

1999

# Administrator's-serving-on-Senate-or-Senate-Committees-Previous-Discussions

Faculty Senate

Georgia Southern Univeristy

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



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

---

## Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate and Georgia Southern Univeristy, "Administrator's-serving-on-Senate-or-Senate-Committees-Previous-Discussions" (1999). *Faculty Senate Index*. 80.  
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/80>

This other is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu).

This was in a request for information about who can vote in elections. 4/26/2007

In yet another related matter, the question of Administrators serving as Senators or as voting members of Senate committees arose. According to BOR policies and our own Statutes, Administrators with academic rank are so eligible. (As a point of interest, a motion to limit Administrator eligibility came to the Senate on 3-23-05 and was defeated; see the archived minutes of that meeting.) However, it has been an almost universally honored tradition at Georgia Southern for administrators – at least those with the words “dean” or “vice-president” or “provost” somewhere in their position titles – to decline these positions.

memo to Candy Schille from BFG

Subject Recommended Revision to *Georgia Southern University Statutes*  
**2-19-2001**

I have reviewed the Faculty Senate’s recommended revision to the *Georgia Southern University Statutes* as acted upon by the Faculty Senate at its November 27, 2000, meeting and forwarded to me in your December 7, 2000 memo. I will recommend these revisions as described below as well as certain editorial changes in other sections of the *Statutes* to the General Faculty at its next meeting on March 5.

#### **Georgia Southern University Statutes, Article V.**

**SECTION 4.** The Faculty Senate shall meet at least ~~twice~~ three times during each regular session and once in the summer, and at other times upon call by the President or upon petition signed by ten members of the Faculty Senate.

**SECTION 8.** The Faculty Senate shall be composed of the following:

A. Voting members. Voting members of the Faculty Senate shall include at least forty regular full-time members of the ~~Corps of Instruction~~ faculty of Georgia Southern University holding the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor who have been members of the faculty of the University for at least one year at the beginnings of their terms; ~~the President of the Student Government Association; and the Student Government Association Vice President for Academic Affairs;~~ and one student representative.

B. ~~Administrative members. The following administrative officers~~ Non-voting members. The non-voting members shall have authority to participate in all deliberations of the Faculty Senate, but shall not vote on recommendations of the Faculty Senate: ~~the President; Vice Presidents of the University; the Academic Deans; and the University Librarian.~~ These non-voting members

include: the President and Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

**SECTION 9.** The ~~forty~~ members of the Faculty Senate from the ~~Corps of Instruction~~ faculty shall be apportioned as follows.

**SECTION 10.** Senators from the ~~Corps of Instruction~~ faculty shall be elected for a term of three years. Terms shall be staggered with one-third elected each year. Terms of office shall begin on the first day of the new academic year.

A. Elections for Senators from the ~~Corps of Instruction~~ faculty shall be held no later than three weeks prior to the end of the spring session.

B. Procedures for the election of Senators from each unit shall be established by the ~~faculty of each unit and~~ Elections Committee of the Faculty Senate, which shall include a method of nomination, ~~and~~ election, and tabulation of results to ensure that each Senator shall be elected by a majority of the votes cast in such elections.

C. In addition to the senators elected from each unit, there shall be at least a first and second alternate but no more than seven alternates elected for one-year terms. These alternates, whose selection follows the criterion for Senator election, shall be empowered to attend meetings of the Faculty Senate and to vote, as proxies, for an absent Senator upon his or her request, and shall automatically fill an unexpired term for the remainder of the academic year; the alternate may also serve on committees of the Senate.

G:\Faculty Senate\Recommended changes to Statutes only.wpd

Title	Discussion of the Draft Revised Statutes and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate
Date Submitted	9/18/2000
Person	
Email Address	
Phone	
Subject of Discussion	
Rationale	
SEC Response	

## Senate Response

**Minutes: 9/18/2000:** Discussion of the Draft Revised Statutes and Bylaws of the Faculty Senate

Dr. Schille invited members of the Senate Restructuring Task Force who are no longer senators to participate in the discussion. She then provided a brief explanation of the relationship of the Bylaws of the Senate and the Statutes of the University and explained that a document to compare the existing and proposed Bylaws would be difficult to produce because of the extensive changes proposed. With the approval of the Senate, she then proceeded to direct the discussion of the Bylaws, section by section. Dr. Schille: Article I: No changes, although Dr. Jill Martin (COBA) has proposed that a statement be included to provide the Senate with the ability to adjust the Bylaws, so long as the changes do not conflict with the Statutes.

