

**2012-2013 University Senate
Minutes for the 19-Apr-2013 Meeting**

University Senate Officers: Presiding Officer Catherine Whelan, Presiding Officer Elect Lyndall Muschell, Secretary Craig Turner

PRESENT Susan C. Allen, Kay Anderson, Kirk Armstrong, Andrei Barkovskii, Alex Blazer, Scott Butler, Dianne Chamblee, Jan Clark, Steve Dorman, Toi Franks, Sandra E. Godwin, Maureen Horgan, Amanda Jarriel, Josh Kitchens, Mary Magoulick, Beth McCauley, Ken McGill, Cara Meade, Julia Metzker, Brian Mumma, Michael Murphy, Lyndall Muschell, Indiren Pillay, Amy Pinney, Chris Skelton, Susan Steele, John R. Swinton, Craig Turner, Carol Ward, Catherine Whelan.

ABSENT Cody Allen, James Bridgeforth, Ben Davis, David de Posada, Bryan Marshall, Macon L. C. McGinley, Sarah Rose Remmes, Amy Sumpter.

REGRETS Ryan Brown, Carrie Cook, Jennifer Graham, Matthew Liao-Troth, Deborah MacMillan, William Miller, Leslie Moore, Jason Rich, Holley Roberts, Mike Rose, Doreen Sams, Stephen Wills.

GUESTS Robert Blumenthal *Chair, Department of Mathematics*
Kyle Cullars *Assistant Vice President of Auxiliary Services*
Walter Dudley *Assistant Director of Building Services*
Douglas A. Goings *Parliamentarian of the 2012-2013 University Senate*
Jason P. Huffman *Director of Strategic Initiatives*
Paul Jahr *Associate Vice President for Student Affairs*
Tom Ormond *Associate Provost*
Bob Orr *Chief Information Officer*
Lori Strawder *Assistant Director of Sustainability*
Elaine Whitaker *Chair, Department of English and Rhetoric*
Matthew Williams *Graduate Assistant of the 2012-2013 University Senate.*

CALL TO ORDER: Catherine Whelan, Presiding Officer of the 2012-2013 University Senate, called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

AGENDA: A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. Catherine Whelan noted that Alex Blazer would give the FAPC report for Leslie Moore, who had extended regrets. The agenda was approved as amended.

MINUTES: A draft of the minutes of the *15 Mar 2013 meeting of the 2012-2013 University Senate* had been circulated by university senate secretary, Craig Turner, to the university senate by email for review with two editorial revisions (replacing Kelli McCormack Brown with Kelli Brown and the removal of an extraneous space) and was presented (as amended with the aforementioned editorial revisions) to those present for consideration. The minutes were approved as amended.

BROADCASTING MEETINGS: Presiding Officer Catherine Whelan reminded university senators that this would be the third meeting recorded for delayed broadcast. She went on to request that all individuals, who were scheduled to provide reports at the meeting, deliver their reports from the podium into the microphone.

RECOGNITIONS:

1. Catherine Whelan noted that certificates of recognition for participating in shared governance are awarded to three groups of individuals. These groups are individuals who
 - a. serve on a senate committee who are not also university senators – called “volunteers”
 - b. are completing their term of service as a university senator – called “senators completing terms”, and
 - c. serve as a committee officer, university senate officer, or serve on Executive Committee – called “leaders.”
2. Volunteers, senators completing terms, and leaders who served as standing committee vice-chairs or secretaries received certificates at the 22 Mar 2013 standing committee meetings.

3. Catherine noted that the committee slate is populated by at least twenty volunteers and that we should extend our appreciation to those who choose to serve as volunteers. We couldn't operate without them.
4. Catherine requested that those individuals who were *senators completing terms* stand to be recognized with applause. As the applause receded, she asked individuals to remain standing for additional recognition – with more applause – if they would be continuing on the university senate by starting another term of service immediately upon conclusion of their current term.
5. Catherine then requested the individuals who served as an officer (secretary, vice-chair, chair) of a committee over the past year stand and be recognized – again with applause.
6. As the applause receded, Catherine recognized the standing committee chairs individually by asking each to come to the front of the room to receive a certificate. Those present who received certificates – and of course, applause – were Susan Steele (CAPC Chair), Maureen Horgan (RPIPC Chair), and Dianne Chamblee (SAPC Chair). Recognized in absentia were Bryan Marshall (APC Chair) and Leslie Moore (FAPC Chair).
7. Catherine recognized Jan Clark with a certificate. Jan had served as Presiding Officer of the University Senate during 2011-2012 and was a senator completing her term of service – only to start another. Catherine thanked Jan Clark for her many contributions to the Executive Committee over her three consecutive years on that committee as its Vice-Chair, Chair, and Chair Emeritus.
8. Catherine recognized Craig Turner with a certificate. Craig had served as the Secretary of the University Senate, Executive Committee, and Subcommittee on Nominations during the 2012-2013 academic year.
9. Catherine recognized Lyndall Muschell with a certificate. Lyndall had served as the Vice-Chair of the Executive Committee and Presiding Officer Elect of the University Senate during the 2012-2013 academic year and will serve as the Presiding Officer of the 2013-2014 University Senate.
10. Catherine recognized President Dorman with a certificate for embracing shared governance at the university since his arrival.

COMMITTEE REPORTS: The following committee reports were given.

