

Meeting of the Faculty Senate, Franklin College of Arts & Sciences – Jan. 19, 2006

1. Call to Order
 - a. Presiding Officer Mitch Rothstein [Mathematics] called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm in Room 2B of the Main Library. It was noted that we will continue to use this location for the foreseeable future.
2. Identification of Proxies and Visitors:
 - a. Proxies:
 - b. Absences:
 - c. Visitors: None
 - d. Total:
3. The minutes from November 17, 2005 were approved
4. Comments by the Presiding Officer, Mitch Rothstein:
 - a. Due to the scheduling of Provost Arnett Mace to address the Faculty as a whole on Feb. 20, 2006 at 3:30pm in SLC 148, he will not address the Senate specifically.
 - b. A sentence has been added to the Bylaws as discussed at the previous meeting, indicating that students will have up to one year to initiate grade appeals.
5. Comments by Dean Garnett Stokes:
 - a. Faculty recruitment is a major activity right now in many departments.
 - b. There is also significant turnover in department headships, and candidates are being identified both by external searches (including the Institute of Womens Studies, Biochemistry, and the Director of the Dodd School of Art) and internal searches as well.
 - c. A College budget proposal went to Provost Mace on January 18; this included 3 distinct budget plans. All units were asked to prepare for a 2% budget reduction and plans for mitigating the effects of the cut; they were also asked to plan for 0% growth and a “4% growth” budget.
 - d. Dean Stokes responded to questions regarding the building of the College development office.
6. Committee Reports
 - a. Committees: did not meet, nothing to report
 - b. Academic Standards – evaluated 15 appeals
 - c. The Admissions Committee reviewed 14 petitions, approved 11.
 - d. Curriculum – approved new policy
 - e. Planning – no report
 - f. Professional Concerns – no report
 - g. Steering – voted on a proposal for inserting the grade appeals statement, 5-0 in favor.
7. Academic Professionals Discussion
 - a. A survey of Academic Professionals in the College was made by the Dean’s office; 27 were identified by Assoc. Dean Ruppensburg’s survey.
 - b. 2 are Senior, 3 Associate, 22 Academic Professionals; 14 have Ph.D.
 - c. 18 were appointed as a result of faculty vote, and most were hired as result of a regional or national search.

- d. Some Academic Professionals have voting rights within department; Cell Biology, the department that originated this issue, does not grant this right.
 - e. Most are operating as though they were faculty for the most part; some faculty are also hired without a national search, at least in the past.
 - f. Salaries and benefits were not associated with this survey; there is a promotion track, but they are not tenure-track.
 - g. The question was whether the bylaws needed to be modified to provide voting rights. It appears that if no change is made, it would not affect the departments as they already have this right.
 - h. There are clear definitions of Academic Professionals on the Provost website, and this survey shows that most APs are in accordance with institutional definition.
 - i. The Senate decided no further questions or comments into this matter are necessary.
8. Discussion of Proposed New Program: M.S. in Archaeological Resource Management
- a. This proposal arose from an external program review, which recommended that the Department of Anthropology reinstitute a master's program in this subfield (the department is a Ph.D. program only in other specialties).
 - b. The M.S. has become the professional degree in American archaeology because of changes in the field in the last 25 years. UGA has not responded to this change, and this is their response, a specialty track to recognize shift.
 - c. It will be a fast-track program, lasting 12-15 months. An Academic Professional will head up the program, complemented by 5 other Faculty.
 - d. Questions and comments dealt with the potential for changes in course load of departmental faculty (they are taking advantage of courses in other departments, so no change is anticipated)
 - e. The program is supported unanimously by faculty in Anthropology
 - f. Motion to vote on approving the proposed program passed.
9. Discussion of the Grade Appeals Bylaw
- a. This discussion is to advise the Academic Standards Committee in developing the new text for the by-law with input from the office of legal affairs, Dean, and OVPI.
 - b. The deadline for the initiation of the appeal was changed at the last meeting to conform with University standards so that the student has up to one year to initiate the appeal; we can recommend to University Council that they change this.
 - c. It was discussed that one reason for shortening this time frame is that temporary instructors may move to new positions, and a shorter time frame makes it easier to connect instructors with appeals.
 - d. Legal affairs says that the language in the current University bylaws is interpreted as granting the right to the student for up to one year.
 - e. It may be important to distinguish what is meant by formal initiation, as that is not clearly defined.

- f. **Motion: The Academic Standards Committee shall recommend on behalf of the Senate, to the University Council, that the grade appeal initiation deadline be reduced to some period less than one year, and that the student make a formal request in writing that the appeal be initiated.**
- g. Motion seconded without discussion; motion carries.
- h. Further discussion is necessary regarding the simplification of both the wording of the bylaw and the appeal procedure itself. Discussion ensued regarding the “bounce-back” mechanism, whereby the effect of a decision in favor of the student at the college level is to send the appeal back to the department for reconsideration. A straw vote on the question showed ten senators in favor of keeping the bounce-back mechanism, and none opposed.

10. Meeting adjourned.