

**Meeting of the Faculty Senate, Franklin College of Arts and Sciences**  
**February 21, 2002**  
**Approved March 26, 2002**

1. Call to Order: Presiding Officer Irwin Bernstein called the meeting to order at 3:35 pm.

2 Identification of Proxies and Visitors:

Proxies: Brian Binder for Wei-Jun Cai; Jennifer Samp for Bonnie Dow (Speech Communication); Senator Ben Blount\*

(Anthropology) for Ervan Garrison (Geology); Senator Steven Grossvogel for Nina Hellerstein (Romance Languages);

Senator Stephen Valdez for Jean Martin (Music); Heinz-Bernd Schüttler for Hennig Meyer (Physics/Astro); Senator

Reinaldo Román for Claudio Saunt (History); Senator Edward Azoff for Robert Rumely (Mathematics); William B.

Whitman for Juergen Wiegel (Microbiology); and Senator Gene Wright for Alisa Luxenberg (Art).

Absent: Randolph

Clarke (Philosophy). 39 Present, 1 Absent. Visitors: John McDonald (Genetics); Rod Canfield (Computer Science);

Brahm Verma (Biological and Agricultural Engineering); and Tim Hollibough (Marine Sciences).

\*The Bylaws state that proxies must be from the same department as the senator being represented.

3. Approval of the Minutes for the meeting of 17 January, 2002 with two minor corrections

4. Comments by the Presiding Officer, Irwin Bernstein:

Officer Bernstein indicated that he had received numerous emails about the proposed changes in parking for next year.

Although it was not on the Agenda, he hoped that the Senate would have time under New Business to discuss the issue.

5. Comments by Dean Wyatt Anderson:

Dean Anderson had several remarks regarding an issue before the Professional Concerns Committee that was reported

during the last Senate meeting. He had asked the committee for advice regarding a contested non-renewal of a contract. The

Dean said that there is an extensive series of guidelines already in place for such matters. The Dean stressed that the

Professional Concerns Committee was not conducting a formal review and its activity in the current matter should not be

considered as setting any precedent.

The Dean noted that there is now a hiring freeze for all non-instructional employees. This does not affect faculty hires, but

will affect all other hires, including staff.

6. Committee Reports:

Academic Standards: Chair David Leigh (Geography) reported that the committee met on 25 January 2002. One petition

was approved and one petition was denied.

1) Excessive Withdrawals: The Academic Standards Committee had continued to discuss the perceived problem of

excessive withdrawals from courses. The committee decided to recommend that the Senate first try to work within the existing system rather than propose other solutions. The Committee proposed two resolutions, the first urging that the faculty make more appropriate use of the WF grade before and after the withdrawal date. That is, to suggest that the faculty follow the existing University guidelines and to make that clear to their students.

Question by James Anderson (Chemistry): Do you have an example of a more appropriate use of the WF?

Answer by David Leigh: For a student who is failing, or may have not taken any exams, and withdraws, a WF might be more appropriate than a blanket use of W.

Comments by Ed Azoff (Mathematics): Policy is not in fact defined. He would be very uncomfortable in such a position, especially in having to put W/WF criteria in a syllabus.

Answer by David Leigh: The intent is not to establish a fixed policy. Each faculty will still make their own decisions. We are trying to make students more aware of the possible negative consequence of a withdrawal. It is possible that if they were so aware, they may be more careful in registration and in their work during the first part of the semester.

The first motion was amended to include the last phrase. It was approved by a vote of 27 yes, 4 no, and 3 abstentions.

“The Academic Standards Committee of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences hereby resolves that faculty make more appropriate use of the WF grade. Also, we urge faculty to notify students in writing on the course syllabus that WF is a possible grade outcome, and we urge faculty to announce this in class and to provide the criteria that will be used to determine if a W or WF will be submitted.”

Chair Leigh said the second motion is intended to further alert students at the time they register. The second motion was amended and was then approved by a vote of 32 yes, 2 no, and 3 abstentions.

“We propose that a succinct statement about the possibility of receiving a WF should be printed in the “Registration Overview” section of the “Schedule of Classes” stating:

Withdrawal Policy: A possible grade for withdrawal both after and before the midpoint of the semester is a WF, which carries the same numerical grade as an F (0 points). Please read the details about the withdrawal policy given in the “Registrar’s Most Frequently Asked Questions” at the back of this booklet and in the “Bulletin”.”

Officer Bernstein said that the first motion would be considered College policy and the second motion would have to be submitted to the University Council. There were no objections to this proposal.

Admissions: No report.

Committee on Committees: No report.

Curriculum: Chair Gene Wright (Art) reported that the committee had met on 8 February. The committee approved 16

new courses and changes to 5 courses. It approved CMLT 3210 as fulfilling the College's Literature requirement; approved

proposed changes in the bulletin describing the Women's Studies minor and major, approved the proposal for a B.S.

degree in Marine Sciences, and recommended, with some reservations, approval by the Senate for both the proposed

Nanoscale Science and Engineering Center (NanoSec) and the proposed Institute of Bioinformatics (IOB). It would

propose an unrelated motion under New Business.

1) NanoSec: The committee moved that "The Senate approves of the establishment of the proposed Nanoscale Science

and Engineering Center".

Brahm Verma (Biological and Agricultural Engineering) and Heinz-Bernd Schüttler (Physics and Astronomy) described

the need for NanoSec. It will be truly interdisciplinary, it will complement and extend departmental- and college-based

initiatives, and will be important for attracting new hires in the area.

Question by Ed Azoff (Mathematics): Will departments be forced to hire in this field?

Answer by Verma: That should not be a concern. If there is pressure, it will not come from NanoSec.