1. **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE** (ECUS) – Catherine Whelan

Officers: Chair Catherine Whelan, Vice-Chair Lyndall Muschell, Secretary Craig Turner

a. **Governance Calendar**

- i. The governance calendar for the 2013-2014 academic year has recently (22 Mar 2013) been approved by the Executive Committee and is now posted at the university senate website. To access this calendar, point your browser to <http://senate.gcsu.edu>, select the *Resources* item in the menu in the left margin and scroll down and select *Governance Calendar*.
- ii. The events on this governance calendar will also be added to the <http://events.gcsu.edu> page. Once there, this calendar will be available to subscribe to as an iCalendar and the events on this calendar will just pop up in Outlook.
- iii. Among the changes to the governance calendar from 2012-2013 are the
 - 1) university senate committee meetings will be followed immediately by the joint meetings of executive committee (ECUS) with standing committee chairs (SCC) on the same Friday rather than having these meetings on consecutive Fridays as was done in 2012-2013. There are some pros and cons for those involved – a single long Friday of two consecutive meetings versus one meeting on each of two consecutive Fridays. The number of these meetings has been reduced from seven each for academic year 2012-13 to six each for academic year 2013-14.
 - 2) number of university senate meetings has also been reduced from seven per academic year to six per academic year. So there will be three meetings of the university senate and three meetings of the committees each semester, and these meetings are interwoven so that every three weeks there is either a committee

meeting (immediately followed by an ECUS/SCC meeting) or a meeting of the university senate.

- 3) department, college committee, and college meetings have been replaced with meetings designated as college meetings. The designation of these meetings (as college, college committee, and department meetings) is deferred to the discretion of the individual colleges. For the purposes of this discussion, the library is considered a college. This provides more flexibility for colleges to customize the meeting schedule. The number of these meetings has been reduced from twelve to eight per semester.

As a result of these changes, more meeting blocks are designated as *Open* during which university-wide meetings can be scheduled. The number of *Open* meeting blocks increased from two in 2012-2013 to twenty-three for 2013-2014.

- b. **MOTION 1213.EC.002.P (SERVICE RECOGNITION POLICY)** On behalf of the committee, Catherine Whelan presented the motion: *To recommend as University Policy the proposed Service Recognition Policy as outlined in the supporting document and to endorse the guidelines and procedural recommendations made therein.*

- i. **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS** Supporting documentation for Motion 1213.EC.002.P, accessible in the online motion database, was displayed on the big screen. There was only one supporting document, entitled *Service Recognition Policy*, and it includes the proposed policy with supporting guidelines and procedural recommendations.

- ii. **CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION** Catherine Whelan shared the following context.

- 1) **Concerns** The week of the recent service recognition ceremony (about a month ago now), I was inundated with emails expressing concerns. Among these were

- a) How do they determine who is recognized and when?
- b) Some people who should be recognized are not being recognized.
- c) Not recognizing all years of employees who have non-contiguous service.

- 2) **Response** I took those concerns to Dr. Dorman and we talked it through and with Lyndall Muschell's assistance, we crafted a policy that will

- a) have increased clarity in the guidelines of who is recognized
- b) be more generous with the recognition than less so
- c) address recognition lag – being recognized for n years of service late in the (n+1)st year where n = 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35 – a concern mostly expressed by members of the faculty as faculty are hired almost exclusively on the first of August. As staff members are hired throughout the year, this concern is not as common among the members of the staff.

- 3) **The Proposal** A proposal called *Service Recognition Policy* had been circulated with the agenda. This document included all the standard information called for by the policy template and included some proposed procedural recommendations.

The proposed service recognition policy

- a) advocates for all years of service being recognized including non-contiguous years of service.
- b) proposes that each year (Aug 1) all supervisors receive from Human Resources a list of the employees they supervise and their respective service times. The supervisor will be asked to consult with each employee and either confirm that the service time is accurate or provide corrections. This should result in the service time for each employee being accurately recorded in the database maintained by Human Resources.
- c) addresses the service recognition lag concern from faculty by first recognizing faculty eligible for the service recognition at the earliest opportunity – a faculty meeting in August prior to classes beginning. For

2013-2014, this is scheduled for Friday 16 Aug 2013 at 9:00 am. A variety of faculty recognitions will be made (promotions, tenures, job reassignments, new faculty), among them years of service recognitions.

- d) proposes the formal service recognition ceremony (receiving of the token of appreciation) for both faculty and staff be combined with the *State of the University* address by the University President. For 2013-2014, this address and the service recognition ceremony are presently slated for Friday 17 Jan 2014 at 2 pm with a campus reception to follow at 3:30 pm.
- iii. **DISCUSSION** The discussion included only one question of clarification from the floor fielded by Catherine Whelan.
 - 1) **Question** So to make sure I understand, traditionally this service recognition has been in April and it is now proposed to be in January and additionally faculty will be recognized in the fall, is that right? **Answer** Yes. At the fall faculty meeting, it will be something like *here's a list of names or please stand up to be recognized* and will apply to those faculty reaching the recognition milestones (10 years, 15 years, 20 years, etc.) but the service recognition ceremony where all employees (faculty and staff) reaching recognition milestones receive a token of appreciation will take place in January.
 - iv. **SENATE ACTION** Following the disposition of the one question of clarification, Motion 1213.EC.002.P was *approved* with no further discussion.