Article II: The change to section 4 introduces to office of Senate moderator. Discussion: Dr. Jill Martin (COBA) inquired about the absence of specified times and time limits for the meetings. A straw poll of the Senators suggested that there was broad support for including both.

Dr. Schille: Article III

Section 1: Added the Senate Executive Committee as officers of the Senate.

Section 5 d: Changed the word "receive" to "review".

Section 5 e: It was proposed that the NCAA representative be allowed to succeed him/herself. A straw poll of the Senators suggested that there was broad support for such a provision.

Discussion:

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) asked about Section 8, term of SEC members.

Dr. Kathleen Koon (CHPS) suggested that a requirement for a written record of SEC meetings be added. There was extended discussion about whether or not the Senate Moderator's limited voting rights means that his/her unit will be under-represented and if

so, what changes should be made to alleviate that problem.

Dr. Schille: Section 7: The Librarian's report should include Ad Hoc committee reports.  
Section 8: Clarified the timing of the election of officers.

Discussion:

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) asked about the timing of election of officers since the final Spring meeting is not the last meeting of the Senate.

Dr. Schille: Article IV

The major changes are the move of the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils to become committees of the Senate, the increase of faculty representation on most Senate committees, the addition of two new committees and the re-division of the Faculty Development, Welfare and Service Committee into three separate Committees.  
Section 2: Senate Committees will be chaired by Senators

Section 3: There is a new responsibility for committee chairs to report the work of their committees in a timely fashion to the Senate Librarian and the Senate.

Committee reports included in the Librarian's report will be individually approved at each Senate meeting.  
The Undergraduate and Graduate committee reports will be separate agenda items at each Senate meeting.

Section 8: This section adds a charge to seek input into the working of the committees from the University community.

Discussion:

Kathleen Koon (CHPS) asked about presence of students on committees.  
(Section 1)

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) asked whether or not committees were to be required to select their chair from Senators on the committee (Section 2).

She then asked about whether the term limit applied when some terms were as Senator and some were as faculty (Section 6).

Dr. Jill Martin (COBA) suggested that dissolution of Ad Hoc committees require some formal action from the Faculty Senate (Section 7).

There was an extended discussion about whether or not minutes from a committee meeting should be included in the Librarian's report before they are approved by the committee (Section 3).

Dr. Susan Williams (COBA) asked whether the appointment of committee members being proportionally representative to the faculty body or equally allocated by College/Library (Section 4). Dr. Lowell Mooney (COBA) pointed out that this point is addressed in individual committee descriptions.

Dr. Schille requested a sense of the Senate regarding Section 3. The discussion on the timely report of committee work to the Senate resumed. This led to the consideration of the role of the Senate Librarian when committee chairs are members of the Senate and to the suggestion that the requirement be changed from "minutes" to a "report" of each meeting.

Dr. Schille: Section 9-11: The responsibilities of the Undergraduate Committee are largely those of the former Undergraduate Council, but with the new requirement that they may address specific questions from the SEC. Membership of the Committee has substantially changed with the removal of Academic Deans, the University Librarian, the

Registrar and the Director of Advisement and Retention from committee membership and the increase of faculty membership. Committee reports will become a separate Agenda item for the Senate and only motions approved by the Senate will be acted upon.

Discussion:

Dr. Kathleen Koon (CHPS) asked about the relationship of the program review required as part of this committee's work and the Academic Program Review now in process as part of University Strategic Planning

(Section 9a).

Dr. Sudha Ratan (CLASS) asked about the process for curricular changes and whether this new committee will function in the same way as the Undergraduate Council or not (Section 9a). Dr. Schille replied that committee responsibilities for the curriculum are unchanged from those of the old Council.

