

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate

9-19-2003

Revised Graduate Faculty Model 9-19-2003

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 9-19-2003" (2003). *Faculty Senate Index*. 480.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/480>

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: Motion to table and send back committee was approved 10/16/2003

Not Approved by the Senate:

Approved by the President:

Nor Approved by the President:

Revised Graduate Faculty Model 9-19-2003

Submitted by: Richard Flynn

9/19/2003

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 now revised the graduate committee model to make it consistent with the motions passed at the June 25, 2003, meeting of the Faculty Senate. That revision has been posted on the Senate web page in order to give Senators ample time to review it, and it may be viewed directly at http://www2.gasou.edu/FacultySenate/Graduate_Faculty_Status_Model_Final_Revision.pdf. Because consideration is likely to take some time, we ask that it be scheduled as a regular agenda item.

Senate Response:

Revised Graduate Faculty Model (to be brought off the table): Graduate Committee Chair Richard Flynn (CLASS): Flynn (CLASS) moved that the matter be brought off the table. The motion was seconded and passed. Flynn (CLASS) noted that the proposed document represents a streamlined process for application to the graduate faculty. It removes the need for submitting volumes of material and reduces the application

package to departmental recommendation and the applicant's CV. The new model also provides greater autonomy and flexibility for departments to recommend graduate faculty. The basic requirements are: an earned terminal degree, potential for or demonstrated ability to teach graduate courses, potential for or demonstrated involvement in graduate programming and curriculum (including advising and directing student research), and potential for or demonstrated evidence of scholarly activity. The new model removes the Associate Graduate Faculty category, and has two categories of membership: member and affiliate member (for those who might be in private business or not full-time employees of Georgia Southern, etc.) Finally, although one must be a member of the graduate faculty to direct a thesis, the document leaves the assignment of such to the departments. There is a grandfather clause such that all current associate and full graduate members will become members and all current temporary members will become affiliate members. The relatively high number of signatures required stems from accrediting requirements in certain colleges. Flynn (CLASS) moved for acceptance of the document. The motion was seconded and opened for discussion.

Michael Moore (COE) questioned the wording "allow departments to develop additional criteria for Graduate Faculty, and the Graduate Committee approve these criteria" on page two of the document, expressing concern that faculty could be excluded from this decision-making process. He also wondered, since the current criteria had, for a long while, been used as a de facto criteria for promotion, if there was potential for that to continue. He speculated that this could become very 'turf protection' oriented and also expressed concern regarding who determines the "potential" because it could end up not being faculty-driven at all.

There was discussion between Flynn (CLASS), Moore (COE) and Mark Edwards (COST) that culminated in the clarification that the Graduate Committee, which is entirely composed of faculty, and not the Graduate College would be approving any additional criteria.

Edwards (COST) asked what would happen in the event of a negative recommendation for Graduate Faculty status (i.e., feedback for someone who is turned down), and Flynn (CLASS) offered that once it was approved at the department level, and after leaving the Dean's office, the assumption was that the Graduate Committee would essentially serve to rubber stamp it.

There then ensued a lengthy discussion on consistency in the wording of the document, specifically the use of "approved" in some places, and "endorsed" in others, as well as

whether an attached flow-chart was officially part of the document. Bob Cook (CIT) noted that this 'online' editing was becoming less than productive and moved to table, which was seconded, and approved by a 20-16 vote. The document was sent back to committee for revision.