2. **ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE (APC)** – Catherine Whelan for Bryan Marshall

Officers: Chair Bryan Marshall, Vice-Chair Macon McGinley, Secretary John Sirmans

- a. **Call for APC Reporter** As Bryan Marshall was not present, Catherine Whelan asked if anyone else was able to provide the APC report. As no one was identified, Catherine Whelan presented the motion submitted by APC for senate consideration.
- b. **MOTION 1213.APC.003.P (DISTANCE EDUCATION POLICY)** On behalf of the committee, Catherine Whelan presented the motion: *To recommend as University Policy the proposed Distance Education Policy as outlined in the supporting document and to endorse the guidelines and procedural recommendation made therein.*
 - i. **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS** Supporting documentation for Motion 1213.APC.003.P, accessible in the online motion database, was displayed on the big screen. There was only one supporting document, entitled *Distance Education Policy*, and it includes the proposed policy with supporting guidelines and procedural recommendations.
 - ii. **CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION** Catherine Whelan shared the following context.
 - 1) **SACS Requirement** This document originated primarily to bring us into compliance with a SACS requirement. It was recently discovered that we do not presently have a formal distance education policy and are required by SACS to have one if we do any distance education which includes online courses and hybrid (part face-to-face delivery with distance or online components) courses.
 - iii. **DISCUSSION**
 - 1) **The Gist of the Policy** The policy that the Academic Policy Committee (APC) approved for consideration by the university senate can be distilled simply to *The online or hybrid delivery of a course is equivalent, with respect to level of rigor and academic requirements, to the traditional face-to-face delivery of that same course.*
 - 2) **Clarifying the Word “Support”**
 - a) **Questions** The formal policy statement begins with *Georgia College & State University supports distance education* but why do we? Do we have any reason to support it other than we have to have a distance education policy statement? At some time, should we not have a reason to support or

not support something of this nature? Do we know that it's of equal rigor and how would we know? Response I think our intent is to ensure that it is of equal rigor. Continuing I'm just curious as to how. I want there to be some discussion. I don't want this to just go through with a "what the heck!" I think this is important and I am not sure that this is consistent with our mission.

- b) Comparing Delivery Methods Nursing faculty were surveyed. They asked us if we have a way that we look at student outcomes and compare online delivery of a course with the face-to face delivery of the same course. So, I was wondering if that is something university faculty are going to have to do. I anticipate that nursing faculty are going to have to do this with nursing courses.
- c) Response to Comparing Delivery Methods I'm sure that, at some point in time, the accrediting body is going to ask for the proof. At this point in time, we do not have that proof. All we are locking into is a procedure for comparing face-to-face and online delivery of the same course. If you look at that process in its current form, the individuals who have the approval authority at this point in time are the department chairs. The staff of the IDEAS (Instructional Distance Education and Advanced Services) unit will review a proposed online or distance education delivery of a course with respect to structural components – not the content – of the course. The course content aspect of the review will be a judgment call by the appropriate department chair. As a part of this proposed distance education policy, there is the notion of developing procedures to get at that. I am sure that SACS will ask us that particular question. So, we are going to have to come up with some way and measure to answer that particular question. As smart as our department chairs are, SACS will still want an answer to "How do you know that these two delivery methods are equivalent with respect to the quality of educational experience?" So the earlier questions [see 2.a above] are right on.
- d) Two Different Policies I find the two sentences in the current version of the policy statement to read like two different policies: one supporting distance education and the other one requiring equivalence (rigor, level, overall educational quality) among the various delivery methods in which a course is offered. I feel that these are two separate issues and I don't know if we might want to consider them as two separate motions.
- e) APC Perspective Other members of APC can correct me if they do not share my impression, but I recall that the committee viewed the first sentence of a policy statement – *Georgia College & State University supports distance education as a way of maintaining and extending quality programs that complement traditional course offerings of the University.* – as a preamble for the second sentence – *Courses delivered in a distance education format must be equivalent in content, level, rigor, and overall educational quality to courses taught in traditional face-to-face classes.* – and considered the second sentence to be the formal policy statement.
- f) Echoing Two Different Policies I would echo what's been previously said. If I understand this right, we are under a SACS deadline to get a policy in place. The second sentence alone would do that, wouldn't it? Answer from the Floor Yes. Continuing I won't be able to support this as it is. In particular, I can't support the first sentence because it is saying that we

- support distance education and we have not had that conversation yet. But I believe that we can agree that anything that we do has to have rigor.
- g) Point of Clarification Is the first sentence, referenced as a preamble, contained in the supporting document? Answer to Clarification Yes, the two sentences – quoted in 2.e above – are the policy statement in the supporting document.
 - h) Ambiguity of Support There are two definitions of the word *support*. If we mean *support* as in *favor*, then we're probably not as comfortable with that. If, however, we mean *support* as in *uphold* or *materially support* or *allocate the resources necessary*, then I think that we are more comfortable with that. Response The latter is how I read it. I just hadn't thought about it the other way. Continuing My concern is that if we read it in the first way – to *favor* this – then I think that we are in trouble.
 - i) Point of Parliamentary Inquiry Would it be in order to make a motion to amend the proposed policy statement? Response: We can do that, if that is what you want to do.
 - j) Existing Online Programs Don't we have some fully online programs at this institution? Answer from Many Yes! Comment And we support them.
 - k) APC Perspective My recollection of the APC discussion is that the second meaning of support was the intent. Georgia College makes sure that we maintain excellence in all modes of delivery that we offer. I wonder if the ambiguity of the word support could be rectified by revising the language to read “provides support for distance education” or something to that effect.
 - l) Alternate Wording Why not just say that we maintain excellence in all modes of delivery as the first statement?
 - m) Presiding Officer If someone would like to offer a motion, go right ahead.
 - n) Motion to Amend 1 A motion *To replace the word “supports” with the word “upholds” in the first sentence of the policy statement* was made and seconded. Discussion on this motion to amend included the following.
 - (1) Other Thoughts? I would like to hear other ideas on how to revise it. I feel like we are rushing this and people aren't really sure what it means and how to say it.
 - (2) Question Does distance education include hybrid classes (part face-to-face and part online)? Response Yes! Continuing How about replacing the word “supports” with the word “includes”?
 - (3) Presiding Officer While that is possible, we still have the current motion on the floor that requires disposition.
 - (4) Question Isn't this the body that approved the fully online first doctoral program? Response from Many Yes! Continuing If we don't support distance education, why would we approve a fully online doctoral program!
 - (5) Presiding Officer Any further discussion on the motion? *Pause with no response.* Hearing none, let's vote on the motion to amend. Just to clarify we are voting on the motion to simply replace the word “supports” with the word “upholds.”
 - (6) SENATE ACTION At the conclusion of the discussion, **Motion to Amend 1 failed.**
 - o) Point of Clarification Before I consider offering a motion, is the end of this academic year the deadline for getting this policy in place to be in

compliance with the SACS requirement to have such a policy? Answer Yes Continuing So you really want this reworded and you don't want to send this back to committee to reword? Response Yes.

