

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

**Senators present:** Paula Adams (LIB), Becky Becker (COA), Greg Blalock (COEHP), Pat Duttera (COEHP), Josh Eyer (COLS), Bonita Fluornoy (COEHP), Pat Hogan (COBCS), Susan Hrach (COLS), Rita Jones (COBCS), Stephanie Lewis (COEHP), Brenda May-Ito (COA), Nick Norwood (COLS), Lisa Oberlander (COA), Neal Rogers (COBCS), David Schwimmer (COLS), Kimberly Shaw (COLS), Gary Sprayberry (COLS), Sandra Stratford (LIB), John Studstill (COLS), Paul Vaillancourt (COA), Dan VanKley (COLS), Troy Vidal (COLS), Elizabeth Wurz (COLS), Jeff Zuiderveen (COLS)

**Guests Present:** At least 26 guests, including Provost Inessa Levi, Angela Green, Noah Roderick, Joseph McCallus, Erma Banks, Alyce Cook, Laurie Jones, John Lester, Gary Wortley, Jim Owen, Brian Schwartz, Harlan Hendricks, Dan Ross, Carole Burke, Bill Frazier, Ely Klar, Pat McHenry, Tom Helton.

## 1. Report from the Provost's Office

The Provost reported that she had several items of update.

- She offered congratulations to Nursing Faculty for a successful accreditation visit recently.
- The Provost also thanked Dr Domin and his group, which have been working on Organizational/Social Research Center. They are now working on an internal search for a Director of this Center, which will provide an exciting opportunity for faculty and students to work together.
- At the last meeting, the Senate asked for a budget update. The state senate is meeting tomorrow (4/6), so after tomorrow we should have a better idea. After the state budget recommendations are clear, BOR will meet and decide on issues regarding tuition and budget allocation. However, the Provost's understanding is that we will have information about the budget by the end of April.
- The scuttlebutt about the budget is that we probably will have a state budget reduction, most probably between 1 and 5% of the state funding budget for the University System of Georgia. The Provost distributed handout illustrating funding levels. **Copy of handout posted separately.** It is likely that the total cut to the USG is going to be between \$150-200M. The handout that we were given, was given by the System Office to University Presidents. Projected state tuition and funds across the university system in first page; second page should have been same data, adjusted for inflation (\$9582 for 1<sup>st</sup> projection; \$5532 for inflation adjusted value of \$6251). These are amounts of money available on average per student across the USG.
- There are some positives about the developing budget. Because of various changes in system, the way we count full time enrollment, and because of termination of fixed-for-four, we expect an increase of 1.4% in tuition budget assuming no change in tuition rates.
- While we were asked to create our state reduction plan assuming tuition would be flat, it is commonly understood that there will be a tuition increase. The news is more positive than we had about a month ago, but we do not know yet.
- In the mean time, some updates on CSU budget. For the first time in the history of the university, the Academic Affairs budget stayed entirely within Academic Affairs. Deans

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

were asked to develop Position Description for the Provost/VPAA during the search last year, and they asked for a vocal advocate for Academic Affairs.

- The Provost's office was able to award close to \$220k this year to support faculty development, faculty/student work, and work on strategic initiatives. This is a tremendous example of shared governance in action, because funds were distributed by faculty committees. At the beginning of the year, senate committee developed undergraduate research grants, and Dr. S. Khan and committee worked diligently in order to do so: 77 individual grants awarded. If it wasn't for the faculty, nothing would have happened. Committee reported numbers of awards and applications, awards given according to committee recommendation. The Provost expressed her thanks to the committee, and to all those who wrote proposals. Provost provided summary handout, pasted in this document as an appendix.
  - The Provost stated a commitment to continue this program. We do not have set funding for this – funds this year came from lapsed salaries, which is one time money, so couldn't be used for raises. Will find the money to continue it next year.
  - Because of tight budget year at work and strategic plans developed this year, we were able to create a number of new positions and fill existing positions, and also had setbacks causing us to close a few searches.
  - The Provost provided a list of new positions:
    - Geography/GIS (to develop GIS concentration in masters program in history, eventual geography major, GIS center)
    - Spanish/classical/modern languages dept – convert full time temp to tenure track
    - Political Science completed search for existing position, and is searching for new position supporting environmental policy and the MPA. Position supported by MPA differential tuition money
    - MPA tuition also supporting Criminal Justice
    - closed search in Psychology. Provost committed to reopen search next year, pending funding – more humane to close search at this time
    - Business had 2 searches for new positions in the organizational leadership masters program (through private funds); and an ongoing search for an endowed chair
    - closed search in Business Law;
    - Funds for nursing position to support accreditation
    - position in Ed Foundations to support doctoral degree and in exercise science to support enrollments
    - in Arts, development efforts here are significant, and positions are often partly funded by endowments – chair in piano, director of orchestra, art education position to support accreditation, chair of theater, wind ensemble position is a replacement position; tenure track position in voice replaced with temporary position (to support budget reductions), cello position.
    - The Provost's Office is leading by example in budget reductions. They have closed the search for Graduate Education Associate Provost; they are transferring staff to COLS to support a vacancy due to retirement. The search for a Director for Grants continues, as this position is important in current economic times.

