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Voting Members Absent: Marie Botkin, Amy Boyett, Robert Costomiris, Olivia Edenfield, Less Furr, Sze-man Ngai, Dontarie Stallings, Stuart Tedders, Caren Town, Laura Valeri, Theresa Welford, Chunshan Zhao

Administrators in Attendance: Brooks Keel, Marilyn Bruce, Kathy Albertson, Jean Bartels, Steve Burrell, Ron Core, Thomas Koballa, Bede Mitchell, Ted Moore, Charles Patterson, Michael Smith, Teresa Thompson

Visitors: Dick Diebolt, Mohammad Davoud, Diana Cone, Stephen Rossi, Deborah Allen, Mehmet Samiratedu, Candace Griffith, Ellen Hendrix, Kathy Albertson, Whitney Manz (Grad. student), Adam Haizlip (Grad. student), Allison Baker (Grad. student), ShaVonda Sewell (Grad. student), Maura Copeland, Tom Koballa.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the February 14, 2012, Meeting: Clara Krug (CLASS), Senate Moderator.

Moved and Approved.

(Secretary’s Note: After approval of the agenda, President Keel and Provost Moore swapped their numbered order; the numbers below represent the actual order in which they spoke.)

2. Approval of the November 16, 2011, Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary:

Moved and Approved.
3. Librarian’s Report of February 14, 2012: Tony Barilla (COBA), Senate Librarian:

Moved and Approved.

(Secretary’s Note: The very full reports of the Undergraduate and Graduate Committees may be found in the Librarian’s Report.)

a. Report from the Undergraduate Committee: Ron MacKinnon (CIT):

From the November 8, 2011 meeting, there were a total of five new courses, twenty course revisions, eight new or revised programs and 6 course deletions. From the January meeting (i.e. the “busy one” with a 400 page agenda) there were 22 new courses, 54 course revisions, 28 new or revised courses, 23 course deletions, and 10 announcements. The report was Approved.

b. Report from the Graduate Committee: Bob Fernekes (LIB):

From the November 10th meeting, it was announced that the revised and new curricular forms were available on the Registrar’s website. Under new business, the committee approved 4 program reviews, 1 course deletion, 14 course revisions, and 16 new courses. At the January 19th meeting, Dr. Patterson introduced the new Director of Graduate Admissions, Samuel “Tristam” Aldridge. Under new business, the approved 51 program revisions, 10 course deletions, 44 course revisions, and 12 new courses. Under old business, the Graduate Committee members were asked to check on the status of their programs undergoing comprehensive program review, and update the committee at the next meeting. Also there were updates on the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, and the Presidential Military Task Force (formerly Soldiers-2-Scholars Military Task Force). The report was Approved.

4. Provost’s Report: Ted Moore:

Lately we have had much emphasis on our strategic vision – being recognized as one of the best public comprehensive universities in the country – and a number of action steps were put in place last year to further that vision. We seek to (1) maintain and strengthen our commitment to teaching excellence, (2) expand our research profile so that we will one day be counted among Carnegie Research University/High Activity institutions, and (3) gain the Carnegie Elective Classification for Community Engagement. A number of strategic actions have been planned and launched with this threefold vision in mind.

- our Teaching Legacy Task Force to help us maintain and strengthen our commitment to teaching excellence
- we have worked with the Vice President for Research and the Office of Research and Analysis to map out the strategic measures needed to secure the High Activity level of Carnegie recognition
• a task force to direct our combined efforts in service and outreach; Wendell Tompkins in University Advancement is the chair of that team
• the Pathways to Success team, chaired by Dr. Mark Welford. The President has charged this team with developing a flexible faculty teaching load model that allows faculty to select different career tracks at different points in their careers; and recommending mechanisms for supporting faculty on different tracks, including teaching, research, service, and administration.

Also, the President has established a set of measures we are instituting to address teaching load, compensation, and professional development.

1. Our student-faculty ratio has increased during the past few years. In terms of “FTE” students and faculty, the ratio for last academic year was 23:1 up from 19:1 a few years earlier. This year it will be a budget priority in Academic Affairs to undertake more hiring of new faculty, not just replacements. Moreover, the size of the student population including concentration patterns of students in various units and programs, must be reviewed. We may have growth potential in some graduate programs and some online offerings and will focus efforts there. In addition, as we continue to see improvement in retention, we should expect to see more of the undergraduate population in upper level courses than we do now.

2. Given no systematic pay raises for four years, and with continued increases in the cost of important benefits including health care, we have all seen erosion in our economic well-being, faculty and staff alike. The President has directed that we assemble and charge a team of faculty and staff to review current compensation policies, and make recommendations for affordable and realistic remedies. Salary compression and even inversion are phenomena that we are now experiencing, and this predicament has been manifest in loss of valuable faculty and staff, as well as erosion of morale. We have up-to-date benchmark data on faculty and staff, as well as substantial data on salary compression and inversion for staff as well. We must be prepared to make equitable salary decisions when that day comes again when we see general raises. And all of us are aware that the erosion in economic well-being has hit low-paid employees the hardest. We have staff members who cannot easily afford health insurance and that is tragic. We will ask the compensation review team to propose ways to address this.

3. The Pathways [to Success] Committee will be asked to examine some specifics in addition to their overall charge. The overarching aim is to develop comprehensive plans to allow faculty members to achieve full success as their careers develop at Georgia Southern. For example, the Provost would like the Pathways Group to study a change in promotions to full professor. Presently promotion to full professor is governed by criteria that are in force at the time of application for promotion, but he prefers to use the criteria that were in force at the time of promotion to associate professor. In this way, aspiring full professors would “know the rules” well ahead of time. The Pathways Team will be asked to consider future revisions of criteria that would distinguish between procedures and criteria. Criteria represent the requirements needed to be judged acceptable for
promotion and/or tenure, whereas procedures describe the process for making that determination. Separating the criteria from the procedures is a “best practice” and would help remove some of the confusion we now see. It is possible that the Pathways Committee will see the need for other changes as well. For example, a permanent University Tenure & Promotion Committee to develop and propose policy governing these important career development actions.

4. Educational Leave was suspended earlier in light of budget pressures. It is well recognized that sabbaticals are critical for professional development, and we are therefore reinstituting Educational Leave. Our target date to resume educational leave is Spring semester 2013.

5. We have a small team doing exploratory work on a Faculty Club, and this includes some preliminary talk with Forest Heights Country Club and our Bishop Alumni Center.

Initiatives involving funding are to be undertaken in a fiscally responsible manner, we do not have enough funding to do as much as we’d like in all areas, but we’ll be guided by the principles of transparency and inclusiveness throughout.

We have recently completed the tenure and promotion cycle. We had 59 applications for tenure and/or promotion; 38 for tenure and promotion to associate professor. Of those 38, 22 were males, 16 female; we had 10 for promotion to professor (5 males, 5 females); 4 for promotion to associate professor (1 male, 3 females); 6 for tenure only (6 males); and 1 to Senior Lecturer from Lecturer and that was one female. All were approved except 3 for tenure/promotion to associate, 1 promotion to full professor, and 1 for tenure only, and in one application for tenure and promotion to associate, tenure was approved but promotion was not approved at this time.

We are launching a new College of Engineering & Information Technology, with target effective date of July 1. Dr. Mohammad Davoud has agreed to serve as Interim Dean of the College. The five departments remain respectively in the College of Science & Technology and in the College of Information Technology for administrative purposes until July 1.

The Office of the Vice President for Research presently facilitates relationships and partnerships with external constituencies and serves the role of coordinating community and state discussions of many economic development activities at Georgia Southern. Recommendations from external entities suggest that additional visibility is required to emphasize a “central point-of-contact” for coordination of economic development initiatives with industry and community stakeholders who may be unfamiliar with the organizational structure of Georgia Southern. To this end, the President has renamed the Office of the Vice President for Research to the Office of Vice President for Research and Economic Development. The President’s Cabinet discussed and approved the renaming on December 15.
Historically, the Associate Vice President for Government Relations has served as an advocate for Georgia Southern in the state legislature and the governor’s office. The position has included liaison with the federal legislative delegation as well. Mr. Russell Keen is now the Associate Vice President, and during his time in office, the position has been expanded in scope to include the functions previously performed, and to add to them extensive efforts to increase the impact Georgia Southern University has on the region and the state. The enhanced function serves as a catalyst for casting a new role for the University in state and community engagement activities. This includes, but is not limited to, working closely with the Governor’s Office, the Georgia Department of Economic Development, and other state and regional agencies as the University’s legislative liaison. In recognition of this expanded role, President Keel has approved changing the position from Associate Vice President for Government Relations to the Vice President for Government Relations and Community Engagement.

The Associate Provost serves as a liaison between the Provost’s Office and the college community by interacting with students, faculty, staff, administration, and eternal constituents. This position includes oversight of the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship; the First-Year Experience program; the Honors program; and support for academic initiatives and special projects. He is retitling the position as Vice Provost, reflecting the shift in responsibilities of the position that has already taken place. The position now includes a stronger strategic orientation and has maintained the same functional duties as well. At the end of this fiscal year (the end of Dr. Kathy Albertson’s term as Associate Provost) he will launch an internal search for a Vice Provost.

Accreditation agencies are enacting standards that require greater accountability, and SACS is certainly no exception. At the annual meeting in the December we learned that we need to track each type of student complaint and present to SACS tables on how many complaints were received, how they were resolved, and so on. This requirement is new since the 2005 reaffirmation for accreditation and includes all types of complaints (for example, financial aid, diversity, grades, registrar issues, parking, health, etc.). SACS also will inspect specific, redacted examples of how online complaints are handled.

He has requested Senate approval of changes in the Faculty Handbook that pertain to the description of the strategic planning process. The current wording is extensive and the process that is described is complex. He wants to shorten and simplify and do so in a way that captures the way we are going about planning at our university. Also, the description presently in the Faculty Handbook describes a planning process that is the responsibility of a single committee. However, the various planning actions that are being undertaken by the Pathways group, the Service and Outreach task force, the Teaching Legacy team, our Soldiers 2 Scholars team, the Space Planning & Allocation Committee, and others are all part of our strategic planning process. This is a highly decentralized approach.

The motion for changes was posted, but subsequent to that posting, in discussion with the Senate Executive Committee, we decided that further refinements in wording of the
final paragraph would be helpful. The change in wording as posted will be brought forward today.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked a question regarding the title change to Vice Provost, but then deferred it to when that issue was scheduled to come up on the agenda.

Frederic Mynard (COST) asked about the new SACS requirement of logging complaints and whether such complaints had to be in writing.

Provost Moore believed it will be limited to written complaints and said we are articulating policies on this and will be floating those very soon.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked when the new policies re: promotion to full professor will take effect.

Provost Moore clarified that the criteria to be used for promotion to full are the ones that, according to the *Handbook*, were in place at the time of application to associate, not when a faculty member comes in. The Pathways Committee will consider how criteria should look. It seemed to him that waiting until you are ready to go up for promotion and then finding out what the rules are is unfair, though those are the current rules in the *Handbook*.

Haberland asked if the new policies will come before the Faculty Senate at some point.

Provost Moore said of course, yes, that will not be a unilateral change coming from his office.

Sabrina Ross (COE) asked the Provost to explain “salary inversion.”

Provost Moore said salary compression is essentially when, for example, for two faculty members of very different rank and seniority (though disciplines and levels of relative productivity are comparable) the salaries are very close, though you would expect the senior professor to be paid more. Inversion means the extreme, and in fact the senior, ranking professor in this example is being paid less than the junior faculty member. We have some examples of compression and possibly of inversion at the University.

Ming Fang He (COE) asked a question about the proposed revision of the language about strategic planning, but it was deferred until later when it was slated on the agenda.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked if, with all this reorganization of promotion and tenure and different tracks, we are moving those kinds of choices out of the hands of the departments to some other level.

Provost Moore said no, nothing that the Pathways Committee would suggest would take tenure and promotion and criteria setting and so on out of the departments.
Schille (CLASS) said she asked because when we talk about FTE’s there is a great difference from department to department in teacher student ratio and how they need to be considered, and it did not seem to her that that has been considered a University-wide, a top-down decision in this case might not also be ineffective or un-thoughtful.

Provost Moore said addressing promotion and tracking faculty duties would continue to reside in the departments.

5. President’s Report: Brooks Keel:

Elite Sports Shooting Education Complex:

We have signed the contract between Georgia Southern and the Department of Natural Resources to move ahead with Elite Sports Shooting Education Complex. That contract was signed in the latter part of December. If plans go right, we should be breaking ground sometime this summer with the facility opening by August 2013. It is definitely a controversial facility or can be seen in that way, and there’s been a lot of lively debate here regarding that, and it is something that we are greatly appreciative of. Some may feel that this was a done deal from the very beginning, but that was not the case. Research on this program started in August 2010 when we were approached by the Department of Natural Resources, and from August 2010 through August 2011 VP Teresa Thompson did a tremendous amount of investigation and research not only on what the facility would look like here, but what other facilities in the country looked like, and the issues that they have gone through, before we took this program to the Board of Regents to seek their approval in August 2011. We brought this program to the Faculty Senate in October 2011. There was a tremendous amount of productive and lively debate and requests for information associated with that. We postponed any decision until the following Faculty Senate meeting in November 2011, in which it was discussed again and a recommendation was made to hold several campus wide forums. We did that in December 2011. And it wasn’t until after those forums that the contract was actually signed.

Name Change:

The Provost mentioned we are renaming the Office of Research to the Office of Research and Economic Development. This is a name change only. But it is a very important name change because it highlights both internally and more importantly externally the important role that Georgia Southern plays in promoting the economy of Southern Georgia. Charles Patterson is that Vice President, he will just assume a new title, but his duties will remain almost exactly the same as they have been. He will be the contact person at the University for that economic development activity. This will clarify a lot of misconceptions in the community about the role we play and who at Georgia Southern is the best contact person. This new titling of the Office of Research is something many universities across the country are doing as they and we move forward in promotion the economy in the areas in which we are situated.
Promotion:

Re: the promotion of Russell Keen to the position of Vice President for Government Relations and Community Engagement, this is a major promotion. It will give Keen a seat at the President’s Cabinet, needed because of the work that he’s doing in Atlanta and in Washington, D.C., and the impact that’s going to have on the University, such as:

- the eminent chairs that we currently have in place. He’s responsible for pushing that political agenda forward
- the funding of the Biology Building we received.
- the highest funding in the entire USG-University System of Georgia two years running.
- he was successful in maneuvering the political minefields associated with getting approval for that Biology Building.
- With another advance dealing with an organization in Savannah (see below).
- And with our own state budget, Keen has provided tremendous input in terms of how we are seen both at the capitol and the Governor’s office, and we are positioning ourselves to take advantage of some of the main criteria that the Governor is using over the next year; it was very important that he be given an opportunity both internally and externally to have a seat at the Cabinet and for the folks that he deals with to see the position that he has here. He will assume that position March 1.

Herty Advanced Materials Development Center:

There is a facility in Savannah called the Herty Advanced Materials Development Center. It is an operation now that generates $8- to $10-million a year in research and development activity. It was created in 1938 as an authority of the state to serve as a business incubator. If you’re a big company like DuPont, and DuPont is one of their main customers, and you want to go from test-tube research up to full commercialization, there’s huge void in the middle that you need to work through, and instead of investing a hundred million dollars in a new product line, it is tremendously beneficial for you to be able to work out all the bugs involved in scale-up, so DuPont will come to Herty, spend anywhere from three weeks to three years there on a project, spending a fraction of the cost of full commercial scale-up, and give them an opportunity to determine commercial viability of a product. This is all contract work. It is work for hire. The entire Herty staff is completely self-sufficient and funded solely by contracts. There is no state money that goes into that operation at all, up until this point. This represents a tremendous research opportunity for Georgia Southern. The Governor’s office has decided to transfer the authority of the Herty Advancement Materials Development Center from the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Economic Development directly to Georgia Southern by way of the Board of Regents. Legislation will transfer the responsibility and the authority of the Herty group to Georgia Southern. The legislation that is being drafted states that it will now be called the Georgia Southern University Herty Advanced Materials Development Center. That process has to go through the lawmaking process because it is an authority, an actual bill has to be drafted and passed. That official transfer of responsibility will take
place July 1. We are in the process now of working through the existing Board of Directors that Herty has to determine how best to transfer the some 40 employees that are at the Herty group. This will be a zero impact on Georgia Southern’s budget from an outgo point of view, but it will represent an $8-to $10-million dollar revenue stream in terms of the research portfolio of the income point of view to the University. It will essentially double the research portfolio of the University overnight. So this is an exciting opportunity for us for material science research, for polymer research, for biofuels research, and the opportunity for our faculty to interact with companies that already have a relationship with Herty is absolutely huge. President Keel had dinner with the President of DuPont, and he’s very excited to learn more about what we are doing here, not only the research that we are doing, but the type of students that we produce, so the opportunities for internships, for places for our students to go to work, is incredible.

**News:**

- For the second year in a row, Georgia Southern University has been ranked one of the top 10 most popular universities in the country. We were ranked seventh, tied with Yale. We are getting a tremendous amount of public relations press out of this. It says a great deal about the fact that students want to come to Georgia Southern as their first choice.
- *Diverse Magazine* ranked us fourth in the country in terms of production of Minorities with Degrees in the STEM. We all can be incredibly proud that we place that much emphasis on trying to encourage minorities to pursue careers in STEM.
- Our online graduate programs have been ranked among the top in the country.
- Our nursing and business programs ranked in the top of the country

**Budget:**

The bad news is there will be no raises for next fiscal year, at least none are being projected, and there will probably be a 2 percent budget cut across the board. We have been expecting that and have already put plans in place to absorb that. Faculty should not feel that budget cut, but certainly will feel no raise. President Keel appreciates that..

**Salaries:**

We have roughly 325 of our staff currently below the poverty level. In other words, they don’t make minimum wage, essentially. We are going to do everything we can to address that as we are able to.

**Addition to the Governor’s Budget:**

Another addition to the Governor’s budget is re: the Herty Advanced Materials group is $614,000 in M&O (maintenance and operation) funds. Heretofore, Herty had not received any state money, it was all contract money, but the Governor realizes that in order for Herty to grow, it needs funds to do so.
**Biology Building:**

The Governor has put in his budget $2.8 million for the equipment funding of the Biology building, which gives us the final tranche of money that we needed to get that particular building funded. And when you consider in the last four years our state funding has dropped from approximately $6,000 per student FTE to $4,000 per student FTE, for us to be able to have anything new, much less a building of the size and magnitude of the Biology building, is truly phenomenal.

**Governor’s State of the State Address:**

The Governor mentioned six or eight priorities to him. One is education, specifically higher education, and the *Complete College Georgia* issue is going to get to be more and more something we are going to have to deal with and work with. He also mentioned job creation, and the primary reason he is moving the Herty Advanced group to us is because of the role that he sees us playing in economic development as it relates to bringing new and spin-off companies to Georgia. He also mentioned transportation, and our logistics program fits hand-in-glove with that so we are very well positioned. And water is going to be a key issue for the state. We are already looking at how to position some of the things that we are doing both on the policy and the research sides to marry them with what the Governor is seeking. The Governor has his eyes on Georgia Southern: His chief of staff is a Georgia Southern alumnus. His primary advisor for higher education and the economy is a Georgia Southern alumnus. The President of the Georgia Chamber of Commerce is a Georgia Southern alumnus. The Director of the House Budget Office is a Georgia Southern alumnus. So for the first time in many years we have some really strong support in very high places.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked if any of the Herty employees would be coming onto the faculty at Georgia Southern.

President Keel guessed no, not at this time. There are about 40 what you might call Technical Staff who run the machines and actually do the technical work. That’s everything from clerical to mechanics and shop folks. They will become Georgia Southern employees, probably, but not faculty. Right now, there are two primary scientists that are working there; it’s an opportunity for them to join our faculty, but he does not think that’s going to be the case. We will be doing a search for a new Director of Herty as this rolls out, and likely this person will come from industry. As we recruit more people to grow Herty, though, there will be tremendous opportunities for them to be part of our faculty.

Mark Welford (COST) asked where they would be housed.

President Keel said that the Herty Group has a facility in Savannah, and it will stay in Savannah and all those 40 folks will stay housed there. There is another smaller operation in Dawsonville, about 8 people, and they will stay there. There’s no intention
for us to move the facility; it would literally cost tens of millions of dollars to move that sort of equipment.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked if, re: FTE, there will be an enrollment cap for the University, whether we’re not planning on going beyond about 21,000.

Provost Moore said there would not be an explicit cap, but passed the question to VP for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Teresa Thompson.

President Keel noted there are only three/four universities in the System that are allowed to cap enrollment, so even if we wanted to, we couldn’t, and that is certainly something that he is not in favor of doing at all. The Provost is correct, there are a lot of ways to manage our growth through admissions standards, transfers, retention, and graduation.

Teresa Thompson (VPSA&EM) said we have been trying to strategically cap for the last ten years. Our minimum SAT has gone up 128 points and that’s been reflected in our retention, so even though we had a smaller freshman class last year, we retained more students because we have a higher caliber student, so all the strategic things we’ve been trying to do, they are wonderful, they worked, except we got great students, and so they stayed on. So there is a problem in that. If we go up in our minimum SAT by 10 points, we will be able to recruit less than 40 percent of the students in Georgia. Up another 10 points, we cut it to 33 percent, so we have to consider if we can continue to have the type of enrollment that we need within that process. It’s a double-edged sword, but the bottom line is we are strategically trying to cap enrollment, because we can’t by the Board of Regents. But fortunately or unfortunately, we’ve got better students and we’re retaining them at over 80 percent.

Haberland has seen that improvement and it is good. She asked if the BOR has any say over where we put that cutoff SAT and if we are still considering using high school GPA’s as well in the admission criteria.

VP Thompson said her office does not make those decisions. The Board of Regents does or every university would end up making its own decision, and you don’t have a University system.

President Keel noted that over the last 10 years our enrollment has increased between 500 and 750 a year. If we continue at that pace, we will be at 25,000 by 2020. There are a lot of opportunities, there’s graduate, there are a lot of opportunities to manage that sort of enrollment. You don’t have to increase the SAT very much to eliminate a large number of students. But then you have to ask yourself what that translates to in terms of income to the university from tuition and fees. It would be nice to only have 15,000 students here, but how are we going to make up the difference roughly $40,000 a student per year?

Jill Lockwood (COBA) asked about transfer students, especially from community college, who might not have had as high an SAT score as required by us for a freshman.
What information do we have on retention rates on those, and graduation rates most specifically?

VP Thompson said the Board of Regents really has the most authority when it comes to transfers, and former Governor Perdue said he wanted a seamless transition from K to Ph.D. Our transfer students have an average GPA, when they transfer to us, of 2.7. They actually are graduating at a higher rate than our students coming in directly. We have a retention rate from that first year to second year of transfers of about 73 percent. So they’re doing better than we sometimes think, though East Georgia transfers bring down the rate; if you took that off, transfers actually would be at a higher level than the 73 percent.

Candy Schille (CLASS) noted what the Provost had already mentioned, which is that the growth is terrific and the rise in standards is also very good, but the student-teacher ratio is really hurting faculty and students.

President Keel agreed. Our number one priority as we move forward is more faculty, and not just replacing faculty who have retired or left because you don’t get anywhere with that. But our growth in faculty has obviously not kept pace with our growth in students. That is reflected in the student-faculty ratio. We’re going to very quickly, and in some cases have already lost the small feel that has made Georgia Southern what it is today, if we don’t address this issue soon.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) wanted to correct a perception, perhaps a misperception: He felt it important to note that the Shooting range only came to the Senate because we asked that this be discussed at the Senate; it was not coming to the Senate for any other reason. The fact that the contract wasn’t signed until after the fora, chronologically makes sense, but the rapidity with which it was signed doesn’t really give us any time to follow-up on what happened at those fora. He thought the whole way this project has come into being speaks to a matter of decision-making that should be more broad-based and if it had been more broad-based before it got to October, perhaps we wouldn’t have seen so much contention about it, and it might have been a very different decision than the one that was finally made. But there really was very little opportunity for faculty to have their say in this matter. Also it still seemed odd that the announcement had never actually come out on gsfac.

President Keel said GSU used a press release as a mechanism to get the word out, but realizing that not everyone sees press releases, it would come out on gsfac.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted the announcements of a couple of title changes for jobs, with another one coming up on the agenda, and that in at least a couple of the cases he gathered that the duties are not changing, just the title. He wondered if there would be pay changes for these positions.

President Keel said the duties have in fact changed for the Vice President for Government Relations and Community Engagement, quite a bit to reflect the Vice President level that this individual has been placed in. With regard to the officers in
Economic Development, we have refined and focused the duties that were already there, but there is really not much difference in terms of what’s happening today and what happened yesterday with that office. That title change really was just more of a clarification of what was already going on in the particular office.

Cyr reiterated his question re: whether there will be pay changes for any of these positions.

President Keel said, “I’m not going to discuss personal issues for a variety of reasons . . . but for any promotion including the pay would be proportionate to the title and the job description.”

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Clara Krug (CLASS), Chair:

Approval of Actions Taken at the November 16 Meeting: President Keel approved the minutes of the Graduate Committee, the minutes of the Undergraduate Committee, the motion from the Academic Standards Committee to revise the grade appeal procedure, the motion to make the General Education Committee a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, and a motion that the administration offer three fora to discuss the Elite Sports Shooting Education Center, however, he authorized two fora, instead of three.

The SEC approved the requests that are on the agenda.

The SEC declined a request for discussion of the change of title from Vice President for Research to Vice President for Research and Economic Development because that decision had already been taken on December 15th, so discussion seemed a moot point, and a request for discussion of the change in title from Associate Vice President for Government Relations to Vice President for Government Relations and Community Engagement because it seemed, again, that the decision had already been made.

An update on the Number of Administrators Employed by Georgia Southern University: Tony Barilla and Marc Cyr continue to work with Paul Michaud of Human Resources, to determine the number of administrators employed at Georgia Southern University. They do not have a final report yet.

Re: Senate Elections in Light of the Reconfiguration of Academic Units: With the reconfiguration of academic units, specifically the College of Engineering and Information Technology, the College of Science and Mathematics, and some programs moving to the College of Business Administration the numbers of Senators representing certain units may change. If a Senator moves to a unit other than the one that he/she represents currently, he/she will continue to serve until the end of his/her term.

Including Faculty Members on the Provost’s Council: Provost Moore has revised the Deans’ Council to the Provosts’ Council, and the Senate Executive Committee has requested that he include at least one faculty member on that council.
Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked whether the President’s Cabinet includes a faculty representative.

Moderator Krug said not currently. The Senate Secretary did sit in the President’s Cabinet when Nick Henry was President, and the Librarian sat on the Deans’ Council, or it could have been vice versa. Also, there used to be a faculty representative on the Foundation board, but that position has been removed.

Haberland recommended that faculty representative be on the President’s Cabinet, and was directed by Krug to submit that as a motion for a later meeting.

6. A Motion from the General Education Committee to Expand the Responsibilities of the General Education Committee to Include Oversight

Last semester the Senate approved establishing the GEC, and at the same time that it was being established we were going through a review of the core curriculum and there was a campus-wide core curriculum committee and the Provost simply asked that review of the core curriculum now be transferred to the GEC. Jake Simons said please say that it was faithfully submitted by him. Barilla moved approval of the request from the General Education Committee that its duties now include oversight of the core curriculum.

Moderator Krug noted that the previous motion that we approved at the November meeting is the same as this one except that this one adds the word “Core Curriculum” or the abbreviation “CC” to the previous motion. Also, an advisor or advising coordinator designated by the Provost’s Office is added as a member.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked for an explanation of the purview of the General Education Committee.

Moderator Krug quoted the motion that had been approved unanimously on November 16, 2011, with the addition of core curriculum and the additional individual.

Tim Teeter (CLASS) asked what the committee does with regard to the core curriculum. Simply monitor how well it’s doing, or does it suggest changes to the core curriculum to the Senate? That is, what does “oversight” mean in this case?

Bob Cook (CIT, Senate Parliamentarian) was on the Core Curriculum Committee and said this is documenting what the Core Curriculum Committee originally developed. The core curriculum has outcomes and each department or college that was in an area covered by the core curriculum identified their outcomes and then identified how the outcomes were assessed. The committee did not dictate to those departments what courses or what outcomes; they simply managed the fact that the departments did identify their outcomes and had an appropriate assessment and evaluation procedure which again was the responsibility of that department. This committee would serve that role on a continuing basis.
Moderator Krug called the GEC “a monitor.”

Teeter said, “The monitors are departmental assessment, in other words.”

Moderator Krug said originally there was some interest in giving these responsibilities to the Undergraduate Committee, but they already have a very full plate, so this was an effort to divide and to refine responsibilities.

Visitor Ellen Hendrix (CLASS) noted that “much of what’s in the core curriculum is mandated to us by the Board of Regents, so we don’t have the authority to say, yes, a course should be in the core, or no it shouldn’t. . . . a situation came up from . . . the College of Science and Technology about what was the process for changing a course, adding a course, and the process really hasn’t been clear so this is an attempt . . . to make it a little bit easier. Now, if you did want to suggest a substitution in an area where we have that right or that control, which I think, C- elective, D-3, would be a possibility, E-elective, are the only places where we would have that opportunity. But at least now we would know where such recommendations or suggestions would go.”

Ming Fang He (COE) asked what the relationship is between this committee and other curriculum committees from the colleges.

Moderator Krug noted this is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, so this committee reports directly to the Senate. The college committees might share information with and report to the Undergraduate Committee and the Graduate Committee, and they may have to share information with this undergraduate curriculum committee also, but college committees don’t report here. This committee will.

The Motion was Approved.

8. A Motion from the Office of the Provost to Revise the Language about Planning at Georgia Southern (Section 111 of the Faculty Handbook):
Jennie Dilworth (CHHS):

The rationale is that the current version of Section 111 (Planning at Georgia Southern) of the Faculty Handbook does not reflect the model of planning in place at the University. The proposed language is submitted to update this section. However, Dillworth had an amendment to the last paragraph of the proposed changes to Section 111, which she passed around. Moderator Krug noted that the amendment was the result of an SEC meeting with the Provost.

Dilworth read the amended paragraph: “Periodically, members of the President’s Cabinet, members of the Provost’s Council, deans, department chairs, faculty members, and representatives of various offices convene to discuss and develop action items that advance the University’s vision and goals. Deans and department chairs share information from these discussions with faculty members, staff, and students. Administrators record this information in print and disseminate it broadly for review and comments. The Provost meets periodically with the Senate Executive Committee to
discuss issues. He reports on the content of these meetings to the Faculty Senate; his report appears in the minutes of the Faculty Senate. Action steps emanate from these discussions; study teams move these action steps forward. These teams consist of faculty members, staff, and, where appropriate, students. Members of all constituencies are welcome and are encouraged to participate in the University’s planning process.”

She moved acceptance of the friendly amendment.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) called the changes laudable, better reflecting what we do, and also expanding the number of folks and constituencies that have a say in our strategic planning process. In that vein, at the end of Section 105, it states “Several of these officers serve on the President’s Cabinet, which provides operational decision making including the operating budget. The President’s Cabinet is comprised of the following individuals . . .” She asked if we could add some Faculty Senate representative or other faculty representative.

Moderator Krug said no, you have to have your amendments in writing. This was posted and if Haberland had wanted to make that suggestion she could have made it. Haberland could suggest that for the next meeting. Further, this was not part of the amendment now under discussion.

Christina Belge (SGA Vice President of Academic Affairs) recommended making the wording “he/she reports or his/her report,” so if the Provost is a female, we won’t have to change it.

Dilworth accepted the revision.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) objected to “periodically”, preferring “whenever.” Krug noted that made no sense. Someone suggested “frequently,” but that was nonsense too. Krug suggested just leaving out a time-descriptor entirely. John O’Malley (CIT) noted the word needed to be removed at another point, too. Removal of both adverbs was accepted, with relief. Dilworth moved acceptance of the now-amended motion.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) asked the Provost or the President to speak to the role in the past of the Strategic Planning Council; he had assumed it still existed until this motion.

Moderator Krug asked Candy Schille if she had anything she’d like to say about the Strategic Planning Council.

Candy Schille (CLASS) had served on it and “found it essentially a meaningless exercise and a time waster.”