p) Response to Point of Clarification This is our last chance (last senate meeting) to approve a policy. As was mentioned at the outset, this is a policy that is expected to be in place by SACS, and is explicitly called for in the SACS standards.

q) Motion to Amend 2 A motion *To strike the first sentence – i.e. to strike “Georgia College & State University supports distance education as a way of maintaining and extending quality programs that complement traditional course offerings of the University.” from the policy statement –* was made and seconded. Discussion on this motion to amend included the following.

(1) SENATE ACTION After a clarification on the statement of the motion, a voice vote was taken with no resolution so a hand vote was taken and **Motion to Amend 2** was *approved* (the count of the hand vote was 19 *for* and 8 *against*) with no further deliberation.

r) Presiding Officer So the policy statement in the supporting document has been amended to remove the first sentence so that the policy is now simply the second sentence. Is there any further discussion on the motion as amended? *Pause with no response.* Hearing none, let's vote on the main motion.

iv. SENATE ACTION Motion 1213.APC.003.P was *approved as amended* by **Motion to Amend 2**. To be specific, the policy statement in the supporting document was amended from its original form of

Georgia College & State University supports distance education as a way of maintaining and extending quality programs that complement traditional course offerings of the University. Courses delivered in a distance education format must be equivalent in content, level, rigor, and overall educational quality to courses taught in traditional face-to-face classes.

to its amended form of

Courses delivered in a distance education format must be equivalent in content, level, rigor, and overall educational quality to courses taught in traditional face-to-face classes.

3. CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT POLICY COMMITTEE (CAPC) – Susan Steele

Officers: Chair Susan Steele, Vice-Chair Julia Metzker, Secretary Cara Meade

a. No Motions CAPC has no motions this month.

b. Information Items

i. DNP Program CAPC approved the renumbering of some nursing courses – specifically a course split into two courses – in the DNP (Doctor of Nursing Practice) program.

ii. Concentration CAPC approved concentrations in Economics.

iii. Semester Away CAPC approved a semester away option in Information Systems.

iv. Courtesy CAPC received as information items, just as a matter of courtesy:

- 1) a new religion course in the Department of Philosophy, and
- 2) some new graduate courses in the College of Education

v. Questions?

• Question1 Could you describe the aforementioned semester away option?

• Answer1 As I understand it – and if there is anyone here who has other information, please correct me – this is a new Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) that we have entered into with Georgia Tech that will allow students to spend a semester away – I believe in their senior year – at Georgia Tech to take some very specific Information Systems courses. It's actually called “semester away.”

- a. Question1.a Do students participating in this semester away earn a minor?
- b. Answer1a No, I think the department considers it a concentration.
- c. Clarification to Answer1 (Associate Provost Ormond) This semester away option is not considered a consortial arrangement – or formal agreement – in the sense that it does not need SACS approval. We ran this by our liaison, just to make sure.

4. **SUBCOMMITTEE ON CORE CURRICULUM** (SoCC) – John Swinton

Officers: Chair John Swinton, Vice-Chair Mary Magoulick, Secretary Kay Anderson

a. **Approvals**

- i. GC1Y: Concepts of Imaginative Thinking First Area B section to propose a team taught section by faculty across colleges (it is proposed to be taught across CoE and CoAS). This will require a policy for distributing teaching credit and FTEs across University Colleges.
 - ii. GC1Y: Public & Collective Memory approved
 - iii. Global Overlay Survey of Philosophy approved (needs BoR approval as well).
- b. **Assessment** Upon request of Cara Meade, Assessment Coordinator extraordinaire, we reviewed available data for baseline assessment of GC1Y sections and provide suggestions for next year.

i. **Findings**

- 1) Initial assessment of student performance appears to be too high
 - a) Faculty seem to be assessing students based on relative performance within the class and not relative to expected achievement during four (or so) years of college.
 - b) A better designed rubric might make clear this difference.
 - c) Faculty development might be needed to make the distinction as well.
 - 2) A more systematic assessment tool is desirable to help provide comparable data – someone needs to compare the information provided from the course-based assessment experiments to the data provided from the rubric-based assessment experiments to determine which are more useful.
- c. **Issue of Concern** It was brought to the attention of the committee (note the weasely use of passive voice as to not implicate the messenger) that in order to address the problem of some transfer students not having the required three Global Perspectives Overlays, transfer students will now be required to have a minimum of one Global Perspective Overlay. The Committee asks that I relay to you our concern. While we understand that mitigating circumstances required the change in policy, we (1) hope that the change is temporary, and (2) hope that departments will respond by ensuring that all majors have at least one upper level course that is available on a regular basis designated as carrying a Global Perspectives Overlay.
- d. **Suggestion for Next Year** Up until now, SoCC has not required syllabi to accompany new GC1Y and GC2Y proposals. We believe that next year's SoCC might be better able to determine if sections will meet the expectations of the GC1Y and GC2Y courses if members can review a syllabus when reviewing a proposal.