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

- The Provost distributed **another handout, reproduced at the end of these minutes**, announcing that the President's Office is looking into the development of a new rotating position in President's Office: a Faculty Executive Assistant to the President. This position will be for 1 year, or longer with mutual agreement. The Provost asked senators to provide feedback about this job description. It will be a 12 month position, with a ½ teaching load. The administration will wait until the next senate meeting to take feedback, will post the position after that.
- Strategic plan update. The current plan goes to 2012, and it is now 2010. Later this year we will start conversations about a new structure to start working on strategic plan 2012 for next time frame. It is possible that revisions to current plan will also be discussed. Asking System Office for assistance in structuring discussions, looking forward to having ongoing productive discussions.  
Question: why is current plan only through 2012? Answer – things develop fast. And we have since had large budget reductions.

## 2. Announcements from the Senate Executive Officer

- State bill 308 update: Senate needs to hear from more of you about whether or not to endorse the Behavior Analysis and Recommendations Team (BART) recommendations. Bill 308 removes current restrictions, and is expected to pass quickly. BART has put in place the language we need to maintain our current restrictions. We are asking for you to endorse recommendations to continue existing regulations, or not. This is not the moment to suggestion revisions, although we can certainly do so later. But we need to have something on our books quickly in order to maintain restrictions.  
Comment: don't see the urgency, it's not as if firearms dealers are waiting off campus. Some of the wording would also eliminate my lab equipment.  
Response: We need to vote to endorse or not –  
Question: If we do endorse the proposal, are we voting to bring firearms on campus?  
Response: No.  
Comment: Phrasing would mess up chemistry or biology labs. No – pocket knives, etc are limitations for students, not faculty.  
Comment: Weapons are defined in the document. Some of these items are art equipment and science equipment. (JZ and DS)  
Response: Those are what is currently in state law. Those are the rules we are currently operating under. If you want to make it an item of business to clarify these rules, that's appropriate. But if we do not endorse this, it will be legal for a student to come on campus with a firearm.  
Comment: Not true, they would have to have firearms licenses.  
Response: It was the opinion of BART that if we don't do this, it will be unnecessarily complicated.  
Comment: I was reading this as there is a policy, but there are places where it does not appear, and endorsing this would publicize it more effectively.  
Comment: If we could follow up on email voting, I'd appreciate it.
- The Senate will need to meet on April 19, 3-5pm. The meeting will either be here or in Schuster. Our agenda is already full with committee reports, consultant branding reports, and more.

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

- Follow up on issues regarding shared governance since our meeting on March 22<sup>nd</sup>. At that time, there was another request for us to follow up on what measures had been put in place to mediate between the faculty and the administration. As you recall, there was a visit from Dr. Portch with Dr. Mescon and Dr. Levi on March 15<sup>th</sup>. There was a suggestion that we touch base with BOR again to find out how this process was coming along. The Executive Committee was also still fielding a lot of requests for vote of confidence or no confidence. The Executive Officer therefore spoke with Dr. Herbst at BOR. Dr. Hrach indicated to her that there are still a large number of faculty interested in vote of confidence/no confidence. Dr. Herbst responded that, from system perspective, actions of Faculty Senates are independent, and BOR will not attempt to interfere with such a vote. The responsibility of tenured faculty members sometimes involves conflict with administration, and faculty need to be prepared to do so if Governance is not proceeding in a way that we as tenured faculty would like. Dr. Herbst recommended that before we conduct such a vote, that the Executive Committee meet with the President to discuss the grounds for having such a vote. Last Monday, (March 29) the Executive Committee met with Dr Mescon. The Executive Officer asked that Senators hold off on comments, questions, until we deal with other items on agenda.
  - Dr. Mescon wanted to have us share our thoughts with the Senate as well. He was eager to resolve particular issues. The Executive Committee explained that the particular issues that need to be resolved were perhaps not so important as the larger, more deeply rooted issues, such as a long-standing institutional culture invested in grassroots decision-making, and suggested that perhaps his instinctive leadership style has been a source of conflict. This is not unique to CSU. The Executive Officer cited in that meeting that nationally, there is also an ideological clash over what a university should be, and the appropriate governance model. Conversation then moved on to include particular issues.
  - The President asked for a list of prioritized issues, and we said we would discuss that with Senate, but we already have resolutions with no official response from the administration. Task Force on Faculty Performance and Engagement appears to be given broader scope, such as when there might be changes in criteria, if there is transition period. The second item was the library resolution. Dr. Mescon is meeting with Interim director trying to understand history. It was clear to him that faculty are supportive of library-faculty ties to academics.
  - It is difficult to convey sense of meeting. Initial remarks made by Dr. Mescon were very conciliatory, as he acknowledged mistakes and the need to have better discussion on campus about decisions, and asked for areas of particular concern. However, as we raised particular issues, he started becoming more argumentative, to what extent problems were real or whether mistakes were made. For example, we discussed the climate of fear of retribution among faculty. His first response there was that this isn't so. As we pressed the issue, he eventually acknowledged that the perception is there, but claims never personally engaged in retribution. We had to argue every point, and the end of the meeting was ambiguous.
  - When we asked the President if he expected these decisions to be so upsetting to faculty, he said no.