Dr. Schille: Section 12-14: The changes to the Graduate Committee are parallel to those changes made to the Undergraduate Committee.

Discussion:

Dr. Lane Van Tassell (Graduate Studies) asked for clarification of the description of the Graduate Council.

Dr. Schille: Section 15-16: This is a new committee. It is taking over some of the work of the old Admissions Committee.

Discussion:

Dr. Ming Li (CHPS) asked about the relationship of the Graduate Committee and the new Academic Standards Committee. Will the latter have the expertise (that is, Graduate Faculty membership) to make decisions about graduate program issues such as admissions policies?

There was an extended discussion of the role of the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). Issues discussed included the overlap of graduate and undergraduate committee responsibilities with those of the ASC; that the role of the ASC should be policy-oriented rather than operational; that it is important that the ASC not become a "supercommittee"

Dr. Saba Jallow (CLASS) asked about what the committee responsibilities as regards grading and exams would be (Section 15a). Dr. Kathleen Koon suggested that it be required that some of the committee members be Graduate Faculty.

Dr. Schille: Section 17-18: The Athletic Committee has only a couple of major

changes: the chairman of the committee must be a Senator and the committee must provide a written report to the Senate.

Discussion:

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) asked whether or not it is appropriate for a Senator to chair this committee rather than the Athletic Director. Also, committee structure varies from the established template. Minutes from the June 19th Senate meeting addressing these issues were reviewed.

Dr. Richard Rogers (NCAA Representative) pointed out that this committee will not have a choice about the committee chair since only one Senator is being appointed to the committee.

Dr. Schille: Section 19-22: The Elections Committee is a new committee.

Discussion:

Dr. Jill Martin (COBA) recommended that there be no committee, but only clearly developed Bylaws to govern elections procedures.

There was an extended discussion about the size of the Senate (which, in the Statutes revision would increase to 50) and the suggestion that the Senate committees from this one forward do not need twelve faculty member, nor do they need six senators on them. It was suggested that it might be sufficient to have perhaps six faculty members, half drawn from Senate membership and half from the general faculty.

Dr. Schille: Section 21-26: The Faculty Development Committee, the Faculty Research Committee, and the Faculty Service Committee come from the three sub-committees of the Faculty Development, Research, and Service Committee and carry on the work of those committees. Membership on the committees has been changed.

Discussion:

Dr. Ming Li (CHPS) recommended that language about the committees responsibilities for specific Awards of



Excellence be included. There was an extended discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of re-separating the committees.

Dr. Jill Martin (COBA) suggested that adding six senators seemed unnecessary. At this point, the time having passed 6pm, it was moved and seconded that the Senate extend debate until 6:30pm. The motion was approved.

A straw poll of the Senators suggested that there was support for separating the committees. A further poll supported decreasing the number of Senate representatives to 1.

Dr. Mark Kostin (COE) asked that consideration be given as to how the separate committees would be coordinated.  
Dr. Schille: Section 27-28: The Faculty Welfare Committee is a new committee.  
Dr. Schille: Section 29-30: The Library Committee has the same responsibilities as the present committee. Membership has been changed to match the pattern established in the other committees and the committee chair will be selected from among committee Senators.

Discussion:

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) asked whether or not it is appropriate for a Senator to chair this committee rather than the University Librarian.

Dr. Mark Kostin (COE) recommended that the number of Senate representatives be reduced to one.

A general discussion about the proposed committees included an extended discussion of the Faculty Development and Welfare Committee not being maintained. Also, the question of available administrative and clerical resources to support the work of the committees was raised.

Dr. Schille: Section 31-35: The Bylaws section on Ad Hoc Committees has been reordered but not changed in substance.

Discussion:

Dr. Kathy Albertson (CLASS) asked about the timing of the submission of requests for a committee to the SEC and whether deadlines needed to be set (Section 31a). Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) asked about the balance of power, wondering if the SEC has too much control over Senate business (Section 34).