Moderator Krug added, “It did absolutely nothing as far as we could tell.”
Provost Moore added that planning is very near and dear to him and was very interested in seeing and learning how the process was working here, and his fears when he came to GSU were justified in that the process in the Handbook was so complex, just defining who’s on it required a computer algorithm. And very little of substance came out of it, and there’s a reason for that: “Planning does not have to be that complex. The more complex it is, the more guaranteed to fail.” Not only that, it placed in the hand of one central coordinating committee all strategic planning of GSU: academic planning, space planning, budget planning, and on and on. This proposal is a highly decentralized approach to planning.

Ming Fang He (COE) felt we might be derogating the efforts of those who had served on the SPC. At least in their early days a lot of faculty members worked very hard on it and made a lot of changes.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked again if we could recommend to the President that his Cabinet include a faculty representative, given that planning will be so laudably decentralized.

Moderator Krug that would have to be a motion for the March meeting. It has to be posted and discussion of the idea now was out of order.

Krug and Haberland sparred for a while until Candy Schille (CLASS) suggest that Haberland just wanted a straw poll. Krug ran the poll and it passed by majority.

The motion was finally Approved.

9. A Request for Discussion of Continued Use of the DFW Rate in Annual Teaching Evaluations of Faculty: Greg Brock (COBA):

The first sentence of the COBA annual self-evaluation asks in the teaching section what strategies the faculty member has to lower the DFW rates in his/her classes. That was explicitly used although we had a discussion in the Senate in September and it was his understanding no one knew where this criterion was coming from, and that the DFW rate was vague. Caren Town mentioned just the W rate. What does that mean, to have a high W rate relative to teaching effectiveness? He pointed out that there is a literature in his field on evaluating teaching, and there’s no mention of DFW rate in that literature. So why are we using this DFW rate? It has no meaning whatsoever relative to teaching effectiveness.

Provost Moore wants our Teaching Legacy Task Force to review what role the DFW rate should have in refining our work in education. He went back to what he said earlier, and that is, the full grade distribution does matter. To say that we would no longer look at grade distribution would be a mistake, but noted Brock was asking, “Why DFW only?” He wants to ask our Teaching Legacy Task Force to look into how we should be looking at the grade distribution, what role that should play in evaluating teaching and learning.
Jill Lockwood (COBA) noted that she is a strong supporter of accountability and DFW’s, but thinks it has no place in year-to-year teaching evaluations. She has no plan to increase or decrease the DFW rate, but rather plans to treat her class each time afresh, look at her student evaluations and add things that she thinks need to be added and stop things that need to be stopped. Maybe a five-year DFW look back would be appropriate, but not annual.

Mikelle Calhoun (COBA) Noted this is her fourth university, but the first where this issue has come up. She does not disagree with the need to look at whether some people give all A’s and some people give all C’s, but thinks that perhaps some comparison information might be useful. Also, three quarters of her classes are online and we need to consider a different standard with online; first-time online students might be shocked to realize they have to teach themselves. And so they are probably a little bit more likely to withdraw, maybe a bit more likely to fail or have significant problems.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked if this is going to be sent to the Teaching Legacy group, could the Provost direct people not to consider DWF rates in evaluations of this kind until that group has reported.

Provost Moore said he would take that under consideration.

Tony Barilla (COBA) asked the Provost also to take under consideration that our enrollment maximization model is counter intuitive to the lowering of DFW’s.

President Keel offered a counter consideration which has to do with the concept of Retention, Progression, and Graduation, which is getting more attention nationwide, “and DFW rates fits into that intimately. . . . This is coming from . . . the White House, and the Governor’s Office, and the Chancellor’s Office and the Board of Regents’ Office, and the Provost and I have been warning [faculty] about this, and I know you’re probably tired of hearing it, but it is going to only get more prominent as we move forward because not only are we all going to be held accountable for Retention, Progression, and Graduation rates, and completion rates . . . but our formula funding is going to be dependent upon meeting the goals that are going to be prescribed to us. So it is only going to get more significant this issue of accountability, and that is going to by definition have to go to the teaching, right into the classroom, become an intimate part of what you do. So . . . you have to ask yourself, why do I care about DFW rates? And I think we also have to flip that around and say we should be deeply concerned about DFW rates because there should be no reason for a student to fail. Now I know that’s a stupid thing to say, but if we have a class that typically is failing a large number of students, then it’s incumbent upon us all to find out why and to implement strategies to try and correct that – whether it’s changing the way we enroll, whether it’s changing the Professors that are teaching the course, whether it’s changing the curriculum, whether it’s changing evaluations, or whether it is putting in more tutors, or whether we use computerization . . . we are going to be required to implement policies, procedures and pathways for students to be successful. And there is no way out of it.”
Moderator Krug asked VP Thompson, if we have more students staying on, and they are better students, why should we have a problem with D's and F’s?

VP Thompson was not sure: “What I do know is that our retention rate is higher in the last five or six years. That goes back to having a higher ability student.”

With time pressing, Moderator Krug asked for a motion to continue to 6:15. It was so moved and approved.

SGA VP Christina Belge asked for an evaluative system so that when a student goes to drop or withdraw from a class, there is some kind of question we ask them to find the reason behind it, so we’re getting data. If we’re going to use DFW’s to help teaching, this data is needed.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) said, “… we, we all know that this is coming down from on high, but you have to, I don’t think you can avoid taking into account what, what Professor Barilla has said and these classes are getting larger and larger, and the impact is clear. I can look at the grade book and see what’s going on. I also think we all hear about accountability, accountability but I want to hear at least once something about student accountability. They are responsible for what they do in class. And if they don’t do the work, they can’t pass the class, and I refuse to change my class to allow students to get through who have not done the work. It just gets down to that, or the whole thing is a sham.”

Tim Teeter (CLASS) opined that he would be hard-pressed to find a student who would admit that social life got in the way. It would be great if you could get them all to be honest, but he had a feeling that would not happen. Also, we’re handed students who can’t read and then we’re told to get them to graduate. There is an inherent tension in having students who are not willing to do the work or are not willing to be prepared, and then told somehow we have to fix this.

10 A Request for Discussion of Changing the Title of “Associate Provost” to “Vice Provost”: Teri Melton (COE):

Teri Ann Melton (COE) said the Provost requested a change in the title of Associate Provost to Vice Provost “The change reflects a shift in responsibilities to a more strategic orientation, while maintaining the same functional duties. The title Vice Provost is not uncommon at other universities, other institutions.”

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked if Associate Deans would now become Vice Deans, too.

Provost Moore noted that this is just for the Provost’s office right now. At institutions worldwide, Vice Provost is a very common title; Vice Dean is not. A typical large academic affairs office would have vice, associate, and assistant provosts, plural. But we’re not quite ready for that yet.
Costomiriris asked what the tangible benefit is of changing the title of this position.

Provost Moore said it’s not so much tangible, but more “symbolic. All titles are symbolic. And this symbolizes something important and it conveys that we are a Provost’s Office that is beginning to move forward and in a sense grow with the overall stature of the University.” He added that the role has already changed rom when he came in the office a year ago. Kathy Albertson, as the Associate Provost, has seen substantial changes in what that office does. It’s much more now on a strategic side, and far less on the transactional side: “If we had a Vice Provost and a couple of Associate Provosts then we would be approaching the size of an office that would be about right. But right now the title’s all I’ve got . . .”

Marc Cyr (CLASS) was unclear on the rationale; it seemed to say “that it will be a different job, but doing the same job – a shift in responsibilities, but maintaining the same functional duties.”

Provost Moore said that’s exactly why this Vice Provost would be still responsible for overseeing First-Year Experience, the Teaching & Learning Center, etc. Those duties remain in place. They are not being delegated to someone else, but in addition that position has already expanded to include more strategic roles.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) asked if this is considered a promotion, or simply a change in the title of the current position.

Provost Moore said, “It is a change in title.”

Yarbrough re-prompted: “With no promotion?”

Provost Moore again replied, “It is a change in title.”

11. Report from the SGA Liaison: Mark Welford (COST):

There was no voting in the latest meeting, but the SGA Executive Committee announced a number of changes within the campus and things like the Pickle Barrel, the new Lakeside renovations, Landrum and the like. They also presented information about the elections. There are 83 new applicants for positions on SGA. They also discussed the John F. Nolen Scholarship. And they also discussed the fact that Georgia Southern SGA.com has recently been redone.

12. Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS):

He gave a shout out to the Women’s Tennis. Their GPA was 3.57, which puts them on the Dean’s List as a team. We’ve nominated two student-athletes, Hannah Nelson on the Volleyball Team and Samantha Williams on Women’s Basketball, for Southern Conference Graduate Scholarships. The University Athletics Committee at its last meeting recommended to recommend to President Keel that we add another member to
the University Athletics Committee, and that would be the President of the Student Athlete Advisory Board. And then the Capital One Cup Standings are out, and at the end of the first cycle of evaluations Capital One Evaluates all of the men’s and women’s athletic programs in the United States: Alabama is #1, North Carolina’s #2, and UCLA is #4, but Georgia Southern’s #9 on the list right now, and we have two more cycles to go through. He would not predict victory, but felt $400,000 for scholarships would certainly be nice.

FALL 2010 & 2011 GPA COMPARISON REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEN'S SPORTS AVERAGE GPA's</th>
<th>FALL 2010 AVERAGE GPA</th>
<th>FALL 2011 AVERAGE GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBK</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGO</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSO</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTN</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WOMEN'S SPORTS AVERAGE GPA's</th>
<th>FALL 2010 Average GPA</th>
<th>FALL 2011 AVERAGE GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBK</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSO</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTK</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTN</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSW</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMBINED 2010-11 ATHLETICS GPA's</th>
<th>2010 FALL AVERAGE GPA</th>
<th>2011 FALL AVERAGE GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Unfinished Business:

None

14. New Business:

None

15. Announcements: Vice Presidents:

None

16. Announcements from the Floor:

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) announced that the AAUP Chapter was holding its next meeting from 3-5 p.m. on Friday, March 2\textsuperscript{nd} in the Dean’s Conference Room of the College of Education.

17. Adjournment:

Moved and Approved.
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Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System – IPEDS

Handout #1 History of BCode conversion to BCATS for IPEDS reporting purposes

Handout #2 BCATS categories and definitions

Handout #3 BCATS Frequently Asked Questions

Handout #4 Master List of Job Categories which feed IPEDS reporting in hierarchical order

Handout #5 Master List sorted in Ascending Order by BCAT #
Background of the BCAT Initiative

During 2001, in support of its ambitious long-range strategic plan, the University System of Georgia (USG) Central Office began an initiative to streamline and modernize its policies and practices. The goals included improving its Policy and Business Procedure manuals, supporting institutional autonomy as appropriate, and doing away with non-value-added processes that had grown up over time.

The USG solicited feedback from campus presidents, chief business and chief academic officers, and other campus constituents about policies or procedures that created obstacles to institutional effectiveness.

One of the most-frequently-cited HR issues was the University System's job-title structure, known as B-Codes. For more than thirty years, all 34 institutions of the USG used this single, prescribed set of coded job titles for faculty and staff positions, as mandated in Board of Regents policy.

There were many frustrations with the B-Codes. The titles initially had been borrowed from a system already in use at the University of Georgia in the 1960s. Although there were thousands of job titles, many were obsolete, and many titles desired by campuses did not exist. Creating any new job title required approval at the University System level, but there was reluctance to add new titles to a structure already bursting at the seams. In practice, many titles were not interpreted or utilized consistently across the institutions.

The campuses -- which range from small 2-year colleges to complex Research I universities -- were stymied by the antiquated one-size-fits-all inflexibility of the system to meet their specific institutional needs. The larger schools, in particular, had developed informal "shadow" systems to work around the limitations of the existing structure.

Beyond that, each B-Code carried designations that dictated how positions were to be assigned for various external reporting purposes. Unfortunately, the original designations had long failed to reflect evolving reporting requirements. Consequences included, for example, federal data submissions that were not fully consistent with IPEDS instructions, resulting in over-reporting of some job categories.

Design

Sponsorship

Prompted in part by pending changes in federal IPEDS reporting categories, individuals from several University System institutions volunteered to meet as a Project Team and discuss the institutions' methods of tracking and reporting of faculty and staff positions.

The USG's senior vice chancellor for Support Services and the associate vice chancellor for Human Resources supported the Project Team's efforts, served as project sponsors and champions throughout the process, promoted the initiative to other senior System leaders and Board members, and ensured that the project was introduced on the agenda for formal approval by the Board of Regents.

Participation

Project Team participants included Human Resource and Institutional Research professionals from a broad cross-section of System institutions, including:

- Georgia State University
- The University of Georgia
- Medical College of Georgia
- Georgia Southern University
- Georgia College & State University

The first meeting was held in March 2002. The working group recognized that retrofitting a new structure onto existing institutional assumptions, historical practices, and active titles would be a challenge, regardless of when an overhaul was undertaken. However, given the discontent and frustration that had been mounting for years among campus academic and administrative leaders with the...
Background of the SCAT Initiative - Human Resources - University System of Georgia

Aged B-Code system, the time seemed right to suggest a proposal. The committee believed the campuses would be willing to absorb the temporary discomforts of adjusting to a new model – in order to achieve the longer-term strategic advantages of a more streamlined approach.

The Proposed Architecture

The group decided to base its conceptual design on basic federal IPEDS job classifications, using IPEDS guidelines and examples for assignment of titles within those classifications. The second step was to develop supplemental, University System-specific guidelines and examples for positions not fully described by IPEDS definitions alone.

For example, executives & administrators were assigned to the “100” series of the new BCAT classification structure. Within the series, positions were then grouped as:

- Senior executive officers
- Institutional & chief functional officers
- Department heads, chairs, & directors

“Other Professionals” were grouped in the “400” series by functional area:

- Academic affairs professionals
- Student affairs professionals
- Institutional affairs professionals
- Fiscal affairs professionals
- External affairs professionals
- Facilities professionals
- IT professionals
- Research & public service professionals
- Health science professionals
- Agriculture, forestry, marine, aeronautics professionals
- Athletics professionals

Within each area, major functional emphases were assigned to categories. So, for example, the Fiscal Affairs professional group contains the following categories:

- 430 – Accounting Professionals
- 431 – Audit Professionals
- 432 – Finance/Budget Professionals
- 433 – Materials Management Professionals
- 434 – Business Operations Professionals

Henceforth, positions will be tracked and reported System-wide largely by these category names. Individualized titling will be the purview of each campus. The decision to use “Senior Accountant” or “Accountant IV,” for example, will be at campus discretion, based on institutional needs.

Implementation

One major operational challenge was the technical mapping and conversion of existing titles to the proposed new categories. Thirty institutions share a collaborative PeopleSoft integrated data system; the other four institutions have either custom legacy data systems or stand-alone versions of PeopleSoft.

The work group mapped each of the existing 1,700 B-Code titles to a proposed “default” category, creating data tables to simplify the anticipated programming demands. This was intended to enable a relatively straightforward technical conversion and implementation.

The following timetable was followed:

Mar-Oct, 2002
Design developed by working committee

**Nov, 2002**
Draft/concept presented to USG human resource officers for feedback

**Dec, 2002**
Technical conversion needs determined

**Jan, 2003**
Structure design “finalized”

**Feb-Apr, 2003**
Presentations & meetings held to gain formal institutional support from affected stakeholders System-wide, including:

- Chief human resource officers
- Chief administrative/business officers
- Chief academic officers
- Institutional research officers
- IT officers and technical staff
- University System senior leadership

**April 16, 2003**
BCAT proposal presented to, and approved by, USG Board of Regents

**April-Aug, 2003**
IT design & crosswalk from old B-Codes to new “BCATS”

**June-Aug, 2003**
Communicated new model for campus rollouts & trained frontline users at day-long sessions offered around the State.

**Aug 27, 2003**
New BCAT System went live; B-Codes inactivated except for historical purposes

**Aug-Oct, 2003**
Campus-level “clean-up” to review default assignments & correct as necessary, to make campus changes based on new guidelines, and to create campus-specific subcategories and titles as needed.

**Nov, 2003**
Effective “capture” date of data for 2003 IPEDS report

**Feb, 2004**
Reporting deadline for 2003 IPEDS “Fall Staff” and “Employees by Assigned Position” data to NCES

**Observations**

Job titles seem like a simple thing. But they have tentacles that reach into virtually every aspect of University System operations. They have obvious impact on activities like budget development and payroll administration, but they also serve as key markers for decision-making at all levels, from strategic planning to detailed operational activities. They are built into systems that determine benefits eligibility; they support academic course load assignment and tracking; they serve as the basis for EEO/affirmative action analysis; they impact research development and administration; they even affect the bane of every campus’s existence: they can be used to determine parking privileges. Changing a system of job titles – even when most stakeholders hated the existing system – was like “changing the transmission while driving the car down I-75.”

Throughout the process, therefore, efforts were made by the Project Team to keep communication open and flowing among the many stakeholders – at both the central University System offices and at the campuses – whose work would be impacted by this conversion. Various constituents suggested thoughtful design changes and improvements, which were considered and often
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incorporated by the Project Team.

Benefits

The BCAT structure for the University System of Georgia offers

- Time savings and operational efficiencies
- Elimination of campus-based shadow tracking systems
- Enhanced compliance with external reporting requirements
- Streamlined internal tracking for planning purposes
- Improved consistency across campuses
- Flexibility for campuses to meet their unique institutional needs

Examples:

Because the previous B-Code system was so complex and used so inconsistently, the University System previously had been unable to utilize a number of PeopleSoft-delivered reports. Now, campuses that had often spent weeks manually evaluating and compiling employee data for annual IPEDS and VETS-100 reporting are able to generate those reports much more efficiently.

The BCAT system allows institutions to “customize” their campus working titles and to build compensation programs appropriate to their own competitive job markets—all within the PeopleSoft integrated data management system, rather than in separate shadow systems that had to be independently maintained.

The BCATs use a logic that assembles similar types of positions by function. As a result, it can be used to streamline the analysis of job groups and career-path positions for such purposes as Affirmative Action Plan development and reporting.

Academic positions in particular have been grouped into a single series, to which special qualifiers may be attached without creating separate codes. So the 'core' title Professor is 200. Adjunct Professor is 200B; Visiting Professor is 200W; Research Professor is 200T and Professor Emeritus is 200H. In the past each such title had a separate code, and they were scattered around a master list that was commonly used in alphabetical order.

Conclusion

To reference Deming, “Every solution creates a new problem,” so it is inevitable that new issues will emerge. The hope and intent of the project team members and sponsors, however, is that the BCAT model will serve the interests of the University System of Georgia and its campuses well for the foreseeable future.

CORE PROJECT TEAM – Sept. 30, 2003

Barbara Carroll
Assistant Vice President, Human Resources Georgia State University

Susan Norton
Human Resources Director
Medical College of Georgia

Andy Brantley
Associate Vice President, Human Resources
University of Georgia

Bonnie Sims
Director, Human Resources & Payroll
Georgia College & State University
Job Categories (BCATS)

Effective August 27, 2003

- 100 Executives/Administrators
- 200 Faculty/Academics
- 300 Other Administrative Professionals
- 400 Other Professionals
- 500 Clerical/Secretarial
- 600 Technical/Paraprofessional
- 700 Skilled Crafts
- 800 Service/Maintenance
- 900 Other

100 Executives/Administrators

Persons whose primary assignments require management of the institution or a customarily recognized division thereof. All are FLSA Exempt.

- 1A Senior Executive Officers
- 1B Institutional & Chief Functional Officers
- 1C Department Heads, Chairs, & Directors

200 Faculty/Academics

Persons whose primary assignments are for the purpose of conducting instruction, research, and/or public service, and who hold academic rank titles. All are FLSA Exempt.

Include those with faculty rank, as long as the individual's ACADEMIC (teaching, research, non-administrative) responsibilities represent more than 50% of full-time effort. Include those with campus titles such as Asst/Assoc Dean, Asst/Assoc Dept Chair, Asst/Assoc Project Director, etc., if administrative duties represent less than ½ time.

- 2A Faculty / Corps of Instruction
- 2B Professionals with Academic Status

300 Other Administrative Professionals

Persons whose primary assignments involve professional and administrative activities within a customarily-recognized division or department of the institution, and who are subordinate to individuals in Category 100 (Executive Administrators). All are FLSA Exempt.

These positions are reported with Other Professionals (Category 400) for IPEDS reporting purposes: While they may hold an administrative title, they meet the IPEDS definition of a professional (perhaps are even a "solo expert" with an area of specialized content expertise), with a primary purpose of supporting academic service, student service, or other institutional support activities at the professional level.
• 3A Administrative Unit Heads / Professionals
• 3B Managers
• 3C Administrative Associates

400 Other Professionals

Persons whose primary assignments involve performing professional-level work in such areas as academic and student services, health professions, fiscal affairs, human resources, and information services. Requires at least a baccalaureate degree in the field, or equivalent, and may require a terminal degree or licensure. All are FLSA Exempt

• 4A Academic Affairs Professionals
• 4B Student Affairs Professionals
• 4C Institutional Affairs Professionals
• 4D Fiscal Affairs Professionals
• 4E External Affairs Professionals
• 4F Facilities Professionals
• 4G Information Technology Professionals
• 4H Research & Public Service Professionals
• 4J Health Science Professionals
• 4K Environment Professionals
• 4L Athletics Professionals

500 Office/Clerical

Persons whose primary assignments are associated with office clerical, secretarial, or office/departmental support activities. Includes first-line managers of such employees. Supervisors (5A) are FLSA-Exempt; all others are non-exempt.

• 5A Office Managers / Clerical Supervisors
• 5B Office / Clerical Assistants

600 Technical Paraprofessional

Persons whose primary assignments required specialized technical knowledge in the field, as typically acquired through apprenticeship, academic training such as a 2-year degree or certificate, or the equivalent. All are FLSA non-exempt.

• 6A Institutional Techs/Paraprofessionals
• 6B Technology Techs/Paraprofessionals
• 6C Research/Lab Techs/Paraprofessionals
• 6D Science Techs/Paraprofessionals
• 6E Health/Medical Science Techs/Paraprofessionals
• 6F Environment Techs/Paraprofessionals
• 6G Other Techs/Paraprofessionals

700 Skilled Crafts/Trades
Persons whose primary assignments require specialized manual skills typically acquired through apprenticeship, formal training programs, or on-the-job training. Includes the lead workers, foremen, and supervisors of such employees. Supervisors (7A) are FLSA-Exempt; all others are non-exempt.

- 7A Skilled Crafts Supervisors
- 7B Skilled Craftspersons

800 Service/Maintenance

Persons whose primary responsibilities involve supporting the comfort, convenience, hygiene, of institutional students, employees, patients, visitors, or other constituents. Typically requires no more than high school or limited post-high-school training and experience. Includes the lead workers, foremen, and supervisors of such employees. Supervisors (8A) are FLSA-Exempt; all others are non-exempt.

- 8A Service/Maintenance Supervisors
- 8B Service/Maintenance Workers

900 Other

Students, temporaries and other limited positions, retirees, and miscellaneous status designations for payroll purposes.

- 9A Student Workers
- 9B Fellows / Interns
- 9C Limited Term
- 9D Temporary
- 9E Occasional
- 9F Retirees & Other Affiliates

return to top
1B Institutional & Chief Functional Officers

Both academic and administrative positions, as long as they:

• Report to an individual in 1A, or to another individual in 1B, AND

• Direct a major functional area, AND

• Direct the work of other professional-level employees

Include those with faculty rank, as long as the individual’s ADMINISTRATIVE, non-teaching responsibilities represent at least 50% of full-time effort.

Include campus titles such as Vice President, Vice Provost, and Asst/Assoc VP, if the position is equivalent to, and meets the definition of, a chief functional officer.

1C Department Heads, Chairs, & Directors

Both academic and administrative positions, as long as they:

• Report to an individual in 1A or 1B, AND

• Direct a customarily-recognized department, AND

• Direct the work of other professional employees

Include those with faculty rank, as long as the individual’s ADMINISTRATIVE, non-teaching responsibilities represent at least 50% of full-time effort.

Include campus titles such as Director, School of Music; Chair, Biology Department; Registrar (AD); Treasurer; Chief of Police, etc., if the position is equivalent to, and meets the definition of, a department head or director.
Frequently Asked Questions

- BCODES vs. BCATS
- Adding or Changing BCATS
- Changing the FLSA Status of a BCAT
- Changing the IPED-S or EEO-1 Designation of a BCAT
- Unused BCAT Subcategories
- Faculty Information System (FIS) & BCATS
- Mail Drop Problem
- IPEDS & Part-Time Positions
- Non-Tenure-Track Faculty
- Temporary/Part Time/Casual Positions

Q: BCODES vs. BCATS

Do we have to switch from using the old B-Codes to the new BCAT system?

A: Yes.

The USG Board of Regents approved the change at its April 2003 Board meeting. The 33-year-old B-Code job classification structure of the University System of Georgia was officially "retired" as of August 27, 2003 - at which time, the 1,684 old B-Code "job titles" were inactivated, and the 200 new BCAT "job categories" were activated. As of that date, B-Codes may only be used for archival purposes (such as tracking position history).

Added 09/30/03

Q: Adding or Changing BCATS

May a campus add a new 3-digit BCAT if we need a category?

A: No.

New 3-digit "root" BCATS may only be added by the University System of Georgia for System-wide use. Requests for new categories should be directed to the BCAT Advisory Team.

Added 09/30/03

Q: Changing the FLSA Status of a BCAT

May a campus change the way that positions in a BCAT are designated for FLSA salary and wage purposes (exempt or non-exempt)?

A: No.

Federal FLSA exemption criteria were fundamental to the design concepts of the BCAT structure. Campuses may not alter these
designations. If a position on your campus doesn't fit the assigned FLSA status, move the position to a BCAT that reflects the appropriate FLSA status for your campus, based on the actual job duties.

*Added 09/30/03*

**Q. Changing the IPED-S or EEO-1 Designation of a BCAT**

May a campus change the way that positions in a BCAT are designated for IPEDS-S or EEO-1 (VETS-100) reporting purposes?

**A: No.**

The definitions used for federal IPEDS and VETS-100 reporting (the latter of which uses EEO-1 criteria), were fundamental to the design concepts of the BCAT structure. Campuses may not alter these designations. If a position on your campus doesn't fit the assigned IPEDS/EEO categories, move the position to a BCAT that reflects the appropriate designations for your campus, based on the actual job duties.

*Added 09/03/03*

**Q: Unused BCAT Subcategories**

The 4th-character BCAT Subcategory codes O, Y, 5 and 8 are defined as “not used.” Does this mean, don’t use them period, or that they are simply not defined as a part of the overall BCAT scheme? We might like to use one of them to help identify a unique status of certain jobs on our campus.

**A: Don’t use them.**

The first four characters (the 3-digit root BCAT + the 1-character SubCAT) are for authorized System-wide designation only. So the unused Subcats should not be utilized unless they are adopted USG-wide. They were not intended to be available for the discretionary use of individual campuses. We tried to keep a few open characters for unanticipated future System-wide needs. However, you could submit a request and the BCAT Advisory Team will take it under consideration.

*Added 09/30/03*

**Q: Faculty Information System (FIS) & BCATS**

We wonder about the FIS and how faculty are captured in that database, because if we don’t use the right B-Code, the faculty person could be pulled off the BOR agenda and we could lose time in getting people approved. Will the B-codes in the FIS system be changed to BCATS?

**A: Short Answer: Keep using the old B-CODES in FIS.**

Long answer: FIS will be a consideration in the short term. As you may know, the current FIS is being phased out, and will be replaced by PeopleSoft’s “Manage Faculty Events” (MFE) module when we convert to Version 8. Rollout of V.8 will happen during the first half of 2004.

Most campuses complete the vast majority of their faculty appointments before the start of the school year. We timed the BCAT conversion to occur after your main faculty-hiring period for 2003. Our hope was that you wouldn’t need to appoint very many additional faculty between now and the time V.8 goes live. Once V.8 is live, you’ll automatically be able to use the BCATS in MFE.
But for the next few months, it didn’t seem worth the effort to modify the dying FIS in order to include BCATS. So – if you need to make faculty appointments via FIS between now and the time of your V.8 implementation – you should continue to use the Old BCode for the title in FIS.

**Q: Mail Drop Problem**

Following the conversion, our campus Mail Drop addresses have disappeared on a number of folks. This address is used for check distribution and is important when one’s work location and departmental account codes differ. Without the mail drop, checks will go to the dept where the expense is charged. Any quick answers?

**A: This issue wasn’t caused by the BCAT conversion.**

PeopleSoft is designed to handle Mail Drop IDs on the Position Level. A previous GaFirst project modification allows users to enter Mail Drop IDs at the Employee Level on the Payroll Data 2 panel.

Because the Mail Drop ID field on the position level is not linked to the Mail Drop Definitions, it is generally left blank. When Position Data is saved and the Update Incumbents box is checked on, whatever is in the Mail Drop ID field in Position Data overwrites the current value of the Mail Drop ID field in Payroll Data 2. Therefore if the Mail Drop ID field in Position Data is blank, the Mail Drop ID field in Payroll Data 2 becomes blank.

This is how the software has always worked. OIIT sent out a reminder to their listserv, reminding those schools who use Mail Drop ID that this will happen.

**Q: IPEDS & Part-Time Positions**

If we assign the BCAT “203R00” to a part-time instructor, are the programming folks are going to design the IPEDS report to show this group of persons falling out under the part-time employees category? Or for that matter, will they automatically know that any BCAT with an “R” in the middle needs to be separated out from the full time employees?

**A: IPEDS pulls data by indicator fields.**

The BCAT Subcat qualifier “R” (part-time) was created as an administrative convenience at the request of one of the campuses, but it's not what will be used to pull the data for the PeopleSoft-generated IPEDS-S Report.

Instead, part-time positions will be recognized based on how the position was established in the Manage Position panels. If you go to

- **GO**
- Develop Workforce
- Manage Positions
- Use Information

Towards the bottom left hand side of the panel, you will see how the position should be set up as either “Part Time” or “Full Time” (and as either “Regular” or “Temporary”).

These are the indicator fields that PeopleSoft will use to pull the information for the IPEDS-S report. As long as you have designated these fields correctly, they will feed correctly for the PeopleSoft IPEDS-S report. OIIT will not be doing any special programming for this.
Q: Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

Case A: We have faculty members hired with rank, for one year, benefited, not on tenure track, usually with a PhD. We usually have conducted a limited search due to time constraints. The following year a full search is done. Of course they can apply and would become regular faculty on tenure track (if they're the successful candidate), or they are not rehired.

Case B: Then we have other faculty who are hired w/rank, for one year, benefited, not on tenure track, usually without a PhD. These faculty members receive contracts year after year still stating that they are temporary because they are pursuing their PhD.

As far as BCATs are concerned, should the Case B folks be categorized differently from the real one-year Case A folks? Or is there some other terminology that we should be using for the second group?

A: It depends.

Some campuses use the term “Visiting Faculty” for the Case A folks. You may want to consider that, such as using BCAT 202W (Visiting Assistant Professor).

Some campuses use the term “Lecturer” (BCAT 204X) for the Case B folks (with the thought that those folks don’t get to have a title with the word ‘professor’ in it until they’ve completed their terminal degree).

You should consult with your chief academic officer about considering adopting one or both of those practices.

Or you could assign both your Case A folks and your Case B folks to the Limited Term Faculty BCAT (922X) and distinguish the two groups on your campus by setting up the last two digits differently for each group.

Q: Temporary/Part Time/Casual Positions

Previous practice was based on institutional intent, not on IPEDS like the new BCATS. For example, many temps are ongoing, especially with the budget as it is. Others are temp due to late notice to retire given by incumbents, while others are temp pending degree award, etc. Why did Part Time Faculty with the part time B-Codes go to the regular faculty BCATs (200 series)? Casual Labor is another example. Most schools use that title for temporary summer workers, etc.

A: This is really several good questions.

So let’s start with the last one first: CASUAL LABOR.

In retrospect, we probably could have defaulted the “Casual Labor” BCode (B1603) to something in the Temporary (930) series or Occasional (940) series, instead of to 810 (Service/Maintenance Worker).

If your campus usage doesn’t fit the default BCAT (810), then just reassign B1603 to the BCAT that does fit the way your campus actually used them.

But — you might ask — how should you handle a situation where most of the people you had called “casual laborers” would now be best described as Temporary Clerical (935) under the new BCATS — but you also have a few that would fit the new Occasional Skilled Crafts (947) better, and a few others that are really Temporary Professionals (934)?
Our suggestion: Default to the most common usage (in our example: 935). Then, for the less-frequent others, go in and give those individuals a new BCAT and new campus title (other than casual laborer), just like you would if you were reclassifying them to a different position.