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

- When discussion was about composition of task forces, committees, and why we wish to include regular faculty and not just admin faculty, - he didn't seem to understand, but acknowledged perspective.
- The meeting became more argumentative as it went on, and he didn't seem to be understanding our points.

Question: What about library contracts? Response: Didn't seem to know about the problem. Dr. Levi volunteered that she would update this later in the meeting.

### 3. Old Business

- a. Evaluation of Administrators (COEHP representation, language of resolution re: chairs' results)
- COEHP has asked a faculty member not on Senate (Rochelle "Ricky" Ripple) be accepted as a member of the committee. Moved by Senator Duttera, seconded by Senator Adams. Motion passes with one abstain.
  - In language in resolution, results of evaluation are currently being reported such that the Department Chair evaluations given to all faculty in their College, instead of all in their Department. Do we wish to let this stand?  
Senator Schwimmer moved that we restrict reporting of chairs to those in department only. Senator Jones seconds. Motion passes.
  - Question: We had talked about doing this evaluation on Survey Monkey, since it should be anonymous. In conversation with someone who uses it frequently, they commented that if you don't capture IP address, a person can fill out multiple evaluations. However, if you do capture it, anonymity goes away.  
Response: there are problems with Survey Monkey and any other survey option you pick. IP address capture doesn't prevent you from going to every computer in a lab. It would prevent someone from accidentally voting twice. It was the Committee's view was that we didn't have a good way to protect anonymity concerns, and so this was the compromise the committee opted for.
  - Dr. Levi commented: During the last meeting of Presidents of the System, there was a discussion about cycles of evaluation of upper administration. They discussed a cycle of 3 years for new administrators, then every 5 years after that. It is important for all of us to be aligned with BOR policy. She cited BOR policy 3.2.4 on faculty rules and regulations, and 2.5.2, and asked Senators to please review them. *Those sections have been cut and pasted from BOR policy, on 5 April 2010 below.*
- .....

### 4. New Business

- a. Report from Performance and Engagement Task Force  
Task force has only met once since the public forums, will meet again on Friday the 9<sup>th</sup> of April. Nothing more to report at this time.  
Comment: The Executive Committee was interested in what will happen after The Task Force makes its' final report. Several potential resolutions were distributed to Senators, and discussion paused to allow senators to review suggestions and then discuss.  
Senator Zuiderveen moved that the Senate accept all three resolutions. Seconded by Senator Eyler.  
Text of resolutions as distributed is as follows:

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

## Resolutions:

1. Faculty who received the approval of their Deans for tenure and/or promotion under the standards in place at the time of their pre-tenure review but were denied in Fall 2009 at the Provost's level deserve appropriate redress. Being given another opportunity to apply for promotion and/or tenure in 2010 is not sufficient redress. Those who applied for promotion and tenure in 2009-10 should be evaluated on the standards in effect during their last pre-tenure, tenure, or post-tenure review

2. Any proposal of new standards for promotion and tenure made by the Provost must be brought to the Faculty Senate for a vote of endorsement and then to the faculty as a whole for a vote of approval. Faculty must be given at least one week to review the proposal before a vote takes place.