At this point, Dr. Schille introduced the draft revisions of the Statutes of Georgia Southern University. She provided Senators with a handout detailing the few proposed changes and explained that the changes to the Statutes are in aid of the Bylaws revision. The changes are contained in Article 5, The Faculty Senate:

Section 8A: Increase the total number of Senators.

Section 9A: Increase minimum number of Senators

**Section 12: Change from University Corps of Instruction to Faculty of the University.**

**This will enable administrators, such as Academic Deans, to be eligible to serve on the Senate if elected by their college. A**

discussion was held about the cost of the proposed Bylaws revision to those who serve as Senators—it is widely acknowledged that there is an almost overwhelming service demand placed upon Senators as a result of this proposal. The discussion of the revision of Senate Bylaws and University Statutes resumed.

Dr. Jake Simons (COBA) asked about the amount of power granted to the SEC by this revision. It was suggested that Colleges select senators and faculty members to be appointed to committees. In discussion, it was pointed out that centralized control of committees allowed for greater operating efficiency. In a straw poll, 10 senators favored returning control to Colleges and 9 opposed it.

Dr. Rosemarie Stallworth-Clark (CLASS), speaking for Kathy Albertson, asked about the role of adjunct faculty in the Senate. Dr. Grube responded that people in staff roles

do not have faculty status.

Dr. Rosemarie Stallworth-Clark (CLASS), speaking for Kathy Albertson, asked about our higher admissions standards and how we anticipate dealing with at-risk students was expressed. After some discussion, it was recommended that Ms. Albertson refer this issue to the SEC for consideration. Several Senators expressed concern about the size of the proposed Senate committees and the amount of labor required of Senators. Will good people opt out of Senate? Will committee members be concerned for the work of the committees? Will committees be unwieldy? On the other hand, if the committees are decreased in size, how will representation be equalized?

Dr. Schille asked to Senators to consider whether the increased workload cancels out the good of faculty empowerment. Dr. David Allen (CLASS) speculated about whether we should embark on such a wholesale change or move more cautiously.

Dr. Sudha Ratan (CLASS) asked about staff support for the changes. Dr. Grube reminded the Senate that Administrators will still support the work of the committees.

Dr. Jake Simons (COBA) suggested that following the Senate meeting that Senators propose alternatives to the proposed committee structure to the Senate Listserv or the Restructuring Task Force. Dr. John Averett (COST) observed that the draft Bylaws have gone through an extended review process with the Task Force and perhaps the Senate should vote on the current document and, if needed, reject it. Dr. Schille suggested that the Task Force would consider all the discussion of this Senate meeting and review and revise the Bylaws accordingly. The plan had been to bring the Bylaws to the next Senate meeting for approval, but given the extent of the requests for changes, that may not be possible. Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) expressed concern about input Senators would be allowed to have with the Task Force. Some consideration was given to defining the role of the Task Force in the

	<p>further revision. Finally, Dr. Jill Martin (COBA) summarized the issues facing the Task Force. The issues are: more clearly defining the role of the Academic Standards Committee so that it does not conflict with the Undergraduate or Graduate Committees; reducing the size of selected committees as recommended by this meeting of the Senate; and reviewing the method of appointing Senators to committees.</p> <p>Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) asked about the process for ratifying the proposed changes. The procedure is spelled out in the Statutes. It was suggested that the Faculty Senate be included in the ratification process.</p> <p>Dr. Jill Martin (COBA) suggested that in section 9A of the Statutes that the language specifying the number of Senators from each College and the Library be left open, deferring to the Senate Bylaws for specifics.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minutes: 3/23/2005: 1st motion failed on voice vote; 2nd motion failed on hand count

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

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

Motion 1

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

Motion 2:

#### Suggestion 1:

Both members of the Corps of Instruction (see Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 302.02) and Administrative Officers (see Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 7 302.03) have the right to be elected to the Faculty Senate. However, all Administrative Officers will act as ex-officio officers without the right to vote in the Senate or hold positions as chairs of Senate committees.