With regard to the question on **PART-TIME FACULTY:**

Again, in retrospect, we probably could have rolled all of the part-time faculty B-Codes, like B5163 (Part-Time Professor), directly into 200R instead of just into 200X. We added “R” (part-time) at the last minute, in response to a campus suggestion, and we didn’t go back through the “mapping” we’d already given submitted for technical conversion.

Now for some general comments on **TEMP, PART-TIME, CASUAL:**

It was actually hard to find consensus on what “most schools” were doing with these types of titles. The Project Team found campuses using “temporary,” “part-time,” and “casual” B-Codes in all sorts of overlapping, interchangeable, and inconsistent ways.

It was the Project Team’s feeling, for example, that “temps,” by definition, should NOT be ongoing, even though that seems to have been the practice on some campuses. If a staff employee worked 19 hours a week for 4 straight years, they might have been part-time, but they were NOT, in our view, temporary.

And if a campus had a “temporary” faculty member who’d been working full-time for each of the last 6 academic years, even if they weren’t tenure-track, it begs the question of whether they should be called “temporary.”

The Project Team had to make a judgment call in assigning each old B-Code to a new 3-digit BCAT. As we’ve said — if your campus doesn’t like the default BCAT — you can override the default BCAT to one that fits better, or add 4th digits to help distinguish special attributes of certain positions.

Under the old paradigm, there was just “regular” and “temporary.” Of course, life was never really that simple. So now there are more variations on those themes. We think the new system is actually more flexible and more descriptive — allowing you more accurate options for assigning positions to categories based what they’re actually doing. You can now use the new Temporary (930) series, Limited Term (920) series, and Occasional (940) series to more descriptively categorize your positions.

BCATs in the 100s - 800s are for “regular” positions, in the sense that they don’t fit the new BCAT definitions of “temporary,” “limited term,” or “occasional.” But the 100s - 800s can and should be used for both ongoing full-time as well as ongoing part-time positions.

You can denote positions that are Part-Time by utilizing the 4th BCAT character (R = Part Time), by assigning them an FTE less than full-time, and/or by setting up the position as part-time in Manage Positions.

*Added 09/30/03*
### UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

**JOB CATEGORIES ("B-CATS")**

**MASTER LIST, with definitions & guidelines**

Last Updated: 09/13/05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCAT GROUP</th>
<th>BCAT #</th>
<th>BOR JOB CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD</strong> - Academic Tenure/Non-Tenure Track Academic Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AI</strong> - Administrative Unassigned Academic Assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1 EXECUTIVE ADMINISTRATORS

- Functions whose primary assignments require management of the institution or a customer/affiliated organization.
- All are FLSA Exempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1A</th>
<th>Sealer Executive Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1B</th>
<th>Institutional &amp; Chief Functional Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1C Department Heads, Chairs, & Directors

- Functions that require management of a complex department.
- Functions that require management of a customer/affiliated organization.
- Functions requiring supervision of FLSA non-exempt employees at least 95% of total effort.

| 1C | 150 | Director, College/Division/Regional/Center |
| 1C | 152 | Director, School/Department |
| 1C | 156 | Department Chair/Head |

#### 1D COMMENTS

1. Report directives to an individual in 1A or 1B, and
2. Direct a customer/affiliated department, and
3. Direct the work of FLSA non-exempt employees at least 95% of total effort.

#### 2A COMMENTS

1. REPORT TO AN INDIVIDUAL IN 1A OR 1B. Ignore if the position is equivalent to a director/department head or director.
2. Ignore if categories only those positions that do NOT serve as department head or director.

#### 3A COMMENTS

1. Ignore if the position is equivalent to a director/department head or director.
### FACULTY / ACADEMICS

Persons whose primary assignments fall for the purpose of
conducting instruction, research, and/or public service, and
who hold academic titles. All are FLSA Exempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2A</th>
<th>Faculty / Corps of Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A.1</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A.2</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A.3</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A.4</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A.5</td>
<td>Fellow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS
Include those with faculty rank, or long-term individual academic ties.

### OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE PROFESSIONALS

Persons whose primary assignments involve professional & administrative activities within a generally recognized division/department
of the institution, attributes who are subordinates to individuals in
Category 1 (Executive Administrations). All are FLSA Exempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3A</th>
<th>Administrative Unit Heads / Professionals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A.1</td>
<td>Director, Subdivision (Unit) AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A.2</td>
<td>Assistant Director, College/School AG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A.3</td>
<td>Associate Director, Area/Division AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A.4</td>
<td>Associate Director, College/School AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A.5</td>
<td>Associate Director, Division/Department AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A.6</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Subdivision (Unit) AD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS
Include individuals who do not otherwise meet the definitions
in Category 1 (Executive Administrations) only,

### MANAGERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3B</th>
<th>Managery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3B.1</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B.2</td>
<td>Assistant Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### COMMENTS
Include exempt-level positions that
are primarily in charge of managing other staff, if only managing non-exempt staff, list on 300, 700, or 800.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>Deputy/Assistant Administrator</td>
<td>Include positions that are not administrative support positions, but are at a &quot;right-hand&quot; senior professional level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Administrative Specialist / Coordinator</td>
<td>Include at least a bachelor's degree in the field or equivalent and may require a terminal degree in a professional specialty in the field. All are FLSA exempt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4 OTHER PROFESSIONALS**

- Academic Affairs Professionals
- Institutional Affairs Professionals
- Fiscal Affairs Professionals
- Student Affairs Professionals
- Institutional Affairs Professionals
- Executive Affairs Professionals
- Facilities Professionals
- Information Technology Professionals
- Research & Public Service Professionals

**OTHER PROFESSIONALS**

- Include positions that do not hold academic rank.
- Include archivists.
- Include student assistants, financial aid, housing, facilities professionals.
- Include academic counselors, psychologists & social workers.
- Include human resource/college admissions/credit development.
- Include business managers.
- Include OAD illustrators, graphic designers, photographers, drafters.
- Include "IT Profs," other for positions that don't fit 461-488.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Department/Profession</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Health Science</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>410 Medical Professions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>411 Dental Professions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>412 Pharmacy Professions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>413 Physical Therapy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>414 Allied Health Professions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>415 Social Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>416 Veterinary Animal Science Professions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>417 Nutrition Professions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4K</td>
<td>Environment Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4K</td>
<td>400 Facility Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4K</td>
<td>401 Environmental Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4K</td>
<td>402 Agricultural Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4K</td>
<td>403 Forestry Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Athletics/PE Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>412 Athletics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>413 Athletics Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OFFICE / CLERICAL**

Persons whose primary assignment are associated with office/clerical, of non-exempt administrative or departmental assistance. Includes first line managers and supervisors of such employees. Supervisors (989) are FLSA Exempt. All other are FLSA Non-Exempt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5A   | Office Manager / Clinical Supervisor | Include exempt first line supervision of employees in Category 5B. Include campus titles such as:
|      |       | * Clinical Supervisor |
|      |       | * Departmental Coordinator |
|      |       | * Computer Operations Supervisor |
|      |       | * Human Resources Supervisor |
|      |       | If not formally supervise the work of other non-exempt clerical employees. |

**OFFICE / Clerical Assistants**

Include non-exempt "Assistant to..." campus titles if the position is equivalent to & meets the definition of a clerical assistant. Include non-campus titles as:

* Accounting Assistants
* Administrative Assistants
* Clerics, School Study
* Computer Operators
* Customer Service Assistants
* Departmental Assistants
* Film/Records Assistants
* Library/Archival Assistants
* Secretaries, Senior Secretaries
### TECHNICAL/PARAPROFESSIONAL

**P nonson whose primary assignments require specialized technical knowledge in the field as acquired through apprenticeship, academic training such as a 2-year degree or certificate, or the equivalent, non-supervisory positions.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Sub-Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Institutional Tech/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Technology Tech/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Science Tech/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>Health Science Tech/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>Other Tech/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>Specialized Tech/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SHIELD DRAFTS

**Persons whose primary assignments require specialized manual skills acquired through apprenticeship, informal on-the-job training programs, or on-the-job training, include the lead workers, foremen, and supervisors of such employees. Supervisors (700) are exempt. All others are FLSA Non-Exempt.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Shielded Craft Supervisor</td>
<td>Incl. Except 1st-line managers or supervisors of employees in Category FB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Shielded Non-supervisor</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SHIELD COMMENTS

**Includes skilled craft persons, as well as non-exempt foremen, foremen, and working supervisors of such employees. Additive campus titles such as:
- Electrician
- Carpenter / Cabinetmaker
- Instrument Maker
- HVAC Technician / System Usability Specialist
- Millwright
- Skillmaster / Stationary Engineer
- Packer
- Molder
- Water / Steamfitter
- Welder**
### BRUNSWICK MAINTENANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Service/Maintenance Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service/Maintenance Worker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Other Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellow Interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Term Positions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments

- Positions are created or abolished for a defined period that is expected to be at least 6 months, but that is not expected to continue indefinitely. Typical examples are positions funded through grants or sponsored projects, where the life cycle of the grant may be 1 to 5 years. Other examples are positions that are established only for a limited period due to a special easing project or need.

- Limited term positions of less than 60% FTE are benefits eligible, and
- Limited terms are paid at a rate no higher than a regular position. Positions expected to last for more than 3 years should be established as regular classified positions.

- Used for professionals staff (eg, nurses) who would ordinarily qualify as exempt professionals, but who need to be paid on an hourly basis due to current demands or facility staffing needs, where hourly work is tracked and overtime is paid.
### Temporary Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>631</td>
<td>Temporary Executive</td>
<td>Ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>Temporary Faculty</td>
<td>Ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td>Temporary Administrative</td>
<td>Ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>634</td>
<td>Temporary Professional</td>
<td>Ex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>635</td>
<td>Temporary Office/Control</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>636</td>
<td>Temporary Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>Temporary Salaried C/Tr</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>638</td>
<td>Temporary Service/Infrastructure</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TEMPORARY positions may be filled for up to 6 months, and may be full-time or part-time. Temporary positions are not benefits-eligible, regardless of FTE. Departments may seek an extension of up to 6 additional months (barring consecutive periods). However, under BOR policy, once the individual has worked for the institution for 12 consecutive months, the employment relationship must end. The individual may not be brought as a temp in the same initial status more than three times in a period of at least 36 days.

### Occasional / As-Needed Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>Occasional Executive</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>Occasional Faculty</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>Occasional Administration</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td>Occasional Professional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>Occasional Office/Control</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>Occasional Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>Occasional Salaried C/Tr</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>Occasional Service/Infrastructure</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OCCASIONAL positions are similar to temporary positions. An individual with an "occasional" appointment works only sporadically, but might work on a recurring basis, as needed, over a period longer than 6 months. Examples include an individual who works 1-2 afternoons a week, or a full-time individual who leads a project during a required period, or a week/year who builds and tests new products a few times per year. These individuals may sign applications or part-time for brief periods, but their total FTE over the course of a year should not exceed almost 25% time. Occasional positions are not benefits-eligible.

### Retiree & Other Affiliates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>Regent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>Retired Former Employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>058</td>
<td>Non-Compensated Affiliate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>059</td>
<td>Title Unspecified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>COBRA Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>061</td>
<td>Retiring Dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>099</td>
<td>Retiree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- 059 is a title designation used for heading personnel through payroll.
- 060: For individuals not paid by your institution, but who need to appear in the system for funding purposes. Examples: ROIC, faculty paid directly by the military. Claims paid directly by other religious order, learned society. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCAT 3-digit</th>
<th>BCAT 4-digit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>(new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Acting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Clinical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>(not used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Tenure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**L+4th (BCG only)**
Executive
Depar
Head
Associate
Intermediate
(not used)
Fac
Lead
Public Service
Part Time
(coless than 1/2 time; not best to-able)
Student
Research
Senior
Temporary
Visiting
(not used)
Faculty
Faculty (less than 1/2 time, per BOR policy)
Distinguished University Chair
Distinguished Professor
Distinguished Scholar
(not used)
Names Professor
Named Chair
(not used)
Emeritus Scholar

**AD = Academic.**
**Holds Tenure/Tenure-Track Academic Rank.**
**AO = Administrative.**
**Does not hold Tenure/Tenure-Track Academic Rank.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Profesor</td>
<td>Regents Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, the 4th digit of any category title will be "C"—meaning none, or an unspecified designation.

However, if there are "positions" associated with an individual's appointment (plus "ending" of "senior") when these positions are desired.

**EXAMPLES**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCAT 3-digit</th>
<th>BCAT 4-digit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>(new)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Regents Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Acting Dean - Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Acting Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Distinguished Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Instructo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Full-time Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

Use these "categories" as a 4th character, following any 3-digit BCAT, to identify specific certifications related to that category title.
**SORTED IN ASCENDING ORDER BY BCAT #**

*Last Updated: 09/13/05*

**NOTE:** These designations may not be altered at the campus level. Any changes must be approved and published by the University System Office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCAT Group</th>
<th>BCAT#</th>
<th>BOR Job Category</th>
<th>FLSA Status</th>
<th>IPEDS Reporting Category</th>
<th>Reporting Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1A</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Chief Academic Affairs Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Chief Business/Finance/Administrative Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Chief Development/Advancement Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Chief External Affairs Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Chief Student Affairs Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Chief Research Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Dean AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Dean AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Assoc/Asst Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Assoc/Asst Vice President</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Assoc/Asst Provost</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Chief Accounting Officer/Controller</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Chief Athletics Administrator</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>Chief Audit Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Chief Auxiliary Services Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Chief Budget Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>Chief Enrollment Services Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Chief Facilities Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>Chief Hospital Administrator</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>Chief Human Resources Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>Chief Information (IT) Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Chief Institutional Research (IR) Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Chief Investment Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Chief Legal Affairs Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>Chief Librarian</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Chief Operations Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Chief Planning Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>Chief Public Relations Officer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Director, College/Division/School AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>Director, Division/Department AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>Department Chair/Head AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Executive/Administrator</td>
<td>Officials &amp; Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Exempt Status</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Faculty Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Faculty Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Faculty Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Faculty Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Faculty Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>Fellow AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Faculty Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Post-Doctoral Associate AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Faculty Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Registrar AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Faculty Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Librarian AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Faculty Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Counselor AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Faculty Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Researcher AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Faculty Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Academic Professional AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Faculty Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Public Service Professional AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Faculty Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Director, Subdivision/Unit AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Assoc/Asst Director, College/School AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Assoc/Asst Dean AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Assoc/Asst Dean AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Assoc/Asst Chair/Director/Head AC</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Assoc/Asst Director, Division/Department AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Assoc/Asst Manager</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>Deputy/Associate Administrator</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>Administrative Specialist / Coordinator</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Academic Services Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Library Professional AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Museum Professional AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Continuing Education Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Artist AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Student Services Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Counseling Professional AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4L</td>
<td>Athletics Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4L</td>
<td>Coach</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>HR/EO/O Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Institutional Research Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Accounting Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Audit Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Finance / Budget Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Materials Management Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Business Operations Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>External Affairs Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Alumni Relations Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Communications Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Development/Fundraising Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Marketing / Public Relations Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Grants &amp; Contracts Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Technical Design Professionals</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Facilities Management Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Safety / Risk Management Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Interior Design Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Facility Operations Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Retail Operations Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4G</td>
<td>IT (Information Technology) Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4G</td>
<td>IT Application Support Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4G</td>
<td>IT Database Support Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4G</td>
<td>IT Client Support Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4G</td>
<td>IT Network Support Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4G</td>
<td>IT Systems Support Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4G</td>
<td>IT Security Support Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4G</td>
<td>Telecommunications Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4H</td>
<td>Research Professional AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4H</td>
<td>Post-Doctoral Associate AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4H</td>
<td>Laboratory Professional AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4H</td>
<td>Public Service Professional AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Teacher AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Dentist AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Pharmacist AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Veterinarian AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Physician AD</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Medical Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Nursing Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Dental Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Pharmacy Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Physical / Occupational Therapist</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Allied Health Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Social / Human Service Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Veterinary / Animal Science Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4J</td>
<td>Dietetic / Nutrition Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4K</td>
<td>Agriculture / Forestry Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4K</td>
<td>Food Science Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4K</td>
<td>Extension Professional / Agent</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4K</td>
<td>Aeronautics Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4K</td>
<td>Marine Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>500 Office Manager / Clerical Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>505 Office / Clerical Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>510 Office / Clerical Assistant</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Clerical/Secretarial</td>
<td>Office &amp; Clerical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>500 Paraeeigal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>601 Athletics Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>602 Audiovisual Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>603 IT Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>604 Telecommunications Technical/Professional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>605 Research Assistant</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>606 Laboratory Assistant</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>607 Life Science Technician</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>608 Social Science Technician</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>609 Physical Science Technicians</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>610 Allied Health Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>611 Dental Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>612 Medical Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>613 Nursing Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>614 Pharmacy Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>615 Physical / Occupational Therapy Technician</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6F</td>
<td>616 Animal Care Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6F</td>
<td>617 Agriculture / Forestry Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>618 Safety / Risk Mgmt Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>620 Social / Human Service Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>621 Dietetic / Nutrition Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6F</td>
<td>622 Marine Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6F</td>
<td>623 Aeronautics Technical / Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6F</td>
<td>624 Technical Design Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6G</td>
<td>630 Library Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>700 Skilled Craft Supervisor</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Skilled Crafts</td>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>705 Skilled Craft Foreman</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Skilled Crafts</td>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>710 Skilled Craftsper</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Skilled Crafts</td>
<td>Craft Workers (Skilled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>800 Service / Maintenance Supervisor</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>801 Police / Security Supervisor</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>802 Police / Security Professional</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>803 Client Care Supervisor</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>805 Service / Maintenance Foreman/Lead</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>810 Service / Maintenance Worker</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>815 Police / Security Lead</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>820 Police Officer</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>821 Security Guard</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>825 Client Care Lead</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>830 Client Care Assistant</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>835 Client Care Lead</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Service/Maintenance</td>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>601 Criminal Justice Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>602 Juvenile Justice Technical/Paraprofessional</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Technical/Paraprofessional/Technicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>Student Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>Work Study Student</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>Trainee</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>Graduate Lab Assistant</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>Graduate Research Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>Graduate Teaching Assistant</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>Intern</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B</td>
<td>Fellow AD</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C</td>
<td>Limited Term Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C</td>
<td>Limited Term Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C</td>
<td>Limited Term Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C</td>
<td>Limited Term Office / Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C</td>
<td>Limited Term Technical / Paraprofessional</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C</td>
<td>Limited Term Skilled Crafts / Trades</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C</td>
<td>Limited Term Service / Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9D</td>
<td>Temporary Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9D</td>
<td>Temporary Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9D</td>
<td>Temporary Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9D</td>
<td>Temporary Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9D</td>
<td>Temporary Office / Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9D</td>
<td>Temporary Technical / Paraprofessional</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9D</td>
<td>Temporary Skilled Crafts / Trades</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9D</td>
<td>Temporary Service / Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9E</td>
<td>Occasional Executive</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9E</td>
<td>Occasional Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9E</td>
<td>Occasional Administrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9E</td>
<td>Occasional Office / Clerical</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9E</td>
<td>Occasional Technical / Paraprofessional</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9E</td>
<td>Occasional Skilled Crafts / Trades</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9E</td>
<td>Occasional Service / Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9C</td>
<td>Hourly Professionals</td>
<td>NonEx</td>
<td>Other Professional</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9F</td>
<td>Regent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9F</td>
<td>Disabled Former Employee</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9F</td>
<td>Non-Compensated Affiliate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9F</td>
<td>Title Unused/Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9F</td>
<td>COBRA Participant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9F</td>
<td>Surviving Dependent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9F</td>
<td>Retiree</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No IPEDS Reporting</td>
<td>No VETS-100 Reporting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Approval of the Agenda for the March 19, 2012, Meeting.

Clara Krug (CLASS), Senate Moderator, announced that the Provost’s report will now precede the President’s report at each meeting, and that on page two of the agenda she inadvertently put Tony Barilla is COST; he is in COBA. With that, the agenda was moved and approved.

2. Approval of the February 14, 2012, Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary:

Cyr had three corrections to the minutes. Robert Costomiris was in attendance, so his name should be listed. On page 17, the second paragraph before #9 should read “Candy Schille (CLASS) suggested,” rather than “suggest.” And on page 19, in the last line before Section 10, it should read, “and then being told that somehow we have to fix this.” With those corrections, the minutes were moved and approved.
3. Librarian’s Report of March 19, 2012: Tony Barilla (COBA), Senate Librarian: Moved and approved.  

   a. Report from the Undergraduate Committee: Ron MacKinnon (CIT).  

      No report.  

   b. Report from the Graduate Committee: Bob Fernekes (LIBR).  

      The Librarian’s Report included the approved Graduate Committee minutes from the February 9th meeting. The meeting began with the approval of the agenda, followed by the Dean’s update. Under new business, the committee discussed the Comprehensive Program Review, and formed eleven sub-committees to take care of the process. In addition, the committee approved two ECON name-change course revisions. Also there were updates on the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research Webinar. They are doing one approximately every month, and the faculty and staff Military Self-Identification Survey. The report was Approved.  

4. Provost’s Report: Ted Moore:  

   Academic Advisement  

   According to the annual National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), called Nessie for short, in 2005, 29% of the freshmen at Georgia Southern rated academic advisement as either “fair” or “poor,” while only 21% rated it “excellent.” In 2011, the fair-poor rating dropped to 11% while 45% evaluated academic advisement at Georgia Southern as “excellent.” Obviously, the trend is good, and Georgia Southern outpaces all other USG school averages when it comes to any of the first-year academic advisement metrics on the NSSE. So hats off to the faculty and staff who do active work in advisement. On the web, you can see the NSSE results:  

   http://services.georgiasouthern.edu/osra/download/NSSE.htm  

   CIRP Survey  

   Another survey that we do with freshmen, and this is also normed against national averages, is the Cooperative Institution Research Program, CIRP, and we participate in this each year. It provides a lot of demographic and other information about our students overall. The Provost suggested we thumb through this and see what kind of information they have to help us plan and manage.  

   Four of our faculty and staff have been nominated by their peers for national awards this year in advising:  

   - In the category of New full-time advisor, Jay Pollet in the College of Science and Technology Advisement Center;  
   - In the category of New faculty advisor, Danielle Smith in International Studies;
• in the category of Faculty advisor, Dr. Ellen Hendrix, Writing and Linguistics Department of College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences;
• in the category of outstanding advisement administrator, Dr. Bobbie Williams in the College of Business Administration.

CIRP: [http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/fye/CIRP_results.htm](http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/fye/CIRP_results.htm)

**Complete College Georgia**

*Complete College Georgia* continues to develop, and five-person teams from each USG institution were assembling Athens, Georgia, to share ideas and learn more about what may be expected under *Complete College Georgia*. Our team is:

• Dr. Teresa Thompson, Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management;
• Dr. Bret Danilowicz, Dean of the College of Science and Mathematics (*see below re: this college name*)
• Dr. Kathy Albertson, our Vice Provost (until recently known as Associate Provost);
• Dr. Jayne Perkins Brown, Associate Vice President;
• Ms. Candace Griffith, Assistant Provost.

**CEIT/COSM**

President Keel has publicly announced our newest unit, the Allen E. Paulson College of Engineering & Information Technology (CEIT), and that what we’ve been calling COST for so many years will become the College of Science & Mathematics (COSM). Both names are effective July 1st, but we’re beginning to see the new names used already.

**Educational Leave**

We will be resuming Educational Leave for tenured faculty in January 2013. We’ll be going through processes to select and assign and accommodate those educational leaves this summer and fall. This is aimed at “promoting scholarly work,” “enhancing teaching,” and “encouraging professional development.”

**Verification, and, in Some Cases, Translation of Academic Degrees**

Provost Moore anticipated the upcoming agenda item:

- Current faculty will not be required to bear the costs. GSU probably will do this on a reimbursement basis; the final guidelines are still being written.

- The federal government is the group that decreed that we shall have all non-US degrees verified. They decreed that not directly to the University, but to the accrediting agencies, of which SACS is one. So this is a national requirement.
- There is no need to worry. The administration is finishing the guidelines and will be in contact as needed with individuals, or through department chairs and deans to give instructions on what to do next. It’s not a terribly difficult process.

**Study Teams**

Our various study teams, task forces, and committees are moving forward. In the near future we’ll see a formal effort put forward to help plan how we might advance our University to a Carnegie “high activity” research institution.

**Performing Arts Center**

The last show of the regular season is *South Pacific*, Sunday, April 1st, at 6:00 p.m. We will mark that occasion with a salute to veterans of that conflict. Special thanks to Carol Thompson, the Director of the PAC, for bringing this about, and also to Dr. Brent Tharp, the Museum Director, who will be providing a World War II exhibit in the Performing Arts Center lobby for that special showing.

**Faculty Club**

The exploratory group examining the desirability and feasibility of a Faculty Club was meeting to review what has been learned in visits to Forest Heights Country Club and the Bishop Alumni Center. If the group proposes going forward, the next task will be to establish an appropriate governing body, and then to make decisions from there.

**Carillon**

In addition to ringing the hour and half-hour, this electronic instrument has a keyboard attached to it, and for many years Dr. Michael Braz performed ten-minute concerts at noon on Tuesdays and Thursdays. This tradition went away when he retired, but recently Monday thru Saturday at 12:15 the carillon is playing our Alma Mater. Last July 4th, between 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m., the carillon played patriotic songs using a pre-recorded memory card. While we would not and do not employ it during classes, since in a few buildings the music can be heard and it is a distraction, the carillon has the potential for use in other special events and celebrations on campus, such as commencements, and thoughts are going forward now on that.

**5. President’s Report: Brooks Keel**

**Advising**

Without question, with regard to RPG, which we’re now hearing an awful lot about, advising plays one of the most important roles in making sure that our students are successful. He added to the Provost’s congratulations to all that do advising, whether it’s just the way we teach, or in the way that we deal with students.
Legislative Session

Both the House and Senate are basically leaving the Governor’s recommended budget untouched. Overall, to the Board of Regents, there is a 2% cut. We will be able to absorb that 2% cut without any marked effect on the University. One thing is for sure, the Governor is not proposing any pay increases for state employees, which of course includes the University System, for the next fiscal year, which will start July 1st. But there is an awful lot of talk about the possibility of implementing pay increases for the following fiscal year, because Georgia has been fortunate in receiving positive revenue projections for the last eighteen months or so and if that trends continues, and every anticipation is that it will, we should be in pretty good stead with regard to the budget for next fiscal year.

Herty Advanced Materials Group

The Governor is moving to have the administration of the Herty Advanced Materials Group in Savannah transferred to Georgia Southern, and that is making its way through the legislature now. We don’t anticipate any issues with that and foresee that Herty will become officially Georgia Southern’s July 1st. We are now having conversation with the Herty staff to look at how their business is managed to determine the best way to intercalate that entity within Georgia Southern. We are very excited about what this will represent in terms of research and economic development aspects, and also how it will help bridge even further Savannah and the coastal part of the state to Statesboro and Georgia Southern.

REACH Scholarship (Realizing Educational Achievement Can Happen).

The Governor announced a month or so back a new scholarship program that is entirely needs-based. It is called REACH. It identifies students in the sixth grade, and the children’s families will actually sign an agreement that if the students stay out of trouble, stay off of drugs, maintain a C average all the way through from the sixth to the twelfth grade, and then get into a HOPE-based university, they will receive $2,500 in addition to all the other scholarships that they obtain. AT&T made a $250,000 contribution towards this program. It will be all covered by a philanthropic fund that the Governor’s office will be responsible for raising. Georgia Southern has agreed to match that. We joined the University of Georgia, Georgia Tech, Georgia State and just recently Georgia Health Sciences University in matching the REACH scholarship. We are going to be using the proceeds from the automobile tags to help go towards that; there was a bill passed at the last legislative session indicating that universities, if they apply, can receive a certain portion of those proceeds of the tag sales with the stipulation that those proceeds go towards needs-based scholarships. We have submitted the paperwork to be allowed to receive those proceeds from the tag sales.

Statutes

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee recommended a committee to review the Statutes of Georgia Southern University. There have been several things that the Faculty Senate has wanted to do, including putting a Graduate Student on as a voting member
of the Faculty Senate, that require a modification of the Statutes. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee also thought it would be a good idea to review the Statutes and see if what we are currently doing in practice actually is codified in the Statutes. The committee so far:

- Henry Eisenhart
- Pat Humphries
- Ron MacKinnon
- Michael Moore
- Fred Smith
- Caren Town
- Robert Vogel

There’s one additional faculty member from whom President Keel was awaiting a response. The committee will take responsibility for reviewing the Statutes to determine if any changes need to be made, and then bringing those changes to the Senate for deliberation and approval.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Clara Krug (CLASS), Chair:

Krug hoped no Senate meetings in future would occur the first day back from a break because of the problems caused by statutory deadlines and the fast turnaround from the previous meeting. That situation re: this meeting had not been helped by yet another Sharepoint breakdown.

President Keel approved all items passed at the previous meeting: the Graduate Committee minutes, Undergraduate Committee minutes, the motion about the responsibilities of the General Education and Core Curriculum Committee, and changing the proposed language for the Faculty Handbook section related to planning.

Krug then noted what items were upcoming on the meeting agenda. She also noted that a Request for Information from Kathleen Comerford re: Campus Security in an Era of Heightened Risk was declined as “Asked and Answered” at Fall Senate meetings and the December forums.

Re: a Task Force on Compensation, Krug noted that the SEC has recommended six names to Provost Moore, who added that he was finalizing six names from the Staff Council. Krug added that the SEC-suggested members are lecturers, assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors from a variety of units in order to represent people with various concerns.

Elections of the Senate Librarian and the Senate Secretary: These will occur at the April meeting. Krug called for self-nominations and said they could contact Secretary Cyr or Librarian Barilla for information on the duties of the positions.
Michelle Haberland (CLASS) noted the recent court case involving Virginia Tech and the implications of the University being liable because of the shooting that happened there and the way they handled that, and it struck her that not everyone understands what happens if there’s a shooter on campus. Recently, by chance, she happened across a copy of emergency response procedures in her department office; she had been unaware of it. She felt it was clear from the declined Comerford RFI and from the responses of many people in CLASS that they are unaware of procedures that are already in place. They are told repeatedly nothing will change with the Shooting Center on campus, but we don’t really know, in light of the fact that we will be inviting more guns to campus, what these pre-existing procedures are. She asked if we could re-distribute and re-highlight these existing procedures.

There ensued a lengthy episode of acrid bickering. On one side, Moderator Krug and President Keel insisted that such questions had been asked and answered multiple times; that claiming the shooting range will result in more guns on campus and claiming that people on campus do not know the in-place procedures for responding to emergencies are two separate issues, and that combining them, as Haberland had done, sowed confusion; and that they had a hard time believing anybody didn’t know these procedures because that information is ubiquitously published and available. On the other side, Haberland insisted she was only saying that many people were ignorant of in-place emergency procedures and asking that the administration consider a means of re-highlighting them for everyone. This back-and-forth produced no conclusions.

7. A Motion from the Senate Executive Committee Related to Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Evaluations: Lowell Mooney (COBA):

Section 205.06 of the Faculty Handbook documents procedures for faculty evaluations. The SEC moved that we add to that section details about criteria on which faculty will be evaluated: “Members of each department shall approve all criteria for evaluation of instruction, scholarship and creativity, and service and all procedures for evaluation. And that these criteria exist in writing.” It’s simply to make sure that faculty know the criteria on which they will be evaluated.

Clara Krug (Senate Moderator) said the SEC drafted this initially out of concern about the D’s, F’s, and W’s that people were being evaluated on, and information didn’t seem to exist in writing anywhere; they found out about it only when they received their evaluations. And Dr. Keel and Dr. Moore had both expressed concern that this kind of information, the criteria and the procedures, needed to exist at the departmental level, which is the focus of Section 205.06.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked if departmental approval would require a majority or plurality, or had to be unanimous.

After some confused (and often inaudible) discussion, Jill Lockwood (COBA) suggested this was a question for the Senate Parliamentarian, and Bob Cook (Parliamentarian) noted that this would fall under Robert’s Rules of Order and a majority would suffice unless the guidelines specified otherwise. The motion was Approved.
Moderator Krug hoped that this would help solve some of the problems of the DFW issue, and added that at the meeting of the University System Faculty Council, other members said that at their institutions they do not yet have this problem.

8. A Motion about the University’s Policy on Verification of All Degrees from a Foreign Institution: Helena Hernández (CLASS):

She moved that GSU pay the fee(s) to have any current faculty member’s degree(s) from a foreign institution verified. She asked also for a friendly amendment, adding “If required by the institution or an outside agency” at the beginning.

The amendment was approved; the amended motion was Approved.