3. Any new standards approved by the faculty should not be put into effect until Academic Year 2011-12. Those applying for promotion and tenure in 2010-11 should be evaluated on the standards in effect during their last pre-tenure, tenure, or post-tenure review.

Dr. Levi stated that she wanted to remind all of BOR policies, particularly the role of president in BOR policy 2.5.3. She further stated that our own statutes have parallel sections, but not exactly similar, since we quote older versions of policy. She further cited BOR policies 2.5.2, 2.5.1, and 3.2.4.

3.2.4 – cited above

2.5.2 – cited above

Question to Dr. Levi: Can you clarify –are you saying that our policy doesn't quote BOR?

Response: Yes,

Comment: But statutes describe policy for awarding tenure.

Dr. Levi responded: our current statutes parallel BOR statutes, but not word for word.

Comment: The ones that are published are the ones that faculty were working under.

Dr. Levi responded: That's not what I'm saying. Yes, many of our statutes are out of date, like references to "fall quarter". In any case, the BOR manual supercedes any university level documents.

Question: If the BOR trumps ours, why do we even have any?

Response: We can add onto the BOR policy, but if there is a conflict, theirs wins.

Comment: Even BOR policy says faculty should be evaluated on published criteria.

Comment: A motion was made for senate to accept 3 resolutions.

Question: In January and February 2009, each department and college did review its' standards of excellence, and were required to sent them to BOR. As far as we know, these were the last ones sent. Have there been others sent since then?

Dr. Levi responds: First of all, I have no direct knowledge of that. BOR understands we are working on revisions to our policies now. A draft of the document produced by Task Force was shared with System Office for comment and feedback. Sent annotated feedback to task force to review also, in terms of alignment with system policy.

Comment: move that we pass this in general, then look at statutes the Provost referred to. (No second.)

Note: At this point, a senator looked up the BOR policies named by the Provost and read policies 2.5.1 and 2.5.2 aloud to those assembled. The other BOR policies cited by the

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

*Provost were not read aloud, but have been included after the minutes conclude in this document for reference.*

## 2.5.1 Executive Head of Institution

The president of each USG institution shall be the executive head of the institution and of all its departments, and shall exercise such supervision and direction as will promote the efficient operation of the institution. The president shall be responsible to the Chancellor for the operation and management of the institution, and for the execution of all directives of the Board and the Chancellor. The president's discretionary powers shall be broad enough to enable him/her to discharge these responsibilities (BoR Minutes, 1972-74, pp. 69-71; 1977-78, pp. 167-168; April, 2007, pp. 76-77).

[http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section2/policy/2.5\\_presidential\\_authority\\_and\\_responsibilities/#p2.5.1\\_executive\\_head\\_of\\_institution](http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section2/policy/2.5_presidential_authority_and_responsibilities/#p2.5.1_executive_head_of_institution)

## 2.5.2 Ex-Officio Faculty Chair

The president shall be the ex-officio chair of the faculty and may preside at meetings of the faculty. The president and/or the president's designee shall be a member of all faculties and other academic bodies within the institution. He/she shall decide all questions of jurisdiction, not otherwise defined by the Chancellor, of the several councils, faculties, and officers.

The president shall have the right to call meetings of any council, faculty, or committee at his/her institution at any time. The president shall have the power to veto any act of any council, faculty, or committee of his/her institution but, in doing so, shall transmit to the proper officer a written statement of the reason for such veto. A copy of each veto statement shall be transmitted to the Chancellor.

At those institutions that have a council, senate, assembly, or any such body, the president or the president's designee may chair such body and preside at its meetings. The president shall be the official medium of communication between the faculty and the Chancellor and between the council, senate, assembly, or any such body and the Chancellor (BoR Minutes, 1993-94, p. 239; April, 2007).

[http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section2/policy/2.5\\_presidential\\_authority\\_and\\_responsibilities/#p2.5.2\\_ex-officio\\_faculty\\_chair](http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section2/policy/2.5_presidential_authority_and_responsibilities/#p2.5.2_ex-officio_faculty_chair)

## 2.5.3 Personnel Policies

The president shall be responsible for the initial appointment of faculty members and administrative employees of each institution, the salary and all promotions of each, and be authorized to make all reappointments of faculty members and administrative employees, except as otherwise specified in this Policy Manual. The president has the right and authority to grant leaves of absence for up to one (1) year for members of the faculty for study at other institutions or for such reasons as the president may deem proper.

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

He/she shall make an annual report to the Board, through the Chancellor or his/her designee, of the condition of the institution under his/her leadership (BoR Minutes, February, 2007).

