

Middle Georgia State College Faculty Senate  
AY 2013  
Minutes of Meeting No. 4  
Joint meeting with the Executive Committee

Guests:  
Dr. Deepa Arora (

present that the documents will continue to be vetted; as such, the documents approved at the meeting should not be considered permanent. It is important that senators continue to bring information to and from the faculty in their units. Dr. Venn confirmed that she will work with the Senate to allow discussion to occur at all levels.

Dr. Venn explained that in June 2012, the system office charged Macon State College and Middle Georgia State College with merging curriculum and with identifying a faculty evaluation plan, faculty grievance procedures, and promotion and tenure/post-



Dr. Venn confirmed that this is the case. However, she has information on promotion and tenure raises from across the University System and has been speaking to state representatives about the issue. The new standard will not be the same as the former Macon State College system. Given the lack of merit raises in recent years, promotion and tenure raises are a means of protecting faculty from future budget shortfalls.

Dr. Gibbons asked whether the parts of the Handbook that can be changed will be labeled or otherwise indicated.

Dr. Venn stated that Board of Regents policies and SACS policies are indicated as such in the document.

ony.

Dr. Venn stated that Albert Abrams, Vice President for External Affairs and Continuing Studies, would discuss the graduation ceremony at the Academic Assembly meeting.

Dr. Bunker then announced that Ms. Sartin would review the Academic Affairs proposals, which had already been vetted by the Academic Affairs Committee.

Ms. Sartin introduced the following proposals from the Department of Information Technology:

ITEC 27, modifying prerequisite requirements for the Senior Capstone course.

ITEC 28, modifying Area F choices for the B.S. in Information Technology.

ITEC 29, adding elective choices for the B.S. in Information Technology.

Ms. Ashford moved to approve the proposals from the Department of Information Technology.

Mr. Houston seconded the motion. The motion nt13(nf)3( TJE2)JTJf1 0 0 1 95.54CD2M6d4od rov1000300257

Ms. Brown asked about arrangements for students graduating under earlier catalogs who might still need the earlier versions of Area B.

Dr. Young-Zook explained that the proposed course blends the content of the earlier 3-hour/1-hour and 2-hour/2-hour models but that the earlier models will still be taught for another competency requirement has been dropped, so the courses that addressed that requirement must be dropped as well.

Dr. Sun explained that the third proposal presents a new version of the core incorporating the Area B changes and allowing World Literature classes and the new history course on world religions to satisfy the Global Perspectives requirement.

Dr. Wallace asked if critical thinking would still be assessed in Area B.

Dr. Young-Zook explained that critical thinking is still taught in Area B but is now assessed in English 1101. Technology for delivery of critical thinking assessment is also in the process of development.

Dr. Wallace moved that the Senate approve the Area B and core curriculum changes with the stipulation that MSCC 1000 be deleted in January 2014. Dr. Brennan seconded the motion.

Several senators asked for clarification on the Global Perspectives requirement: can one course count toward Area C and fulfill the Global Perspectives requirement?

Dr. Wearn answered that one course could fulfill both requirements; the intention is not to require students to take an additional three credit hours.

communication course requirements.

Dr. Venn explained that when the consolidation required a new version of the Area B courses, the initial proposals more closely mirrored what the former institutions had been offering in Area B. But the Board of Regents did not accept those proposals. The current proposal represents what the General Education Council approved. Health classes will still be offered but physical education is no longer required.

and their Business 1205 course. -credit public speaking class

Dr. Venn stated that business courses are not considered part of the core, which must consist of liberal arts courses.

Dr. Wearn added that the communication class could be developed into a three-hour class.

Dr. Collins explained that his concern is for students who need those courses for GPA or eligibility reasons.

Dr. Venn pointed out that the institution must consider those issues more broadly as financial aid ability to retake courses.

Dr. Collins asked if Business 1205 could still be offered.

Dr. Wearn stated that it can still be offered but it cannot be considered part of Area B.

Business 1205. After this summer it will change to an ITEC designation; will students who take the course this summer receive Area B credit?

Dr. Venn said that students taking the course in the summer could still receive Area B credit if it  
- 0.