9. A Motion Requesting Faculty Representation on the President’s Cabinet: Michelle Haberland (CLASS):

Haberland noted that the SEC had suggested a friendly amendment that she thought was excellent, to change “faculty representative” to “a tenured member of the Corps of Instruction to serve as the faculty representative.”

The amendment was approved; the amended motion for the SEC to recommend and the Senate to elect a tenured member of the Corps of Instruction as the faculty representative in the President’s Cabinet was Approved.

10. A Request for Information about the Archery and Firearms Shooting Center Business Plan: Robert Costomiris (CLASS)

Moderator Krug noted that this had been answered via a copy of the Campus Recreation and Intramurals Sports Education Center Business Plan posted on March 8 to the SharePoint website.

11. A Request for Discussion of a Change in the University Calendar in Summer 2013 and Fall 2014: Teri Melton (COE).

Melton being absent, Jim LoBue (COSM) introduced the topic: The Fall 2014 calendar was approved with only one week of classes after the Thanksgiving break. The Summer 2013 calendar was approved with no classes scheduled on Friday, July 5th. Also, there will be no classes on Thursday, July 4th.

Moderator Krug recognized Wayne Smith of the Registrar’s office. Smith said the committee brought this to Faculty Senate because in 2010 it was approved that the Calendar would have two weeks of classes after Thanksgiving. But for Fall 2014 calendar, if we had the two weeks after Thanksgiving, we would be doing grade processing on December 22nd and 23rd, and then we would be off for a week, and we would be in the middle of processing grades, and posting those grades on the website. Also Financial Aid would be in the middle of processing satisfactory academic process, and other processes would be interrupted. The committee thought the best way to do it was to only have the one week of classroom instruction after Thanksgiving.
Provost Moore noted that he chairs the Calendar Committee and that the calendar doesn’t always cooperate in giving us two weeks between Thanksgiving and Christmas break. About half the years we have that luxury; the other half, we don’t unless we want to place quite a burden on the staff who are processing grades and doing other required reports. So they wanted to explain that they had not simply ignored the very important desire to have two weeks between Thanksgiving and Christmas break when possible.

Wayne Smith (Registrar’s Office) also wanted to make sure that everybody understood that for the summer 2013, July 4th falls on a Thursday and there will be no classes and none on Friday, July 5th.

Barry Balleck (CLASS) said that when we went to the two weeks after Thanksgiving, that also allowed us to start a week later in August. Will we start closer to August 13 to make up for that lost week?

Smith said we will be starting on August 18th. Balleck asked if that meant we’d lose a week of instruction. Smith said No.

12. Approval of the Resolutions Adopted by the University System of GA Faculty Council.

A. “That the University System allow 10-month-contract faculty and staff the option to be paid over a 12-month period and/or be paid semimonthly.”

Helena Hernandez (CLASS) whether we’d be paid monthly or bi-monthly. Krug said that would be an option.

Tom Buckley (CHHS) asked what effect this would have on people who have summer grant money for summer salary.

(Secretary’s Note: I apologize for the lengthy direct quotations following. I am an English professor and believe my attempts at summary here would damage clarity.)

Charles Patterson (VP of Research and Economic Development and Dean of Graduate Studies): “This type of payment system would be detrimental to both faculty, charging faculty time to grants and contracts, both during the academic year as well as summer, as well as effort report. There are Universities that have quit charging faculty time on sponsored projects simply because of the inability to reconcile this type of payment schedule.”

Moderator Krug asked if she understood him, that this type of schedule would be detrimental to faculty time for contracts and federal reporting.

Charles Patterson (VP of Research and Economic Development and Dean of Graduate Studies): “It would be detrimental to the ability to charge for faculty time.”
Clara Krug (CLASS) Senate Moderator said okay: “It would be detrimental to the ability to charge faculty time for contracts and to do federal reporting.”

Charles Patterson (VP of Research and Economic Development and Dean of Graduate Studies): “That’s correct.”

Bob Cook (Parliamentarian) asked, “Isn’t it the case that faculty are restricted to receiving a certain percentage of their salary during the summer? So if you were on research and then had a 12-month payout, would that exceed the limit that’s specified?”

Charles Patterson (VP of Research and Economic Development and Dean of Graduate Studies): “It would be difficult in the summer to reconcile what proportion of your pay came from the academic year portion and what portion of your pay came from summer grants and contracts, as it pertains to effort reporting. Right now, if a faculty member, for example, has a contract and during, say, July, they get paid one month of salary, that’s 100% effort for that month. With this proposed plan, it would be very difficult for us to reconcile the effort. As it pertains to direct charging the faculty time during the academic year, that changes the base rate of pay by amortizing over 12 months, and so, in essence, we would be undercharging for faculty effort – 20% during the academic year no longer becomes 20%. So we’d have to back-calculate what that percentage would be and for the numerous faculty we do that for would be very, very difficult.”

Tom Buckley (CHHS) asked if this would be optional per faculty member, or would the whole University opt-in or opt-out.

Krug said it would be per individual faculty member.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked Vice President Patterson if those faculty who have these kinds of grants could be encouraged to choose the 10-month option and then the rest of us for whom that does not pertain could choose 12-month. She also asked if this all was a result of ADP.

Moderator Krug said that once upon a time in Georgia we were paid over 12 months. We were also paid at a different time of the month, so that people who bought houses, for example, had their mortgage checks due on a certain day and then we put the last workday, so over time things have evolved. It’s just a desire for faculty members to know what they’re going to get every month, and not have to save money ahead to be able to pay for bills in the summer.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) recalled that when he came here 25 years ago, our salary was busted up into 12 installments. However, at the end of spring quarter, we received three month’s pay. They gave it all to us in one big lot, at that time, which for those of us who are not in Accounting, helped with summer budgeting. Re: accounting difficulties, the books were cleared at the end of the spring term. The money had been paid out. There was nothing to calculate over the summer, so he did not see too much of a difficulty although his Accounting colleagues may disagree.
Haberland again asked Vice President Patterson if he could have those faculty who are on those grants choose the 10-month option and encourage them to do so with a smile.

VP Patterson was not sure what her question was. Could he strongly encourage faculty who are active in research and scholarship, who are writing proposals and managing grants not to elect a 12-month pay schedule? Sure. But dictating that would be out of his realm of control.

The motion was Approved.

B. Health Insurance Resolution, including council amendments:

“Whereas the University System of Georgia faculty as a whole has concerns about health care coverage issues including, but not limited to:

1. In network provider participation
2. LabCorp mandate
3. Medicare supplementation

The University System of Georgia Faculty Council recommends that the Board of Regents revisit our plan in light of these concerns.”

Frederic Mynard (COSM) was not sure what “revisit” meant, so it might be asking for trouble because these days if we revisit the plan, it doesn’t mean we are going to get a better plan without any guidelines as to the nature of the things to revisit.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) supported Mynard, saying “it has been bad enough the last four years. This is kind of inviting them to come in and do another tap dance on our heads and our wallets.”

The motion was Not Approved.

C. Funding Resolution

“To recognize the importance of faculty governance to the University System of Georgia, the University System of Georgia Faculty Council recommends that the Board of Regents provide funding for costs associated with the semi-annual council meetings.”

The motion was Approved.

D. Domestic Partners, as amended

“In the interest of equity and in order to attract and retain all of the best-qualified faculty and staff, the USGFC recommends that university system benefits be extended to domestic partners.”

The motion was Approved.
E. Consolidation Resolution, as amended

“Faculty are a critical component of the University System of Georgia. Faculty should have been involved in and must be included in decision-making affecting programs, staffing, accreditation, and other academic matters.

In November, 2011, the USGFC resolved: The USG Faculty Council recommends to the Chancellor and the USG Chief Academic Officer that representatives of faculty and academic affairs of those institutions most likely to be considered for consolidation be included in discussions and deliberations involving consolidation. The USG Faculty Council is hopeful that the missions of those institutions that are considered for consolidation be included during consolidation discussion.

February 25, 2012: Since November we have had neither an acknowledgement that our communication was received nor any comment from the chancellor regarding our proposal. It is the USGFC position that consolidations were proposed and are proceeding without sufficient faculty involvement.

The USGFC looks forward to meeting with you to address these concerns.”

The motion was Approved.

F. Retirement Plan Resolution

“We propose that the USGFC reach out to Dr. Hugh Hudson, Executive Secretary of the Georgia State Conference of AAUP, and Mr. Stephen Anthony to obtain advice on effective strategies that can lead to change in the current TRS/ORP decision structure, which may lead to providing an opportunity for USG faculty, after 10 years of service, to switch from one system to the other.”

John O’Malley (CEIT) asked who Stephen Anthony is. Moderator Krug said he is the person from the state AAUP who works on legislative issues.

The motion was Approved.

13. Update: The Number of Administrators Employed by Georgia Southern University (see data table below): Tony Barilla (COBA).

He and Marc Cyr were tasked by the SEC to figure out if there was a difference in the number of administrators versus the number of faculty hired from 2007-2011. They attempted to figure out spreadsheets that were given by Paul Michaud. The data were quite convoluted and so he went the old government way, which is two big groups, faculty/non-faculty, broken down by pay range (in thousands), just using 0-49, 50-75, 75-100, 100-150, and 150 and over. 80% of the Non-Faculty make less than $50,000; he assumed no administrator or any person with any type of authority or responsibility makes less than that. So figure that 80% are groundskeepers, building service workers, and so on. Cyr wanted to know the difference in hiring, and if you look at just the Non-
Faculty above $50,000, there are 31 more of them than there were in 2007. In contrast, for the faculty, there are 62 more of them in 2011 than in 2007. Re: pay ranges, faculty numbers are dwindling above $75,000, but increasing in the lower pay ranges; we can likely make the assertion that that is more temporary hires or a lot more new hires at the assistant level than before. In contrast, for Non-Faculty in the higher income levels there are more people hired. Those, of course, are administrators, or administrative assistants, and so forth. Re: pay raises, Cyr had requested a listing of the top twenty salary earners here on campus. Barilla could explain every one of these away by either a market adjustment, a new hire, some people that are putting on more work than they were previously, or new lines that were created and weren’t here before. But some of the administrators did not take raises like a lot of people thought, at least from 2007-2011. So for all of us, Barilla asked President Keel, “Where’s our money?”

President Keel said our money is in Atlanta. He further noted that 2009 was the most money we’ve ever received from the state in terms of our formula funding, and it equated to right at $99 million, and it was approximately $6,000 per FTE. For 2012, that’s dropped to about $70 million, which equates to about $4,000 per FTE. So our state funding has decreased 33%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2007 Avg Sal</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2011 Avg Sal</th>
<th>Diff Avg Sal</th>
<th>Hiring Diff 11-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - $49,999</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>$39,644.84</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>$39,458.64</td>
<td>-$186.20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>$59,457.17</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>$59,375.33</td>
<td>-$81.84</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>$85,399.79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$85,515.24</td>
<td>$115.45</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$111,102.15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>$111,374.53</td>
<td>$272.38</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 -</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>$61,846.34</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>$61,160.96</td>
<td>-$685.38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Faculty</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2007 Avg Sal</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2011 Avg Sal</th>
<th>Diff Avg Sal</th>
<th>Hiring Diff 11-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - $49,999</td>
<td>1053 (80%)</td>
<td>$28,663.84</td>
<td>1133 (79%)</td>
<td>$28,892.54</td>
<td>$228.70</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $74,999</td>
<td>149 (11%)</td>
<td>$60,394.56</td>
<td>173 (12%)</td>
<td>$61,924.08</td>
<td>$1,529.52</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 - $99,999</td>
<td>61 (5%)</td>
<td>$86,466.21</td>
<td>63 (4%)</td>
<td>$87,127.80</td>
<td>$661.59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 - $149,999</td>
<td>45 (3%)</td>
<td>$117,545.05</td>
<td>46 (3%)</td>
<td>$121,973.84</td>
<td>$4,428.79</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 -</td>
<td>14 (1%)</td>
<td>$180,219.61</td>
<td>18 (1%)</td>
<td>$186,193.97</td>
<td>$5,974.36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>$39,478.66</td>
<td>1433</td>
<td>$39,894.00</td>
<td>$415.34</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just $50,000 and up</td>
<td>269 (20%)</td>
<td>$111,156.36</td>
<td>300 (21%)</td>
<td>$113,554.92</td>
<td>$2,398.56</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Ten Paying positions</td>
<td>2011 Salary</td>
<td>2007 Salary</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>$342,200.00</td>
<td>$299,098.00</td>
<td>$43,102.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>$250,000.00</td>
<td>$184,000.00</td>
<td>$66,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Football Coach</td>
<td>$223,000.00</td>
<td>$213,004.00</td>
<td>$9,996.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Finance</td>
<td>$203,500.00</td>
<td>$185,000.00</td>
<td>$18,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBA Dean</td>
<td>$187,000.00</td>
<td>$172,000.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Student Affairs</td>
<td>$177,848.00</td>
<td>$177,848.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Foundation</td>
<td>$176,674.50</td>
<td>$176,674.50</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alum Relations*</td>
<td>$176,672.00</td>
<td>$150,600.00</td>
<td>$26,072.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head BB Coach</td>
<td>$175,000.00</td>
<td>$175,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean CHHS</td>
<td>$172,000.00</td>
<td>$166,410.00</td>
<td>$5,590.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Research*</td>
<td>$169,125.00</td>
<td>$142,000.00</td>
<td>$27,125.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean COBA</td>
<td>$165,000.00</td>
<td>$152,440.00</td>
<td>$12,560.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP Tech</td>
<td>$160,000.00</td>
<td>$160,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Mkt Dept</td>
<td>$156,500.00</td>
<td>$138,500.00</td>
<td>$18,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Student health</td>
<td>$156,000.00</td>
<td>$156,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Class</td>
<td>$155,000.00</td>
<td>$155,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean COE*</td>
<td>$155,000.00</td>
<td>$139,050.00</td>
<td>$15,950.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>$148,592.30</td>
<td>$148,592.30</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Cost</td>
<td>$142,000.00</td>
<td>$142,000.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Dept Finance</td>
<td>$140,000.00</td>
<td>$139,050.00</td>
<td>$950.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**14. Report from the Elections Committee: Tony Barilla (COBA).**

All colleges seem to be finally up and running with elections that are probably going to be starting the week of April 2nd. We want to try to get them done before finals, so he requested Senators to lean on their own college administrators and people who are chairing that committee so we can get it all done, and to encourage people to run – we have a lot of openings: As a wise man said, democracy is for the people who show up.

Moderator Krug noted some colleges, like CLASS, have trouble filling their slates and getting elections done in a timely manner. She urged everyone to themselves urge their colleagues to participate, and do so with all deliberate speed.
15. **Report on the Pathways Study Group: Mark Welford (COSM):**

They are in the process of defining pathways and appropriate workloads and have four that they are thinking of, and these are within the tenure track; they are not dealing with non-tenure track. The four pathways being considered: an enhanced practitioner, an enhanced research and creative activity, an enhanced teacher, and enhanced service something. They haven’t come up with a name for that one yet. Several jocular proposals were bruited, but no conclusion reached. They are also going to discuss appropriate workloads. Minutes of their meetings can be found on the President’s site.

Moderator Krug noted that Pathways reports would be featured on future agendas because we tend to have reports from Task Forces and ad hoc committees scheduled for each of the meetings.

16. **Report from the SGA Liaison: Mark Welford (COSM).**

There was a very lively debate that developed around the issue of voting in the recent SGA campus voting. Punches weren’t thrown, but it got very lively. H had heard this from a proxy because he deliberately avoided the meeting.

17. **Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS).**

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that Geyerman told him he was teaching and would not be able to make it to Senate to give his report.

18. **Unfinished Business.**

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked about the shooting center business plan: The appendix that has the expenditures shows many of the expenditure remaining flat over a ten-year period. So salaries, operating expenses, utilities, equipment – it seemed incomprehensible to him that such things could remain completely constant for ten years. He wondered how they came up with that. He also asked if this is still the budget that they are working on or if it has changed.

Amy Ballagh (VP Student Affairs & Enrollment Management) said the salaries and benefits for full-time personnel have an increase built in to them. The other pieces remain flat because we are able to control those expense based on the revenue coming in. So we are projecting the ability to do that.

Costomiris questioned our ability to control utilities.

Ballagh said the utilities cost is an estimate. So we put some cushion in there in the front end and anticipate not actually having to use that full amount in the first few years.
Costomiris (CLASS) then noted that the RAC operations fees is noted as $200,000 for the ten-year period, but in the informational meetings in December, the number was $300,000.

Ballagh said that number was $325,000, “the piece that will go into the facility construction, and the $200,000 is an annual expense that’s estimated to go along with the operating expense and that’s something that was budgeted for in the very beginning, as with all the expenses and programs that we do with Campus Recreation & Intramurals. It’s from the RAC fee.”

Costomiris asked, if there is a revenue shortfall, is there any limit to the amount of RAC operations fees that will be encumbered to run this facility?

Ballagh said they “will prefer to scale back the operations of the facility rather than increase the costs or increase what we are using from the RAC fee operating fund. The operation is developed in highly scalable mode so that we can have some flexibility with the budget.”

Costomiris: “Even though you’re going to have full-time employees?”

Ballagh: “That would be the most inflexible part of the budget, but we can always determine the need for those employees as vacancies arise.”

Costomiris asked how they were doing on raising their million dollar endowment.

Ballagh said they are doing rather well. Vince Miller (VPSA & EM) concurred. They have had several conversations with prospects on the fundraising side, and just recently received a gift for $25,000 from one organization. He thinks we will reach our estimated goal in 24 months. Costomiris asked how much they have now. Miller said they have $500,000 from one organization, $200,000 committed from another, and that just received $25,000.

Ballagh: “Since this is a highly-specialized facility we thought that would be appropriate plus we are actually modeling the design for our revenue stream from a current operation from Michigan State University . . . and this is what they do and it works well.”

Switching Old Business subjects, Fred Mynard (COSM) noted that the numbers presented by Barilla don’t align with previous data that we had from the GSU Fact Book. He wondered where this discrepancy came from.

Tony Barilla (COBA) thought it’s just from a definition of what an administrator is versus what an administrator isn’t. A lot of people on this campus are wearing more than one hat, where they’re in a temporary administrative role, but listed still as faculty. It’s very fluid and so that’s why we decided to do it just faculty versus non-faculty because that way it was very clear cut. The number of temporary administrators is probably going to be a really fluid number, too.
Mynard next wondered what the GSU *Fact Book* operating definition was of “Executive/Admin/Managerial.” Parliamentarian Cook suggested he submit a Request for Information.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said there was a real problem with his original RFI [re: employee numbers and pay]. He had been trying to make clear definitions and the problem is that depending on who you ask and what data bank you’re looking in, who is defined as what, shifts; it shifts over the years here at school, it shifts from this school to other schools to the state level; it’s a real nightmare. But he agreed it would be interesting to find out what executive/admin/managerial is because those numbers were so wildly different: The original numbers supplied by the Provost’s office were that we had fewer administrators, whereas the GSU *Fact Book* suggested that we had way more administrators, in fact hiring nine admin/exec/managerial for every one faculty member over that period of time. And then Barilla’s numbers kind of suggest a different hiring pattern. “It’s a morass,” Cyr opined.

**19. New Business.**

None.

**20. Announcements: Vice Presidents.**

None

**21. Announcements from the Floor.**

None

**22. Adjournment.**

Moved and Approved.
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Clara Krug (CLASS) Senate Moderator and Chair, Senate Executive Committee, called Ginger Malphrus forward and presented her with a gift from the Senate in appreciation of her work as the Senate’s administrative support staff.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the April 17, 2012, Meeting.

Moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the March 19, 2012, Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary:

Cyr had two emendations, both in the second paragraph on page 7: #1: Because he broke Robert’s Rule against criticism, he cut from the first line “There ensued a lengthy episode of acrid bickering. On one side,” so that the paragraph begins with “Moderator Krug”; “On the other side” was cut from lines 7-8, and that the sentence begins with “Haberland.” #2: Cyr had misheard and subsequently misread in the transcript a statement by President Keel, so he cut the last sentence of that paragraph and replaced it with “President Keel suggested that the Chief of Police update faculty
on in-place security and how the Eagle Alert System operates and can be contacted.”
The corrected minutes were Moved and Approved.

Moderator Krug noted that the President did not indicate in what venue the visit from
the Chief of Public Safety might occur. She also noted that President Keel was absent,
in Atlanta at the BOR meeting.

Librarian Tony Barilla (COBA) not yet having arrived, Moderator Krug called for the
report from the Undergraduate Committee.

a. Report from the Undergraduate Committee: Ron MacKinnon
   (CIT):

At the March 6th meeting of the Undergraduate Committee, from CLASS there was
one course revision, and one announcement; from COBA there was one new course,
nine course revisions, and six course deletions; from COST, mainly from engineering,
four new courses, twenty-two course revisions, two revised programs, and three
course deletions for a total of five new courses, thirty-two course revisions, and two
revised programs, and nine course revisions. The report was Approved.

b. Report from the Graduate Committee: Bob Fernekes (LIBR):

The Librarian’s Report includes the approved Graduate Committee minutes from the
March 8th meeting. The Dean’s update highlighted the Graduate Research
Symposium, the Averitt Awards for the Excellence in Graduate Research and
Instruction, DegreeWorks Graduate Management Enrollment and Hobson’s Connect.
Under new business the committee discussed continuous enrollment, and approved
two course revisions and four course prerequisite changes for the Department of
Mechanical and Electrical Engineering. Under old business, the committee discussed
comprehensive program reviews. The report was Approved.

3. Provost’s Report: Ted Moore:

Faculty Credential Verification

We must have complete records to satisfy the so-called “faculty roster” requirement of
SACS, which arises from federal requirements. We are over halfway there with the full
verification project: This means we must have on file an approved statement that
confirms that faculty members’ academic credentials, coupled with research and
scholarly accomplishments are sufficient so that they may teach the courses to which
they are assigned. The name “faculty roster” is a bit of a misnomer; it’s really a course
roster, and for each course that faculty teach, they have to have credentials
demonstrating ability to do that. In the vast majority of cases documentation is very
straightforward. For instance, a Ph.D. in history is easily argued to equip you to teach
history-prefix courses.
We also must verify academic credentials earned at non-US institutions, and we’ve had some discussion of that before. Faculty have been notified if some of their credentials need verification at this point, and have been supplied with approved service firms that handle this requirement.

The University will reimburse faculty for out-of-pocket costs. This is still a cumbersome requirement and the administration is continuing to seek workable solutions that will allow us to satisfy compliance requirements and reduce the burden on faculty. If faculty members encounter a problem, they should contact the Provost’s office for help; the remedy cannot simply be to ignore the requirement.

**Sustainability**

The President has approved an organizational structure that will continue with the work done by the Energy Task Force. It is the *Center for Sustainability* and will include representatives from the academic sector as well as from our facilities and utilities sector at the University. There is already a Center for Sustainability, now in the College of Science and Mathematics, and this takes that center and elevates it to the University level.

Moreover, last week President Keel re-signed the American College & University Presidents’ Climate Commitment. This gives us two years to produce an acceptable plan to achieve climate neutrality. The President will be inviting members to join the Center, and their first charge will be to begin developing that plan and continuing to oversee and implement the recommendations of the Energy Task Force.

**Educational Leave**

Procedures for educational leave are now approved at all levels and will be distributed soon. The first such leaves may begin in the spring semester of next year.

**General Faculty Meeting**

We have a General Faculty meeting scheduled for April 30, 4:00 [in the Nessmith-Lane building]. There will be reports from a number of University officials including the President, as well as some planning teams who will describe their upcoming developments. Not what has happened, but what will happen. He urged Senators to encourage all faculty colleagues to attend. There will be high-quality door prizes, too.

**Summer Enrollment**

We have impressive national empirical data, as well as local data, that support the premise that summer attendance affects persistence to degree completion. In fact, according to the national data, completing only four credits or more in the summer is linked significantly to finishing degrees on time. It’s more than just having a few more hours on the record; it is essential to continuing the sense of engagement with pursuing the degree throughout the full calendar year that seems to affect persistence.
He asked that faculty make announcements in their classes reminding students to get advised and get registered now for summer if they plan to enroll.

Explain to them that committing early helps ensure the most desired class schedule.

If faculty hear reports from students of difficulties in arranging advisement sessions and/or in registering, please contact an associate dean.

This message applies to all students, but especially freshmen and sophomores.

Adopt-a-Soldier

As part of our effort to support our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines in Afghanistan, the Adopt-a-Soldier Program had a 5K race coming up on April 21, with about 450 participants already signed up. The proceeds were to go to the Program. Also, groups of students on campus are helping collect and pack up items of value that we will send to soldiers in Afghanistan.

Provost Moore then called for questions.

Mark Welford (COST) noted one faculty member who has three degrees from outside the USA and is not on the list for degree verification.

Provost Moore asked that such omissions be reported to him so they can be fixed.

Moderator Krug asked about the door prizes for the General Faculty meeting.

Provost Moore said they were still in the process of securing pledges on these door prizes, but gave some examples of suggestions given by the Senate Executive Committee: a free ticket for one of the Performing Arts Center performances, one year of free parking, a gift certificate from the bookstore, and a year’s membership in the RAC. He hoped for five or six prizes.

Moderator Krug noted that the SEC did decide that you have to be present for the drawing (toward the end of the meeting) to win a prize. So you may not drop a number in the hat at the beginning and then leave town.

4. Senate Executive Committee Report: Clara Krug (CLASS), Chair.

Before moving to her report, Krug noted that we were mourning the recent deaths of Ardian Greca (CIT), former member of the Senate Executive Committee, and Robert Warkentin (COE), who was the very first Senate Moderator, and Chair of the Senate Executive Committee.
a. **Presidential Actions Taken Re: Faculty Senate Recommendations Made at the March 19 Meeting.**

President Keel approved the following items: the February 12, 2012, Graduate Committee Minutes, the Senate’s recommendation about the University’s Policy on Verification of All Degrees from a Foreign Institution; and the Senate’s Recommendation About Criteria and Procedures for Faculty Evaluations. President Keel did not approve the Senate’s recommendation to include Faculty Representation on the President’s Cabinet. He stated that at the cabinet level the Provost represents the full academic sector, so including Faculty Senate representation on the President’s Cabinet is not needed. Moreover, the Provost plans to include a faculty member on the Provost’s Council beginning next academic year, and President Keel said this is a natural body for faculty representation.

b. **Approved for the agenda:**

- A Request for Discussion from the Office of Strategic Research and Analysis and the Staff Council
- Request for Information from Fred Mynard
- Elections for Senate Secretary and Librarian.

c. **The Task Force on Compensation.**

The Provost approved the SEC’s recommendation that the following faculty members serve:

- Tony Barilla of Business Administration;
- Jim Braselton of COST, soon to be Science and Mathematics;
- Nanette Eisenhart of CLASS
- Susan Franks of the College of Education
- Mary Hazeldine of COBA, and
- Jerri Kropp of Health and Human Sciences

The Task Force would meet for the first time on April 20th.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked Provost Moore why the President’s Cabinet is not a natural place for faculty representation and input, as is planned for the Provost’s Council.

Provost Moore said it’s not the case that the President doesn’t believe faculty involvement in the cabinet is necessary. He thinks it is already there by virtue of the Provost representing the faculty. Also, the Provost’s Council will have a faculty member beginning with the fall semester.

John O’Malley (CEIT) was concerned that not all colleges were represented on the Task Force on Compensation.
Moderator Krug noted that COBA, COST (or Science and Mathematics), CLASS, COE, and CHHS are represented. COBA filled the SEC desire for both a number-cruncher and someone who had served as an administrator; then the SEC wanted to represent various academic ranks. Also, the SEC had a maximum of six faculty members to nominate.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked Provost Moore whether having a faculty member on the Cabinet might not address some of the issues that he and the President have talked about re: being more inclusive and more transparent.

Provost Moore said he tries hard to be as transparent as he can with the faculty and thought faculty had seen evidence of that. Some items are appropriate to be communicated to the faculty, and he communicates them fairly quickly and thoroughly. There are items, however, that come up in the Cabinet meetings, as well as a few in the Provost’s Council, that are hypersensitive and confidential in nature, for example involving economic development plans. In those cases, he is not at liberty to be transparent about those at that time. But at the moment that he is able to be transparent, he is so, and that’s a commitment to all faculty.

Costomiris remained confused about what’s available to the public, and asked if these meetings are closed to the public, or whether there is a public record or minutes.

The Provost said there is a recording made of the major items that are discussed, but there are not actually minutes per se.

Candy Schille (CLASS) noted that when the Senate was reorganized and set up as it currently runs, it was because Dr. Grube had invited faculty to the President’s Cabinet and suggested that the Senate as it was functioning was really a non-functional body. And so he asked the Senate to be a more present and meaningful organization. Maybe we became more present and more meaningful than he expected, but it seemed to her that representation on the President’s Cabinet would not be out of line; it was done in the past without breaches of security.

Moderator Krug noted that, at that past point, when she attended some of those meetings, whenever there was a confidential matter, she was asked to leave, and that sometimes would happen fifteen minutes into the meeting; how long she got to stay would depend on what kind of confidential business was being transacted.

The Librarian having arrived some time earlier, Moderator Called on him for his report.

Barilla noted that this report included the minutes of the Pathways to Success group meeting because many senators have requested those be put into the Librarian’s Report; this first installment goes back to February, and in subsequent Librarian’s Report of April 17, 2012: Tony Barilla (COBA), Senate Librarian:

Barilla noted that this report included the minutes of the Pathways to Success group meeting because many senators have requested those be put into the Librarian’s Report; this first installment goes back to February, and in subsequent Librarian’s
Reports they’ll be submitted monthly, as with all other committees. That noted, the Librarian’s Report was moved and approved.

6. **A Request for Discussion of the Campus Tobacco Survey: the SEC, on behalf of Raymona Lawrence (COPH):**

America Minc (CRI and Member of the Staff Council) noted that the last decade has seen a major initiative about moving to tobacco-free environments. One of the goals of the Staff Council is to provide recommendations for improving the quality of life for staff, faculty, and students. The committee met with Dr. Keel, who suggested that they see what the campus had to say. With the office of Strategic Research and Analysis, they designed a survey to assess opinions of the current tobacco policy and see if there was a possibility of having any kind of policy change. The survey was administered online in Fall 2011, with the report being provided to them in December. Tobacco is a public health risk. Custodians and grounds keepers are subjected to a health risk when cleaning up; access for people with disabilities is threatened; some faculty, staff, and students do not have a choice of entrances and exits into buildings, and their respiratory systems are compromised when subjected to secondhand smoke. The committee hopes to prepare students for tobacco-free work environments, and to provide public health policy leadership. Also, the American College Health Association put out a position statement to show its support for Healthy People 2020 and Healthy Campus 2020 of the United States division of Health and Human Services. Their goals are by 2020 to reduce the portion of adults who smoke to below 12%, the number of college students who smoke to below 14% and who use smokeless tobacco to below 3%, and generally influence college students to remain or become tobacco-free.

The survey went out to 21,987 people; 36%, or 7,945, responded. The report shows the percent of faculty, staff, and students who responded, and also whether they were tobacco users or not. The largest group to respond was non-users at 78%. They also tried to gauge eight attitudes, among them:

- Do people really believe that secondhand smoke is harmful.
- Do they believe that secondhand smoke or tobacco use in general increases health care premiums.
- Do they believe it harms the environment.

Some results:

- 62% responded strongly agree, or agree that secondhand tobacco goes against the rights of non-tobacco users.
- 62% responded strongly disagree or disagree that limiting tobacco use on campus goes against the rights of tobacco users.
- 72% of respondents strongly agree or agree that Georgia Southern has the right to limit tobacco use on campus.
The survey asked people to choose among three options: (1) zones or designated tobacco use areas; (2) a completely tobacco-free campus; or (3) maintain the current campus policy. The majority of tobacco users opted for no change in the current policy. Most non-tobacco users opted for designated areas or zones. Overall, 46% of respondents chose to go with designated areas or zones. There were also over 500 pages of verbatim responses, 3,650 comments, 46% of which came from students.

In 2009, there were 365 universities with tobacco-free policies. In 2012, it’s gone up 339. Of our peer and aspirational institutions, one out of the ten is tobacco-free. Four out of our twelve aspirational universities are tobacco-free. What Minc was hoping to do was to discuss the interest in the Faculty Senate for writing a resolution to support any of the options for policy change, then move forward with a committee to assess current practices, work with research into the National Center for Tobacco Policy, and make formal recommendations to the President for policy change.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked if Minc was asking for a motion.