The president of each institution, or his/her designee, is authorized to accept on behalf of the Board the resignation of any employee of his/her institution (BoR Minutes, 1977-78, p. 123; 1982-83, p. 225).

[http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section2/policy/2.5\\_presidential\\_authority\\_and\\_responsibilities/#p2.5.3\\_personnel\\_policies](http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section2/policy/2.5_presidential_authority_and_responsibilities/#p2.5.3_personnel_policies)

Not read aloud, but referenced during the meeting:

## 3.2.4 Faculty Rules and Regulations

The faculty, or the council, senate, assembly, or such other comparable body, shall, subject to the approval of the president of the institution:

1. Make statutes, rules, and regulations for its governance and for that of the students;
2. Provide such committees as may be required;
3. Prescribe regulations regarding admission, suspension, expulsion, classes, courses of study, and requirements for graduation; and,
4. 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 also have primary responsibility for those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process, subject to the approval of the president of the institution. (BoR Minutes, 1986- 87, p. 333).

[http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section3/policy/3.2\\_faculties/#p3.2.4\\_faculty\\_rules\\_and\\_regulations](http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section3/policy/3.2_faculties/#p3.2.4_faculty_rules_and_regulations)

.....

Comment: I don't see how the first two policies have any bearing here – they are just a description of the office of the President. The problem is that a new set of criteria were applied after promotion and tenure dossiers left the Dean's office.

Comment: We can't have people reading minds. We must go by written policy. If you want to change it, fine. But the written policy is what the problem is. Resolutions numbered 1 and 2 are reasonable; in resolution 3, the 2011/2012 piece may or may not be needed. Recommend we adopt first two only.

Comment: It is not sufficient just to give people another chance. They need more than time to retool to new expectations. Just because they now know new standards are coming, doesn't mean they will have time to get it done sooner than this.

Comment: Put yourself in someone else's shoes. Faculty still don't know what the criteria will be for next year. A postponement is appropriate, since new criteria are not in place. New policy isn't written, and won't be approved until January 2011, but Promotion and Tenure applications and review happen in Fall 2010. This bases things on our standard



# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

timeline, assuming Task Force gets its work done before that time. We have to have voted on the statutes in departments before you can hold people to that.

Comment: Just because we verbally said it doesn't mean that we should be working toward it.

Comment: As the Senate, we don't have the authority to put these rules into effect. We are an advisory body only. These resolutions are suggestions to the administration.

Vote? Motion passes. All three resolutions are approved.

Provost Levi Would like to request feedback from this body, regarding the Task Force and how it will interact with departments. Would like to hear feedback for following structure: the current Task Force has 2 from each college. Would this body be interested in developing parallel task forces on each college level, serving to be advisory to deans? Task forces reporting to main task force, once main task force completes its' work?

Question: Would be more straightforward to go straight to dept level?

Comment: Don't mind idea of task force to inform college personnel committee. To have college level task force in COLS in particular, due to disparities of disciplines, would be a productive thing. Understand your comment – grassroots up is instinct.

Question: Could it still work to do dept 1<sup>st</sup>, then to college level?

Comment: I'm just thinking if you have 4-5 things for college to look at, then department can focus.

Comment: But if college discussion goes 1<sup>st</sup>, then no dept will be as disenfranchised.

Comment: Will collect further comments and forward to provost.

## b. Charging of Committees (Election Committee, Committee on Committees, Special Designation Task Force)

### Election Committee Charge:

1. how many reps each college should now have & how many seats will be vacant after the 2010 term

2. whether further breakdown among colleges is needed (for example, representation from schools within colleges)

3. if each college should perhaps elect an alternate who would be available to attend meetings and have voting privileges in the absence of a regular senator

4. how to make sure Basic Studies and Library faculty have representation, since they are outside of the college structure

5. Discuss whether colleges should elect an alternate faculty senate member who may attend meetings, and vote, as a representative for a Faculty Senator from their college who cannot attend.

### Committee on Committees Charge:

1. circulate request form for voluntary faculty committee assignments

2. forward committee lists to Task Force on Diversity for any suggested modifications

3. forward lists to VPAA

### Special Designation Task Force Membership:

COA: Mike McFalls (Art) and Danna Gibson (Communications)

COLS: Dan Ross (English) and Kim Shaw (Earth and Space Sciences)

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

COEHP: Jim Brewbaker (Teacher Education) and Ellen Martin (Physical Education & Exercise Science)

COBCS: Ed Bosworth (Computer Science) and Ron Kettering (Accounting & Finance)

LIB: Tom Ganzevoort (Arts Liaison)

SENATE AT-LARGE: Paul Vaillancourt (Music)

PROVOST: John Lester (Public Relations), Chip Reese (Student Affairs), Fred Cohen (Music)

The group still needs to get a student member, and needs to get community and alumni input.