5. **FACULTY AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE** (FAPC) – Alex Blazer for Leslie Moore

Officers: Chair Leslie Moore, Vice-Chair Mike Rose, Secretary Beauty Bragg

- a. **Post-Tenure Review Policy/Procedures** FAPC continues to work on the post-tenure review policy and will recommend it be an item of deliberation for the 2013-2014 FAPC.
- b. **Faculty Evaluation** A couple months ago, FAPC approved the following resolution on faculty evaluation to be reported to University Senate as an information item:

Given

- *That the tasks to be performed at Georgia College are complex and diverse such that interdependence among administration, faculty, and others is necessary, and*
- *That the ideal form of governance in the academy is shared decision-making, and*

- *That where this ideal can be attained it should be pursued, and*
- *That faculty evaluation is essential for decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and salary, and*
- *That these areas regarding faculty status (decisions regarding tenure, promotion, and salary) are among the issues for which faculty have primacy,*
then
- *Academic-year faculty shall actively participate in the determination and modification of policies governing faculty evaluation including sharing responsibility with administrators for informing the development and review of the policies, procedures, and practices appertaining, including decisions regarding the stated and definite criteria used to assess or evaluate faculty performance.*

6. **RESOURCES, PLANNING AND INSTITUTIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE** (RPIP) – Maureen Horgan

Officers: Chair Maureen Horgan, Vice-Chair Jennifer Graham, Secretary Benjamin Davis

RPIP did not meet on 22 March 2013.

- a. **12 month Pay Option** This is the only outstanding item from this past year. Maureen is waiting to hear back from several parties on queries made.
- b. **Smoking Policy Enforcement** The joint Student Government Association and Health Education initiative is up and running. There is a front page report in today's *Colonnade*.
- c. **Shared Sick Leave Policy** Communications will go out to the campus today. The enrollment period will be April 29-October 1. Eligible employees can sign up or just donate unused leave. Because this is a change in practice, there will be several announcements.
- d. **Public Art Policy** A committee has been formed to develop guidelines and procedures for the future accessioning (putting up) and de-accessioning (taking down) of artwork, but not the selection of artwork - that will be between the requesting party and the artist. The initial committee will consist of:

Chair University Architect Michael Rickenbaker

Facilities designate John Webb

University Advancement designate Bill Doerr

Art Department representative Professor Valerie Aranda

Faculty Professor Bob Wilson, Professor Anna Hiscox (Coordinator of Art Therapy in the College of Health Sciences)

Staff Tim Vacula and Shannon Morris

Student Creighton Perme

There was a very good response to the call that the SCoN (SubCommittee on Nominations) put out to the university community. People who expressed an interest in serving and were not appointed at this time will have an opportunity to serve in the future.

7. **STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE** (SAPC) – Dianne Chamblee

Officers: Chair Dianne Chamblee, Vice-Chair Amy Pinney, Secretary James Bridgeforth

- a. **Motions** SAPC has no motions to offer for consideration.
- b. **Meeting** The SAPC March 2013 meeting was held Friday March 22.
- c. **SGA Initiatives** We were honored to have two very passionate members of the Student Government Association (SGA) in attendance in addition to our always passionate student member, Stephen Hundley. The following SGA projects were presented to the committee.
 - i. **RSO Survey – Sarah Rose Remmes** A survey conducted targeting RSO (Recognized Student Organization) presidents asking the following questions:
 - 1) What is the official name for your RSO?
 - 2) State the number of students registered with your RSO.
 - 3) Of the previous number, how many regularly attend your RSO's meetings?
 - 4) Where does your RSO's meeting generally take place?

5) At what time does your RSO meeting generally take place?

A number of graphs were provided as well as a list of comments. SGA will provide a final summarization of their findings to SAPC at early meetings in Fall 2013. The 2013-2014 SAPC will share these findings with the University Senate.

ii. **Student Emergency Fund "Students Helping Students" - Caitlin Mullaney**

1) Money Raised: \$254.95 (total)

- Papa John's Partnership \$84.95
- Sonic Partnership: \$70
- King of Diamonds Winner: \$100

2) Current Events:

- Emergency Fund Raffle - extended until 4/19

3) Recurring Events:

- Papa John's Partnership - April 9, 10, 29, 30, May 1 & 2
- Sonic Partnership - April 4 & 25

4) Upcoming events:

- Color for a Cause 5K - April 20
- Dodgeball for a Cause - April 23 4pm

d. **Obstacles to Progression / Graduation** SAPC took the opportunity to get feedback from the two visiting students on GCSU obstacles to completing degrees in four years.

i. Availability of online classes during the summer was seen by each of the students to be an obstacle along with a variety of other issues.

ii. The students committed to conducting a student survey through SGA to help identify perceived obstacles from a larger population of students. An update will be provided at the next SAPC meeting.

iii. Anticipate more information to report on this matter by the middle of Fall 2013 semester.

e. **Student Insurance** Issues regarding student insurance have been brought to our attention. At present, SAPC is in the information-gathering stage on these issues.

f. **Continuing Items** The 2012-2013 SAPC will recommend that the 2013-2014 SAPC continue to consider the issues pertaining to *Student Insurance* and *Obstacles to Progression / Graduation*.

8. **STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION (SGA)** – Cody Allen

Officers: President Cody Allen, Vice President Stephen Hundley, Secretary Sarah Rose Remmes

a. **No Report** There was no SGA representative present at the meeting to provide an SGA report.

9. **SUBCOMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS (SCoN)** – Lyndall Muschell

Officers: Chair Lyndall Muschell, Secretary Craig Turner, No Vice-Chair position for this committee.

a. **Committee on Public Art** A call for nominations/self-nominations to serve on the Committee on Public Art was sent to the university community on Tuesday, April 2. The recommendation has been made to select up to four members representing both faculty and staff for the upcoming year as the new committee works to develop procedures and guidelines. There was also the recommendation made that someone representing the Library be a part of the first committee to assist in determining the best use of the large public art space within this facility. Nominations and self-nominations were reviewed by SCoN members. The appointees selected by the committee and submitted to Michael Rickenbaker, Chair of the Committee on Public Art, were Tim Vacula, Shannon Morris, Bob Wilson, and Anna Hiscox. Note that Shannon Morris represents the Library.

b. **Slate of Nominees for 2013-2014** The slate of nominees for the officers and committees of the 2013-2014 University Senate has been finalized.

i. All senators, volunteers, and appointees have been invited to attend the organizational meetings of the 2013-2014 University Senate and its committees scheduled for April 26.