Moderator Krug noted this was a request for discussion only. She had told Ms. Minc that to have a vote on something would have needed to be a request for a motion.

Fred Mynard (COST) found it peculiar to have a survey on attitudes towards tobacco that is named “Tobacco-Free Campus Initiative”; it was like a political survey on attitudes toward President Obama titled the “Is President Obama the Most Terrible President in History?” survey. On the issue of tobacco litter, Minc had mentioned that cleaning crews may have a problem with that, but that GSU did not have such a litter issue, as far as he could see. He noted a colleague who visited Emory recently and mentioned that as a result of their new tobacco-free policy, the ashtrays have been removed, and the litter is much worse as a result. Re: promoting a healthy lifestyle, he did not think prohibition the best approach because the next initiative would have to be a burger-free campus if we’re going to go with the issue of promoting wellness. Re: secondhand smoke, if you ask him if it can be harmful, of course he will answer yes, and this is the way the question was posed. If asked if secondhand smoke outside is harmful, this is a very different question, and he would clearly answer no. There are already tobacco-free zones, which are all the buildings, and tobacco-friendly zones, which is anywhere outside, so it seemed this is proposing a solution that doesn’t have a problem. He noted for the record that he is not now, nor has he ever been, a smoker.

Mary Hazeldine (COBA) said zones do not work well. A lot of the smoke-free campuses started with zones, but smokers move away from zones and smoke wherever they want to. She also said COBA has cigarette butts all over the place.

Tina Belge (SGA) noted we have tobacco zones for students who want to smoke, but live in Residential Housing. She has seen students transfer schools because they can’t deal with our campus not being tobacco-free, though that’s a rare number. Also, people don’t always follow rules even if you try to enforce them. She pointed out that SGA already voted for zones despite the costs and the zones’ inefficiency because
people move from smoking to non-smoking zones instantly, but SGA wanted to support the majority of students’ wishes as found in the survey. But she also wanted to say that she took the survey; Minc’s presentation said “Tobacco-Free” on the top, and that’s an issue because the actual survey said “Tobacco Use,” and she would have freaked out if she had seen “Tobacco-Free” on the survey when she took it. So far as she noticed, “Tobacco-Free” was not in any of screenshots throughout the actual survey. So the survey had a different title than the final report.

Jennie Dilworth (CHHS) asked what the difference is between the zones and the current policy. What was sent to the SEC re: the discussion request actually said “zones” and “current policy” were the same things.

Minc noted current policy just prohibits smoking indoors. A lot of people think there’s a 25 or a 50 foot rule, but there’s actually not, only a statement in the Statute about a reasonable distance, so zones would make a designated area, while current policy would be just not smoking indoors.

Candy Schille (CLASS) noted that she is in Newton, and pasted on her window is a sign which says no smoking within 25 feet, so she believed there might be some sort of zone thing going on already.

Minc said that’s not per the University Human Resources employee manual.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said one of the problems with the validity of the survey was the point that was just raised, that there were three options offered: 1) limit tobacco use on campus and create tobacco-friendly zones; 2) create a tobacco-free campus; and 3), and this is the way it’s worded in the survey, maintain current campus tobacco policy, “See #1 above,” which seems to suggest that the two are pretty much the same. So the options are confused and confusing. Insofar as the issue of signage is concerned, when those signs were put up in Newton, he emailed Paul Michaud of Human Resources and pointed out that the signs – which are the signs still called for in the official signage manual (Cyr had checked two days prior to this meeting) -- did not reflect the actual tobacco policy on this campus, a policy he knew pretty well because he was on the committee that wrote it. Michaud phoned him back and laughingly said they were just getting ahead of the curve. That was close to two years ago. The sign has not been changed. Also, the Thursday prior to this senate meeting, the HR Manual said that campus employees are not allowed any tobacco use, not just smoking, on campus. Again, that is not University policy. People in the Staff Council and Human Resources have known for about two years that signage and policy statements do not match the actual policy of the University. Not only had he personally informed them of that, it also was in a letter that was published in the George-Anne, yet nothing has changed. He further opined that the survey was badly designed and therefore largely invalid. He thought there were questions of bad faith with how this issue is being approached.

Moderator Krug noted that the Senate Executive Committee discussed what Dilworth and Cyr had brought up about the confusion of options, and it seemed that people
taking the survey might believe that “zones” and “current policy” were, if not identical, at least similar.

Minc pointed out that the actual survey listed the current campus policy, and in the options did not say “see item 1.” It said “maintain the current campus policy, see current policy above.” She was not sure if the SEC was just looking at the report, and not also the copy of the survey provided.

Moderator Krug noted that Minc had referred, in her presentation, to the report, and that’s what Dilworth, Cyr, and she were referring to.

Minc asked Jayne Perkins Brown (Strategic Research and Analysis) to respond, and Brown clarified that page 10 of the handout was the survey report, while page 18 in the appendix shows the actual survey.

Minc then asked Chief Executive Human Resources Officer Paul Michaud to respond to Cyr’s comments re: signage and policy misstatements because she was not aware of that issue. Michaud said, “Our present tobacco policy states the following, ‘Smoking and the use of tobacco products (cigarettes, cigars, smokeless tobacco, etc) are prohibited in all Georgia Southern campus facilities and University vehicles including golf carts.’”

Cyr noted that University policy is only re: smoking. When it was originally written, the committee of which he was a member discussed smokeless tobacco issues and decided that, given that their recommendations were based on their research, secondhand smoke in buildings was the problem, but they couldn’t see a reasonable way in which smokeless tobacco made a secondhand health risk, so it was not included. Yet it is included in the official signage manual and in the April 12, 2012, item that Michaud had just read.

Sze-man Ngai (COST) strongly supported the tobacco-free campus initiative. He did not think our current campus policy protects non-smokers enough. The main problem he has is the entrance to the buildings. Last fall he visited a University in Asia, and their campus became smoke-free five years ago; he things we are behind.

John O’Malley (CEIT) also supported a no smoking policy on campus, also mainly because of the smoking gauntlet at building entrances. He further noted that it’s not unusual for students and faculty to walk around campus with cigarettes. Non-smokers shouldn’t have to deal with secondhand smoke.

Greg Brock (COBA) asked how zones would be enforced. Are the campus police going to fine people? There can’t be someone standing there all the time, so do zones have any meaning if aren’t enforced?

Minc said research shows that when you have a genuine respect for others complemented by respect for the environment, you don’t need a punitive approach, i.e. enforcement. They’re not suggesting a ticket system, but are looking at a
marketing campaign through our Wellness Program and other avenues. She couldn’t give specifics because they don’t know which way the University is going to go, but the general consensus of the committee is to not enforce a punitive system.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) said he was still confused on what the current policy is. He quoted the current policy from the survey and noted that what Paul Michaud had just read was quite different from that.

Lowell Mooney (COBA) noted that regardless of where we end up on the zones versus current policy, only 29% of the respondents want a tobacco-free campus, and should the will of 29% trump the will of 71%?

**7. A Request for Information about the University Fact Book**

**Definitions of Categories of Personnel:** Fred Mynard (COST):

Mynard read his question: What is the definition of the personnel category “Executive/Admin/Managerial” used to assemble data in the university Fact Book? What criteria are applied to allocate a given position to the category “Faculty” or to the category “Executive/Admin/Managerial”?

Mod Krug noted that the Senate Executive Committee asked Jayne Perkins Brown to respond, and Brown and Paul Michaud would provide that information.

Paul Michaud (Human Resources) gave a little history: Many years ago, we had “B-Codes.” In 2002, the USG asked Georgia State University, University of Georgia, Medical College of Georgia, Georgia Southern, and Georgia College and State University to come up with a new system called “B-CATS.” That’s what we use. Whenever HR gets a request for classification or re-classification of a new position at the University, the manager of Comp and Class goes to the B-CATS classification structure, and that will determine what numbering system or code they give in order for the IPEDS report to be generated year after year. IPEDS set definitions [inserted below] that describe administrative/executive/professional, etc. That is the information that Dr. Jayne Perkins Brown uses in order to generate her IPEDS report. This is a statewide system that we adhere to in order to generate similar information from each institution in the USG.

Jayne Perkins Brown (Strategic Research) added that IPEDS is a suite of surveys. HR is one of the ones in that collection. IPEDS stands for Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. This is part of the National Center for Educational Statistics. So you’ll see often NCES IPEDS.

Michaud noted there are nine categories:

- positions that fall in the 100 series called executive/administrators.
- 200 series is faculty/academics
- 300 other administrative professionals
• 400 other professionals
• 500 series called clerical/secretarial.
• 600 technical paraprofessional
• 700 skilled crafts
• 800 service maintenance
• 900 other

He believed Cyr, Barilla, and others were interested in the administrative/executive group, which is the 100 series. Depending on the title of the position, Human Resources affixes a B-CATS code, then the IPEDS report is generated by Alana DeAngelis. He urged the Senate to remember that 2 ½ years ago we went from PeopleSoft to ADP, and so going from system to system the numbers may have changed. We also made a decision not too long ago to include all chairs in the administrative/executive group.

Alana DeAngelis (HR) noted chairs have always been considered B-CATS IPED Executive/Managerial; however, in previous years they’ve been reported as faculty. This year, with direction from the Provost’s office, they are reported as Executive to fall in line with the rest of the University System.

Moderator Krug asked if every USG institution, all 35, have the same definition of a department chair as a B-CATSS 100 manager/administrator.

DeAngelis said yes.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said that when the SEC got the initial responses to this most recent RFI on this subject, he hunted down IPEDS online, and so had their Executive/Administrative/Managerial definition in hand: Did the pertinent B-CATS match the IPED Executive/Administrative/Managerial definition?

Michaud could only make an assumption that back in 2002 that was the reason why they went with B-CATS, to provide consistent data to IPEDS, so he could only say that hopefully all 35 institutions are using the same B-CATS codes, and only hope that the B-CATS code equals this IPED.

DeAngelis (HR) said she uses the same file to generate the IPEDS Report and the Fact Book, so it’s the same population for both, and the same numbers that we report to IPEDS are reported to the Fact Book.

Moderator Krug asked what B-CATS stands for.

DeAngelis did not know. Michaud said that CAT stands for categories, but he never could find out what the B was.

Krug rephrased: “. . . when you publish the Fact Book, you use IPEDS, but is that information the same as the B-CATS, so the B-CATS and the IPEDS are both
represented in the *Fact Book*, or is it only the IPEDS or is it the B-CATS or some[thing] else?”

Jayne Perkins Brown (Strategic Research) clarified that the *Fact Book* comes from HR; her office collected that information from HR and reported it as is. Typically, in all of the HR data, in the IPEDS HR survey especially, Academic Affairs staff and HR staff collaborate because of the faculty positions and administrative/academic positions that are in there.

Krug wondered, if the *Fact Book* says Human Resources and Human Resources is presenting IPEDS, then why are we referring to B-CATS unless IPEDS and B-CATS are synonymous?

DeAngelis backed up a little: When a position is created it’s assigned a BCAT. That BCAT is determined to have IPEDS code 1234, etc., by the Board of Regents. So when we say BCAT and IPEDS code, it’s the same for everybody across the state; anybody who uses this BCAT gets this IPEDS code. We’re told this BCAT is this IPEDS code. We cannot change that.

Cyr asked, “So the B-CATS are what we use to report to IPEDS, but the IPEDS definition of what we’re reporting isn’t necessarily the B-CATS?”

DeAngelis replied, “So a BCAT code for us looks like 3946X, and in IPED 1, 2, 3, or 4. It’s kind of like, it’s different types of cars. A BCAT is a Toyota versus a car. The IPED is a car, whereas the BCAT that is for your position is a Toyota or a Honda.”

Cyr said his RFI of last fall that got this ball rolling was trying to find out who is doing what work and for how much money. We’re still trying to find that out. He had to think that somebody knows who is doing what work, partly because they’re giving them money. He figured that if you are giving them money, you know who they are and what they do.

Brown said each of those numbers in the IPEDS survey, and there are pages of outputs in the IPEDS survey itself, as well as the table in the *Fact Book*, are supported by individual rows of data. At any time those could be provided if it is within the scope of confidentiality and HR policy.

Jill Lockwood (COBA) said it’s even worse than what the senate was hearing. She was interim chair for the Accounting department, but was listed and treated as a faculty member with an extra summer stipend. She still can’t figure out if she was BCATted or IPEDded or what.

Paul Michaud (HR) said the decision as to whether she was an administrator or not did not come from Human Resources, but from the Provost’s office.

Moderator Krug said it seemed to her, then, that if we looked at every human being in the B-CAT 100 range, from 110 all the way up to 196, which includes all department
chairs, that would give us the information that Fred Mynard asked about. Michaud agreed.

Mynard said that sounded “more or less like an answer.” He added that all this started from the question of what amount of our resources is going towards administration and how much to faculty lines, and it turned out to be difficult to split these categories, and in particular the Fact Book numbers were kind of wide, showing a very large increase in administrative lines, and a very small increase in faculty lines, and the point is to try to clarify the definitions we can go by to compare these data year to year, so that we don’t have to go through all this discussion again.

Paul Michaud (HR) agreed; consistency is HR’s goal.

Lowell Mooney (COBA) understood that there are multiple B-CATS mapping into a given IPED, but wanted to pursue Cyr’s other question, whether there is a salary range associated with each B-CAT or IPED count, such that when a person moved from one IPED number to another their pay could be impacted.

Michaud said there are set ranges, a minimum point and a maximum. We have people over the maximum because we’ve either had to hire in that way because of market conditions or other economic reasons, but most of the people are within the ranges of that particular pay grade. We have 41 pay grades. The first seven are not used, so it’s actually 34.

[Here are the IPEDS definitions found online by the Senate Secretary, inserted here to help clarify for readers of these minutes.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Related Terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct faculty</td>
<td>Non-tenure track faculty serving in a temporary or auxiliary capacity to teach specific courses on a course-by-course basis. Includes both faculty who are hired to teach an academic degree-credit course and those hired to teach a remedial, developmental, or ESL course; whether the latter three categories earn college credit is immaterial. Excludes regular part-time faculty (who, unlike adjuncts are not paid on a course-by-course basis), graduate assistants, full-time professional staff of the institution who may teach individual courses (such as a dean or academic advisor), and appointees who teach non-credit courses exclusively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Persons identified by the institution as such and typically those whose initial assignments are made for the purpose of conducting instruction, research or public service as a principal activity (or activities). They may hold academic rank titles of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, lecturer or the equivalent of any of those academic ranks. Faculty may also include the chancellor/president, provost, vice provosts, deans, directors or the equivalent, as well as associate deans, assistant deans and executive officers of academic departments (chairpersons, heads or the equivalent) if their principal activity is instruction combined with research and/or public service. The designation as “faculty” is separate from the activities to which they may be currently assigned. For example, a newly appointed president of an institution may also be appointed as a faculty member. Graduate, instruction, and research assistants are not included in this category.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time instructional faculty</td>
<td>Those members of the instruction/research staff who are employed full time and whose major regular assignment is instruction, including those with released time for research. Also, includes full-time faculty for whom it is not possible to differentiate between teaching, research and public service because each of these functions is an integral component of his/her regular assignment. Instruction combined with research and/or public service. Primarily instruction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Faculty (full time)</td>
<td>See Full-time instructional faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Faculty Salaries (SA)</td>
<td>This data, now part of the IPEDS Human Resources (HR) component, was previously a separate collection. It collects data as of November 1 of the reporting year on the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of full-time instructional faculty</strong> by rank, gender, and length of contract; total salary outlays; and <strong>fringe benefits</strong> and number of full-time instructional faculty covered by these benefits. The data have been collected annually since 1990; however data are not available for 2000. Prior to the 2001 collection, data were requested by <strong>tenure</strong> status. As of 2004, this component is applicable to all Title IV degree-granting institutions, unless they meet one of the following exclusions: all instructional faculty are part time; all contribute their services; all are in the military; or all teach preclinical or clinical medicine. Formerly referred to as Salaries and Fringe Benefits of Full-Time Instructional Faculty (SA).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-to-faculty ratio</strong></td>
<td>The ratio of FTE students to FTE <strong>instructional staff</strong>, i.e., students divided by staff. Students enrolled in &quot;stand-alone&quot; graduate or professional programs and instructional staff teaching in these programs are excluded from both full-time and part-time counts. &quot;Stand-alone&quot; graduate or professional programs are those programs such as medicine, law, veterinary, dentistry, social work, or public health, in which faculty teach virtually only graduate-level students (also referred to as &quot;independent&quot; programs). Each FTE value is equal to the number of full-time students/staff plus 1/3 the number of part-time students/staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Executive, administrative, and managerial** | A primary function or **occupational activity** category used to classify persons whose assignments require management of the
institutions, or a customarily recognized department or subdivision thereof. Assignments require the performance of work directly related to management policies or general business operations of the institution, department or subdivision. Assignments in this category customarily and regularly require the incumbent to exercise discretion and independent judgment. Included in this category are employees holding titles such as: top executives; chief executives; general and operations managers; advertising, marketing, promotions, public relations, and sales managers; operations specialties managers; administrative services managers; computer and information systems managers; financial managers; human resources managers; purchasing managers; postsecondary education administrators such as: presidents, vice presidents (including assistants and associates), deans (including assistants and associates) if their principal activity is administrative and not primarily instruction, research or public service, directors (including assistants and associates), department heads (including assistants and associates) if their principal activity is administrative and not primarily instruction, research or public service, assistant and associate managers (including first-line managers of service, production and sales workers who spend more than 80 percent of their time performing supervisory activities);

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) said some of this information was illuminating, but asked what is correct, the *Fact Book* or what Tony Barilla presented at the previous senate.
meeting? Have we seen the kind of increase that the Fact Book suggests in the numbers of administrators or not?

Moderator Krug though one would just go through the B-CATS numbers 100 and then tally how many there are and then tally how many there were.

Costomiris asked if that was the method that created the numbers in the Fact Book.

Paul Michaud (HR) said the report that HR did with Barilla did not show that.

Costomiris asked where those numbers came from, then.

Michaud could not speak for the Fact Book because HR has nothing to do with it.

Alana DeAngelis (HR) said the increase in executives this year was due to the fact that in prior years we had a certain population of executives that were reported as faculty. This year their IPEDS codes have them reported as executive. They also found some discrepancies in moving the data from PeopleSoft to ADP that were fixed last year. And we saw an increase of people just hired into vacant positions.

Costomiris still felt it necessary to ask, then, what are the correct numbers?

Moderator Krug thought there’s a benchmark now to use with this as year one to in the future refer to, but that this didn’t exist a few years ago, so HR cannot really retrieve data because it doesn’t exist.

DeAngelis said that was correct.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) was still confused. His biggest point of confusion was why Cyr received a different set of numbers than in the Fact Book. He though it still hard to understand, if they all come from essentially the same source, and not withstanding that some have changed over the years, how one can ask for the same data for the same year and from the same source, yet get two different answers.

DeAngelis did not know what information Cyr was provided. The spreadsheet she used to report IPEDS is the same exact one she used for the Fact Book. It could have been the way the report was worded.

Moderator Krug Noted that actually we had three different sets of answers because she made a phone call and got another set, which was not the B-CATS as written.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) objected to the statement that past data does not exist. It does. It has to exist, though it may be tedious to figure it out. She thought it very important that we understand where we were and where we’re going. She asked if we have as an institution faith in the conclusion that Barilla presented us from the data he was given, that for every two faculty hired over the last several years there was one
administrator hired, which she thought to be an astonishing allocation of resources in a time of fiscal austerity.

Jayne Perkins Brown (Strategic Research) said the data output does not exist in that format because the definitions have changed. Also, we’re now using different software, so it’s hard to do apples and apples although they were mapped in.

Alana DeAngelis (HR) went back to the ADP conversion; the prior system that we were on, we were given a snapshot of that old database, so we can report some things, but not everything was kept because they are keeping one database for the entire University System. The Board of Regents and ITS determined what they felt would be important things that we needed to keep. We can’t get apples to apples for 2008-2011 because we don’t have the same exact data from the years compared.

Some follow-up Q & A established that DeAngelis had not seen or read Barilla’s report and so could not comment on it.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) wished that somebody had mentioned IPEDS back last Fall, or even suggested that they existed. It might have saved a whole lot of trouble. As for us now having a baseline, he would believe that two-three-four years down the line when they don’t change it again, so that it’s not constantly everybody being put in the position of comparing apples to oranges. He noted HR was not doing this on their own, but still didn’t know why we can’t get a straight answer anywhere.

DeAngelis could not speak to somebody else following her procedures, but she has procedures now for collecting the data the same way, sorting it the same way, and putting out the same way.

Rob Yarbrough (COST) asked further questions that confirmed that 2011 is the baseline year for such personnel data, and Jayne Perkins Brown (Strategic Research) clarified that the B-CATS have been there for several years, but in 2011 the Provost’s office decided to count academic department chairs in a different fashion.

Yarbrough said that doesn’t make the data incomparable in the meantime, if all that changed was that we reclassified department chairs; we an account for that easily. Brown said that was possible. Yarbrough noted, then, that if we can easily make that apples to apples, then the statement that was made several times that we can only start from today is not accurate. He offered to take a stab at the oranges/apples conversion, with Barilla’s help; Barilla and Mynard assented.

8. Election of the Senate Secretary:

Marc Cyr was the sole nominee and was elected for another term.

9. Election of the Senate Librarian:

Tony Barilla was the sole nominee and was elected for another term.

Most elections were either finished or would be finished campus-wide within the next ten days.


The SGA had their end of year banquet and swore in their new President and new Senators.

12. Report from the SGA Liaison: Mark Welford (COST):

COSM. I’d like to report that the SGA’s had their end of year banquet, which went very well. They swore in the new President, and the Senators and the food was excellent.

13. Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS).

Geyerman was absent teaching, so there was no report.

14. Unfinished Business – None.

15. New Business – None.

16. Announcements: Vice Presidents – None.

17. Announcements from the Floor – None.

18. Adjournment: Moved and Approved.

A Reminder from the Senate Executive Committee:
We will convene on June 6th (Nessmith-Lane Ballroom # 1603) for the final meeting of the academic year.

Comment [GM10]: Correction: re: Item 11, “Report on the Pathways Study Group,” the text there belongs in Item 12, and what is in Item 12 should be deleted. Item 11, then, should read, "Other than what is in the Librarian’s Report, they also are beginning to discuss the possibility of an overall T & P committee.”
1. Approval of the Agenda for the June 6, 2012, Meeting. Clara Krug (CLASS), Senate Moderator

Moderator Krug called for a minute of silence to honor the allies who fought on the beaches of Normandy on this day in 1944. Following, the agenda was moved and Approved.

2. Approval of the April 17, 2012, Minutes Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

Cyr had several corrections and clarifications:

First, the corrections:

- Page 1, add an “l” in Olivia Edenfield’s name in “Voting Members in Attendance.”
- Page 6, it should be “Moderator Krug called,” small “c,” when calling for the Librarian’s Report.
• Page 8, it should be “cleaning crews might,” not “may.”

• Page 13, “they’re giving them money” should be “somebody is giving people money.”

• Page 14, “their pay could be impacted” should be “his or her pay could be impacted.”

• Page 16, in Instructional Faculty Salaries, “facultycovered” should be two words.

• Page 17, “wass” should be “was,” and “Krug though” should be “Krug thought.”

• Pages 19 & 20, re: Item 11, “Report on the Pathways Study Group,” the text there belongs in Item 12, and what is in Item 12 should be deleted. Item 11, then, should read, “Other than what is in the Librarian’s Report, they also are beginning to discuss the possibility of an overall T & P committee.”

Clarifications:

• On page 18 of the minutes, Paul Michaud is noted as saying Human Resources has nothing to do with the GSU Fact Book. However, Jayne Perkins Brown of Strategic Research has pointed out that on page 13 of the Minutes she is noted as saying that, in fact, the Fact Book does come from Human Resources, so Michaud misspoke. But actually, both of them only semi-misspoke: As Perkins Brown further noted in her clarifying email, it is only the referred-to data table in the Fact Book that comes from Human Resources; the Fact Book as a whole is produced by Strategic Research.

The corrected and clarified minutes were moved and Approved.


   Moved and Approved.

   a. Report from the Undergraduate Committee: Ed Mondor (COSM).

   The committee approved 13 new courses, 37 course revisions, and 9 new or revised programs. (See the Librarian’s Report for details.) The report was moved and Approved.

   b. Report from the Graduate Committee: Bob Fernekas (LIBR).

   The committee approved 1 new program, 3 program revisions, 4 new courses, and 9 course revisions, and 10 committee reports for the Graduate Programs that underwent Comprehensive Program Review this year. (See the Librarian’s Report for details.) The report was moved and Approved.

Key administrative appointments and changes: Martha Abell will serve as interim Dean of COSM, Curtis Ricker as interim Dean of CLASS, Bill Wells as interim dean of COBA, all effective July 1. Mohammad Davoud will continue as the interim dean of CEIT. Greg Evans joined us on April 1 as Dean of JPHCOPH. Patrice Buckner has been named Dean of Students, and Velma Burden is now our University Registrar. He then bid farewell to Dean Bret Danilowicz and Dean Ron Shiffler, who have taken jobs elsewhere, and to chairs Godfrey Gibbison and Brian Moore, who likewise are moving on. He further noted that Mike Smith, now Dean of CLASS, will begin as Vice Provost on July 1.

He thanked Clara Krug for her service as Senate Moderator, and noted that Fred Mynard would assume that responsibility next year.

Another department chair was retiring, Colonel George Frederick, to be replaced by Colonel Gary Morea, who will serve as Professor of Military Science and head of our ROTC Eagle Battalion.

Provost Moore then announced the members of the founding board of the Georgia Southern University Club:

- President -- Bruce McLean
- Vice President -- Greg Brock
- Secretary -- Greg Chamblee
- Treasurer -- Clara Krug
- Events Coordinator -- Michael Moore
- Marketing & Comm.-- Pattie Beblowski
- Membership Officer -- Michael Backus

Some after-work social gatherings of the University Club would be planned for the fall.

Next: Our Space Planning & Allocation Committee is working with our Facilities Division to identify and ultimately solve critical storage needs for all units and also working toward centralized space planning. The Sanford Hall renovation is moving ahead, and the Brannen Hall Renovation is also on course so that occupants can begin move-in on July 16, 2012.

The University Compensation Study Team has been established and given its charge. They have been supplied with detailed comparative salary data and are conducting an assessment of faculty compensation, institution-wide. They will identify areas that are under the greatest pressure in terms of compression and salary inversion. The staff members on the team are reviewing pay bands for staff members, and helping us prepare for compression that will result in some cases as a result of bringing salaries of those who make below the poverty level up to that level beginning June 23rd of this year.
In approving the Librarian’s Report, the Senate approved entering into an articulation agreement in Logistics with Savannah Technical College. This is a major move with substantial workforce development implications for Savannah and elsewhere, and it symbolizes a very strong relationship that we have developed with Savannah over the years.

We are beginning an aggressive effort to improve our academic program assessment process, as required in SACS standard 3.3.1.1. We are still not at the point where we need to be in conducting thorough, data-based assessments of program outcomes in all areas. In several we are, but some we clearly are not.

Our retention efforts are being re-shaped in a comprehensive Complete College Georgia plan, which is due to the System Office on July 1. Due to several factors, our student population for the two summer terms will be below 10,000 and under the record set last year. The total fall enrollment, on the other hand, is actually a little ahead of where we were same time last year.

The findings and recommendations of the Teaching Legacy Task Force, chaired by Dr. Kathy Albertson this past year, will guide us as we pursue our strategic vision while maintaining and honoring our strong teaching ethos.

The Career Pathways Team has a blueprint for career progression of faculty that will support all three legs of our mission – teaching, research and service. The path toward a stronger presence in research, scholarship and creative achievement is being paved with hiring of more faculty who will help us move ahead, as well as by major thrusts such as acquisition of the Herty Advanced Materials Institute. For fiscal year 2013, the budget authorizes over 35 new faculty and librarian positions across the campus, in addition to replacement of existing lines, and we are also adding to our cadre of academic advisors.

We are planning and preparing now for application to the Carnegie Foundation for national recognition in 2015 for outstanding service and community engagement.

Provost Moore then confirmed that he had resigned effective the end of July. He would, however, remain in Statesboro.

Mark Welford (COSM) asked if the money for new faculty hires was from Complete College Georgia funding or if the 35 new lines announced were above and beyond that.

Provost Moore said no, those 35 will be supported by the $4.7 million coming for Complete College Georgia funding.

Moderator Krug asked Provost Moore to leave the room. Lowell Mooney (COBA) then read a resolution crafted by the Senate Executive Committee:
RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION FOR PROVOST TED MOORE

WHEREAS Dr. William T. "Ted" Moore has provided strong leadership as Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost of Georgia Southern University, and

WHEREAS Provost Moore sought greater transparency and shared governance in the administration of the institution, and

WHEREAS Provost Moore inaugurated the practice of the "Provost's Report" at our Senate meetings, through which he provided clarity concerning the Administration's long-term objectives for this university, and

WHEREAS Provost Moore significantly increased faculty involvement in strategic planning at the university through committees such as the Pathways to Success Study Team, the Teaching Legacy Task Force, and the Task Force on Compensation, and

WHEREAS Provost Moore supported the establishment of the Military Resource Center to assist our students who are in the armed forces and the re-establishment of the University Club to improve esprit-de-corps among all university employees.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate, on behalf of all Georgia Southern University faculty and staff, extends its appreciation to Provost Ted Moore for his leadership and service and we wish him much success in his future endeavors, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Provost Moore be furnished a copy of this Resolution, which is spread upon the minutes of this June 6, 2012 meeting of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate.

The resolution passed unanimously. Provost Moore returned to the room and thanked the Senate.

5. **President's Report: Brooks Keel:**

   **Committee to Review Grievance Procedures and Committee to Review the Statutes**

   The former was in the process of being seated; the latter was already formed. Both would be charged in the Fall.

   **Complete College Georgia**

   The *Complete College Georgia* part of the overall budget that we received from the Board of Regents that goes to Academic Affairs - $4.7 million – represents 54% of the entire budget for the University. It will go to hire some 35 new faculty and librarians as well as new staff, primarily advisors. The Board of Regents is going to be holding individual campuses accountable for that part of the budget which goes towards *Complete College Georgia*; the Chancellor will want to know what progress we’ve made on hiring those 35 positions. President Keel was delighted that the Board of Regents has put that sort of accountability in place, and thought it speaks volumes about what the Board feels with regard to *Complete College Georgia*.
Staff Pay

The President’s Cabinet felt strongly that we needed to address the fact that a large number of our staff – a little over 400 people – have not been making the minimum salary needed to put them at the minimum poverty level, which is $23,050 a year. We have allocated a significant part of the budget to cover that. It does create some compression issues at that level of the pay grade, but he saw those as being good problems to have, and we would address those problems the best we can in short order.

Interim Provost

He had asked campus-wide for nominations for the interim Provost position by close of business the following Friday, June 8. Nominees would be evaluated with the help of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Deans’ Council.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked if we would be conducting deans’ searches simultaneously with a search for a new Provost.

President Keel said there were two schools of thought. One is to replace the Provost first and then let that individual lead the charge in replacing deans. We have a time-sensitive issue to do with our SACS Accreditation. Our five-year review is coming up in the next couple of years and to have stability in the Provost’s Office is going to be extremely important in order for that to take place. As well, Complete College Georgia has to be kicked off this summer and our retention rates need great attention, so it makes some sense to have some stability at the Provost’s level for a period of time until we can accomplish all of those things. If we have that in place, it would allow us to go ahead and begin the search for deans in the colleges right away; that was something he was giving some serious consideration to.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked both Provost Moore and President Keel to give us a sense of how we are going to address our failure to meet SACS 3.3.1.1.

Ted Moore (Provost) said we are in preliminary discussions with our officers at SACS who indicated that they continue to find weaknesses in our Program Assessment Plan. And that’s not a weakness in the programs per se. This is about the assessment process itself. We’ve accelerated efforts to basically redo a full-cycle of all academic assessment plans. Terri Flateby is working on that now with a team of faculty and with the deans and program directors to have the plans that we judge to be possibly weak completed in August and the remaining plans done by this fall, and that will give us enough time then in the event we still find weaknesses to go back through and correct those.

Haberland asked, given that we haven’t met SACS requirements twice now, what we are doing differently to make sure that we meet them, and what happens if we don’t.