#### Suggestion 2:

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

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

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

Welford then introduced the motion:

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

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

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

Welford then introduced a second motion:

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

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

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

11/1/1999: Minutes: 11/30/1999: Dr. Grube: "As you consider what this Senate might look like, you might also consider whether or not we have certain committee structures on the campus that currently run outside of the Senate that we might, for the purposes of discussion, want to consider as committees that might run inside the Senate, or some hybrid thereof....but these are essentially committees established by the Senate that are faculty committees with administrative help but not dominated by administrators."

Restructuring the Composition of the Faculty Senate: Dr. Larry Mutter

Minutes: 11/30/1999/12/1/1999b. Administrative members. The following administrative officers shall have the authority to participate in all deliberations of the Faculty Senate: the President; Vice Presidents of the University; the Academic Deans; and the University Librarian."

The Statutes make it clear that administrators and students are members of the Georgia Southern University Faculty Senate, though administrators may not vote on the business of the Senate.

However, the Board of Regents Policy Manual does not specify this particular composition. It leaves the issue of what constitutes an institution's Senate membership up to the institution. The Board of Regents' Policy Manual addresses the subjects of faculty meetings and faculty rules and regulations in the following sections: "302.05 Faculty Meetings

Each faculty shall meet at least once each academic term and at such other times as may be necessary or desirable, except at those institutions which have a council, senate, assembly, or other such body, in which case the faculty shall meet at least twice per year..."

and

"302.06 Faculty Rules and Regulations

The faculty, or the council, senate, assembly, or other comparable body, shall make, subject to the approval of the President of the institution, the Chancellor and the Board, statutes, rules, and regulations for its governance and for that of the students; provide such committees as may be required; prescribe regulations regarding admission, suspension, expulsion, classes, course of study, and requirements for graduation; and make such regulations as may be necessary or proper for the maintenance of high educational standards. A copy of the statutes, rules, and regulations made by the faculty shall be filed with the Chancellor. The faculty shall prescribe rules for the regulation of student publications, athletics, intercollegiate games, musical, dramatic, and literary clubs, fraternities and sororities, and all other student activities and affairs, subject to the approval of the President of the institution, the Chancellor and the Board."

The first part of the first sentence of Section 302.06 makes it clear that an institution's faculty

senate may enact statutes, rules, and regulations for its governance, subject to the approval of the institution's President, the Chancellor, and the Board.

Keeping in mind that the composition of the Senate's membership is an institutional prerogative, not a Board of Regents policy, I will make a motion in a moment to alter the composition of the GSU Faculty Senate.

The motion is offered simply to get a sense of whether the voting members of the Faculty Senate desire to amend the Statutes of Georgia Southern University regarding the composition of the Faculty Senate. The amendment I offer would have the effect of restricting membership of the Senate to elected faculty senators or their alternates.

It is important to note that amendments to Statutes are governed by Article XII of the Statutes of Georgia Southern University, which states that amendments are to be handled through a specific process that involves the President appointing a "Committee on Revision of the Statutes." If it is the Senate's desire to amend the Statutes per the motion below, the proposed amendment then would be reviewed by the Committee on Revision of the Statutes. The Committee's job would be to review the proposed amendment, make changes to it if necessary, and offer it for adoption by the Faculty Senate. If approved by a majority of the Senate's voting members, it would become Statute.

Motion: Dr. Larry Mutter motioned that Article V, Section 8, of the Georgia Southern University Statutes be repealed and replaced with the statement: "The Faculty Senate shall be composed of forty regular full-time members of the Corps of Instruction holding the rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor who have been members of the faculty of the University for at least one year at the beginning of their terms."

The motion was seconded and the floor was opened for debate.

Dr. Larry Mutter (CHPS) asked if the vote on the motion could be conducted by ballot per Robert's Rules of Order. By general consent of the faculty, it was agreed that the vote would be conducted by ballot.