- ii. Immediately following the organizational meeting of the 2013-2014 University Senate, the organizational meetings for the 2013-2014 committees will be held.
- iii. The members of the 2013-2014 ECUS will conduct the election of officers and facilitate the organizational meetings of the senate committees. Those facilitating the elections will be notified and directions will be given for reporting back on officer election results.
- iv. SoCC will not meet on 26 Apr 2013 because the new CAPC chair will be responsible for calling the organizational meeting for SoCC and conducting the SoCC officer elections.
- v. Rooms in A&S have been reserved for all the aforementioned organizational meetings.

PRESIDENT’S REPORT: President Steve Dorman

In the written report he submitted, President Dorman acknowledged and extended appreciation to Dr. Paul Jones and Susan Allen for their work in the preparation of these remarks.

1. **ONE MORE RECOGNITION** I know that you will be acknowledging this, probably more formally, at the organizational meeting next week, but in the recognitions that Catherine made earlier, she forgot one – namely herself. Catherine has done an outstanding job as your leader this year. To be the leader of the senate requires you to not only think about and attend the university senate meetings, but also attend a number of other meetings. The leader of the senate is the *go to person* when we want to include the faculty and the staff in a variety of initiatives around the university. Catherine has represented you so well – she’s done a great job. Even though you will likely acknowledge her next week, it would be appropriate to recognize her now. Those in attendance responded with a thunderous round of applause.
2. **FY2014 BUDGET** As you probably know, the Board of Regents at the meeting this past Tuesday released the budget for the University System of Georgia for FY2014.
 - a. I would like to mention several highlights that we can see from our initial review of the materials:
 - i. Overall, the University System of Georgia had a good year from the Legislature.
 - ii. Formula funding was up approximately 3%.
 - iii. Capital Funding for the USG was also up this year.
 - iv. For Georgia College, we received \$1,202,090 in new formula funding. This important funding will support:
 - 1) Increases in health insurance and retiree fringes
 - 2) Increases in teacher’s retirement
 - 3) We also received nearly 70% of our budget requests, which will support institutional priorities (Complete College initiatives, Retention, Progression and Graduation efforts, and other important initiatives).
 - b. After Cabinet has had an opportunity to closely review the FY2014 Allocation, I will update the campus on initiatives from the Budget Hearings during the fall that we will be able to support in the coming year.
 - i. Georgia College received the equipment funding for Ennis (\$1,000,000)
 - ii. Tuition will also be modestly increased. Undergraduate in-state students will see an increase of 2.5% or \$83 dollars per semester. Graduate tuition will increase approximately 3%.
 - iii. The only change in mandatory fees is a \$3 increase in Parking and Transportation to help support the growing demand.
 - iv. Again, this was a good year for the USG and Georgia College.
 - v. Unfortunately, the FY2014 budget does not support merit increases this year.
3. **ORP TO TRS LEGISLATION** The legislation which would allow movement from the ORP system to the TRS retirement system was approved by House committee to go forward for financial review and will be considered in the next legislative session pending that review.
4. **APPRECIATION** Special thanks to Amy Amason for her work during the legislative session.
5. **QUESTIONS? COMMENTS? CONCERNS?** There were no questions/comments/concerns from the floor.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: There was three items of unfinished business.

1. **COMPLETE COLLEGE GEORGIA (CCG)** – Tom Ormond (Associate Provost)
 - a. **Academic Affairs Intranet Link** With respect to the Complete College Georgia Initiative, an Academic Affairs link has been set up to chronicle all pertinent information related to CCG. http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/acad_affairs/ under "**Academic Affairs' Reports & Documents**"
 - b. **Status Report** The CCG committee is presently writing a Status Report that is due to the system office on June 14, 2013. This report will list successes and areas in need of attention as they pertain to the existing CCG document. Catherine Whelan will be asked to identify three faculty members who will help review the report in late May before it is submitted to the USG.
2. **GOVERNANCE RETREAT** – Lyndall Muschell
 - a. **Format** We were hopeful to repeat the overnight format that premiered last year, but that didn't come to fruition this year in light of budget considerations. We are hopeful that the overnight format can perhaps be an every other year practice going forward.
 - b. **The Plan** We are exploring the feasibility of some venues in the Lake Oconee area. We expect to receive several quotes early next week and hope to finalize the venue soon. This year we would like to invite not only the senators, but also the volunteers and appointees to attend. It was such a meaningful experience last year to have us all together and have that time to get to know each other before we had our formal meetings on campus. Hopefully, I will have new information to share at next week's organizational meeting of the 2013-2014 University Senate.
 - c. **Questions?**
 - i. **Question** Is it still going to be a two-day retreat?
 - ii. **Answer** No, it will be a one day retreat. We anticipate the retreat date to be August 14 and to this point that date seems feasible with all our potential venues. That said, we are still going to hold August 15 as a back-up date, just in case. The tentative plan is to have morning meetings, lunch, afternoon meetings, and a dinner.
3. **RECYCLING INITIATIVE CLARIFICATION** – Kyle Cullars

Note: Catherine Whelan noted that RPIPC mentioned the recycling initiative at the 15 Mar 2013 meeting of the University Senate and further clarification was desired by the body on this matter.

