

Franklin College Faculty Senate
Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, April 21, 2009

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 pm in room 250 of the Miller Learning Center, Joe Hermanowicz presiding.

Members present: J. P. Caillault, Wayne Coppins, Steve Dalton, Gauri Datta, Charles Doyle, Mario Erasmo, Ray Freeman-Lynde, Christine Haase, Joe Hermanowicz, Christopher Hocking; Philip Holmes, Thomas Houser, Edward Kipreos, John Lynch, Gordana Matic, Masaki Mori, Diana Ranson, Dawn Robinson, Paul Schliekelman, Jake Short, Eric Stabb, Roger Stahl, Mike Tiemeyer, Bram Tucker, Shuzhou Wang, Mark Wheeler.

Proxies: Adrian Burd for Charles Hopkinson; Ismailcem Budak Arpinar for Rod Canfield; Maguerite Madden for Marshall Shepherd; Amy Ross for Nik Heynen; Chris Sieving for Kristin Kundert-Gibbs.

Visitors: Ashley Brown, graduate student at Georgia Southern University; Joseph Fu, Head of the Department of Mathematics; and the members of the Bylaws Revisions Committee, Bill Barstow, Department of Biology; Brigitte Rossbacher, Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages; Adrian Burd, Department of Marine Sciences.

Members not present: Yuri Balashov, Kelly Dyer, Michael Hahn, Shane Hamilton, Roy Kennedy, Michael Kernis, Ron Miller, Kanzo Nakayama, Ron Orlando, Vladimir Popik

Approval of the minutes from the 24 Mar minutes: Eric Stabb moved, Dawn Robinson seconded; motion carried unanimously.

Presiding officer Joe Hermanowicz's remarks:

1. There was meeting of the Executive Committee of the University Council on 9 Apr 2009. In addition to routine business, the committee forwarded to the Council for vote the Compact for Responsible Scholarship that has been proposed by the Student Government Association and Teaching Academy.
2. Regrettably, Michael Kernis, Faculty Senator from the Department of Psychology, is gravely ill. Faculty senators are asked to keep Dr. Kernis in our thoughts.

Dean Stokes' remarks:

The dean discussed (a) budgetary issues resulting from the State's recently passed budget for 2009-2010, and (b) reaccreditation of the university.

Old business:

New College Bylaws: The proposed revisions to the College Bylaws were discussed by the faculty of the Franklin College at a college faculty meeting on April 7 at 3:30. Of the five articles, four generated little discussion, but suggestions were offered for Article IV about procedures for reappointment of the Department Head.

Dawn Robinson, acting on behalf of the ad hoc Bylaws Revisions Committee, first offered a motion that would allow the faculty at large to vote on each article of the revised bylaws separately.

Motion 1:

On behalf of the Bylaws Revisions Committee, I move that the Senate amend its motion of January 27, 2009 to divide the question of the revised bylaws by article.

Wayne Coppins seconded, motion carried unanimously.

Dawn Robinson then presented the following motion to formalize changes to the wording in Article IV.

Motion 2:

On behalf of the Bylaws Revisions Committee, I move that the Senate amend its motion of January 27, 2009 by incorporating the following changes to Article IV before sending to the College Faculty for a vote.

Section I. Appointment

Department Heads shall be recommended by the Dean to the President as follows:

1. The ~~Dean Faculty of the Department~~, in consultation with the ~~Dean Faculty of the Department~~, shall form a search committee consisting of no fewer than five members, and shall have the obligation of providing for appropriate minority representation and representation from the professorial ranks in the Department on the committee. ~~The Dean may choose to select members for inclusion on the committee, including other individuals from outside the department, if appropriate. The committee will include members recommended by the department and may include others from outside the department, if appropriate.~~

...

Section II. Review and Removal

1. The Department Head shall be reviewed every three years following the incumbent's appointment as Head. Service as Acting or Interim Head for a period less than one calendar year shall not be included for determination of the timing of the review. The process usually begins in the Fall Semester of the third year and must conclude by the end of that year. Before the process begins, the Dean ~~will ask must decide whether to consider reappointment of the incumbent head. If the Dean does wish to reappoint, then he or she asks~~ the incumbent head whether he or she wishes to serve another term. ~~These decisions~~ ~~The incumbent head's answer~~ will be reported to the faculty. The process may now proceed along one of three courses:

one: If the head does not wish to serve another term ~~or the Dean decides not to reappoint~~, then a search for a new head will occur in accordance with section 1.

or

Two: If the head wishes to serve another term, the Dean will then ask whether any other faculty in the department also wish to serve as head.

...

4. The Dean may initiate a review of a Department Head at any time. The ~~review may~~ shall include consultation with departmental faculty members (and may include consultation with others, such as staff, students, and alumni).

Mark Wheeler seconded, motion carried unanimously.

