

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate

1-29-2003

Faculty Senate Representation of the New IT College

James M. LoBue

Georgia Southern University

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



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

Recommended Citation

LoBue, James M., "Faculty Senate Representation of the New IT College" (2003). *Faculty Senate Index*. 270.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/270>

This motion request 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.

Approved by the Senate: 2/12/2003

Not Approved by the Senate:

Approved by the President: 2/18/2003

Not Approved by the President:

Faculty Senate Representation of the New IT College

Submitted by: Jim LoBue

1/29/2003

Motion:

I move that the Faculty Senate take up consideration of the proper and expedient incorporation of the new IT college into Faculty Senate and its subcommittees.

Rationale:

Faculty Senate representation is mandated by the Board of Regents in the Statutes of Georgia Southern University. With the addition of a new college it is the responsibility of the Faculty Senate to see that the dictates of the Board of Regents are carried out properly.

Response:

Reapportionment, census taking and adding the new Information Technology College: Jim LoBue (COST, Senate Elections Committee Chair) LoBue distributed a fact sheet re: faculty numbers and distribution among the colleges; the information contained therein was the best available, but was not necessarily 100% accurate (suggesting the need for a census). With Information Technology coming online this Fall, he proposed a motion that they hold a special election in August for seating of their

Senators for the first Senate meeting in September, all of this contingent on the College developing an election process; the motion was seconded.

Discussion ensued as to which issues to deal with today, and in what order. Allen (CLASS, Senate Moderator) suggested the first issue should be to move one Senator each from COST and COBA to IT; Cyr (CLASS) opined that general reapportionment was a vexed issue and we needed to get IT represented before getting into it; LoBue wanted to bypass discussion of how IT would elect anyone and where the seats would come from until it was decided that they would get 2 seats and would have some kind of election;

Mark Edwards (COST) wanted to discuss apportionment and census taking first.

Allen stepped in and proposed the Senate start with the simple – getting IT set to go – and move on to the more complex later – census taking and general reapportionment, which would require much discussion and strategic thinking. Krug (CLASS) called the question on LoBue’s motion; it was approved.

LoBue then moved to the Bylaws, wherein “five colleges” are specifically referred to several times. He presented two pages of specific revisions to remove the specific number of colleges from the language. Allen pointed out that a Bylaws amendment needed to be formally proposed for the next meeting, which would allow time for Senators to read and consider the wording before voting. Peacock (CLASS) asked how many faculty would be in IT; LoBue could only estimate about 31-32.

Carol Cornwell (CHHS) asked what “unit” referred to in the proposed revisions; LoBue answered that it referred to each college and the library, and invited proposals for clearer wording.

LoBue then noted some of the difficulties involved in apportionment and that the Bylaws and Statutes do not discuss how it is to be done. The Elections Committee is going to work up some methods and models for Senate consideration, dealing with census taking, apportionment, and the number of Senators. But that was for the future; no big changes were being contemplated for right now because they would gum up the works while getting IT online. A fair bit of discussion then ensued re: those “big changes” anyway; after some time, it became apparent why the Elections Committee needs to work up clear options for Senate consideration.

Edwards (COST) suggested we get back to the business at hand.

Cyr (CLASS) made a motion that one Senate seat each from COST and COBA be moved to IT so they'd actually have something to elect in their just approved special August election; seconded.

John Brown (COBA) pointed out that the SEC is charged with handling apportionment.

Krug (CLASS) found the language in the 2002-3 Handbook: "review and revise as appropriate the apportionment of Senators from the colleges and the library according to the Statutes."

LoBue pointed out, though, that this doesn't say how to do it.

Jim Stephens (COE) queried whether the present motion needed to address the election processes of COST and COBA.

LoBue and Allen pointed out that they would just elect one less Senator each and turnover would cover it; no one would actually be turfed out of the Senate.

Stephens suggested the motion include directions to COBA and COST to elect fewer Senators than they're used to. The friendly amendment was accepted; the amended motion was approved.