 - a. **Introduction** Kyle Cullars first noted that he was reporting not in his capacity of overseeing auxiliary services, where one typically finds him, but rather in his capacity of holding an interim role overseeing facility operations. He further noted he had been asked by Dr. Paul Jones, who was unable to be in attendance himself, to report on the next phase in the campus-wide recycling initiative.
 - b. **Background** This initiative has been developed and endorsed by a committee of faculty, staff, and students from across campus with representatives from The Sustainability Council, The Sustainability Office, Facilities Operations, University Housing, and The Student Green Fee Committee. This has been shared with the administration. It's been shared with RPIPC. And now, I am sharing with the University Senate.
 - c. **What's New** The recycling initiative is not new to this institution, but what is new is how we are going to implement recycling as we move forward with this initiative.
 - i. **Who?** In the past, our campus recycling efforts have been implemented primarily by volunteers, in particular by student volunteers. While we appreciate all the time and energy that these volunteers have invested to forward this initiative, it has become very clear that we, as a university, cannot do recycling at the level appropriate for a university our size just relying on volunteers. So we will call on our employees to help advance this initiative, primarily those holding custodial support positions within building operations. That said, we will also ask every member of the faculty and staff to do their part and be good stewards of university resources and good stewards of the environment in general.
 - ii. **What?** Changes that will be implemented as part of this initiative include the following.
 - 1) **Bins** A recycle bin will be placed where you currently have a trash can – specifically in offices and classrooms. The trash cans will be removed from these

locations. The research shows that over two-thirds of the material presently deposited in trash cans is recyclable. This includes white paper, plastic, and newsprint.

- a. The items that should be placed in these new recycle bins include paper, newsprint, plastics, metals, and other recyclable materials.
- b. There is no need to sort the materials. This sorting is being outsourced to our vendor.
- c. The bins will be serviced once a week by the custodial support staff.
- d. Additional bins are available upon request.
- e. Bulk recycling bins will continue as presently available.
- f. Non-recyclable items – typically food waste – will be taken by each employee to a common trash area.
- g. The common trash areas will be located in bathrooms, break rooms, kitchenettes, and just outside building exits.
- h. All trash cans in these common trash areas will continue to be serviced daily by custodial support staff.
- i. Additional common trash areas or increasing the number of trash cans will be implemented in particular campus areas as such needs are identified. So please keep us apprised of your needs as this initiative is rolled out.

2) **Reception**

- a. When I first heard about this initiative, my initial response was “What, you’re going to require me to do something different? This is not fair. You’re going to make me take my trash down the hall?” This is a normal initial response to any change.
- b. But in my case, I backed off and asked “What really is going to be different for me?”
- c. Typically at my desk, 90-95% of what I throw away is recyclable. I do like the occasional snack at my desk. After all, I do oversee food services here on campus. I will say that our campus food services unit is so great that we don’t typically throw away the food, but rather the containers of the food.
- d. I may have an apple core or a banana peel at my desk. What’s really going to change for me? Well, instead of throwing it in a trash can under my desk, I’m going to leave these items on my desk until I get up in a few minutes to go to the restroom or to go to another meeting as we are all so accustomed on this campus. And when I do get up to go to that meeting, I will pick up these items and drop them in the trash can at the exit of my building. Or as I get up to walk down to the restroom, I will pick up these items and drop them in the trash can in the restroom.

3) **Transition**

- a. Will this take some time to get used to? Sure!
- b. Will it be inconvenient? Not necessarily, there may be a modicum of inconvenience to get used to the difference.
- c. Is there anything that is truly going to “rock my world” in terms of a major difference in what I’m doing? No!
- d. Is it something I can fully support even though I wasn’t the one that came up with the plan? Absolutely!
- e. I encourage you, as you hear people talking about it and hear those types of responses, do your part to try to help them see the bigger picture and approach it from the picture outside of ourselves.

iii. **When?**

1) We are planning to do this starting in mid to late May of 2013, so some time after commencement.

d. **Questions?** I'll be glad to take any questions.

Note: Questions were fielded by Kyle Cullars and Walter Dudley.

- i. **Question (Marketing)** First of all this is great news. Second, I'm assuming you'll be sending out emails to let people know, right? **Answer** We will. We have a marketing campaign that will include email, flyers, and posters. We will definitely get the word out.
- ii. **Question (Lab Spaces)** I want to second that I think this will be awesome. What about teaching spaces and laboratory spaces – some of those are special cases – will the same thing be happening there? **Answer** I think we will need to look at those on a case-by-case basis. If there are some things that are out of the norm, we need to have those discussions. In a general classroom setting, typically you are going to have paper waste going into the trash now that is recyclable. If there are particular lab spaces doing something out of the ordinary, then we need to look at what's being done there.
- iii. **Question (Sorting)** I, too, want to say great job for implementing this. If we are already separating out our waste from recycling in our office, can we continue to do that or do we want to have it all sorted off-site? **Answer** Kyle Cullars referred this question to Walter Dudley, who introduced himself as Assistant Director of Building Services. The goal is for Georgia College to take on social responsibility, not just for Georgia College but also for us as human beings. So any initiative that can help push our program and that we can speak to for Georgia College should be continued at this time. **Reiterate Question** So you do want us to continue sorting if we do so already? **Answer** That is completely up to you. It is single-stream recycling, so the sorting will be done offsite. We are not asking anyone to sort. If you prefer to do the sorting, have at it. In the future, we hope to get to the point where we will do some of the sorting on our own. Eventually, perhaps all the sorting will be done onsite. There are reasons to sort it onsite. At present, we are not taking on the onsite sorting.
- iv. **Questions (Bin Size)** Have you chosen the size of the recycling bins that will be supplied for individual employee offices? **Answer** They are comparable in size to the typical trash can currently supplied in classrooms and offices.
- v. **Question (Lab Space Bin Size)** Related to the previous question, when considering lab spaces, would it be possible that, prior to implementation, department chairs of science departments could be included on the conversation? **Answer** Absolutely! **Follow-up to question** The conversation points would include the size and types of recycling bins for use in lab spaces and the possibilities of certain lab spaces being exempt from this initiative. **Answer** I encourage you to be proactive with this. If you have special needs, please let us know ahead of time. Probably the easiest way to communicate these needs is to send an email to recycle@gcsu.edu, which serves as a central clearinghouse for all issues related to the campus recycling initiative.
- vi. **Question (Old Student Exams)** Is it appropriate to place old student exams, quizzes, and papers into the recycling bins? **Answer** I would suggest that such items be shredded first. Once shredded, these items can certainly be recycled.
- vii. **Question (Shredding)** At some of the other institutions I've been at, they've had huge bins that are permanently sealed that you can put all your tests in and then the college takes them and onsite shreds them and then recycles the shredded materials. Is this something that could be initiated here? **Answer** That is not presently a part of this initiative. That is not to say that it couldn't be implemented in the future.
- viii. **Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)** Walter Dudley noted that a document containing anticipated frequently asked questions is in development. This FAQ is based on a pilot program implemented in Miller Court, conversations with other institutions at which