There is a large

interest among the faculty of the University, as demonstrated by a large attendance at a recent symposium here. The Georgia

Research Alliance has announced support for programs in this area.

Comment: Will this be a paper Center only, like some other Centers?

Answer by Verma: The Vice President for Research reviews all Centers.

Question: Will there be joint appointments with the Center?

Answer by Verma: No

Answer by Schüttler: We do, however, anticipate that there could be joint appointments between departments for faculty

in this area.

The motion to recommend approval of NanoSec was approved unanimously, with 38 yes, 0 no, and 0 abstain.

2) IOB: The committee moved that "The Senate approves of the establishment of the proposed Institute of

Bioinformatics".

John McDonald (Genetics) described the need for the IOB. He indicated that it should have been established ten years

ago. Every biologist will have to be involved in some way with Bioinformatics if they are to remain competitive. There is

now a large overlap in the courses taught by various departments in this area and review and systemization of courses

is one goal of IOB. Instrumentation has had to be purchased by different units across campus. We need a centralized

core facility within IOB to facilitate management and oversight of new and existing equipment.

Question by William B. Whitman (Microbiology): Who are the organizers and members of the proposed

IOB? What

approvals have you obtained from departments?

Answer by McDonald: We did not list these. We did not solicit supporting letters from department heads.

Question by Robert Lund (Statistics): How would the IOB affect hires?

Answer by McDonald: It should facilitate hires. For instance, Genetics is trying to fill a position in this area and an IOB is

probably essential in filling the position with a superior candidate.

Question by Lund: Let me restate the question. Statistics feels pressure to hire in Bioinformatics, although we are already

overwhelmed in teaching existing courses unrelated to this field.

Comment by Rob Canfield (Visitor, and Head of Computer Science): There is pressure. Our department had to give

back two positions and we got one back, a junior position in Bioinformatics. Is that pressure? I have no complaint about this

particular event, but I do have concern about the process. Most new positions have been specified as to area, which is

probably about a 2-fold increase over that number in the past. A department can lose the ability to shape itself if the area of

new hires are specified by the Dean. My questions to the Senate: What does approval of the IOB mean, to what are we

really committing if we approve the IOB?

Comment by Dean Anderson: The Provost, Vice President for Research, and myself believe that Bioinformatics is a very

important field. In general, the administration has a responsibility to urge departments to hire in advancing, specific fields.

The ability to recover positions is based in part on whether they contribute to strengthening such areas. In the particular,

Statistics is being pressured. One reason is that the Jonathan Arnold (Genetics) Fungal Genome proposal was not funded

mainly because of low input from the Mathematics and the Statistics Departments. There are examples in other areas;

expanding the number of Languages taught here, for instance. Directed hires will likely increase due to all positions vacated

by retirement going back to the Provost. I believe that this process is the honest and right thing to do.

Comment by McDonald: There is also external pressure by granting agencies.

Comment by Ed Azoff (Mathematics): The Dean had defined reality. But there is still the question of the degree to which

the administration affects the composition and direction of departments.

Answer by Dean Anderson: I did not invent this. It does not mean that all such positions will be specified, but some

directions will be. Positions are not vested anywhere. UGA in fact does much less of this than most places. Here we have

lots of departmental input as to their perceived needs and new directions.

Comment by Officer Bernstein: There are two issues being discussed here. The first is the merits of the IOB. The second

is administrative policy, which I encourage should be addressed later.

Comment by Whitman: This proposal is completely anonymous. There is no list of committee members, no letters of support.

Question: What are the ongoing costs of the IOB?

Answer by McDonald: There are none in 2002-03. Only the core facility will require some funds for new

equipment.

Question by Glenn Galau (Botany): Does the core facility already exist?

Answer by McDonald: Yes, it is in UCNS space. There will be no cost associated with that.

Question: What are long term plans, objectives?

Answer by McDonald: 1) Determine how the core facility will be run and what it contains. 2)

Coordination of courses

and possibly in the long term to create a Ph.D. program in Bioinformatics. 3) Facilitate and integrate with other programs at

our sister institutions in the state, in particular at Georgia Tech, which has already started. 4) Establish summer teaching institutes.

Motion by Elissa R. Henken (English): I move to table the motion until we have more information and departmental approvals.

The motion was seconded and the motion to table was approved with 15 yes, 13 no, and 4 abstains.

Officer Bernstein: The proposal is sent back to the Curriculum Committee with the charge that they request this information.

3) B.S. in Marine Science: The committee moved that “The Senate approves of the proposed B.S. degree in Marine Sciences”.

Without discussion, the motion to approve was passed with 34 yes, 0 no, 0 abstains.

Visitor Tim Hollibaugh (Marine Sciences) thanked the Senate for its action.

Planning: No report.

Professional Concerns: Chair Ben Blount (Anthropology) reported that the Professional Concerns Committee had met

several times about the non-renewal of contract. The committee was trying to discover information. He also emphasized that no precedent was being set by the committee’s meetings.

The Senate had asked that the committee get a response to the Senate’s two motions concerning parking during

football weekends, which had been sent earlier to several offices and entities. No response has been obtained, but the

motions apparently were on the agenda of a meeting of the Taskforce on Parking, headed by Jennifer Tougas, Assistant

Manger of Parking Services.

7. Old Business: None.

8. New Business:

Officer Bernstein asked Steering to direct Professional Concerns to study the new parking policy, in particular to get its

details and if any response should be coordinated.

John Brewer (Biochemistry and Molecular Biology) submitted a copy of a petition regarding access to new journals in the

Science Library. It was directed by Steering to Professional Concerns.

9. Meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm.

Submitted by Glenn Galau