Dr. Linda Bleicken (Acting Provost) stated: "The Senate might be interested to know that last year the Deans' Council met with the Senate Executive Committee and a proposal that was somewhat similar to this was forwarded to the members of the Senate Executive Committee by the Deans' Council. The Deans' Council had heard at some point that there were members of the Senate who may feel intimidated about speaking out on issues given that there were a number of administrators sitting around the table. So the proposal that was suggested to the Senate Executive Committee at the time was that one Dean be elected as a member of the Senate and the other Deans not sit around the table. At the time, this was greeted by the Senate Executive Committee with some consternation. And the general response was that this would signal that administrators did not have an interest in what was going on in Faculty Senate if this occurred. So I put that to you so that you know that there has been discussion of this. This is a

slightly different motion than the proposal that was made by Deans' Council last year." Dr. Patrick Novotny (CLASS) asked Dr. Mutter: "I just have a question to follow up on Dr. Bleicken's comments. I'm honing in on two words, and that is "restricting membership." It seems to me that by our votes membership is restricted. We are all mature. I think we can infer what the words "restricting membership" mean, but it seems to me in a technical sense, respectfully, that membership is restricted already in the context of votes. And so what we're talking about perhaps is something different. Would you care to respond to that?"

Dr. Mutter (CHPS) replied: "I'd like to address your issue, Patrick, by reading something I sent to Robert Warkentin on October 18th in response to his request that I explain what I meant by the term "activist Senate," which I used at the October 4th Senate meeting. This is what I wrote to Robert: "First, I must tell you that I have not enjoyed my term as a senator. I see the Faculty Senate as a reactive body, with no developed agenda of its own, no or little resources with which to advance an agenda, and weak access to decision making. These observations have dampened my interest in being an active senator. Worse still is the tense, intimidating environment of Faculty Senate

meetings. I am intimidated by the presence of some administrators who in the past have shown thinly veiled contempt in their tone of voice, facial expressions, and body language for our most vocal senators. As a junior faculty member, I never would have thought of opening my mouth in such a setting."

"I am not alone in thinking this way. When I made this same statement at a recent College of Health and Professional Studies' faculty meeting, several faculty members also said they felt this way. In my many interactions with faculty all over this campus I hear it time after time "Why do we have administrators at our Senate meetings?" I think it's a shame that the 600 or so faculty members on this campus who are principally teachers and researchers don't have a forum that is under their control and independent from administrators. The instructor/assistant professor/associate professor/professor job series is probably the largest class of employees on campus and we have no independent forum in which to think, dream, and debate our unique vision of this University. I think that's a shame."

Dr. John Averett (COST): "I'd like to raise a different point. Not so much about the merits of the issue, but the way we would go about this. In particular, we considered this in the Senate Executive Committee. And the principle point that we raised is that we will be considering all of these things at a future date anyway and do we really want to write legislation in a group like this? I would urge you to defeat this motion simply for that reason. There are other words that need clarification, such as, what a Corps of Instruction is, who is a person responsible for teaching, and I think there are a number of things that need definition. It's the sort of thing that you need to really work out in committee."

Dr. Mutter (CHPS) replied: "My response to your issue, Dr. Averett, is that it's sensible to address the issue of Senate composition before we deliberate any other structural reforms. It is



important to address who we are before we even begin to think about where we are going, and how we hope to get there. The issue of Senate composition is fundamental and should be addressed alone and before all other issues.

Dr. Charlie Crouch (CLASS) stated: " I would like to speak to one thing Patrick said earlier, and that is that politics is not only about voting, it's about symbols, and I think Larry has addressed a very important symbol. I know when I was an untenured member of this Senate I was very intimidated. Secondly, as to why not roll it into broader reform, I think Larry makes the point beautifully. We need to define ourselves before we get redefined again by another body. I think Larry's motion puts that process in step."

Dr. Janie Wilson (CLASS) stated: "And for whatever reason tonight we actually saw at least three senators explain their vote based on a question from a Dean. I don't think the Dean asked for that, but it was obviously interpreted that way. And as long as we are explaining the way we voted something is definitely wrong in this room."