Comment [GM1]: Take out extra that per Marc Cyr at the 9/19/2012 Senate meeting.
The Provost said that if we are told that we are being continued on review, then we have another year, until next April, to remedy all of the deficiencies, and as far as we have been told we are weak in only that one area – 3.3.1.1.

Haberland next asked what resources are being directed towards this problem.

Provost Moore said he had put in about $15,000 in one-time money this year to support meetings and workshops of this special academic assessment team, and, in addition, we had hired another person in the office of Institutional Effectiveness, in addition to replacing Steve Zerwas. Unfortunately, he had found out that morning that person might not come, so we will then immediately work to hire another deputy in that area.

Haberland next asked what happens in April 2013 if we don’t meet SACS Accreditation.

The Provost said we could be put on probation.

So Haberland asked what that would mean.

Provost Moore said we are still on monitoring and that’s a weak form of probation, but it’s not probation. And we’ve been on that for a while. We’ve had issues for some time in the area of Program Assessment.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM) asked for a sense of the percentage of programs deemed at this point to be below par.

Provost Moore said that, based on two reviewers for each of the academic programs, about 15% are weak; they are distributed through most but not all of the colleges.

Tim Teeter (CLASS) asked if those 15% are weak in their assessment, or weak as programs.

Provost Moore said they are weak in their assessment. This only has to do with assessment.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked if we could have a SharePoint site so faculty involved in assessment could get the information from SACS so that we can better understand how we can respond and give SACS what they want, because there can’t be this many problems with the programs; it’s problems with what we’re telling them.

Provost Moore agreed that it is a documentation issue, and some of it is not reporting in the format that SACS wants. That tends to happen in the programs that are nationally accredited and go through their accreditation process, and some use as much of that same documentation as they can rather than rewrite to get what SACS wants, which is a certain summary of information, and in some of our reports we have, for example, referred them to, say, a 55-page document that was used for accreditation, but that is not what SACS is asking for.
Haberland asked if it would be possible to post to SharePoint the actual feedback documents from SACS so that those involved in assessment literally see “SACS said say it this way.”

Provost Moore said once we get the letter from SACS, they will make that full information available for everyone.

President Keel entered the discussion. In terms of resources, we will put in any and all resources necessary to make this happen. This is the number one priority for this University at this point in time, and will be the number one thing that the next Interim Provost will have to deal with. If we get put on probation, that is not something that we can accept. The ultimately bad thing that can happen is to lose accreditation and thus lose all ability to receive federal funding, which includes aid to students. For SACS, it doesn’t really matter whether the programs themselves or the programs’ assessments are weak: What we think is a more than adequate assessment of the success of our ability to pass knowledge onto students is one thing. What SACS thinks is sometimes another. What SACS is looking for is information we will certainly make available as widely as we possibly can so that everyone knows exactly where we are and what is required. We will be asking the faculty, the program directors, the chairs, and the deans to let administration know what they need.

Tim Teeter (CLASS) asked when we would receive from SACS the letter on this matter.

Provost Moore said it was expected in late May or early June, noting it already was June.

Teeter then asked if this letter would detail from their point of view our problems with assessment.

Provost Moore said, “It will certainly give us a formal response to the report that we submitted to them.”

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Clara Krug (CLASS), Chair.

President Keel approved the March 6, 2012, minutes of the Undergraduate Committee and the March 8, 2012 minutes of the Graduate Committee. The SEC approved the requests for motions listed on the agenda, and the Faculty Research Committee’s request for discussion of recent changes in competitions for funds. The SEC did not approve the Request for a Motion to Reconsider President Keel’s Decision to Overturn the Unanimous Vote of the Faculty Senate That an Elected Faculty Member Sit on the President’s Cabinet. Regarding Joe Ruhland’s withdrawn request for information about changes in a definition in our long-term disability plan, Paul Michaud of Human Resources provided an answer to Ruhland which Lowell Mooney would present.

Krug noted we continue to have trouble with SharePoint; attempts to fix the problems also continue.
Tentatively the 2011-2012 SEC and the 2012-2013 SEC would meet later this month to complete committee assignments.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) noted SharePoint problems prevented her from seeing the SEC response for the rejected motion and asked if Krug could clarify why it was rejected.

Moderator Krug noted she contacts the individual who has submitted a motion (in this case, Michael Moore) when it is declined, in order to explain why. The problems were flaws in the rationales: We do, in fact, have a Senate-approved strategic planning process that includes faculty, as per BOR mandate; and Linda Noble, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, said no policy specifies the make-up of the President’s Cabinet. She documented her rebuttal of the rationales.

Krug added that the SEC discussed making requests for reconsideration in a public way, versus “sitting down with somebody and having a conversation where you don’t take the person into a public court.” She recommended some of the 47 faculty who submitted the rejected motion try that in future: “Talk individually, invite somebody to lunch. Go to the faculty University Club in the fall and have some wine and cheese.”

Haberland thought that the faculty governance standards at Georgia Southern directed faculty in a very clear way to bring these kinds of issues before the Faculty Senate.


Original Motion: “In the interests of shared governance and to insure consistency across academic departments the Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook under Section 105.03 ‘Evaluation of Administrators.’

The term of office for Department Chairs shall be five years. A Chair shall not be limited to a particular number of consecutive terms. In the fourth year of a Chair’s tenure and as soon as possible after the Chair’s fourth annual evaluation, the Dean of the Chair’s college shall conduct a thorough review of the Chair’s performance to determine whether the current chair should be recommended for renewal for a succeeding term. This review shall include:

1. a meeting between the Dean and the faculty of the department to discuss their concerns

2. a review by the department’s faculty of the faculty’s annual evaluations of the Chair and all other relevant evidence, including but not limited to: the Chair’s CV, the Chair’s annual reports to the Dean, a summary of the Chair’s accomplishments for the current term, and a summary of the Chair’s goals for the coming term

3. a vote by the voting members of the department to recommend or not to recommend that the current chair be renewed.
Voting will be by secret ballot at the time of the meeting or electronically. Votes will be tabulated by two members of the department and the results presented to the Dean. After considering the vote of the faculty and following any additional consultation deemed appropriate, the Dean will either reappoint the Chair for another five-year term or begin the process for the selection of a new Chair. If the Dean decides to renew the term of the Chair despite a negative vote by the department’s faculty, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing an explanation of his/her decision to continue the Chair’s appointment.”

Costomiris offered a friendly amendment that he had distributed to Senators: The amended sentence would become “votes will be tabulated by two members of the department and the results presented to the department and to the deans.” The amendment was Approved; the amended motion was Approved.

8. A Motion Regarding Votes of No Confidence in Department Chairs: Robert Costomiris (CLASS).

Original Motion: “Faculty Welfare Committee moves that the following policy be adopted by the Faculty Senate and placed in the Faculty Handbook.

A vote of no-confidence may be called for at any time during a Chair’s term. To call a vote of no confidence, the faculty will meet in the absence of the chair to determine the level of confidence in the chair. If 30% of the eligible tenured voting faculty believe the evidence warrants a vote of no confidence in the chair the faculty will petition the Dean of the College to call the question. The Dean must then meet with the department in the absence of the chair to discuss the petition and, if it is deemed necessary at that time by the faculty, to oversee a vote of no-confidence.

Voting will be by secret ballot at the time of the meeting or electronically. Votes will be tabulated by two members of the department and the results presented to the Dean. A simple majority of the eligible voting faculty will be required to pass a vote of no confidence in a Chair. After considering the vote of the faculty and following any additional consultations deemed appropriate, the Dean will either allow the chair to continue in his/her term as Chair or begin the process to select a new Chair.

If the Dean decides to continue the term of the Chair after a faculty vote of no confidence, he/she will provide to the faculty in writing a summary of the complaints that were made against the Chair and an explanation of his/her decision to continue the Chair’s appointment. Further, the Chair, in the interest of departmental cohesion, will provide a written plan to address the complaints brought forth by the faculty in the vote of no confidence. If, after consideration of the Dean’s and the Chair’s response, the faculty is dissatisfied with the results, upon a vote of 70% or more of eligible faculty, they may appeal the decision of the Dean to the Provost for further review and action.”

Costomiris noted and distributed several proposed amendments based on comments from the Senate Executive Committee: In the second full paragraph, first sentence, it should read “A vote of no confidence may be called for at any time during a Chair’s term, but no more than once per
semester.” In the fourth line of that paragraph, the word “eligible” should be struck because unnecessary. In line 10 he proposed adding the language that votes be tabulated by two members of the department and the results presented to the department and to the dean. He further noted a second unwanted “eligible” to be struck in the succeeding line; Reed Smith (CLASS) pointed out more “eligibles” in the final paragraph, and striking these was added to the amendments list. The amendments were Approved; the amended motion was Approved.

9. Motion for a Resolution about President Michael Adams’ Retirement Package: Jennie Dilworth (CHHS).

“That the Faculty Senate of Georgia Southern University express our concern and dismay at the recent decision to award a retiring president of a unit of the University System of Georgia a $2.7 million package and that we urge the Board of Regents to consider the disturbing message that this large award sends.” The rationale: Given the recent economic hardships faced by faculty members and staff members, the vast majority of whom have not received a raise in several years, and by students, who bear increasing costs for their education, this decision appears insensitive.”

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) and Michelle Haberland (CLASS) thought the rationale was an understatement. Moderator Krug noted that we were trying to be polite. The motion was Approved.

10. A Motion Regarding a Moratorium on Executive, Administrative, and Managerial Increases in Numbers and Salary: Marc Cyr (CLASS).

“We move that Georgia Southern University institute a moratorium on Executive, Administrative, and Managerial Increases in Numbers and Salary until resources are available to significantly increase the numbers and salaries of the membership of the Corps of Instruction and the salaries of GSU staff members who are paid below the poverty level.”

President Keel appreciated the perspective, but was confused about how he could even address this if he were in a position to do so. He hoped putting 35 new lines in the faculty would address part of this issue. Also, GSU had just increased the salaries of staff members who are paid below the poverty level and so addressed that part. Also, he had actually read the minutes from the last two faculty senate meetings in which this issue had been discussed ad nauseum in terms of whether we do or do not have more administrators, and it looked like we hired twice as many faculty as we did administrators. He appreciated that you can massage these numbers until you get the answer that you want. He did not believe we as a University want to put a moratorium on hiring anybody if that particular individual is needed to address key problems. For example, were this motion to pass and it is determined that we need to hire an administrator to help us with SACS compliance, we wouldn’t be able to do so. He appreciated where signatory faculty were coming from and noted that since he’s been here, hiring faculty is a number one issue. But we’re addressing that now and will continue to do so. He would not be in a position to be able to put a moratorium on hiring anyone.
Robert Costomiris (CLASS) understood that the motion pertained to an increase in numbers, and presumed we had somebody in place already dealing with SACS compliance, so that person could be hired. The motion was addressing new administrative positions, not ones that currently exist.

President Keel said we have that person in place, but 15% of our programs are not in SACS compliance, which made him unsure we have enough individuals in that office to address the needs we have. The motion would put a stop on something today that would put us in a bind, unable to hire necessary individuals tomorrow when problems that we are not even aware of could come up.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that with the numbers that had come out since fall, it seemed the most presumably accurate numbers show that for every two faculty members hired, an administrator is being hired. That seemed like an awful lot of chiefs. He further pointed out that the moratorium also was on increases in salary. As the rationales pointed out, when faculty members’ workloads are increased with more students, more classes, more assignments, and so on, they do not receive an increase in pay. However, when this occurs with somebody in the administrative/managerial/executive category there tends to be an increase in pay, very often along with a change in job title. He added that the moratorium was prepared before the large announcements made earlier about staff pay increases and so forth, but it still seemed to him to be a good idea that we hold back on the chiefs until we’ve got more indians, and more indians being paid properly.

President Keel asked if Cyr would also suggest that we put a moratorium on providing the pay increases that go along with faculty promotions, given that we increase the pay of administrators who have taken on more responsibility or who have been promoted, but we also do the same thing with faculty who have been promoted. The proposal gets us into a very gray area that would be difficult to objectively carry out.

Moderator Krug wondered if this could be considered as a philosophical issue, that is, to use the word from the Legacy Report, it is our ethos that this be what we try to do.

President Keel thought the moratorium’s point already had been well-made, that all administrators will think twice about this. As our budgets increase, as he’s said many times, it is going to be the number one priority. And if he didn’t want to do that, the BOR would force him to do that through Complete College Georgia, the accountability that we’re going to have to make sure we have the faculty and staff in place to make sure that works.

Moderator Krug took that to mean that he has the same philosophy that faculty do.

President Keel said, “Absolutely.” But the moratorium would not allow him to, say, hire a dean for a new college, or an administrator for a new program that we all would instantly say is in the best interests of the University and our students. He would hate to back us into a corner.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) pointed out that the faculty will have gone six years with no salary increase, and were going to come in over the summer to work on SACS, many un...
because they are not under contract. She guessed what President Keel was seeing was a lot of frustration.

President Keel said he understood completely.

Haberland continued, noting $300,000 paid to an Associate VP of Institutional Effectiveness over two years, and that the proposed new faculty will have salaries the same as hers, and said it’s long past time that faculty compensation be addressed, yet she was not seeing that happen.

Again, President Keel agreed completely. But raises are a Board of Regents decision to make, and that is predicated upon how that would be perceived by the Governor’s office and the legislature. He also noted that it’s not just the 700 faculty here, it’s also the 1400/1500 staff not seeing a raise, and even though we had addressed an egregious issue with regard to our lowest paid staff, that really is not a raise, that’s just the right thing to do, an equity issue. Very few states are giving raises. But talk about pay increases is beginning to happen. We could put moratoriums in place all day long, free up lots of money, and he still couldn’t pass it on to the faculty because he’s not allowed to give raises.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) said his main concern was not raises, but more faculty and a lower student-teacher ratio to increase the quality of education at GSU, and decrease the burnout and demoralization of the faculty here. He thought that, in general, when administrators have a problem, they figure that we need to hire somebody to study that problem, another administrator to come up with a couple, three, four, five programs to fix this problem. And so that administrator gets hired. One of the things he hoped that this motion would do is redirect that thinking towards the faculty, and that without something like this motion that was unlikely to happen.

President Keel said he and his colleagues don’t think that way. He noted again that he has said since he interviewed for his position that the most important thing we have to do is hire more faculty. He hoped that the budget this year would give faculty some comfort that we are beginning to put money where his mouth is. This fiscal year 54% of the entire budget goes to Academic Affairs. If you take out the component used to increase staff pay to poverty level, it would have represented 63% of the entire budget. Last year Academic Affairs had 67% of the entire budget. Putting more faculty in place is a priority we will tackle aggressively.

The motion was Approved with 6 opposed.

11. A Discussion of Recent Changes in Competitions for Funds Administered by the Faculty Research Committee: Fred Mynard (COSM).

The Faculty Research Award competition next year will be split into two different competitions: a Seed Award competition that will have a budget of $10,000 maximum, directed towards projects whose primary aim is to secure external funding; and separately there will be a competition called Scholarly Pursuit, with a smaller budget of $5,000 maximum, whose intent will be to support projects in basic research based on the merit of the project, regardless of its potential for external funding.
Another change concerns the publication fund that so far has provided support on a first-come, first-served basis for page charges, off-prints, and reprints. This type of expense will no longer be supported, and instead these funds will now support the cost of editorial services and provide refunds for submission fees upon acceptance of the paper. This is because in some disciplines some quality journals, to cut down on frivolous submissions, have a submission fee; this shift in funding may be better than supporting page charges for journals that are at times not a very high quality.

Also, there will be a new program to provide matching funds for travel costs to visit program directors at funding agencies to discuss a grant proposal. The idea of matching funds is to cut down on people applying just to take a trip, so faculty members need to come up with half of the money and the Faculty Research Committee funds will support the other half.

Just for information, this year we funded some Grant writing workshops. This was one-on-one mentoring, and everybody was providing very positive feedback. There will be a follow-up workshop in August, and depending on success, such workshops will be continued.

Tom Buckley (CHHS) took exception, saying that in the health sciences there are journals that are very high quality that have page charges, and the proposal is going to hurt health sciences faculty. It may be discipline specific as to where there are submission fees, because some journals that really are not very good have high submission fees, where basically if you pay the money, it gets published.

Mynard said the committee focused on precisely this problem, how to avoid supporting situations where it ends up a you-pay-we-publish proposition. So what Buckley pointed out, that maybe some disciplines might need a submission fee, is something that can be revisited.

Moderator Krug moved that the meeting be extended; the motion was Approved. She also set five minutes as the max for all remaining agenda items because of the time crush.

12. The Long-Term Disability Plan Definition of “Any Occupation”: Lowell Mooney (COBA).

Mooney presented information received by Joe Ruhland about a substantial change in coverage. Long-term disability plans replace a portion of income after a covered employee becomes unable to work. How you meet the definition of disabled changes over time. For the first 24 months after the waiting period, you’re deemed disabled if you are unable to perform the primary duties of your “own occupation.” After 24 months, you must be unable to perform the duties of “any occupation” in order to receive the benefits. Under our old coverage provided by the Hartford, the definition of “any occupation” was “any occupation means any occupation for which you are qualified by education, training or experience, and that has an earnings potential greater than the lesser of 60% of your indexed pre-disability earnings or the maximum monthly benefit.” With our new coverage with Lincoln Financial, the 60% of pre-disability earnings qualifier was absent. Strictly interpreted, faculty are qualified by education, training, or experience for a very long list of minimum wage jobs which could be performed even while
being severely disabled from a lay person’s perspective. However, the ability to perform that job means we are not disabled from the insurer’s perspective; “qualified for” does not mean “commensurate with.” Since it would be very difficult to meet that definition our coverage after 24 months was fairly limited. Since long-term disability coverage is administered at the individual institution level, this also put us out of line with almost all other USG institutions. When he approached them with this question, Ruhland was more or less told by Lincoln Financial to trust that they would do the right thing. He found that unacceptable and pushed the issue. After some back and forth with Lincoln Financial, assisted by Paul Michaud’s group and their hired benefits consultants, Lincoln has given Georgia Southern a mid-term policy language amendment which now defines “any occupation” as “any occupation means any occupation for which your training, education, or experience will reasonably allow and that has an earnings potential of greater than the lesser of 80% of your previous ability earnings and/or the maximum monthly benefit.” This change now places Georgia Southern in the upper echelon of USG institutions with respect to the richness of our long-term disability coverage.

13. **University Fact Book Personnel Categories and Trends Update: Rob Yarbrough (COSM).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (Fall)</th>
<th>Exec/Admin/Managerial</th>
<th>Faculty*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>194**</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| %of change 2007-2011 (accounting for department Dept/Unit heads) | 120.48 | 9.21 |
| %change 2010-2011                                                   | 5.15   | 1.58 |

*Total Full Time Faculty (Full Time Regular plus Full Time Temporary Faculty)
**Reclassification of dept/unit heads from faculty to Exec/Admin/Managerial accounts for approximately 21 of these positions beginning in 2010

*Source: All data were compiled from the University Fact Book for each academic year.*

Yarbrough thanked Paul Michaud, Human Resources officer; Alana DeAngelis, Business and Finance support; and Jayne Perkins Brown, Associate VP of Strategic Resources and Analysis, for taking time to help him try to tease out this information. He did not worry so much about anything except for essentially looking at the Fact Book numbers to see if there is any reason that there cannot be a fair comparison over the years that Marc Cyr initially queried about, 2007-2011. The Senate has received different answers from some of these queries. Answers dependson, we found out, issues of B-CATs and IPEDS, and how faculty may or may not be categorized or what these categories mean when we look at the Fact Book numbers. Each employee is assigned one and only one B-CAT, and those B-CATs that we learned about at the April Faculty Senate meeting have not changed during this time period; any change would have to come from the Board of Regents and it hasn’t. All full-time faculty have a 200 B-CAT and
anyone who is a twelve-month employee and acquires annual leave is not considered part of the “faculty” category. This is one reliable way to begin to distinguish between the Executive/Administrative/Managerial category and the faculty category in the Fact Book. Administrators like President Keel, Provost Moore, deans, associate deans, have always been 100 B-CATs, and they have always been a part of that Exec/Admin/Managerial category in the Fact Book. Faculty -- which includes tenure-track, lecturers, temporary faculty -- have always been 200 B-CAT and are always faculty in the Fact Book. What has changed, he thought, and this is a discussion he had with Paul Michaud, is that during the change from Peoplesoft to ADP, someone recognized that department chairs and unit heads were likely being classified incorrectly, that is, they had the wrong B-CAT, and this was corrected with the switch to ADP, which accounts for about 21 of the new Exec/Admin/Managerial employees as of fall 2010, so that of the increase from 84 in 2009 to 194, 21 can be accounted for by this move -- 21 fewer in the faculty category; 21 more in the other. If you look at just the 2010 through 2011 numbers, the ratio of those changes or growth in Exec/Admin/Managerial to growth in faculty has become much more comparable, there is much more parity now, and going forward he would expect that to continue given the report that the President gave.

Moderator Krug said she could allow only one minute for questions, but noted that much of this information – the B-CATS and all of the other vocabulary and jargon associated with that – is in the minutes of the April Senate meeting.

Fred Mynard (COSM) pointed out how much this data supported the previous motion on the moratorium.


In the coming school year, we are going to start the elections process in November, with the elections in January/February so that we don’t back up to the end of the semester, which we did this year.


Given that he had only 5 minutes and the PowerPoint alone would take 40, he suggested that he just take questions because he figured everybody had seen the white paper (on the President’s site under Strategic Planning, and in the Librarian’s Report). At this point, they have recommended four pathways: teacher/scholar, research/creativity, service, and practice. They have also recommended that there be a committee to replace the Deans’ Council on tenure and promotion, made up of tenured, full-time professors, to make the last recommendation (within the University) to the Provost for tenure.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) noted that the Pathways criteria, Number 3, says faculty can only change pathways if successful in their current pathway and in consultation with the unit chair, but there can be temporary changes or there can be changes through extenuating personal circumstances. It seemed to her that people would be most likely to want to change their pathway if they find that they are not being successful in the pathway they had chosen. Did that come under extenuating personal circumstances?
Welford said the key thing is that people are going to be hired in future into a particular pathway, so if you are hired in on “teacher/scholar” or “research” criteria and you’re failing at that, they didn’t feel that just because you are failing at that you have the right to change your particular pathway.

Steirn said that did not seem to allow for personal change.

Welford thought the personal change element would come when you’ve reached a tenure or a three-year decision. And then you can make a change. But if you’ve been hired with certain expectations into a particular pathway and are failing, what could GSU do? There has to be some accountability.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked if the Senate would ever get to vote on this issue: Would it be presented as a motion?

Moderator Krug said a straw poll had been requested by Welford. She called for a show of hands: 16 in favor, 9 opposed, 8 abstentions. She asked why there were abstentions, presuming in answer to her own question that there had been a lack of time to study the white paper.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM) said he had read it, but we didn’t have time to discuss it, and he had some questions.

Goran Lesaja (COSM) agreed and so thought it was premature to put it to a vote and suggested more discussion in Fall, then a vote.

Moderator Krug said if you want to have lengthy discussion, you need to divide up the discussion time. If you take 20 minutes for one item, you don’t get 20 minutes for all of them.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) noted that there were several people in the gallery who had come to discuss and to hear what was said on this matter, and that fact suggested even more reason for additional discussion.

Krug said that was a point well-taken, and that was why it could be on the agenda in the fall. She reiterated her thought that it is incumbent upon people, if they want to have lengthy discussion, to measure their discussions on other issues they might consider of lesser importance.


The report was about 19 pages in length, so because of the time crunch he excerpted and summarized the 7 recommendations they had based on what they believe define our identity at Georgia Southern: Teaching Ethos, Preserving Teaching Excellence, and Scholarship.

1. Re: teaching ethos, as much as we speak about it there’s really very little that is written that gets to what an understanding of what our teaching ethos is. We need further reflection on what constitutes our teaching ethos.
2. Re: evaluation of teaching, we need more meaningful and multiple measures of what “teaching excellence” means. All academic departments and colleges should review their teaching evaluation guidelines to insure that there are multiple measures and implement these measures when evaluating teaching.

3. Best practice recommends that development centers always consult with faculty, and the task force recommends that faculty have an equal partnership with the centers in designing any kind of initiative that they might have.

4. Consolidate the support centers -- the Center for Online Learning (COL) and the Center for Teaching, Learning and Scholarship (CTLS) -- and incorporate a campus instructional technology capability in that consolidated center.

5. To provide comprehensive pedagogical support on campus, we need to create an instructional technology support functionality, seeking to maximize the best possible student learning through effective application from technology to learning.

6. Teaching assistant training should be grounded in the research discussed in the report. Because we have only recently moved or are moving toward much more of a teaching assistant model, much work remains to be done at this institution before we have an effective teaching assistant training program.

7. Teaching awards should be consistent with the goal of sustaining and strengthening teaching excellence at Georgia Southern. A survey should be conducted re: institutional teaching awards. The University as a whole and the colleges offer a variety of teaching awards, which vary dramatically in criteria as well as in monetary awards. A framework should be developed that applies to all institutional teaching awards.

   Though not a recommendation, the Task Force also suggested that administrators who carry faculty rank should teach at least one course a year. It will send a clear message about the importance of teaching at the institution.

   Moderator Krug noted that the full report is available on the President’s Website, under Strategic Planning.

   Ming Fang He (COE) applauded the suggestion that administrators teach one course a year. Krug noted that in the past there have been administrators who have done that.

   Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked Gossai if he could explain what the task force might be thinking about in terms of other ways of evaluating teaching excellence. Krug noted that was included in the report. Haberland said the report wasn’t linked on the agenda, so she didn’t see it. She asked that in future as many items as possible that refer to documents be linked on the agenda. Krug said it was a good point. She added that all of the various Task Force reports and meeting minutes were available on the President’s site under Strategic Planning.

They have been studying faculty salaries for every department across the University. He thanked Paul Michaud for getting them the data. There is compression in every department across the University, which they expected. They have also seen many cases of inversion. They are creating a rubric to rank a person’s amount compressed or inverted. They will submit that rubric to the Provost.

Rob Yarbrough (COSM) said he had looked at the website as recently as the previous Monday, and there was still no charge posted. He asked about the particular charge of the committee.

Barilla said the charge of the committee is to study the compression to see if, first, does compression exist, and they found much evidence of that. They split it into a staff section and a faculty section. The faculty section is to identify instances of compression and make suggestions re: dealing with that: If they can’t give us a pay raise, then can the University contribute more to our health care? Or could the University make a larger contribution to our retirement account? Or can we get free RAC membership, or free parking, or something like that? And so forth.

Robert Costomori (CLASS) asked what Barilla meant by a rubric, and how they would handle issues like people in COBA generally earning way more than people in other disciplines.

Barilla answered the second question first: “If you go to a football game, it’s one stadium. If you sit on the 50-yard line, do you expect to pay the same thing as somebody who sits in the upper deck of the end zone? The answer is no, although this is one university, this university is made up of different markets. Every department, every college, has different markets. For instance, in COBA, since you brought mine up, as the economists we are the lowest paid in COBA. We understand that because there are, of course, we teach that. So I can tell you why we are underpaid, I just can’t explain anything else past that. But accountants generally get paid more than economists because Ph.D. accountants are rarer than Ph.D. economists. And so when you look across the university you have to remember it’s one university, but it’s made up of, you know, a ton of different markets.” As for the rubric, by department they’re creating an average salary by rank and then trying to see what percentage individuals are off from the average. For example, if you’re an associate professor in the Economics Department, how many Assistant Professors are making more than you are? And then you would count those situations of inversion and figure out how to weight it so that we can get a rating.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) said it sounded like the compensation committee is institution-bound, not making comparisons with peer institutions.

Barilla said they are looking at peer and aspirant institutions. Getting the data by department is taking some time, and they really have to track market by market by market. If you look only at the big picture, some people are going to be really left out in the cold and other people are going to benefit like you wouldn’t believe. So they are trying to do it as individually as possible so that everybody benefits from this study.
18. **Report from the SGA Liaison: Mark Welford (COST).**

Nothing to report.

19. **Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative: Chris Geyerman (CLASS).**

He had three items: First, violations for this academic year totaled just one: A student-athlete got too many tickets to an away game. We discovered this and reported it to the NCAA, which classified it as secondary, so no further action should be taken. Second, the NCAA is re-doing their certification process. We lucked out. When it was our turn to be in the barrel again, they put a moratorium on the certification. It’s going to come back in a year and we’ll probably be first in line, and as more details come out he will report them to the Athletics Committee. Third, the spring 2012 Grade Comparison Report: All of our teams are in great shape with the exception of men’s basketball, who in spring 2012 posted an average of 1.92, which is of great concern when you consider that 2.00 is required to graduate. Attention is being given to that and it needs to change. When you go inside the numbers, we have approximately 400 student-athletes. A total of 224 student-athletes had a 3.00 or better. In that 224, 104 of them were 3.00 to 3.49; in that 104, 76 were on the Dean’s List, and 44 on the President’s List; 19 women’s softball players were on the President’s List – and the team won the Southern Conference for good measure.

20. **Unfinished Business.**

Fred Mynard (COSM) called for a round of applause for Krug’s service of two years as Moderator. (Applause.)

Sabrina Ross (COE) asked if the Task Force on Compensation information will be based solely on salary.

Tony Barilla (COBA) said that’s all they’ve been given.

Ross then asked if they envisioned that the rubric information on average base salary for each college and each department would be posted.

Barilla said no, that he was not going to be the person who publishes individual salaries of individual faculty members. He invited folks to contact Paul Michaud to find out the averages.

Parliamentarian Bob Cook (CEIT) noted that in Computer Science there’s research that even if you give people averages they can use them to deduce individual salaries for small populations, so anything like that would have to be done very carefully to protect privacy.

Ming Fang He (COE) complained that the agenda and meeting had been too rushed.
Moderator Krug agreed and thought that in future if, for example, someone has a 40 minute report, the SEC needs to know that, and set aside time, and if necessary there should be a separate senate meeting to discuss the results of Task Forces. The report period was not intended to be a reading of the document, but a summary, and clearly there were faculty members who had additional questions who needed to share them.

Ming Fang He complained on another issue on behalf of the international faculty – though recognizing that GSU has always been very supportive, and this is a SACS requirement – for having to verify their degrees, even undergraduate degrees. She has graduated more than 40 doctoral students; if they ask her to go back to verify her degree, are they going to ask all her doctoral students who have obtained a degree under her to verify their diplomas? All international faculty across campus consider this decision from SACS to be unreasonable, discriminatory, and unprofessional. When she and others were admitted to doctoral programs in different prestigious universities, they verified their previous degrees at that time. So this is redundant as well as discriminatory.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) wanted to invite the folks in the gallery to talk because it seemed a shame to have all these people assembled to discuss Pathways and not be able to do it.

Moderator Krug reiterated that if we wanted to have a lot of time for discussion, we would need to have a separate meeting. She also reiterated that if people really have something they want to have discussed at length, that they need to modulate the amount of time they discuss other items that they can consider less important which precede those agenda items.


None.

22. Announcements from the Vice Presidents.

None.

23. Announcements from the floor.

None.

President Keel then recognized the outstanding work that Clara Krug has done as Faculty Senate Moderator, saying it had been a “distinct pleasure and privilege . . . working closely with Clara on exciting topics and on very, very difficult topics. . . . She has represented this entire faculty and this University incredibly well. She has not been afraid to tackle issues head-on, but she’s done it in the most collegial and professional manner which I have ever had the privilege of being associated with.” He presented her with a plaque.


Moved and Approved.
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1. Approval of the Agenda. Fred Mynard (COSM) Senate Moderator:
With three changes noted – the venue was actually the Russell Union Ballroom, there would be no SGA Liaison report, and the NCAA report would come after item 10 – the agenda was Approved.

2. Approval of the June 6th Minutes. Senate Secretary Marc Cyr (CLASS):
With one typo noted (remove one “that” in the second to the last line on page 6) the minutes were approved.

3. Librarian’s Report. Tony Barilla (COBA), Senate Librarian:
Approved. Moderator Mynard noted the absence from the report of Undergraduate and Graduate Committee minutes. Undergraduate had met but did not have a quorum. Both of these committees have deadlines, so it is crucial that members attend meetings or arrange for an alternate to attend.
4. Provost’s Report: Jean Bartels:

SACS

Given the nature of the SACS letter (received on July 17, 2012), and given what she perceived as her personal role in protecting the institution, she had elected not to present it anywhere in print because she does not want to see it on the front page someplace, which she thought could be potentially harmful. She instead would read it aloud, and anybody who wants to see whether she read correctly could come to her office and study it.