Ask Dr. Levi to set date for first meeting, get them working.

Dr. Levi: don't mind setting up first meeting, but had been asking Senate to assume ownership.

Dr. Hrach agreed to call first meeting.

c. Discussion on whether to hold a Vote of Confidence/No Confidence

Discussion on vote of confidence/no confidence in leadership of university.

Dr. Hrach: stated that she was happy to share other info, entertain discussion.

Question: Is the vote for a person, an entity? What happens to it afterward?

Response: As far as what this does – it doesn't necessarily guarantee anything other than a public statement of some sort. A gesture on the part of faculty. The form of the vote itself could take different forms. One suggested is to have a simple ballot the voter would check off.

Comment: Some of the faculty would prefer that the vote be held separately.

Statement: An absent Senator asked another Senator to read a prepared statement on this issue.

That statement was as follows:

“Fellow Senators,

I am writing in response to the note on the bottom of the agenda for Monday's meeting regarding the discussion of whether or not a No Confidence vote should be taken. I will be unable to be at the meeting as I will be on a field trip out of town with my class, so I am sending you my response which may be shared.

First, I am strongly AGAINST taking a vote of no confidence at this time. My reasons for this are two-fold. First, we are developing and planning to carry out an evaluation of administrators. In this evaluation, there is a question specifically focused on this issue of confidence. It seems to me that it would be disingenuous to be planning to engage in this assessment process (including this question) and then to conduct a confidence vote prior to completing the assessment and evaluating the results. There seems to be no point when the information will be included in the assessment results.

Second, we have requested and are supposedly in the process of receiving assistance from the Board of Regents' representatives regarding shared governance. There have begun to be some attempts by upper administration to participate in a more open manner regarding information sharing and decision making. All of this is still in process. To conduct a vote of confidence at this time would be premature and, in my opinion, unwise and unfair. We must be willing to give the assistance we requested a chance to work and a "good faith" effort on our part. If we do not do this, we are not giving others what we have requested ourselves.

Thank you for sharing this information at the meeting.” End statement...

Comment by Dr. Levi: I promised earlier to give information about the status of the library faculty contracts for this year. We are in process of developing them. HR was originally

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

included in this. Pres. Mescon, Mr. George, Director of Library and Provost are meeting in a week or so to discuss current structure, including the pros and cons, and finding an amicable solution. Roberta Ford (Acting Dean) has been instrumental in locating information that is representative of other institutions in the system.

Continued comment by Dr. Levi: Wanted to comment on other things here as well: Shared governance is important question. Structural and application standpoint. Structural: there is a document that has been around since 2007? Not sure of date. It is important that conversation about shared governance include faculty, administration, and divisions different than Academic Affairs. Representative groups that can start that discussion would be very constructive. Need to ensure equitable representation of all parts of university.

Also would like to comment on task force compositions: important that we hear things from different perspectives. Faculty, administration involvement is important. Several task forces have been developed through Senate, including undergraduate research, faculty awards. Important that Faculty Performance and Engagement Task Force work be recognized – they have done outstanding work in putting first draft together. Feedback will be incorporated in final document. Working together and sharing responsibility, we have done a lot of good things this year.

She spoke before about new positions. Will also tell you that some universities opted out of any budget discussion, but we did create budget request based on colleges implementation of strategic plans, made request to state – faculty and staff salary increase #1 thing in request. Need to work together to solve these issues.

Question to Provost: Why is HR involved in a faculty contract? We are non-tenured faculty. We have been told several times that contracts were coming. Levi – no answer to why.

So they will not follow BOR format? Not true – will follow BOR policies.

Comment: on behalf on junior faculty. Would never presume to speak for all, but junior faculty are terrified. Fear, paranoia, conflict established. Specifically this is due to shakeup of tenure policies, and general lack of communication. This has very serious consequences for faculty morale. Not just about being dissatisfied, or worrying about having a job. Eventually people will leave, and go somewhere where criteria are clear and they are valued. And we lose the investment in those faculty. Shape of university has changed. Will have big turnover every few years, and we can't afford that.

Question: Someone suggested that we wait for mediation process – is there any continuing process that we know of? Dr Hrach responds: we have no info about further planned meetings. I understood a previous comment to be about the evaluation of administrators. Can you respond to the 2<sup>nd</sup> part of her comment?