Dr. Lowell Mooney (COBA) stated: " I'd like to speak against the motion. Not on the merits, although I don't agree with the motion, but I think we would be throwing away a valuable resource of information if we were to exclude administrators. I don't want us to do a piecemeal approach to this restructuring issue. The President has been meeting with us, on the SEC, monthly since he came here and he has convinced us that we really do need to address the structure of the Senate. It may be that we will recommend that the President create this committee which Larry talks about, but let's bring all that together in a complete package. Let's don't try to do this piecemeal where we do something today and then when we look at the big picture later on. Can't we give the processes that are in place now time to function? It may very well be that Larry's motion is a part of that recommendation, that overall recommendation that we bring."

Dr. Jim Bigley (CHPS) stated: "In response to that and a couple of other observations, this is not about losing resources for these meetings. These other people--the administrators and students--could sit in the gallery, they could be addressed, we want their input, we need their input, but this is our Senate and as long as it has other people as members, and administrators are members, it's not a Faculty Senate. And the rush, if it is perceived to be a rush, is that at the first meeting the President gave us the keys to a hotrod, and he said "here, go with it." We need to do that. This is the time to strike on this thing. We don't want to fold it into a bunch of other efforts. At the beginning of this meeting, he put some kind of governor on the hotrod, with his process thing, which I think is what you are referring to, but we still need to go with this. This is like throwing the kings tea in the harbor kind of thing. Or firing on Fort Sumter, if you're a Southerner."

Dr. Hal Fulmer (CLASS) stated: "I want to speak against this on a couple of points. I want to make the observation that I have been on the Senate now going on a third term. I was an untenured member on this Senate, and maybe I was fortunate because of who I had as a Dean or a Chair, I never felt intimidated and I spoke freely as an untenured member. And I want to call

your attention to the fact that you can't move administrators away from the table, and leave them in the room if intimidation is part of what's driving this document. You will have to excuse them from the room.

Now the other thing that worries me a little bit about this is we're taking students off of it. Georgia Southern has a very long and proud history of students involved in the governance of the University, and I am proud to sit as your representative on SGA. My point is is that when you do that you drive another wedge between groups on this campus that I think historically have operated quite well. And what concerns me is that what we are saying is there ought to be this significant difference between faculty and administrators. A lot of our administrators came up through the ranks. A lot of them continue to teach. And I am concerned that somehow we think that they don't have some kind of interest in what we are doing. And so, I speak against it, and hope you will, too."

Dr. Alison Morrison-Shetlar (COST) stated: "I agree with that. One of the reasons I was interested in getting on to the Senate was a fact that it was a balanced community. And that we can get input from all sorts of aspects of the University, and I would also be very sad to see that go. I think everybody has a valuable contribution to give and I would like to be able to hear that contribution."

Dr. Lane Van Tassell (AVPAA; Dean of Graduate Studies): "I want to echo the comments that Hal ended on. But let me say as a preface, I applaud Larry Mutter and others who contributed to this initiative. I think this is probably a conversation this body needs to have from time to time regardless of where it goes. But I do want to make a couple of observations, and I probably come at this from several hats. Quite frankly, I have been at this institution for a pretty long time. That brings a lot of pro and cons, perhaps, even to this discussion. But I came up through the ranks. I served six terms on this Senate. I've seen this body evolve. I've seen this body change. Not always for the better; quite frankly, one of the detriments to this body over the years has been a rather shabby record that all of us have had about coming to these meetings prepared to discuss the items on the agenda. Now, if indeed a different composition of the Corps of Instruction would change that I would be all for it, in some ways. I think there would be some very big losses, however. Secondly, I just want to make the observation that, and maybe this is the other hat, I am very troubled by what I heard tonight about the we-and-them mentality that has run through four or five major issues. And I am concerned about excluding the students. They have made this body a bit of an exception throughout the System. And so I think those are serious moves but I do think this is a conversation we need to have."

