How can we be a research institution and still focus on undergraduate education?
- How do we preserve the relationship between professors and undergraduate students, while building a graduate culture?
- How do we preserve what is cherished, while still aspiring to a new level?

These and many other questions are still up for debate at the SPC, and your input would be greatly appreciated.

8. **Election of SEC Chair/Moderator for 2008-2009**

Richard Flynn (CLASS) nominated Marc Cyr

The motion was seconded. There were no nominations from the floor. Marc Cyr was elected unanimously.

9. **Motion: Bylaws change re: definition of full-time faculty. Michael Moore (COE) for the SEC** moved that in Bylaws II.1.a and IV.17.f, we delete the phrase "regular full-time faculty" and replace it with "full-time faculty."

10. Motion: Bylaws changes re: committee membership and Chairs. Michael Moore for the SEC moved that the senate make the following changes to the areas of the Bylaws that concern the membership and Chairs of standing committees.

- To III.7, add a subsection “c”: that says “serve as chair of the Senate Elections Committee.”
- From IV.2, delete the sentence “Standing committee Chairs shall be elected by the voting members of the committee while ad-hoc committee Chairs shall be appointed by the Senate Executive Committee.” Replace the deleted sentence with the following: “The Faculty Development, Research, and Service Committees; and the Library Committee shall be chaired by the senator appointed by the Senate Executive Committee. The Elections Committee shall be chaired by the Senate Librarian. The Graduate, Undergraduate, Academic Standards, and Faculty Welfare committees shall be chaired by a senator on the committee elected by the voting members of the committee. Ad-hoc committee Chairs shall be appointed by the Senate Executive Committee,” and then
- From IV.17.d, delete the phrase “to the Librarian,” and then
- From IV. 18, dealing with the membership of the Elections Committee, delete the sentence “The committee shall be chaired by the senator.” Replace this with “The committee shall be chaired by the Senate Librarian,” and
- To the end of the last sentences of IV.20, IV.22, IV.24, and IV.28 add the phrase “appointed by the Senate Executive Committee.” Now regarding the Chairs, the Research, Service, Development, and Library Committees we had a conflict in the language currently in place in the Bylaws. That language now stands IV.2 “directs that these committees elect a Senator as their chair,” while the sections on the individual committees indicate that the Senator appointed by the SEC must be the chair.

The changes suggested in this motion seek to resolve this conflict and maintain what has been the de facto chair situation on these committees, and then in terms of the Elections Committee, we had run into some problems notably last year we had some problems with elections. We needed a closer tie with the Senate Executive Committee then, and it is now afforded by Secretary sitting on that committee as a non-voting member, so what we ended up doing by having the Librarian be the chair, the Librarian, already sits on the Provost’s faculty advisory committee and also on the Senate Executive Committee and is responsible for reporting election results in the Librarian’s Report, anyway. So making the Librarian the chair of the Elections Committee seems to be a natural fit. It should also be noted that this change was recommended unanimously at a meeting of the Elections Committee, and is included here as part of this Executive

Committee motion in order to coordinate it with the other recommended changes, so I move we accept this motion.

After some discussion, the motion passed with one vote opposed.

11. **Motion: Bylaws change re: elections deadline (Michael Moore, Senate Elections Committee Chair):** The final motion and I have to say I appreciate Jean-Paul in bringing that discussion up during the last motion because it seemed kind of weird me bringing up motion that had not controversy to them, so. This one's about the elections deadline, and this motion, I move that we delete from Bylaws IV.17.e, the last word "and," place ";and" at the end of sub-section "f," and add a new sub-section "g" that reads "complete elections and report election results to the Senate Executive Committee by April 1 of each year." And this date really is to ensure timely completion of elections, which have been a problem in the last couple of years, so that the Librarian can report these election results to the Senate by the last meeting. This would give it time to be in the Librarian's Report to make the April, and this date will also help the elections of the Secretary and Librarian for the coming year in addition to the Executive Committee staffing the standing committees, which is done in April or May and/or during the summer, as well. So I move acceptance of this motion.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

12. **Faculty Welfare Committee report on their charge to look into faculty service (Jean-Paul Carton, Senate Faculty Welfare Committee Chair):**

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator explained that the SEC gave a mutual charge to the Welfare Committee that Jean-Paul chairs and to the Service Committee that Jerry Wilson chairs to look into how service is valued and evaluated around or across the campus.

Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) reported that the committee found that not all colleges and not even all departments within the same college seem to view service uniformly. In some situations there are possible discrepancies and inconsistencies, but overall we do feel that the faculty service policies and procedures outlined in the Faculty Roles and Rewards document are adequate. The committee recommends that Drs. Grube and Bleicken must positively convey to the Deans, Directors, and Department Chairs (and all the way down) that service *is valued* and that all individuals and committees involved in personnel actions (contract-renewal, annual evaluation, pre-tenure review, promotion review, tenure review, post-tenure review) need to be reminded annually to follow established policy. Furthermore, shared governance requires *all* parties to be involved. Deans, Directors, Department Chairs, and faculty need to continue to be educated on the philosophy embodied in the Roles and Rewards recommendations. The committee found that what discrepancies and

questionable practices they uncovered were most often a result of the policies in place not being followed or, in some instances, not even known.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator called for discussion and comments, reminding senators that there was no motion on the floor.

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked whether new faculty have copies of the [Roles and Rewards report](#). How would they even know?

Senators Marc Cyr (CLASS) and Jean-Paul Carton (CLASS) assured her that it is online and that the recommendation of the committee was that all faculty and administrators were to be apprised of the report's availability.

Michael Moore (COE) pointed out the importance of encouraging "culture of service" in addition to the formal guidelines, and noted that service isn't as highly valued as it should be.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) Senate Moderator commented that even in the examples offered in the Faculty Roles and Rewards document service is shortchanged.

After further discussion, Dr. Cyr thanked Dr. Carton for the report.

13. Unfinished Business

None

14. New Business

None

15. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Linda Bleicken (Provost) Announced that the President's cabinet approved the calendar committee's recommendation that, beginning in Fall 2008 we will have the entire week of Thanksgiving, that Monday through Friday as a holiday for faculty and for students.

She then extended an invitation to an all-faculty conversation on January 25th to discuss the reclassification of Georgia Southern to a Carnegie Doctoral Research University. The conversation will begin with a luncheon at 11:45 in the Nessmith-Lane Continuing Education Building in the big ballroom. Following lunch, faculty will convene in the Performing Arts Center for a presentation, and then will adjourn into separate department meetings to continue the conversation. During the spring semester, Provost Bleicken will visit individual departments to continue the conversation further.

16. Announcements from the Floor

Clara Krug (CLASS) asked that students be informed that The Lakeside Café is once again going to open at 7:00 a.m. during exam week.

17. Adjournment

Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Moderator, called for a motion to adjourn which was quickly seconded and unanimously passed. The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.