Question: At our last meeting, we just approved the evaluation documents? Is there any reason to do this a week or two earlier?

Response: A vote on paper instead of on Survey Monkey, solo, has a different status. Evaluation of Administrators was first proposed a year ago. The timing is unfortunate here. But that is not a good reason to put off this vote, since evaluation is not intended to be a vote of confidence or no confidence. A vote would be public statement, and would be reported to BOR.

Comment: I'm trying to understand. The last question on the evaluation is the same as the vote. Why doesn't it carry the same weight?

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

Response: Not as rigorous a fashion, and it is not intended for that purpose. That question was designed to parallel questions on our teaching evaluations. (Is this a good teacher?) It is not a separate question from the larger evaluation.

Response: Other way to look at it, is that it can be used to check the responses. If they are drastically different, might indicate a problem.

Comment: I have only been here this year, and not at all where I expected to be. There has been a lot of push and pull. The voice of faculty carried to BOR, asking for change. Have seen some things of change, perhaps more than you. If you call for this vote, it says to the administration that faculty don't want it to get better.

Comment: I have been here 15 years. I was previously at a school that almost broke apart due to a vote like this. Some programs there still stymied. I see efforts to reach out here. I don't think we can expect him to share all our opinions. I think it is time to attend open meetings, and I don't think we lose anything by not doing this now. I appreciate that you feel you may not have been treated in the way you deserve. Some faculty not on the Senate may not be aware of these events.

Comment: This is a reason *to* vote. We *do* want it to get better. We have been through such a vote before. We were not academically strong at the time, and almost every year it has gotten a bit better. The last 1.5 years have been a disaster. When you make progress slowly and incrementally, it's easy to undo in a hurry. President himself said if you don't measure it, it doesn't matter. So we should measure it.

Comment: I am here representing my school/college. Each one of us needs to consider what our colleagues want. The only thing that matters in this question. I'm non-tenure track, and my promotion was turned down. I have my own feelings, but I am representing more than myself. Are our colleagues ready for this?

Comment: Of all those I talked to no one said don't take the vote. I asked if they understood what it meant, or if they had any objections. They did say they would be concerned about repercussions and confidentiality.

Comment: I have had faculty come to me and demand such a vote, and say the Senate needs to do its job.

Comment: As a member of shared government task force, I sat in on meetings where these issues were raised. This vote must represent everyone's voice. What are the implications of such a vote? This is not clear. What are the outcomes, benefits? I commend the Senate for taking time to do things appropriately. I am not sure if at the department level our colleagues at the grass roots level are aware of all the issues. A colleague I met on my way here was unaware of everything. Where is the scientific approach? Not sure if appropriate at this moment.

Comment: I can address a few issues: is the Senate a representative body? Not sure if any other body is representative. We may not be perfect balance of opinion, but our role is to represent faculty. Information is important. If we do have a motion to go forward, we should not have the vote until 20-21<sup>st</sup> of month, in order to disseminate information and clarify issues with colleagues.

Comment: I would add that senate has done remarkable job of communicating issues to faculty. If faculty are unaware, they are not paying attention, and that's a choice. Minutes posted quickly, and meetings have been open.

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

Comment: Senate is just voting on whether to call for a vote. Faculty have felt excluded from most important decisions. I don't see any big change in this. If Senate does not go forward, will not be further excluding faculty voices.

Senator Norwood moved that a vote of confidence/no confidence be taken. Senator Sprayberry seconded.

Comment: I think I'm one of the only ones here from the last no confidence vote, and I was new then. I don't see those issues now, and I think inter-faculty communication is better.

Dr. Hrach: We want all to vote their consciences, for or against this motion, so what's going around are paper ballots in order to be confidential.

Question: May senator vote a proxy? There are two in place.

Motion to accept proxies? Senate hasn't allowed in this in the past... makes for worrisome precedent. Opens the door to further use as precedent.

Bad precedent.

No proxies were allowed.

Vote on paper. Vote in favor of the motion 16 – 5. Motion passes.

Comment: Discuss having a college meeting series to publicize this. Have Senate publish a statement, including ramifications of the vote.

Executive committee will circulate a statement about this. Senators will need to man ballot boxes, will have attorney (Frank Martin) count ballots pro bono. Balloting locations at the two libraries. Need to circulate signups for people to sit shifts at ballot box.

Question: Who is eligible? All full time faculty only?

Senator Zuiderveen moved, and Senator Adams seconded that all full time faculty eligible. This includes non-tenure track, tenure track, even administrators with faculty status. Motion passes.