recycling is being implemented, and the feedback received from the various committees that have been involved in this conversation. This document will address the kinds of questions we are asking today including what should you do or what to expect. As Kyle mentioned, this is phase one of a process that hopefully down the line will be more sustainable. *Note: The 15 Apr 2013 draft of this FAQ was supplied electronically by Kyle Cullars and is attached to these minutes as a supporting document.*

- ix. **Question (Personal Trash Cans)** A conversation point during RPIPC deliberation was to note that while the institution may no longer supply a trash can to offices, nothing prevents an employee from supplying a trash can. **Response** Absolutely! A little trash can or plastic grocery bag, whatever you find convenient.
- x. **Question (Trash Cans)** Is it possible for employees to maintain the use of the trash cans currently supplied in offices? **Answer** We will be collecting all such trash cans. We will repurpose some of them for use in centralized trash areas. But the main reason that we are collecting them is we don't need to be issuing trash cans for a service that we will no longer be providing. And that is, we will no longer be picking up trash daily from offices. So we want to keep down the risk of pests and odors and that kind of thing.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **EMAIL MIGRATION JULY 2013** – Robert Orr, Chief Information Officer
 - a. **Who's Migrating and When?** Microsoft is decommissioning Live@edu email services which requires moving all @gcsu.edu accounts to Office 365. Everyone with an @gcsu.edu email account will have their account moved to the new system between 5:00 pm on July 3 and 8:00 am on July 8th.
 - b. **Microsoft Details** At this time Microsoft is telling us that we should experience no outages and that we shouldn't have any service interruptions. This has been a very fluid process with Microsoft; they have been migrating campuses for the last few months and apparently are cleaning up their processes.
 - c. **Change in URL** One thing that will change is the URL for browser access. www.live.com is being decommissioned. The new URL is: <https://www.outlook.com/gcsu.edu> The new URL is already functioning and you may begin using this URL at any time before the migration.
 - d. **For MacMail Users** People using Microsoft's Outlook client, whether on a PC or Mac, should not experience any outage. However, we have a few people still using Mac Mail that may need to change their settings to match Microsoft's new system. We do recommend that if you're using Mac Mail to please consider upgrading to Outlook to avoid any possible outage.
 - e. **Need More Detail?** Please refer to Unify (unify.gcsu.edu) under the IT News tab for more detailed and up-to-date information regarding the conversion.
 - f. **Questions?** If you have questions or concerns about this change, please let us know by contacting SERVE at 478.445.7378 or serve@gcsu.edu.
2. **COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORTS** Catherine noted that committee annual reports are due at 5:00PM on Wed Apr 24 and urged all senators to assist their committee officers in the completion of those reports. The idea is that we would love to have those reports available to distribute at the Apr 26 organizational meetings of the 2013-2014 committees. If not, we definitely would like to have those reports available for the governance retreat in August 2013.
3. **ORGANIZATIONAL MEETINGS** The organizational meeting of the 2013-2014 University Senate is scheduled for 2:00PM on Friday, Apr 26. At this meeting, senator pins will be distributed to first time senators and the slate of nominees for officers and committees of the 2013-2014 University Senate will be considered. As this meeting will likely run for only 15 to 20 minutes, all volunteers, appointees, and senators have been invited to attend. Immediately following, we will hold the organizational committee meetings. Each organizational committee meeting will be facilitated by a member of the 2013-2014

Executive Committee and these facilitators will conduct the committee officer elections and precede these elections with a summary of the responsibilities of each officer position.

4. **SHARED GOVERNANCE APPRECIATION** Catherine Whelan extended her appreciation to all in attendance for their support during the 2012-2013 academic year and for their commitment to shared governance at Georgia College. She acknowledged that participation in shared governance is time-consuming and can be a frustrating endeavor at times, but it is definitely one that is worthwhile. So thank you!
5. **ATTENDANCE AND THE SIGN-IN SHEET** Catherine Whelan requested that each individual present at the meeting sign the university senator attendance sheet or guest sign-in sheet on their way out if they hadn't already signed in.

ADJOURN: As there was no further business, a motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and approved. The meeting was adjourned at 3:16 p.m.

ATTACHMENT

- Recycling_FAQ_2013-04-15 (referenced by Kyle Cullars in the Recycling Initiative Update)
This document is the 15 Apr 2013 draft of Frequently Asked Questions on the Campus Recycling Initiative.