

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate

10-27-2003

Revised Graduate Faculty Model

Richard Flynn

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

Flynn, Richard, "Revised Graduate Faculty Model" (2003). *Faculty Senate Index*. 479.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/479>

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: 11/17/2003
Not Approved by the Senate:
Approved by the President: 12/9/2003
Nor Approved by the President:

Revised Graduate Faculty Model

Submitted by: Richard Flynn

10/27/2003

Motion:

I move that the newly revised model for graduate faculty be scheduled for a motion to take it off the table for consideration.

Rationale:

The Graduate Committee has once again revised the Graduate Faculty Model in accordance with the discussion at the October 16th Faculty Senate meeting and wishes to bring the newest version to a vote.

Senate Response:

Motion to bring off the table the Revised Graduate Faculty Model

Flynn (Chair, Graduate Committee) pointed out changes made to the Graduate Faculty Model, specifically that additional criteria and initial nomination materials, etc., will come from faculty committees within departments, schools, and colleges, and that the committee had voted to not include the flowchart as part of the document. He moved that the revised model be accepted.

Gautam Kundu (CLASS) called attention to the wording, in the second sentence, "creative scholar or creative performer in his/her discipline," and wondered what kind of scholarship was being addressed, i.e., did it refer to being innovative?

Flynn (Chair, Graduate Committee) clarified that in some departments, scholarship takes the form of performance, set design, etc., which is why the word 'creative' was included. Kundu (CLASS) noted that lack of wording concerning emeritus and wondered if they are eligible for dissertation committees? Flynn (Chair, Graduate Committee) said emeritus faculty could, if nothing else, serve on a committee as an affiliate member, as that category was meant to recognize outstanding scholars and those who are not full-time employees of Georgia Southern University.

Michael Moore (COE) was still concerned about different criteria from department to department and requested assessment after a year to see how departmental criteria were working out. Cyr (Moderator) noted as a point of procedure that if the Senate Graduate Committee is looking at and approving these criteria then that is an ongoing review process and problems can be brought to the attention of the Senate at any time.

Moore (COE) wondered if there would be publication of college and department criteria, or how that would be accessed. Flynn (Chair, Graduate Committee) offered the clarification that if a department should wish to establish criteria not included in the revised Graduate Faculty Model, those criteria would have to originate from a faculty committee, and come to the Graduate Committee for its approval at which time those criteria would undoubtedly find their way into the Senate Librarian's Report, and since actions of the Graduate Committee have to be approved separately, those criteria ultimately would have to be approved by the full Faculty Senate.

Ming Fang He (COE) called attention to Item 3, 'potential for directing student research' and requested the wording be changed to 'directing graduate program research' to avoid confusion with undergraduate students. Flynn (Chair, Graduate Committee) argued that graduate research is implied from the primary clause, which is demonstrated involvement in graduate programming, in curriculum, including advising and directing student research, and to his reading, did not imply anything but graduate research. Further discussion yielded that the fact that it was a Graduate Faculty model pretty much covered it. He (COE) followed up Moore's (COE) question regarding criteria, i.e., what is demonstrated ability, what is demonstrated involvement, how the criteria are kept consistent across the campus.

Laing (CLASS) reminded the Senate that this document had been provided to faculty well in advance of this meeting, and confirmed with Flynn (Chair, Graduate Committee) that no questions or concerns were raised to him prior to the meeting. Based on the

large number of faculty who are waiting on this document to be passed, she urged the Senate to support it, trusting that any problems that develop can be revisited in the Future. Stone (COST) queried where non-tenure track faculty would be included in this document. He noted that there are individuals across campus that have degrees and teach graduate courses, and the grandfather clause would seem to include them as affiliate members, however the list in the document does not seem to accommodate such. Edwards (COST) pointed out that the document says 'affiliate' can be used to recognize outstanding scholars including, but not limited to, and then goes on to name possible categories, so faculty members in that category could be affiliate members. Charlie Hardy (Dean, College of Graduate Studies) agreed that it seemed to cover it, but noted on the final page the clause that says requests for exceptions to the policies and procedures must be submitted to the Chair of the Graduate Committee and Dean, providing the necessary door for these faculty. Edwards (COST) moved to call the question; the revised graduate faculty model was approved.

[Graduate_Faculty_Status_Model_Final_Revision.pdf](#)