Question: Do we include deans, chairs, etc? Yes.

Senator Zuiderveen moved that there be separate ballots for the President and the Provost.

Senator Lewis seconds. Motion passes with one abstain.

Distributed by the Provost.

## Internal grant update:

- **Undergraduate research grants** (as of March 22)
  - **Fall 2009**
    - 31 Individual grants awarded
    - \$7,922 Total funds awarded
  - **Spring 2010**
    - 46 Individual grants awarded
    - \$10,797 Total funds awarded
  - **Total undergraduate research grant awards**
    - 77 Individual grants awarded
    - \$18,719 Total funds awarded
- **Additional allocations**
  - \$15,988 extra student travel allocations
- Faculty grants (as of April 1, 2010)
  - **Faculty Mentor Program:**
    - 4/8 Recommended for funding

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

- \$11,622 Total funds recommended
- **Summer Research Grants:**
  - 21/39 Recommended for funding
  - \$42,000 Total funds recommended
- **Research Equipment Grants:**
  - 3/10 Recommended for funding
  - \$26,141 Total fund recommended
- **Faculty Development Grants:**
  - Fall 2009
    - 5 Total grants awarded
    - \$15,396 Total funds awarded
  - Spring 2010
    - 6 Total grants awarded
    - \$15,859 Total funds awarded
  - Total funds awarded: \$31,255
- **Total faculty awards:**
  - 39 Total grants awarded
  - \$111,018 Total funds awarded
- **Distance learning grants** (as of March 22, 2010)
  - **Fall 2009**
    - 24 Individual grants awarded
    - \$36,500 Total funds awarded
  - **Spring 2010**
    - 27 Individual grants awarded
    - \$40,500 Total funds awarded
  - **Total distance learning grant awards**
    - 51 Individual grants awarded
    - \$77,000 Total funds awarded
- **Total funds awarded: \$222,725.**

.....  
DRAFT

FACULTY EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT

The Faculty Executive Assistant to the President, a member of the Cabinet, reports directly to the President. The Faculty Executive Assistant provides executive support to the President by acting as a key presidential liaison to a wide variety of constituents both within and outside the university, by providing feedback and advice to the President on a wide variety of issues, and by undertaking special projects as assigned by the President.

The Faculty Executive Assistant's essential duties and responsibilities are to:

- Support the President and Provost in maintaining effective and positive working relationships and lines of communication with faculty, staff, and other constituencies important to the university;
- Generate ideas, advice and solutions for the President's and the leadership team's consideration on issues important to the university;
- Represent and act on behalf of the President as directed;
- In conjunction with the Provost, monitor progress relative to the strategic plans of major campus units and advise the President on progress toward strategic goals;

# Approved minutes

5 April 2010

Faculty Senate Meeting

Meeting called to order at 3:04 pm

Approval vote completed 4/14/10

- At the President's direction, prepare and assist in preparing reports, briefings, presentations and responses;
- Chair task forces and committees as assigned by the President;
- Assist other members of the leadership team in achieving their objectives;
- Undertake other appropriate duties as assigned

The specific experience, knowledge, skills and abilities required are:

- An earned doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree, with a career history that has gained the respect of the university's faculty and staff;
- Holding a tenured faculty appointment;
- At least five years experience as a faculty member at the university;
- Capability to perform complex tasks and to prioritize multiple projects;
- Advanced verbal and written communication skills;
- Demonstrated leadership, organizational, and management skills;
- Ability to foster a cooperative work environment;
- Advanced analytical, evaluative, and objective critical thinking skills and the ability to analyze, summarize, and effectively present data;
- Strategic planning skills; and
- Exceptional interpersonal skills and the ability to interact effectively with public constituencies, senior academic leadership, faculty, students, staff, trustees, alumni, donors, and other constituencies important to the university.

Not read aloud, but referenced during the meeting:

## 3.2.4 Faculty Rules and Regulations

The faculty, or the council, senate, assembly, or such other comparable body, shall, subject to the approval of the president of the institution:

1. Make statutes, rules, and regulations for its governance and for that of the students;
2. Provide such committees as may be required;
3. Prescribe regulations regarding admission, suspension, expulsion, classes, courses of study, and requirements for graduation; and,
4. 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 also have primary responsibility for those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process, subject to the approval of the president of the institution. (BoR Minutes, 1986- 87, p. 333).

[http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section3/policy/3.2\\_faculties/#p3.2.4\\_faculty\\_rules\\_and\\_regulations](http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section3/policy/3.2_faculties/#p3.2.4_faculty_rules_and_regulations)

.....