Committee reports:

Steering Committee: Chair Thomas Houser reported discussion among the committee as to whether the Faculty Senate should vote on the composition of next year's committees (see Committee on Committees below) based on the committees as described in the newly revised bylaws or in the older bylaws. (The older bylaws describe two more committees than exist in the new

bylaws, and committees' names have been changed). The Steering Committee agreed that the Senate should vote on committees described by the revised bylaws; if the revised bylaws do not pass, then committee changes will be made to conform to the former system before the College Senate's first meeting next Fall.

Planning Committee: Chair Jake Short submitted a committee report (see Attached) detailing (a) progress on the issue of increased support for the humanities (b) the procedures necessary for changing graduate faculty status.

Curriculum committee:

1. John Lynch reported approval of 11 new courses, and 7 course changes.
2. Associate Dean Hugh Ruppensburg presented a motion from the Curriculum Committee to approve a new Asian Studies Program which would offer a Certificate in Asian Studies using existing faculty and courses. The motion was carried unanimously.

Academic Standards: Chair Mike Tiemeyer announced 9 petitions decided and 1 pending.

Committee on Committees: Chair Dawn Robinson offered the following three motions, all of which carried unanimously.

1. Motion to Approve membership in a Major Awards Committee consisting of:
Andrew Herrod, Professor of Geography, representing Social Sciences
Malcom Adams, Professor of Mathematics, representing Physical Sciences
Ellen Neidle, Professor of Microbiology, representing Biological Sciences
Leonard Ball, Professor of Music, representing Fine Arts
Ron Miller, Professor of English and African American Studies, representing Humanities
2. Motion to appoint the following chairs for Faculty Senate committees for 2009-2010.
Executive Committee: Charles Hopkinson, Marine Sciences
Planning Committee: Roger Stahl, Speech
Curriculum Committee: Ron Orlando, Chemistry
Academic Standards Committee: Kelly Dyer, Genetics
Faculty Affairs Committee: Ray Freeman-Lynde
3. Motion to appoint the following officers for the Faculty Senate for 2009-2010.
President: Eric Stabb, Microbiology
President Elect: Diana Ranson, Romance Languages

Professional Concerns and Admissions Committees report no business.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Bram Tucker, Secretary and Senator from Anthropology

Report
Committee on Planning and Evaluation
April 21, 2009

The committee concludes its work for the year on three principal matters: credit for multiple types of instruction, support for the humanities and revision of graduate faculty status.

Recommendations to the Senate on the first of these was made at the meetings of January 27 and February 24 of this year.

The committee's report on support for the humanities is not quite complete and will be submitted by 15 May 2009.

The matter of revising graduate faculty status is altogether more complicated and would, if the Senate is in favor, need to be continued next year.

The committee has devised the following language for a proposed revision of Graduate Faculty status:

All tenure-track faculty with Ph.D. or terminal degree in their field and rank of Assistant Professor or higher are automatically appointed to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Georgia and remain members of the Graduate Faculty for the duration of their appointment unless removed for cause.

All Instructors, adjunct faculty, non-tenure track academic appointments and emeritus faculty must apply for Graduate Faculty Status according to the established guidelines and procedures.

Removal for cause from the Graduate Faculty shall be according to the established procedures for removal.

As far as the committee has been able to ascertain, there are two ways of revising the policy, which is controlled by the Graduate Council. (There is, however, some ambiguity surrounding this question, which the Senate might look into.)

The first of these would be a vote within the Council itself; the second a general meeting of the Graduate Faculty.

This latter alternative is possible only with a petition to the Dean signed by at least five percent of the total Graduate Faculty, including at least five percent of the Graduate Faculty in three or more colleges or schools. A quorum for *action* by the Graduate Faculty requires a *majority* of the full Graduate Faculty, presumably a difficult thing to assemble.

But managing a favorable vote within the Graduate Council itself is by no means more certain than convening a general meeting. Of the *thirty* members of the Graduate Council, only *six* represent the Franklin College. Even counting—purely provisionally, as a matter of speculation—representatives from other schools and colleges falling broadly within the natural and physical sciences (Ecology, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, etc.), we find only thirteen representatives who might reasonably be expected to vote our revisions.

In neither case is there a “natural” majority for a revision that would only affect the Franklin College—a majority clearly sufficient to overcome institutional inertia, internal division and bureaucratic resistance to change.

In other words, a modification of Graduate Faculty status appears highly unlikely unless steps are taken to bring other schools and colleges, or their Graduate Council representatives, on board, whether by proposing to revise the policy for more schools and colleges, and thereby gain a majority, or by persuading the representatives of other schools and colleges fundamentally to act on behalf of the Franklin College.

Either scenario suggests the need for communication with colleagues in other schools and colleges, for more knowledge about the workings of the Graduate Council and some cultivation of relations with its members, our own or other representatives.

If the Senate is in favor of pursuing this, the committee recommends some general discussion of tactics and approach and, therefore, a deferral of this matter until August 2009.