

2-9-2005

Student Fees Attached to Courses or Academic Programs

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

Georgia Southern University, "Student Fees Attached to Courses or Academic Programs" (2005). *Faculty Senate Index*. 594.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/594>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents 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: 3/23/2005

Not Approved by the Senate:

Approved by the President: 3/28/2005

Not Approved by the President:

Student Fees Attached to Courses or Programs

Submitted by: Michael Moore

2/9/2005

Motion:

Be it resolved that student fees attached to courses or academic programs (with the exception of breakage fees, lab fees, and PEA Activity fees under fifty dollars) follow the same process as any course or program change for approval as specified in the Faculty Handbook.

Rationale:

The addition of student fees associated with courses or academic programs ARE changes to courses and programs and impact all stakeholders, students, faculty, and administration. When there are changes to courses or programs, these must go through college curriculum committees, undergraduate or graduate councils, and via these minutes to the Faculty Senate, and then as recommendations to the President.

The Faculty Handbook, page 20 and 21, Article IV - Committees, Standing Committees, Section 9, a) clearly states, "recommend to the Faculty Senate policy and procedures concerning undergraduate programs and curricula; review and approve all changes in undergraduate courses, major and minor programs, emphasis, concentration and degrees; and maintain continuous review of all undergraduate academic programs.

Further, the Faculty Handbook on page 28, 203.02, number 3 states that we “have a right to criticize and seek alteration of both academic and nonacademic University regulations and policies, whether or not [we] are directly affected,” When as a faculty are unaware of these changes we cannot exercise this charge.

Recent events concerning student fees associated with a course and a program have demonstrated that we cannot address issues that we do not know about.

Response:

Minutes: March 23, 2005:

Michael Moore (COE) submitted an agenda request concerning student fees attached to courses or programs. The SEC unanimously approved that and it appears as item number eight on today's agenda.

Motion from Michael Moore: Student Fees Attached to Courses or Programs Michael Moore introduced a motion which read as follows:

“Be it resolved that student fees attached to courses or academic programs (with the exception of breakage fees, lab fees and PEA Activity Fees under \$50) follow the same process as a course or program change for approval as specified in the Faculty Handbook.”

The motion was seconded and, when recognized, Moore immediately amended his motion to removed the parenthetical phrase so that his motion now read

“Be it resolved that student fees attached to courses or academic follow the same process as a course or program change for approval as specified in the Faculty Handbook.”

Moore argued that the addition of a course fee of \$250 for Student Teachers was a change that impacted the curriculum and thus should face the same approval process that all such curriculum changes. This procedure, Moore argued, was in the spirit of shared governance advocated by University administration.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins asked for discussion and first called on Pat Walker (CLASS). Walker, a member of the Art department noted that almost all art courses had fees attached to them. For some of these courses, the fees were determined by the market

value of the materials purchased for use in the course. Walker worried that the Art Department would have to go back to the Undergraduate Committee for approval every time the market value of these materials changed. This would lead to a whole new layer of bureaucracy to be negotiated in order to set fees for all of their courses.

Candy Schille (CLASS) asked whether a distinction in the objection being made between adding a new course fee and setting the size of the fee. Moore noted that the course revision form asked for course-fee information and so it seemed that both items should be considered.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) expressed concern about the extra bureaucracy introduced by the motion.

Kim Ruebel (COE) stated that the Student Teaching fee that motivated the Moore motion had been discussed over a year's time before it was implemented.

Ming Fang He (COE) noted that such fees were charged at many institutions nationwide. Ming also asked Linda Bleicken (Provost) to summarize the history of this student fee. Linda Bleicken (Provost) stated that this Student Teacher fee was considered by the relevant Departmental and College committees and went through a process that was appropriate for any fee change.

Virginia Richards (CHHS), a member of the Undergraduate Committee, also worried about the extra load this motion might place on this committee. Richards also disagreed with Moore on the issue of whether the addition of a fee constituted a curriculum change.

Charisse Perkins (SGA) noted that she had been approached by several students who were upset by the Student Teaching fee. She thanked Michael Moore for trying to alleviate the new financial burden being placed on the students.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) asked, if there was a space for fees on the form required for new courses, didn't this already go through the Undergraduate Committee. Jeanette called on Cindi Chance (Dean, COE) who stated that the space on the form was intended for new courses.

David Robinson (CLASS) moved to amend the already amended Moore motion to the effect that any new course that required a fee would need approval by the

Undergraduate Committee. After some objections by various senators, Robinson withdrew his motion.

Bob Cook (CIT) called the question so that a vote was taken as to whether debated on the amendment would end. This motion, which required a 2/3 majority to pass, failed.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) moved that the Moore motion be amended to add the word “new” before “student” so the that motion would read

“Be it resolved that new student fees attached to courses or academic programs follow the same process as any course or program change for approval as specified in the Faculty Handbook.”

This motion was seconded and debate continued.

Pat Walker (CLASS) wondered why the Senate should be interested in the size of course fees. Rice Jenkins stated that fee size might influence a student’s choice of major.

Godfrey Gibbison (COBA) responded that fees influenced all of our choices. Charisse Perkins (SGA) replied that course fees did indeed influence some students’ choice of major.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins (Senate Moderator) called for a vote on adding the word “new” to the Moore motion.

This motion to amend passed by voice vote. Rice Jenkins then called for a vote on the entire Moore motion: “Be it resolved that new student fees attached to courses or academic programs follow the same process as any course or program change for approval as specified in the Faculty Handbook.”

The motion passed by a one-vote margin. A hand count was taken with the Senate Moderator casting a tie-breaking vote.

President’s Response:

Following review of the recommendation adopted by the Faculty Senate at the March 23, 2005, meeting, as provided in your memo of March 25, 2005, I have approved the

motion presented by Dr. Michael Moore, which stipulates that new student fees attached to courses or academic programs follow the same process as a course or program change for approval as specified in the *Faculty Handbook*.