Mr. Houston asked whether students could still improve their GPA by re-taking the course if the designation changed.

Dr. Venn recommended that advisors consult the registrar to answer that question.

Dr. Wearn recommended that as many students as possible take the course before the designation changes.

Ms. Sartin reiterated that students would not be harmed by these curriculum changes. She reviewed the motion on the table. The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Bunker introduced the draft of the Statutes, explaining that they have been under review for six years and can continue to be reviewed. Some changes are driven by changes in University System policy; the Statutes are still in draft form but few changes remain and none are expected before the fall semester.

Dr. Venn explained that the current mission statement has been approved at the system level.

Mr. Swenson moved to approve the draft Statutes. Dr. Sherry seconded the motion. The motion carried with 36 votes in favor, one vote against, and one abstention.

Dr. Bunker explained that the approved documents would be placed on the faculty governance ions. She then called for discussion of the Academic Assembly By-Laws. This document has undergone few changes; the Board of Regents still stipulates one meeting per semester of the Academic Assembly.

Dr. Elmore moved to approve the Academic Assembly By-Laws. Dr. Young-Zook seconded the motion.

Mr. Swenson asked about Article 3A naming the voting membership of the assembly: should all campus deans and campus directors be included?

Dr. Venn verified that all campus deans should be included.

Dr. Collins suggested deleting the specific mention of the executive director of the Warner Robins campus.

s.

Dr. Bunker called for a vote incorporating the emendations discussed and suggested that the documents should either repeat full committee names throughout or include a shortened name and definition at the beginning. The Senate agreed with this change.

The motion to approve the Academic Assembly By-Laws carried with 29 votes in favor and one vote against from the Senate, and a unanimous vote in favor from the Executive Committee.

Dr. Burnham suggested that repeating full committee names throughout the documents was preferable.

Dr. Bunker agreed that the documents would be edited to reflect this change. She then opened the floor for discussion of the Faculty Senate By-Laws.

Dr. Young-Zook moved to approve the Faculty Senate By-Laws. Dr. Burne seconded the motion.

Dr. Bunker stated that committee names would be changed for consistency with the other documents.

Ms. Canady asked whether the Faculty Senate By-Laws should stipulate the at-large membership of the Senate as the other documents do.

Dr. Bunker stated that the at-large membership should be included and that correction would be made.

The motion to approve the Faculty Senate By-Laws carried unanimously.

Dr. Bunker opened the floor for discussion of the Senate Rules of Process. The Rules have been under development for three years and have been substantially and repeatedly reviewed,

Dr. Collins stated that the first of

Mr. Houston stated that the Student Code of Conduct seems to require that academic dishonesty

Mr. Stewart clarified that this was not the case and specified that academic infractions never

Dr. Lopez asked whether the reporting procedure would be cumbersome.

Mr. Stewart explained that the change to one infraction form was an effort to make the process less cumbersome. Reporting an academic infraction requires the faculty member to submit four syllabus.

Dr. Taylor asked whether all complaints from all campuses would come to Mr. Stewart.

Mr. Stewart confirmed that this was the case.

Dr. Young-Zook moved to approve the Student Code of Conduct. Dr. Baker seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Dr. Bunker announced the calendar for Senate and standing committee meetings for the fall: the Senate will meet on the first Friday of each month, the Executive Committee on the second Friday of each month, and the Academic Affairs Committee on the third Friday of each month. Documents will come to the Senate after they have been approved by relevant committees. The Senate will probably meet during Fall Convocation week. Senators are also reminded to review the documents that will be voted on at the May 9 meeting.

Dr. Spaid noted that the blog remains open for discussion of the Promotion and Tenure Task Force recommendations.

Dr. Bunker added that Dr. Venn can also take comments on promotion and tenure and asked Dr. Taylor to speak to the Promotion and Tenure/Post-policies.

feedback has been incorporated into the Handbook. Most of the discussion on the recommendations came in three areas:

The Kennesaw State University model: changes to w  
purview but the model will be addressed in the creation of evaluation rubrics.

Salary adjustments: the committee does not have authority to address this matter directly, but will send recommendations forward.

Timing

Board of Regents policy allows consideration for tenure in the fifth year of service but the