[Secretary’s Note: What follows are verbatim quotations from the transcript; I have excluded some boilerplate.]

“The Commission on Colleges reviewed the institution’s referral report from the submission of the institution’s Fifth-year interim report in June 2011. The institution is requested to submit a monitoring report due April 15, 2013, addressing the following referenced standard of the principles—CS3.3.1.1” (Institutional Effectiveness: Educational Programs).

“The institution is in the early stages of its new program review process with expected outcomes identified for its educational programs. Evidence suggests that the extent which the institution has assessed the outcomes in some of its educational programs, and used data to improve varies widely in quality and consistency.”

“The institution should demonstrate that it identifies student learning outcomes for each educational program, assess the extent to which those outcomes are achieved, and uses the results to make improvements based upon the analysis of the assessment. Guidelines for the monitoring report are enclosed because it is essential that institutions following these guidelines please make sure or make certain that those responsible for preparing the report receive this document. If there are any questions about the format, contact the commission staff members assigned to your institution. When submitting your report please send five copies to your commission staff member.”

“Please note that Federal Regulations and commission policies stipulate that an institution must demonstrate compliance with all requirements and standards of the principles of accreditation within two years following the commission’s initial action on the institution. At the end of that two-year period, if the institution does not comply with all standards and requirements of the principles, representatives from the institution may be required to appear before the commission or one of its standing committees to answer questions as to why the institution should not be removed from membership. If the commission determines good cause at that time the commission may extend the period for coming into compliance for a minimum of six months and a maximum of two years and must place the institution on probation. If the institution has been placed on probation within the two-year period extension of accreditation beyond the two-year period for good cause is dependent upon the amount of time the
institution has already been on probation. The institution may be on probation for not more than two years. If the commission does not determine good cause or if the institution does not come into compliance within two years while on probation, the institution must be removed from the membership. See enclosed commission policies, sanctions, denial of reaffirmation, and removal from membership, and that document is enclosed as well.”

Our monitoring report is due in April.

Provost Bartels said that as an institution, we consistently talk about and pride ourselves on being a teaching institution that is student-focused and student-centered. Yet we have very little evidence and in some cases absolutely no evidence that documents the success of our students or if our graduates actually do something with what they know as a result of the learning experiences we have provided for them. She has had faculty remark to her that they know if a student is going to be successful within the first week or two of class, and they then use their grades to determine that the student actually has met expectations for a particular course and moved on. But that has never translated in most places into the larger program expectations for a graduate in that particular area.

Her personal opinion, which she believes she shares with the higher academic community and certainly with assessment people, is that when we operate without clearly defined and communicated expectations and outcomes, and when we operate without collected and analyzed information about our students’ actual performance and abilities, we are unable to be credibly articulate about our successes in terms of what we do in the teaching and learning enterprise, even to our students, which she thought was actually the worst of the sins. When our students and our communities of interest are the last to know our expectations, we are creating a silo effect, a phenomenon that is teacher-centered, not student-centered. So that’s why we need to care about student learning assessment, and that’s why all of us are moving forward in some very positive and very successful ways to create an embedded culture for studying and learning from our teaching/learning experiences and processes in order to make them better — the whole purpose of doing this at all. It is our goal to make such assessment an expected and routine way of operating so that when various accreditations come around they are not crisis events; we just routinely bring out or information and share it.

Prior to receiving the SACS letter, we had already started a focused effort to create a culture of assessment that was consistent with our mission as a credible teaching institution, and that was a system that was compliant with expectations from our communities of interest, primarily SACS. We established an office of Institutional Effectiveness; we staffed it with nationally recognized experts in student learning outcome assessment, in program effectiveness and in accreditation, people who are called on a routine basis to provide consultation on SACS accreditation and in program assessment. We worked with all of our programs across the institution in every college to begin or to enhance those things that were existing around student learning assessment outcome plans. This often involved existing programs revisiting and making public their current and past work in evaluating student achievement and looking at their curriculum and how that was reviewed and revised and how they were developing
their programs. From that we ascertained a fair amount of information that just had not been reported, though the activities were actively being done. This all happened by the time of the Fifth-Year Review and was an improvement, but we still did not have consistency in terms of demonstrating our process or identifying our student learning outcomes and assessment plans in a way that met expectations consistently across every program level.

Our plans were identified as being at an early stage of development and inconsistent, in particular in terms of how we collect data, analyze it, and create an action plan for improvement. This past spring, we initiated an increased track redevelopment in the area of assessment, planning, and development. We requested complete cycles of assessment activities for the action plan phase for each program, and then we formed and trained an assessment committee which had representation from faculty from every college, chaired by a faculty member who reviewed the program assessment plans using a rubric that was congruent with the expectations of our accrediting body, and also reflected the best practices of assessment. We gave extensive feedback to all of the programs, including a rating of the program’s demonstration of our expected level of competence with assessment planning. Programs that were seen to be below the expectations were asked to rework their plans and to resubmit their 2011-12 cycle of assessment to the assessment committee by August. Individuals from across campus often assisted in that work. In other cases, it was the work of the individuals who were on 12-month contract and were program directors. Those reviews are still being completed, in some cases, and some of them are still experiencing difficulties in demonstrating the required level of assessment activity. Those that are still having difficulties have been working virtually one-on-one with institutional effectiveness people, and with a group out of the assessment committee called the PALS, who are the Program Assessment Leaders who have been identified to each college to help in specific areas.

In order to meet the expectation that we have two full cycles of the assessment plan, the Provost has asked that all programs’ 2011-2012 plans be submitted by October 1st, so they can again be placed into a cycle of assessment with our assessment committee, which will provide feedback to the units, helping again where there are deficiencies. We are looking for all plans to reach mid-range expectations at minimum, which is Level 3. Some programs are far ahead of that, while others need more attention. She anticipated that our monitoring report in April will be successful and, more importantly, that we will create a systematic, ongoing culture for assessment that can assist faculty in two important things: program development, and the management of programs’ curricula in a way that actually creates for us a student-centered environment.

We also are gearing up for the SACS Reaffirmation of the Institution which happens every ten years. These SACS Reaffirmation materials are due to be available online to our SACS review team by fall of 2013, and the onsite visit for SACS will occur in the spring of 2015. We are putting together a leadership team that will consist of individuals representing Faculty Senate, faculty from each college, and representatives from all divisions in the institution because we’ll investigate every part of the institution through SACS standards. I will be a large team, divided into sub-teams who will work on very
specific criteria and start to do that this year. The standards include a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). Our last QEP development was "student engagement and created things like our First Year Experience. That QEP was also one of the first ones in the country that actually went to full cycle, and earned a SACS commendation. Such QEPs are expected to be a continuing process, but you have to come up with a new QEP plan for the next five to ten years. We need now to start thinking about the things that would make good focus points for us as an institution to work on. The leadership team should begin work in October.

Pathways to Success

Provost Bartels’ perception is that there is a lack of real consensus about this initiative. There are many legitimate concerns that were raised by faculty in forums regarding potential for creating caste systems, for people to wind up in the wrong line not for any cause of their own, and that the roles and workload responsibilities for some of the Pathways should be determined at the level of the department. She fully shares those concerns. She thinks we need more discussion to see whether it is something we want to move forward with, or if we take from it the things we’ve learned and create some other support mechanisms.

Teaching Legacy Task Force

The Task Force supported the notion that we really do not well-defined nor assessed what teaching excellence means and that has made the Pathways kind of activity complicated as well. We need to have additional discussion and then potential action on looking at the teaching enterprise and how we want to think about that, define it, and perhaps find ways beyond student evaluations to actually assess success as faculty in the teaching endeavor.

Compensation Task Force

There were two subcommittees created: One was faculty focused, one was staff focused. The staff subgroup has submitted its report; it includes some recommendations for things that they we should be looking at. The faculty subgroup met once, but didn’t really have the data that it needed to be able to identify places where we could move forward, so that group is still underway.

Complete College Georgia

This is a mandate coming down from the Governor. It was the brainstorm of several West Coast governors distressed about the low number of degrees produced; they had read some of the literature which was showing that the United States was somewhere in position 14 or 15 in terms of the number of people who graduated post-high school with a certificate, a baccalaureate degree, or associates degree. They didn’t like being that far down the pipeline while people think we’ve got the best educational system in the world. Those particular states that started this, also were starting to see that they did not have the educated work force that they needed for the jobs that they were trying to pull into
their states or that were appearing in their states. So it got them on a bandwagon to try to tie rewards and tie funding and tie all kinds of other things to institutions’ graduation rates.

Governor Deal was one of about 26 to 30 governors that have signed on to this. He mandated it down to both the University System of Georgia and the Technical College System of Georgia, and also insinuated that the private schools should be involved in this as well. He has asked that plans be developed in every institution to increase the number of graduates we have in certificates, associate degrees, and baccalaureate degrees to about 250,000 additional by 2020. This summer we had a group put together a potential plan for Georgia Southern because we were mandated to have that in by the first of August. We did that. Much of the plan reflected things that we are already doing to increase retention and graduation. It was held up as a model.

One potential outcome of Complete College Georgia is that eventually some of the formula funding could be associated with graduation rates and retention rates. That’s not a given yet, but it’s clear that this is being taken very seriously. So we have no choice but to try to achieve some of outcomes from our plan.

Because this work was done in summer, though, Provost Bartels thought we didn’t have good enough representation from across the institution, so she has reconstituted the committee to be more representative of the colleges and the faculty. She has also included students, and brought in as was recommended an economic development community member, and a couple of members from P-12 because part of the expectation is if you create those kinds of linkages the economic development folks are supposed to be helping you to see what kinds of career needs are out there to be dealt with. The group will be looking at what kinds of action plans we might want to put in place to address some of the issues that are identified in our own data. From what she heard from other institutions, our data sources are extraordinarily good and we really can get at some things very quickly compared to almost everybody else in the system. She did not anticipate phenomenal big things that we’re going to force down everyone’s throat, and we are already doing a lot of things to support students who might need some help in our programs. Whatever we do is not going to be built on lowering standards, but rather we’re looking at if there is anything we can do to intervene by putting resources under faculty for dealing with particular issues. So that’s kind of what’s happening with Complete College Georgia. She will report on plans to faculty on a routine basis.

Educational Leaves

Fourteen were granted; there was one individual who declined to accept the leave for 2013. And there’s one that’s been granted for fall of 2013. She believed that we need to revisit that process and criteria to see if it’s giving faculty the kind of help and assistance they need and making the most efficient use of resources. In a number of instances there were multiple people asking for release time from the same department and she worried about what impact that would have on internal resources. She saw this as connected to the even more important issue of how we think about workload and how we think about
creating situations where we can free faculty up on a rotating basis to give them the additional time they need without having to put extra burdens on the entire department.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked if she had misheard, or if Dr. Bartels had indeed said that there was some concern that this might be becoming or indeed has become a teacher-centered university as opposed to a student-centered University.

Provost Bartels said when you create a situation where you can’t give evidence of what you are doing to make improvements happen, that you can start to be very siloed, in other words, faculty can start to think that the most important thing is my course, and don’t worry about how it is potentially connected to other courses. Students then become the last to know what we are expecting of them as they progress through their program. When you start to create that system, you very much become a teacher-centered institution because every faculty person is doing just his or her own course, not thinking about the big picture and you get that big picture through assessment.

Schille added that she felt that the SACS letter not being made public is a bad idea because it’s going to get out there anyway and GSU should respond to it in a positive way:

5. President’s Report: Brooks Keel:

He noted that he was going to give his report from the podium. Previously he had given it from a seated position. He thought that may have given the mistaken impression of a lack of respect for this body. That was never his intention. He thought it would give the impression of being a little more collegial, but he saw that somebody may have misinterpreted that action. Unless he breaks his other leg, he will give his presentations standing up.

He noted that at the last Faculty Senate meeting there were several motions in the form of recommendations that were passed on to him. Some he approved, some he didn’t, and some he has deferred for other action:

Proposed Pre-Business Admissions Requirements

He did not approve this. This would have implemented a minimum GPA requirement for the College of Business Administration. Such a requirement would have eliminated a significant number of students from being able to choose business as a major and require these students to either change majors or drop out/or transfer out of Georgia Southern altogether. While this might have approved the RPG rate of COBA, it might have shifted the burden of these students across other colleges or significantly impacted the RPG of the University as a whole. Therefore, he has charged the Provost with submitting the proposal to the Council of Deans for their consideration and to the Enrollment Management Council for analysis and recommendation as well. He considered this a deferral of the recommendation for further analysis, although according to the Bylaws he has 30 days from the time in which a motion has made, a recommendation in which to accept or deny that. The opportunity to defer is not one of
those options, so he had to officially deny the recommendation, but his intention is to have it deferred for a further motion after discussion.

**Motion on Moratorium**

He also disapproved this motion on a moratorium of hiring administrators/staff. As he had said at the June meeting, he could no support this motion because staff needs — both faculty and administration — cannot always be projected or anticipated. Such a moratorium would place a very unrealistic burden on the University and its ability to effectively plan and grow. He was fully aware of the increased workload of all of our faculty and staff, and had stated publicly numerous times that the hiring of more faculty and staff is a priority of this administration. He noted that the FY ’13 budget provides for the hiring of approximately 36 new faculty positions into new, not existing lines. These won’t get us where we need to be, but are a step forward in the right direction. He has also increased the FY ’13 budget that will address the issue of our staff who are currently below the poverty line. Hence, many of the issues that were associated with the motion he had addressed already. He could not support a moratorium on hiring administrative individuals, any more than a moratorium on hiring faculty and staff.

**Faculty Welfare Committee Motion Regarding Votes of No Confidence in Department Chairs & Faculty Welfare Committee Motion Regarding Periodic Review of Department Chairs**

He also disapproved these two motions that came from the Faculty Welfare Committee. He also considered these to be *de facto* deferrals and had charged the Provost to carry the recommendations to the Council of Deans; he believed conversations were already under way between the Council of Deans and the Faculty Senate on that. This does not preclude votes of no confidence at the present time, but he was concerned that codifying procedures for votes of no confidence in the *Faculty Handbook* was a very wrong message related to civility and collegiality, and that it could significantly hamper deans’ ability to effectively manage a college; they should be provided an opportunity for input into this motion before the President takes action. This should have taken place before the Senate ever took this issue up. In the future, because of the relationship we now have in Academic Affairs with the Senate Executive Committee, he anticipates that these issues will be worked out before they ever come before the Senate.

**Parking Fees**

There was a lot of misunderstanding and disappointment that we implemented a $5 increase in parking. He admitted they could have done a much better job in notifying individuals of the increase in the face of no pay increases in five years, and health care coverage increasing. The $5 increase seemed like a slap in the face. This was the last year of a multi-year increase to get us where we could afford road repairs, etc., across the campus. The total generated from Faculty/Staff by parking fees is $220, 000 a year. He knew there was a lot of discussion about eliminating the parking fees as, if nothing else, a gesture to the fact that we have not had a pay raise increase in so long. He liked that idea, but we would have to reduce somewhere else to find that lost money. He
reminded faculty that we have free parking available at Paulson Stadium and the bus service.

**Land Purchases**

We are land-locked to the north, east and west, due to either city, private, or commercial land. To grow in the next 25 to 30 years and beyond, we have always been looking for opportunities to purchase land to the south. When 208 acres directly across 301 from us became available, we took advantage of this opportunity and started the process of acquiring that land. Land acquisition is not something that can be discussed publicly. The price of that land would have escalated. We purchased the first half of it last fiscal year and are in the process of closing the deal on the second half.

Where did the money come from? If we can afford $8 million dollars for 208 acres, why can’t we afford pay increases for faculty? There are different pots of money. We had year-end-non-renewable, non-recurring money that we used to purchase this land. We can’t put non-recurring money into faculty and staff. We do have the flexibility to spend it on land because that is not a recurring cost like salaries and benefits. Also, we have improved several buildings across campus over the last three or four years -- Hendricks Hall, Cone Hall, Brannen -- and we are renovating Samford Hall now. We have had year-end-money over the last several years because our enrollment has been increasing dramatically over the last ten years or so. This is the first year in some time that the University System of Georgia has had campuses with a decrease in enrollment. Some campuses that have made projections for enrollment increase and have bonded buildings because of that, now are not able to meet those demands. Our enrollment is stable, as best we can determine. We'll probably be somewhere around 300 students more this year than last year. We have been averaging 500-750 a year over the last ten years. He hoped he had provided at least some explanation as to how we can spend money on one thing, but not another.

**Budget**

We are going to have an additional 3 percent budget cut this fiscal year, which will be carried into the next fiscal year. That amounts to $2.6 million. We should be able to absorb these cuts without layoffs or furloughs or reductions, but it means no raises for the next fiscal year. That is information coming out of the Governor's office. The ability to grant raises to state employees is not the President’s, and it’s not the Regents; it comes out of the Governor’s office and the legislature. He and the Chancellor have been trying to find ways to get raises for faculty and staff, but we have a Governor who has the rest of the state to deal with as well.

**Fees charged and endowment accounts**

This is another issue he thought probably could have been handled better in terms of getting the word out, although he noted that this was discussed at the November 11th, 2011, Faculty Senate meeting. The Foundation is now charging one percent to endowment accounts, and a five percent one-time fee to gifts. This money is going back
to the colleges themselves. There was some confusion, perhaps caused by his comments at the November Faculty Senate meeting that gave the impression this money was to be used to hire additional staff. It is not. It is being used to support additional staff and those staff are in the actual colleges themselves. For the first time colleges will have budgets that can be used for travel, donor recognition events, and cultivation and alumni events. In years past, the Deans had to use their own money if they chose to have these sorts of events. Now they will have Foundation money to raise money for scholarships, for the support of faculty, for research, for scholarship, for creativity, and for other events within the college. So the money was not to hire staff, but to provide support for staff. He said that virtually every major university in this country is charging such fees and many charge more than we do.

**Ad hoc Committee to Review Faculty Grievance Procedures, and Ad hoc Committee to Review the University Statutes:**

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee has made suggestions for membership on both of these committees and he was in the process of seating them.

**Office Hours**

He has established office hours in an attempt to provide faculty an opportunity to come see him regarding any issue that's on their minds: September 26th, October 30th, and November 28th from 1-4:00. All the slots have been booked. He was really excited.

**Follow Up**

He followed up on the Provost’s comments about SACS: (1) He applauded the leadership of Provost Bartels. He is sleeping much better knowing that she's at the helm in Academic Affairs. (2) He thanked all faculty who spent numerous hours over the summer when typically they would have had that time off for other activities.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked if all the money brought in by the one-time fees and the endowment fees is going back to the colleges.

President Keel said yes.

Cyr said he was asking because the minutes of the Foundation from May of this year show $415,000 total brought in from both the one-time gift and the endowment fees, yet a couple of weeks ago Mr. Hood [Foundation Chair] said a little over a $195,000 had been distributed to the colleges.

President Keel said the colleges had not spent that money yet, he thought because they were ramping up all of the fundraising efforts within the colleges. They were hiring new development officers, and these were going through extensive in-house training to get them up to speed on what to do when they make calls. They have significantly ramped up the number of folks that these development officers are going to have responsibility
for, so the money was there. The money was earmarked for the colleges, but they just weren’t ready for it yet.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) had four questions: (1) Of the 36 new faculty, how many of those will be tenure-track jobs?

President Keel: All of them. He added that, depending on the positions needed, that number might be, say, 34, or it might be 37. There are also some staff, principally for advising, to be hired. The Governor has been explicit that the money slated for these hires NOT be part of our budget cuts. He is going to hold us accountable for this.

Costomiris’s question (2): Regarding pots of money, he was pleased to hear that the staff wages that were so low have been increased, but asked where the money came from to fund those raises if we don’t have any money in a “raise” pot?

President Keel said that money came from is recurring money that came to the University from the state through formula funding, which this year the Governor re-implemented. Formula funding is defined by headcount based off enrollment, and based off the Governor’s budget you get so many dollars per student. The $4.6 million slated for the faculty positions came from that, and the little over a million dollars that went to the staff came from that, as well. No one suffered a decrease in wages so that some could have an increase.

Costomiris’s question (3): Has anyone considered using the year-end pot of non-recurring money to give one-time bonuses to faculty, with the understanding that we can’t count on getting this ever again?

President Keel said this has been considered, and it is still being considered, but there are several confounding factors. One is just that it is sometimes difficult to give folks a one-time bonus and not have the expectation that it’s going to be there forever, and so many people will plan on that in their own lives, and then it is devastating when they don’t get it the next year or any time beyond that. Also, whether called bonuses or something else, such payments have to have Board of Regents’ approval, which includes the Governor’s approval, and there’s just no appetite for that in Atlanta right now at all. He did not want anyone to think that the Governor doesn’t like higher education; he’s got a multitude of government agencies to consider, or which the USG is only one, and many of the other agencies do not have the benefit that we do of tuition and other revenue sources, and he has said that if there will be a raise, it will be a pay raise for everybody, or nobody gets one. President Keel noted that he and all other system presidents are frustrated at being hamstrung in their attempts to deal with this morale issue.

Costomiris’s question (3): The Foundation intends to hire new members to help raise more money: Where does the money come from to pay for these new staff members?

President Keel said that members of the Board of Trustees now must commit to either personally contributing or to raising a set amount of unrestricted money that can be
used for personnel. That has caused some controversy within the ranks of the Board. Some have decided that raising money was not in their wheelhouse, and they have moved to other types of membership within the Board of Trustees, and the Foundation was in the process of aggressively recruiting new members.

Goran Lesaja (COSM) asked about the likelihood of furloughs, because in our contracts it’s stated they might happen.

President Keel could not give a definite yes or not, but his gut feeling was that there will be no furloughs this year. When they happened before, they were mandated by the Governor for all state agencies; it wasn’t our call. President Keel had confidence that we will be able to absorb the roughly $2.6 million cut without furloughs, and hopefully without going into the operating budget very much, because we have a robust and stable enrollment. But nothing is absolutely certain until the Governor comes out with his budget, which will be right after the first of the year, and the legislature takes that budget and makes a recommendation back, which will occur as late as April. That then goes to the Regents for them to implement and it’s usually, if we are lucky, early April, if not May before we actually know what the money coming to us is. And that’s just a quirk of the System that we are in, and is one reason we wind up with so much year-end money. The good news is that we have a lot of year-end money; the bad news is we don’t know how much we are going to have until the year ends.

Russell Keen (VP Government Relations) agreed with the President’s assessment.

Provost Bartels added that the provision re: possible furloughs in the contracts was a BOR requirement because of the uncertainties about the budget.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) asked if she had heard correctly, that there was going to be a development officer for each college?

President Keel confirmed this, and Provost Bartels said there already is a development officer that is uniquely and only focused for each college.

Steirn asked if it is realistic, given how many colleges we have, to have a full-time person for each separate college?

President Keel said it actually would be more realistic to have several full-time people for some, like COBA; we probably will have to go to at least two in COBA because business colleges typically have the greatest opportunity for philanthropy, unless you have a medical school or a law school. He added incidentally that we have hired a consulting firm that has been working for the better part of a year now wealth screening all 75,000 of our alumni, as well as friends of the University who have not graduated from here, and he noted that it would probably scare the beejebies out of us to know how specifically they can get into our accounts and know how much we are worth and how much we can donate if we are willing, as well as what our propensity is to donate; they can tell us with great confidence how much we can expect to raise for the alumni of each college. From that information, they develop an expectation of what the Deans are
going to be held accountable for raising. In the past, deans have never been given the resources to go out and raise this money, and now through these fees they will have those resources. Our capital campaign is running behind, but Vice President Arthur has done a great job with creating the needed organization, and he has great expectations of the amount of money that will generate.

6. NCAA Faculty Athletic Report: Chris Geyerman (CLASS):

As has been the case with every report he’s given in the past, the student-athletes’ GPA’s across the board are higher than the general student population.

7. Senate Executive Committee Report: Fred Mynard (COSM), Chair:

Reports such as the one Geyerman had just delivered, as well as the Graduate and Undergraduate reports, will from now on be filed in advance with the Librarian’s Report and will not be read, but just open for discussion and questions.

a. Blog and survey:

The Faculty Senate Moderator’s blog offers an opportunity for the entire university community to discuss issues at hand, and he encouraged everyone to participate. Also, on that site can be found the result of the first survey that we ran, and he offered help to standing committees to organize surveys of their own; it turns out to be relatively easy to survey the entire faculty, and it might be a helpful tool.

b. Denied motions from June senate meeting:

President Keel had already discussed this issue. Mynard noted, though, that because the 30 day rule had not been followed the President’s responses not part of the record yet. He would post all of the written responses shortly after the present meeting. One thing he wanted to note was something that came up during follow-up on the denied motions. The Senate Executive Committee asked if the Board of Regents Policy 2.5.2 applied in the case of these motions; the part of 2.5.2 that is relevant for the discussion here reads as follows: “The president shall have the right to call meetings of any council, faculty, or committee at his/her institution at any time. The president shall have the power to veto any act of any council, faculty, or committee of his/her institution, but, in doing so, shall transmit to the proper officer a written statement of the reason for such veto. A copy of each veto statement shall be transmitted to the Chancellor.” Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs Maura Copeland contacted the BOR office of Legal Affairs to discuss this rule. In the BOR interpretation, the key word in this policy is the word “act.” Since the Faculty Senate is advisory to the President, the Senate does not act; only the president does. Therefore, the president cannot be in a position to veto any action by the senate, because the senate does not take action, but only provides advice. The president follows or does not follow our advice, which is not formally a veto. Therefore this provision of BOR 2.5.2 currently does not apply on our campus. Additionally, BOR
counsel indicated that he is not aware of any report to the Chancellor being made in recent memory by any institution of the system, under this provision.

As a follow up, Mynard contacted BOR counsel to clarify the intent of a rule on presidential vetoes, if presidents are never in a position to veto anything. The rule exists because while there is no council on our campus that can take action, there is—or at least there may be—councils at other system institutions that can act. So this rule essentially does not apply to our campus.

Maura Copeland (Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs) confirmed that was right.

Mynard then turned to four RFI’s received for this meeting. Three were approved, and one denied. The three approved were points 7, 8, and 9 on the current agenda. The other (submitted by David Seaman re: Chick-fil-A’s relationship with GSU) was considered inappropriately worded for an RFI, as which it had been submitted, and more appropriate in the form of a motion request; therefore, the RFI was not approved.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) didn’t know who to address this to, but wanted to know if the legal ruling re: the BOR policy meant that the BOR just did not want to know about any disagreement on a campus. No one could answer.

Robert Costomiris wondered if this meant the thirty day rule is inapplicable.

Mynard said that our colloquial use of the term “veto” is inapplicable, but there remains a time limit per written policies for the President to approve or disapprove a passed motion. He added that, of course, the implementation (or not) and the conditions of implementation, as he now understood the situation, are entirely up to the President.

8. RFI: Student/Teacher ratio in core classes (SEC). Candy Schille (CLASS):

This one originated with the Senate Executive Committee as a body: “What is the ratio of students to teachers in core curriculum courses, sorted by College and, if possible, by course number for the following period: Academic year 2006-2007 through Academic year 2011-2012?” Rationale: “Even with such measures as Supplementary Instruction, class size—especially in core curriculum courses—has some bearing on teachers’ and students’ collaboration in teaching and learning. The data requested would be an early step in our discussion of how best to educate, retain, and graduate students with meaningful degrees.”

Provost Bartels noted she had had some discussion with the SEC about expanding this RFI because that would be really helpful as we look for the reasons for what’s happening. It would be very difficult to identify what would be meant as a core course first of all, and the issue is bigger than the core courses, so she had proposed that the RFI response include a listing of all faculty, all courses, and student numbers in those courses for every year from 2006 to the present time, so that we have a full range of
numbers, not just two which could potentially be outliers. This would take her more
than a week or two, but her office was already getting that data. That data will also be
helpful when looking at Complete College Georgia issues and at how we define top-level
workload, too.

9. RFI: remuneration of work on assessment during Summer 2012: Robert Vogel
(JPHCOPH) for the SEC:

The questions were: “How many 10 months faculty, in each college, have worked on
SACS related assessment duties during Summer term 2012?” 2. “How have these
faculty members been remunerated for their work, in each college?” 3. “If
remuneration was not distributed in a uniform way in a given college, what was the
policy applied to decide the level of remuneration?” The rationale: “Faculty members
from various units have reported a range of levels of remuneration for their work on
assessment during the Summer, while they were not on contract. In some cases, it
appears that people have been asked to work for free. In this context, concerns
regarding the fairness of the process have been raised.”

Provost Bartels said she was in the process of collecting that information from each of
the college deans. (Administrative Response has been posted since the meeting)

Since submitter Rob Yarbrough (COSM) was not present, Moderator Mynard read the
next RFI.

10. RFI: Status of Compensation Study Task Force. Rob
Yarborough(COSM)

“What is the current status of the Compensation Study Task Force? What were the
findings/conclusions of this task force and what are its recommendations? What
strategies and resources does the administration plan to utilize to address salary
compression and inversion issues amongst faculty and what might be a timeline for
such a process?” The rationale: “The Compensation Study Task Force is one of several
study teams recently charged by the Provost’s Office. A brief update of this task force’s
work was provided at the June 2012 Faculty Senate meeting. However, to date no
meeting minutes have been posted, no findings have been presented to the senate, and
the task force’s conclusions and recommendations have not been made available to the
university community.” (Administrative Response has been posted since the meeting)

Provost Bartels noted that she had already give a brief report on the compensation task
force during her earlier remarks, and would post updates on the website appropriately
and provide a full response to the RFI when the information became available.

11. Parliamentarian election (nominated: Bob Cook (CEIT)).

Cook (CEIT) was elected by acclamation.
12. Student Government Association Liaison election (nominated: Lisa Yocco (COSM)).

Yocco (COSM) was elected by acclamation.


None.


Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked about the upcoming student vote on various fees: How do such initiatives come to a ballot that is presented to the students to vote on? What is the process by which they arrive before the students? I

Teresa Thompson (VP Student Affairs and Enrollment Management) said the process is different for different fees: Student Activity Fees go through the SGA. Athletic fees have a group of students that can make recommendations to the Student Government, and the SGA can decide whether they are going to take the fee forward to the students or not. The sustainability fee came about in a little bit different way, but it did then come to SGA. Typically it all goes through SGA in the end.

Costomiris asked if the Administration has no say in the matter.

President Keel (President) said the administration has quite a bit of say, and obviously works very closely with Student Government, and worked very closely with the Student Government on this particular issue. The Board of Regents also has a tremendous amount of say as well, and it’s become apparent through the Board of Regents in recent months that there’s great concern about fees being promoted that do not have the concurrence of the entire student body, instead of just the SGA.

15. Announcements: Vice Presidents.

None.

16. Announcements from the Floor.

None.

17. Adjournment.
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c. Report from the SGA liaison (no report)

4. **Provost’s Report: Jean Bartels:**

She and Moderator Mynard had decided that, for the sake of efficient use of meeting time, the Provost would no longer give a regularly-scheduled report, but instead, if she had something to deal with, it would be a specific Agenda item.

5. **President’s Report: Brooks Keel.**

There was a recent BOR meeting and recent Presidents' Retreat during which several items were discussed:

**Budget**

We are in the process of implementing a 3 percent budget cut. There is talk statewide about the possibility of an additional 2 percent cut on top of that. We probably won’t know more about that until the legislative session starts in January. The Chancellor has been using the term “new normal”: Every indication is that although it looks like the economy will soon move into an upturn, we should not expect any cuts to be reversed. What we have right now is basically what we're going to be dealing with.

**Enrollment**

Enrollment growth system-wide between Fall 2008 and 2009 was 6.7 percent; from Fall 2009 to Fall 2010 the increase was 3.2 percent; from Fall 2010 to Fall 2011 was 2.1 percent; from Fall 2011 to Fall 2012 there has been no significant increase at all. Roughly half of the system campuses have had a slight decrease; some have had a significant decrease; some have had a moderate to small increase. Georgia Southern will be up probably 300 students or so versus what we had last fall. That’s small, but any increase is positive since our budget at this point in time is dependent upon enrollment: tuition and fees, and headcount-based formula funding. There’s every indication that this formula funding in the future will be based not only on enrollment, our headcount, but also on meeting the criteria set forth in Complete College Georgia.