Dr. Mutter (CHPS) replied: "I think it is important for senators, voting senators, to remember whom we represent. We are elected by the Corps of Instruction of our respective Colleges to represent their concerns. The Corps of Instruction is defined in Statute as full time professors, associate professors, assistant professors, instructors, lecturers, and teaching personnel, full time research and extension personnel and duly certified librarians. I think it is important to have an SGA liaison to the Senate but, as with administrators, why should they sit as members of the

Faculty Senate when they are not elected faculty members? Simply put, the Senate should be the official domain of elected senators. All others are welcome guests, and their issues should be addressed with the endorsement of elected senators. Maybe it's all semantics anyway. Perhaps we should simply rename ourselves the University Senate. This characterization would then fit our present composition. Or is there a perspective unique to the Corps of Instruction that warrants a true Faculty Senate made up of elected faculty who convene their own meetings?

Dr. Leo Parrish (COBA) stated: "Department chairs around the table are elected. They are part of the Corps of Instruction. Is that correct?"

Dr. Mutter (CHPS) replied: "Very important point. This motion excludes all administrators from the table. If there is a weak point in this motion, it is in interpreting the term "Corps of Instruction." That is a very important issue that needs to be looked at. The way I interpret it, I don't think Chairs are considered "full-time professors, associate professors, etc." as suggested by the Statutes. I read the Corps of Instruction to preclude chairs that sit on our Senate right now. That's my reading of it, but it's an open issue."

Dr. Parrish (COBA) followed up: "You know if what we are saying is we can no longer elect chairs to the Faculty Senate, and I understand that is the response you just gave, I'm very much opposed to it. Second question: as I read this I am confused, Larry, that the motion is offered simply to get a "sense." I'm confused as to what I would be voting on."

Dr. Mutter (CHPS) replied: "I would like to clarify that. Article XII of the Statutes lays this out. We don't make any decisions here. We are simply getting a sense of the Faculty Senate's view on this issue. It then moves to the President, who must appoint a committee to review and consider this change to the Statutes. The President has the power to appoint anyone he or she wants to this committee. This committee then reviews and revises the proposal--this motion that I made--and then gives it back to the Senate for consideration. If the Senate approves it, it's still advisory to the

President. If the President buys into it, it then goes to the Chancellor. If the Chancellors buys into it, it goes to the Board of Regents. This is a very lengthy process. We are just getting a sense today of whether the Senate wants this issue forwarded in the first place."

Dr. Jake Simons (COBA) stated: "I speak against the motion because as I see it the crux of the issue is that since the administrative members are non-voting members, and since at the same time the meeting is open and we say that we encourage them to come, the question is really one of whether or not we are explicitly inviting them to come and participate. I believe that that's important for two reasons: 1) for availability to us as senators to be able to get information that we need in our deliberations, and 2) while I do acknowledge that certainly there are going to be instances where people are intimidated by the presence of someone, if there are contentious issues, I think it is equally important for the administrators to be aware of that, which they won't necessarily be unless we ask them to come and hear."

Debate was closed on the motion. The motion was defeated 19-9 with 3 abstentions.

Submitted: 11/17/2004 Approved by the Senate 11/17/2004 (sent to ad hoc committee)

## Agenda Item Request

**Title:** A Resolution to Reduce Bias Tenure and Promotion Decisions within the Unit and College on the Georgia Southern Tenure and Promotion Decisions within the Unit and College on the Georgia Southern Tenure and Promotion Decisions within the Unit and College

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

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

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

Mary Hazeldine (COBA) spoke in favor of the motion by saying that former administrators who are returning to a role as full-time faculty need to concentrate on teaching and scholarship in order to prepare for post-tenure review and shouldn’t be burdened by extra service. Bruce Grube (President) asked Welford what was meant by the word “bias” in this motion. Welford replied that former administrators who served on Departmental- and College-level Tenure and Promotion Committee often based their decisions on information that they were privy to during their administrative duties. This information was, many times, not in the package being judged by the committee. Other committee members had no way of knowing or independently verifying whether this information was true or not. Grube also wanted to know if the term “administrator” extended to include Department Chairs and Welford replied that it did. Virginia Richards (CHHS) noted that this motion would place a burden on small colleges such as CHHS where every tenured associate and full professor was needed to staff the necessary committees in the College. She further stated that the possibility of bias did not exist in her College.

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

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

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

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