**Articulation Agreements**

There was a lot of discussion about articulation agreements between the University System of Georgia and the Technical College System of Georgia. For us, the Board approved an articulation agreement with Savannah Technical College in the area of Logistics. Savannah Tech will now be offering Associate Degrees that will seamlessly transfer those students into Georgia Southern for those who wish to pursue degrees in Logistics. He commended COBA faculty for doing yeoman’s work in terms of course by course comparisons between what we offer and what Savannah Technical College offers. The System office will be looking at any future such articulation agreements very carefully to ensure there's no duplication of offerings in our geographic region.
MOOCs

MOOCs (“Massively Open Online Courses) are getting much attention nationwide, and here within the USG. Georgia State is already beginning to take a look at how they may offer credit for students that bring indication of completing MOOCs that they have taken from other universities. He thinks this is something Georgia Southern needs to get on the leading edge of. It is coming. There is no way around it. Indeed, some faculty may already have had students wanting to transfer or receive credit for taking such courses. We need to have a conversation about this, see if there's something we want to do, and, if we do, how to go about doing it, and what implications it will have on our accreditation. We either need to get out ahead of it, or we're going to be run over by it.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Fred Mynard (COSM), Chair.

There was one item rejected on a technicality: The Staff Council submitted a “Tobacco Free Campus” resolution proposal as a discussion item, instead of a motion. Likely it will come back as a motion at the next Senate meeting.

RFI: Use of full senate meeting time

Filed by Greg Brock. Basically, it’s less an RFU than a technical suggestion to limit the use of senate meeting time to read reports or simple corrections of typos in the minutes, etc., by having reports and corrections and so forth submitted for inclusion in the record prior to the meeting. Mynard noted that, re: various standard reports, the SEC has already shifted to this model. As for the minutes, corrections often come in at the last moment, but from now on only substantial changes will be orally reported.

RFI: Chick-Fil-A

Filed by David Seaman: What is the nature or extent of Georgia Southern University’s relation to Chick-Fil-A? The rationale was that the CEO of Chick-fil-A supports anti-gay organizations, and Seaman asked if this offends GSU’s diversity principles, as it offends him. The administrative response is that the University’s relationship with Chick-Fil-A is a licensee agreement, in which the University pays a royalty of 10% of gross sales to use the Chick-Fil-A brand. The employees are all GSU employees. Also, Chick-Fil-A funded one classroom at the time of construction of the COBA building in 1995. The College of Business Administration has received no additional funding from Chick-Fil-A since that time.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that other funded rooms in COBA have a plaque of some kind that says “thank you for donating this,” but the Chick-fil-A room has three of its four walls wallpapered with images and the company history and a statement of the religious principles on which the company was founded. [NOTE: Cyr has since informed the Senate list that this is incorrect; only one wall is so papered, while two other walls have a couple of large plaques each.] He wondered how that squared with various state and federal laws pertaining to promotion of an individual private company in a competitive market, and perhaps the separation of church and state.
Maura Copeland (Associate VP, Legal Affairs) said there should be no problem in either of those areas.

Someone unidentifiable [NOTE: There are numerous instances throughout the recording of incomprehensible statements] said there is no evidence that the company has treated homosexuals badly in any way. Statements by company CEO Cathy, made to a biblical magazine, have nothing to do with diversity on our campus. Mynard noted that that observation was part of the administrative response that this is a purely business relationship.

RFI: *Extent and Use of Summer Incentive Funds*

Mynard displayed onscreen the administrative answer rather than the form of the RFI because the questions are reproduced in the answer.

The first questions: What is the total dollar amount of Summer Incentive money returned to ALL colleges? What is the breakdown by college? Mynard referred senators to the spreadsheet supplied.

Next questions: What was the total dollar amount of summer incentive money given to each department for each of the past three years? What is the breakdown by department? A: “Departmental breakdowns were allocated by individual Deans based on semester credit hours produced by each department. This information is only available from each College.”

Next questions: In what year did a percentage of Summer Incentive money come to be considered “recurring funds”? How was that decision reached? A: “In 2011, then Provost Moore made the decision to allow each College to allocate up to 30% of summer incentive money to recurring costs. Each College Dean (employed by Georgia Southern at the time) made decisions as to if/how recurring funds would be used. ... Deans used recurring funds to convert casual labor staff to ¾ or full time employment (per compliance rules from the USG), to add positions to their College in high need areas, to provide support resources needed for ongoing College needs, and/or to address the most severe compression issues in their College.”

Questions 5 and 6 led Mynard to refer senators, again, to the chart.

Q #7: In each year since summer incentive money could be used as recurring funds, how many faculty members in each college have received “market adjustments”? A: “Decisions on the use of recurring funds to address compression issues were made by each individual Dean as appropriate to individual College needs. The chart provided indicates the breakdown of recurring funds, but does not indicate the number of faculty that have received market adjustments.”

Q #8: Next question: In what departments have these market adjustments occurred? A:
“Information regarding individual department use of recurring funds for addressing compression issues was decided at the discretion of the Deans, and the information regarding which faculty received these funds is a private personnel matter. Information regarding the number of adjustments may be requested at the College level if available.”

Q #9: How have faculty been selected to receive "market adjustments" from Summer Incentive funds? A: “The use of recurring funds for addressing compression issues was allowed at the discretion of the Deans employed in those roles at the time.”

And, finally, #10: What would prohibit designating a greater percentage of Summer Incentive funds as “recurring funds” and using them for an increased number of "market adjustments" of faculty salaries? A: “Effective this year (2012), the practice of allowing summer incentive funds to be used for recurring expenses has been stopped. Given the downward trend in summer credit hour production, the reliability of consistent recurring funds cannot be assured at this time.”

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) referred to the chart: It showed the summer allocation for 2012 as $7,290,000 and student credit hours of 67,043. The money went up, but the hours down. Could that be explained?

Provost Bartels said that each year the allocation for summer budget is negotiated, and it indicated a slightly higher amount negotiated back to Academic Affairs. She said the hours decrease was significant.

Costomiris asked if he understood correctly, that the amount of summer money allocated is not connected directly to student credit hours.

Provost Bartels said not the amount that is returned to Academic Affairs. A portion of the money that is actually attained from student credit hours is returned to the general fund. She believed the Academic Affairs portion is 60%-65%.

Mark Hanna (COBA) asked in regard to summer funds that have been applied to recurring, permanent uses, whether that will reduce the funding available for COBA this year, and how long that amount will continue to come out of summer funds.

Provost Bartels said the term “recurring funds” is a little misleading. What was allowed by Provost Moore at the time was that a Dean could make a decision to use a portion of the money that we’d anticipate occurring again the following years, on the assumption that we would have summer school and money would come in again. This means that in subsequent years, that amount is consistently and always committed for that following year, which she believed to be the reason that Provost Moore restricted that amount to just a certain percentage of what a college could assume would be recurring summer
incentive money. But it will continue until such time as it’s not needed because of changes in the status of the particular individual, or the particular need that has been funded in this way.

Customiris said that Senators had been referred a number of times to go back to the individual colleges for information, but he understood that Senate is the appropriate venue and the Provost the appropriate source to ask for this information: How do we find the information out if it is not being provided here?

Provost Bartels said that in part the decisions were made by people no longer in those positions or who are gone from the institution, so the only way to trace back is to see if the Dean of that particular college can answer.

Customiris noted that, for instance, regarding the numbers of faculty, the question was not asking for names or anything personal, just how many people had their salaries adjusted. He figured that to be a number that should be able to be determined by anyone with access to that information.

Provost Bartels said because these were decisions made by deans of particular colleges, she could not trace those funds.

Customiris asked, “So this is gone into some kind of black hole?”

Provost Bartels and all other administrators present remained silent. Moderator Mynard commented, “Apparently, yes.”

Jennie Dilworth (CHHS) was still unclear and asked if the amount that goes back to each of the colleges is dependent on how many student credit hours each college produces for the summer.

Provost Bartels that is correct.

Customiris asked how one year of student credit hour decline for summer can be termed a trend on which to decide that recurring funds are not assured.

Provost Bartels said this was because student credit hours are variable. It was the decision of Academic Affairs that this had been a poor decision to allow to happen, and that we should not chain ourselves to something that will require recurring funds when they might change, and because the policy or the process used was less than the best.

Someone unidentifiable from COE asked if there is a University-wide policy on market adjustments of pay. He or she asked because apparently only some colleges were creative enough to make market adjustments, while some did not.
Provost Bartels said that was part of the problem. There was no policy; there was no formal process, nor any formal procedure for how decisions would be made.

Costomiris thought that thought that though this was perhaps “unartfully” applied, the concept itself is a fairly creative response to a dire situation, and he encouraged the Provost to not run away from it so quickly because it is an effective means of redressing some of the salary compression issues that we don’t seem to be able to address in any other way. So, while its implementation in the past might have been flawed, he encouraged her to not abandon a tool that could be used effectively.

Tony Barilla (COBA) echoed Costomiris. He liked that initiative was shown to use a different pot of money to fund a market adjustment. He also noted the frustration that everybody has with the budget when the answer given is “It’s a different pot of money.” As an economist, he wants to count the pots. He asked how many pots of money Georgia Southern currently has.

There was again complete silence in response. When Moderator Mynard reiterated the question, President Keel said he could not say off the top of his head.

RFI: Legal authority

Filed by Michael Moore as a follow-up on an issue reported about at the September meeting: BOR Policy 2.5.2, which deals with Presidential vetoes. The question: “What is the legal authority being used by the Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs at Georgia Southern and the BOR Legal Affairs Office behind the . . . response to the Faculty Senate question as to BOR Policy 2.5.2?” Mynard recapped that the problem was with the word “act,” and in legal terms, the interpretation was that only the President can act, and therefore, there is no act of the Senate to have vetoed, and therefore, legally, there is no veto to [report to the Chancellor]. The question is whether there can be further clarification on that from the state level.

President Keel said the question had been asked and answered by the Legal Affairs Office at the USG.

Moderator Mynard recognized Michael Moore from the gallery. Moore said he wasn’t looking for an interpretation, but for why a policy exists that doesn’t seem to apply to anything or to any institution that we know of, and no examples have been supplied as to who it does apply to. When you read 2.5.2, it looks like it applies to faculty, but apparently we found out it doesn’t. But that’s an interpretation, and he wanted to know if this comes from the attorney general, or maybe the Board of Regents. He also said his RFI was part of a much bigger question: What does the Senate actually do? When he
heard this interpretation of 2.5.2 at the last meeting, he had thought a good motion right then would be a motion to dissolve the Senate, and if faculty had anything to go to the President, we could just send him an email or write him a note. Because it made it seem faculty are putting in a lot of work for no apparent reason. This was different from how it had seemed before during all the years he had been here. When the President had to write a response back as to why he turned something down, faculty thought that this also went to the Chancellor. Now he had been told that the President acts and that’s all there is to it. He could no longer see the relevance of the Faculty Senate.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that if we could ask the BOR attorney, we would do so and not hassle our GSU administrators, but we’re not allowed to contact the BOR; our own administrators are the only conduit that we have. Even when Moderator Mynard was invited by Provost Bartels to contact the BOR attorney, the BOR attorney bounced it straight back to Maura Copeland. So the question is really not directed at our own administrators, but as a request for them to get the information: What is the law? What is the basis that the lawyers are building this interpretation on? We are not trying to hassle our own administrators; we’re forced to ask them to hassle the BOR for us.

Provost Bartels said that the attorney at the Board of Regents level had told her that anyone who wanted to contact him should do so, and believed that Mynard had talked with him. Mynard noted that he sent an email to him, but the reply came from Maura Copeland because the BOR counsel indeed bounced it back to Legal Affairs here.

Maura Copeland (Associate VP Legal Affairs) confirmed that Mynard’s query had rebounded to her. What the BOR attorney had told her, though, was not that this rule never has any application – in fact, “he said that he believes that there are committees he knows of at USG that do have rulemaking or lawmaking power” – he just didn’t know of an instance in recent memory where a President had vetoed an action and therefore reported it: “So it’s not that those committees aren’t doing what they are supposed to do, or doing those things, it is just that there has not been a veto that’s been reported.”

Cyr said he and everyone else, then, appears to have been under a misapprehension that we had been told that no one on any USG campus can legally act except a President.

Copeland said her email exchange with Mynard was that she is not aware of a faculty committee on this campus that has rulemaking authority, but there could be one; she may just not be aware of it. But she did share that the Board of Regents said that there are committees within the System that do act in that way.

President Keel said the Faculty Senate is not one of those committees. The Institutional
Review Board might be because it is constituted federally, but he wasn’t sure. To his knowledge, though, there is no committee on this campus that has that authority vested in it, though among the 34 campuses across the USG there might very well be one.

Cyr requested that Copeland “find out where this unicorn is stabled” because the issue goes right to the heart of Moore’s question, which is, “What is the legal basis? What is the legal authority? What the heck are we dealing with here?”

7. Motion Request: Future Use of Year-End Funds: Robert Costomiris (CLASS):

Costomiris moved the following: “Until the time when the University receives sufficient resources from the state of Georgia to make market adjustments in faculty and staff salaries, we move that the university devote 80% of all year-end money to making market adjustments to faculty and staff salaries in the form of one-time awards.”

President Keel said we can’t do it. We are not allowed by the state of Georgia to give bonuses, whatever we call them. Giving cash prize awards for great work, which we do, is radically different. Even if we could, it would be unreasonable to tie up any direct percent of year-end money and completely remove the flexibility that we have in terms of using year-end money. Such a move five years ago, for example, would mean we would not now have Cone Hall, Brannen Hall, and Hendrix Hall renovated.

Costomiris asked if it is ever possible to make one-time awards with University funds, and had that ever happened to individuals who work here.

President Keel was not aware of any such instances, and he believed that even the awards that we give are Foundation funds. If we had a huge endowment, that might be another story. But we’re constrained by the stipulations on using state money.

Costomiris said what it seems to be coming down to is that there’s always money for property and renovations and such, but there’s never money for people. And we’re into five years of no raises, looking at two years more like that, and, if a person works 35 years, 20% of their career will have been spent without a raise. This affects everything in their lives, and well into the future, including retirement and social security. Did President Keel have any other ideas that could work?

President Keel totally agreed and sympathized, but the only way that we have to implement across the board raises is through an increase in state funding that comes primarily out of the Governor’s office, through the legislature and the Board of Regents and then to us. It’s a different pot of money, and there are limitations on the uses of the money in every pot.

Charles Patterson (VP Office of Research) suggested that, if we are going to have discussions on what is and is not allowable, we come with information about what is allowable, rather than asking, what can we do? Because what we can do is very clearly written in policy.
James LoBue (COSM) asked if all this meant that the use of summer incentive money for raises actually violates the rules of the Board of Regents.

Provost Bartels said, “Actually, what the summer incentive money did was it was money that we anticipated we would receive again, so we chose to put some away and save for the years to come. We will use it for that. . . . but it’s not money that recurs, it’s money that we’re just forward thinking may happen.”

LoBue (COSM) understood that part of it, but reiterated that he needed clarity on whether it is legal because we are self-generating funding through credit hours and putting that in the pay pot. And if that’s legal, can we find clever ways to generate more credit hours that might increase our pot of money?

President Keel said again that the Governor’s office has placed limitations on what he can do as President. The Chancellor is trying to negotiate with the Governor to see if we could use additional money that might be coming to USG through formula funding and earmark some of that to dole out to the campuses, earmarked for faculty pay increases. That was not met with enthusiasm. But this isn’t all black or white. We just gave pay increases to the lowest paid employees we have on this campus. Senators enthusiastically supported that because it was the right thing to do. That was a pay increase in anybody’s dictionary: “We are able to do that sort of thing, unless we raise a big deal about it, in which case we probably have to take that money away.” But pay increases across the campus are just not possible at this time.

Tim Whelan (CLASS) asked whether summer incentive money could be used, not for bonuses, but for monetary “awards.” Maybe we could have ten times the number of awards we’re giving now? This led to a back and forth exchange:

President Keel said our awards come from Foundation money. Whelan suggested that summer incentive money be slated for awards. President Keel reiterated he can’t give across the board raises. Whelan said he was talking about awards, not raises. President Keel said by any name, he couldn’t do it. Whelan said such awards didn’t need to go to everybody; it could be a competition for a larger number of awards. President Keel said he can’t use state money for awards. We have the flexibility to do what’s been called “market increases” for retention pay increases and those sorts of things for select individuals. That’s fairly common, and fairly well understood. To do that across the entire board is not possible. Whelan re-insisted he was not talking “across the board” but about particular categories or people. President Keel said we do that for promotions and we can maybe look at increasing that amount somehow, but that money will have to come from something else we could be spending it on. So Whelan asked if we could, on the basis of the President’s answers, assume there is some money for such things. President Keel wished someone would point out where.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked if the USG dictates to us how we divide up our pots of money. Do we have latitude to move money from pot to pot?

President Keel said that is dictated by any number of sources:
1. Student fees are dictated by the University System of Georgia.

2. The amount of money we get from the state certainly is.

3. Tuition and fees are dictated by the state of Georgia.

As for moving money from pot to pot, no, we can’t do that. And we have to keep in mind that any money is dependent on enrollment. There are some universities right now having to lay off or furlough staff and non-tenured faculty because of that. But he would love to have more budgetary flexibility.

Costomiris wondered if he had this right: Short of getting more money from the state earmarked for pay, there’s nothing that can be done in terms of increasing the salaries of the faculty and staff.

President Keel confirmed this. Or if we were allowed to use tuition increase money, but even that would be dicey because enrollment is flat and tuition increases are directly tied into HOPE and HOPE is in real trouble.

Costomiris asked if student fees could be used.

President Keel said only if you could convince somebody to accept the student fee for that, but the Board of Regents is not going to be receptive to implementing student fees for a faculty and staff pay increase. Costomiris noted the BOR had approved such a fee for our Athletics. President Keel said that has nothing to do with faculty/staff pay increases. Costomiris understood; he was just trying to be creative, as President Keel has urged faculty to be.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked, if the President was telling us that what this motion asked for is illegal, could we even vote on it?

Bob Cook (CEIT, Parliamentarian) said it could be voted on, but wondered why this defect wasn’t pointed out before it came this far. He thought a good idea would be to identify the ways in which faculty can actually be given benefits. He suggested referring the motion to either the Faculty Welfare Committee or the Compensation Committee.

Kent Murray (CLASS) agreed. He then asked about a related subject, “this elusive 300 acres down 301 South,” and what the commitment plans are for this land, and what timeframe, because it’s going to take other money to develop that.

Moderator Mynard said that was not the topic of discussion at the moment. He encouraged Murray to file an RFI.

Goran Lesaja (COSM) believed that pay issues will soon lead to long-term leaving, and that will seriously impact the quality of teaching and research in this university. If we cannot give money, maybe we can look at making the environment that faculty work in more flexible. Since Roles and Rewards and Pathways seem to have petered out, maybe Welfare could look at a “banking system” to save for time off, “banking” uncredited work.
like directed studies, or perhaps teaching an extra course during a term. Such a “time bank” could give faculty concentrated time for research.

In consultation with Cook and Mynard, Costomiris moved that his motion be referred to the Compensation Committee. This motion was approved.

8. Motion Request: University Club to move funds to gain higher interest rate:

Greg Brock (COBA) said the Club wants to move $120,000 of their $141,000 in funds from a non-interest-paying Foundation account to interest-bearing FDIC insured CDs at Queensborough Bank, which has the highest rates.

From the gallery, Clara Krug noted this action has already taken place; the motion makes transparent what the club is doing with faculty money, and asks for a resolution of support for this action since the Senate has no formal say in the matter.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) why the money has been in a non-interest bearing account.

Clara Krug, treasurer for the Club, said they had wanted to keep the money at the University, but an interest-bearing Foundation account would not have allowed them ever to use the principle, only the interest. But now they had decided they needed to make this move to alleviate the diminishment of those funds’ value.

The motion was approved.

9. Discussion: Educational Leave Policy

Rob Yarbrough (COSM): “In a memo dated Sept. 7, 2012, Provost Bartels expressed concerns that she and President Keel share regarding criteria for Educational Leave. Specifically, the memo noted that ‘The problem with the criteria is that it is difficult to differentiate normal expectations for scholarship and creative activity related to promotion, tenure, and faculty role responsibilities/expectations from expectations for scholarship and creative activity meriting additional time, resources, and support.’ What criteria should be used to evaluate Educational Leave proposals? In addition, from where should those criteria originate (e.g. departments, the college level, the Provost’s office)? Should there be a uniform set of requirements/evaluation criteria for all proposals across the university? Who is ultimately responsible for approving or not approving applications for leave? Given that no university resources are allocated for Educational Leave, what specific role should the Provost and President play in the approval process?”

Yarbrough then asked if Provost Bartels could give an update on what has been done since September regarding this issue.

Provost Bartels said that the Deans’ Council had asked for a joint meeting with the Faculty Welfare Committee to further look at the issue to see if we can clarify some of the things that might be helpful for the decision-making process. They have been looking at other institutions’ educational leave policies to develop a clearer sense of what
the expectations should be at the end of the leave time in terms of what the faculty member should produce, and how and by whom it will be decided whether resources exist to support the leave, and how and by whom oversight of the whole leave process will be conducted. There is also ongoing discussion of how to determine what activities require and/or justify educational leave. They also want to make sure that the process is conducted similarly by all colleges.

Yarbrough asked if she foresaw some flexibility across colleges in regards to how they define criteria, and to clarify her comment about who decides if resources are available: He said that particular departments would be “pick up the slack,” and asked how higher echelons, then, could be valid decision-makers given that situation.

Provost Bartels agreed that “there should be a fair amount of decision-making done at that [department] level” as the current plan is structured. But deans and Academic Affairs have to be sure that we are not committing ourselves to something that we really can’t support so as to avoid a bombardment of “Oh, we really didn’t mean it, that we couldn’t cover it, now we need this.” She’s also concerned about fairness and avoiding “serendipity decision-making,” like who got there first with their proposal, and wants to ensure that at the department and college levels there is good analysis that these are priority things to support, and that they do not put a burden that may not be appropriate on an entire department.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked Provost Bartels what she would tell people who are currently thinking of applying for an educational leave.

Provost Bartels thought they should continue to put forward proposals via the existing process. As the process is refined, they may be asked to provide additional materials, and lower units to provide additional materials to show how the leave will be covered. She’s also concerned about the number of leaves that might in progress at any given time, not only because of concerns about covering them, “but also because of the message it sends when it’s made public that these are occurring . . . . if the Board of Regents says how can we do like 50 of these things at one time. Then the idea that we are short on faculty, need additional resources . . . . might actually raise some undesirable questions we don’t want to have to answer.”

Marc Cyr (CLASS) noted that a colleague had just asked him – since he was “already in deep doo-doo” – to make a suggestion: Would it be possible to support educational leave with summer incentive monies?

Provost Bartels said, “What a novel thought!” There was no further comment.

Yarbrough noted that the Provost’s September memo mentioned the difficulty of comparing different proposals for educational leave. He asked if she could give an example of a legitimate proposal for educational leave as opposed to something that faculty should just simply be doing already. That seemed to be the crux of the memo.

Provost Bartels said she has probably had some change of heart since writing that sentence. That said, it is a question of things like “I want to have this semester off
because I’m going to finish an article . . . that I haven’t gotten a chance to get around to” versus “I really need to get up to speed on a particular new concept and new development that is happening in the field so that I can improve the teaching that we’re doing in the program and the curriculum that’s there. I need to be able to have intense time to study that.” Or, better examples, “I might need to go and travel to look and see what’s going on with that,” or “I really have a commitment to write a particular significant work and I really need uninterrupted time.” She felt all would agree those were more meritorious than “[I] just didn’t kind of get the article written and maybe I could have a semester off to do that.”

Tim Teeter (CLASS) asked whether the decision of whether a leave was validly coverable would be made at a level higher than the department involved.

Provost Bartels said they want to be shown plans for coverage by chairs and deans. This didn’t mean higher levels would be making the decision, only that they want to be able to ask the questions that will ensure coverage without compromising programs and the university’s mission. She also wants to avoid overloading faculty who will cover their colleagues’ leaves.

10. Discussion: Join national Keep guns off campus group:

Greg Brock (COBA) said we have the opportunity to sign a resolution either as the Faculty Senate, as Valdosta State did, or as the Presidents of many institutions including Auburn, Alabama, Delaware, Central Florida, George Mason, UVA, have done. This is a resolution saying that we as a University are opposed to legislation that would preempt an educational institution’s right to prohibit or adopt policies to regulate possession of firearms on campus. There has been legislation introduced recently in at least 18 states that would prohibit colleges and universities from adopting policies that regulate the possession of firearms on campus.

Tim Teeter (CLASS) asked where we could find the document under discussion. Brock said it was in SharePoint. (www.keepgunsoffcampus.org) Teeter asked if a motion was likely to be made in future, and Brock said it would be.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) asked whether the motion would ask the Senate or the President to sign. Brock said it could be either.

Marc Cyr (CLASS) asked President Keel if he would sign this were it passed asking him to do so for the institution.

President Keel said he couldn’t answer that right now. He is totally opposed to having guns on campus, or the ability for people to carry guns in the classroom, that sort of thing. The University System of Georgia has been fairly vocal about that, and all 34 Presidents have basically said the same thing. However, he would have to ask Legal Counsel to take a look at it and be sure he would not be committing the institution to anything in a way he’s not allowed to or shouldn’t. Also, he has asked the Vice President for Government Relations to judge the temperature in the legislature about this sort of thing, where this is a sensitive issue. There are two ways to approach such a sensitive
issue. One is to rub it in the face of the legislators, which serves no purpose, or the other is to use more subtle ways to keep legislation in the state from passing, which involves our Vice President for Government Relations, the Government Relations office at the System, and the Chancellor working behind the scenes with legislators. He did not think the Senate would want to have him put the University into a public position that could potentially infuriate the legislature, which has the ability to control our budget. He realized this was a very political answer, but he needed to consider the ramifications.

Cyr asked if a motion crafted for the Senate to sign were passed, would that cause a problem? President Keel said, “If there is a problem to be caused, that would cause much less of a problem. Does that make sense?” Cyr said it did, and that was why he was asking.

President Keel gave an example of a political ramification: His and our efforts to stave off the budget crisis led to legislators being inundated with phone calls and emails and so forth, many irate, many uninformed. Such public pressures, then, can be counter-productive.

Cyr wanted to clarify that, if we pass a motion for the Senate to sign and endorse, that would not prevent President Keel in the future, depending upon the political situation, from signing for the institution. President Keel said it would not.

11. Unfinished Business.

None.


None.

13. Announcements: Vice Presidents.

None.

14. Announcements from the Floor.

None.

15. Adjournment.

Submitted by Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary
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Non-Voting Members (Administrators): Bob Cook, Brooks Keel, Marilyn Bruce, Jean Bartels, Russell Keen, Charles Patterson, Teresa Thompson, Mohammad Davoud, Curtis Ricker, Bill Wells, Thomas Koballa, Martha Abell, Greg Evans, Bede Mitchell
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SECRETARY’S NOTE: For this meeting, the recording system failed. Having been assured, however, that it was working, I took minimal notes. I apologize for these skimpy minutes.

1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 27, 2012 meeting: Fred Mynard (COSM), Senate Moderator.

The agenda was amended to remove the “Report on the Fall USG Faculty Council Meeting.” As amended, the agenda was Approved.

2. Approval of the October 17, 2012, Minutes: Marc Cyr (CLASS), Senate Secretary.

Approved.
3. **Librarian’s Report of November 27, 2012**: Tony Barilla (COBA), Senate Librarian.

The report was approved for accuracy. There was no discussion of the included committee reports: 

a. Undergraduate and Graduate Committee reports 

b. Report from the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative 

c. Report from the SGA liaison 

4. **Provost’s Report**: Jean Bartels 

Related to the Complete College Georgia plan, formula funding will in future be tied to graduation rates, but on an incentive basis, not as punishment. We are developing Retention, Progression, and Graduation (RPG) plans with special focuses on helping freshmen and sophomores who are struggling, and helping special needs students, as well as developing our online offerings. She emphasized that none of this is being driven by a goal of producing graduates merely for the sake of numbers.

We are doing well regarding Assessment, especially in how units are using the data for improvements, that is, that we are seeing a shift in mindset from Assessment being a burden to it being an asset.

5. **President’s Report**: Brooks Keel 

Personnel moves: Mohammad Davoud will move from interim to permanent (and founding) Dean of the College of Engineering and Information Technology. Tom Kleinlein is the new Director of Athletics. Marilyn Bruce has retired as Chief of Staff and Leigh Price will take over her role.

For various technical reasons, the BOR expedited approval of our new fees supporting our football program; the new “green fee” will wait to go through the usual approval process.

Our official Fall enrollment was 20,754, with an average SAT of 1115 – both records, despite the fact that our growth has slowed, though not as much as elsewhere in the system, with most schools seeing flat or even declining enrollment. That SAT average does not take into account the 570 or so EIP students, who have an average of 990, but also a 94% success rate.

6. **Senate Executive Committee Report**: Fred Mynard (COSM), Chair. 

**RFI: Pay for Summer Teaching**: Discussion revolved around paying faculty (subsequent to individual negotiation) less than the Handbook-stipulated 3% or their annual salary per credit hour for classes with “low enrollment.” Provost Bartels noted that, given the “pay as you go” nature of financing summer sessions, the alternative was canceling such classes, consequently denying the faculty member any pay and potentially causing damage to students’ progress and to
programs. One issue raised was in regard to classes that, subsequent to such an arrangement being made, reached full enrollment numbers: Could contracts be configured that would, in this event, restore the stipulated 3% per credit hour pay rate? Provost Bartels said this was not possible, though further questions on this point did not elicit why this was so.

RFI: F&A Cost Adjustment for Grants and Contracts

Rejected request for discussion: Administration expectations for, and data on, faculty research productivity

Visitor Michael Moore read a prepared statement (MM's November comment.docx) regarding what he considered an unacceptable response to an RFI dealt with at the October meeting, one dealing with BOR policy 2.5.2, a response he argued was unsupported: “The Associate Vice President [for Legal Affairs, Maura Copeland] in this mornings response states that BOR Policy 2.5.2 does not apply to Georgia Southern. Other than her opinion, she cited no Attorney General opinion, BOR policy statement, or any other authority that supports her interpretation.”


The skimpy record produced by a lack of a meeting recording/transcript led Dilworth to ask that this portion of the minutes include her recollections on two points:

Dilworth asked Provost Bartels whether faculty members, under financial pressure after five years of no raises but increases in other costs, who initially contracted for less than 3% per credit hour due to low enrollment could later be paid the full amount when it was determined that the college/university was making a profit from summer; the Provost answered, “No.” When Dilworth then said she considered these arrangements “involuntary donations” by faculty to the university because those profits were then spent by administrators on “stuff” – for summer 2012, $2.2 million had been given back to colleges and departments – Provost Bartels said that if that’s what faculty agreed to in their contracts, then they would be held to it.

This amendment to the minutes submitted by Faculty Senate Secretary Marc Cyr (CLASS)

7. Senate moderator election

There were no candidates, so the election was deferred.

8. Motion Request: Faculty Senate supports www.keepgunsoffcampus.org resolution.

Discussion centered on the fact that the resolution does not call for a firearms ban, but for supporting the right of institutions to regulate guns on their campuses. The motion was Approved.
9. **Motion Request:** *Administrators serving on faculty senate and on senate committees*

Discussion centered on this being a request to administrators to step aside from membership on the Senate or Senate committees, not a requirement, because BOR policy designates some administrators as “faculty” and because who is and who is not an administrator is often a dicey question and needs to be determined on a case-by-case basis; and on the fact that this motion would formalize the traditional but informal situation already in place. The motion was Approved.

10. **Discussion:** *Differentiated workloads and Pathways to Success model*

Discussion led to the likelihood of the Senate Executive Committee seeking a way to ascertain whether faculty even want to make such a change, in whatever particular form, since they were not asked this question before that initiative was launched.

11. **Discussion:** *Athletic Program's Support for Academic Mission of the University*

President Keel had asked faculty NCAA representative Chris Geyerman (CLASS) to respond to the possibility of some portion of our athletic program’s revenues being given to Academic Affairs. Geyerman noted that out of an athletic budget of about $11 million, more than $3 million already goes for scholarships that pay tuition and fees, a large part of which goes to Academic Affairs. He also noted that at year’s end the athletics balance is zero.

12. **Unfinished Business.**

None.

13. **New Business.**

None.

14. **Announcements: Vice Presidents.**

None.

15. **Announcements from the Floor.**

None.

16. **Adjournment.**