

Meeting of the Faculty Senate, Franklin College of Arts & Sciences
Feb. 20, 2003
Approved _____

1. Call to Order:

Presiding Officer Juergen Wiegel [Microbiology] called the meeting to order (in place of Ed Azoff [Math]) at 3:34 PM in Room B-2 of the Main Library.

2. Identification of Proxies and Visitors:

Proxies: Hamid Arabnia for Suchi Bhandarkar [Computer Science]
Evan Firestone for Alisa Luxenberg [Art]
Gary Love for Henning Meyer [Physics]
Robert Rumely for Ed Azoff [Math]
Kavita Pandit for Ikubolajeh Logan [Geography]

Absences: Clanton Black [Biochemistry], David Leigh [Geography]

Visitors: None announced.

Deans: Wyatt Anderson & Hugh Ruppensburg.

Senate Total: 33 Present, 5 Proxies, 2 Absent.

3. Approval of Minutes of Previous Senate Meetings:

Minutes for the Jan. 16, 2003 meeting were approved after being amended so that the unidentified visitors were identified as Lioba Moshi (Director of African Studies) and Akinloye Ojo (Instructor of African Studies). As usual, all minutes, once submitted, may be viewed on-line at the Senate's web-site: www.franklin.uga.edu/dstaff/admin.fcsenate.htm .

4. Comments by the Presiding Officer, Juergen Wiegel [Microbiology]:

4a) The annual address of the A&S faculty by the Dean will be held on Tuesday, 4/22/03 at 3:30 PM in 265 Park Hall. Dean Anderson invites all faculty in the College to attend.

4b) The plan to convert to electronic balloting will not be implemented until Fall 2003 because of logistical complications. This will be discussed in the Professional Concerns Committee report later in this meeting.

4c) The meetings for selection of the new Provost are on-going. The A&S

Faculty should be active in obtaining information. We should also speak to colleagues at other universities who are familiar with the candidates.

4d) The Dean will update us on the status of "Proposal for Universalization of BA/BS Degrees" during his comments.

5. Comments by Dean Wyatt Anderson:

5a) The Dean's Office strongly supports the move to electronic voting for College-Wide committees. It saves time and paper, and appears to yield a higher response rate.

5b) Associate Deans Hugh Ruppensburg and Cliff Pannell made spirited presentations at the University Council meeting (2/06/03) at which the "Proposal for Universalization of BA/BS Degrees" was discussed. The Deans of Terry College of Business and Social Work appeared neutral with respect to the changes, since those colleges intend to keep their current degree designations (BBA, MSW, etc.). It appears that all other Deans (except A&S, of course), support the motion to some extent or another. Nonetheless, because the issue had generated so much controversy, Acting Provost Mace requested that the motion not be voted upon at the 2/06/03 meeting, but be re-introduced at the first University Council Meeting in August. In the meantime, Provost Mace appointed a committee, co-chaired by the Deans of Arts & Sciences (Wyatt Anderson) and Family & Consumer Sciences (Sharon Nickols) to gather more information on this matter before a final vote is taken.

There was some discussion of Dean Anderson's report, with one senator expressing the opinion that he felt that this was "theft of our degree". Others asked if it were possible for us to require other colleges desiring to offer 'BA' and 'BS' to adopt our requirements, such as those concerning Foreign Languages, but the answer was negative. Another factor not in our favor is that many other universities have already gone to a universal BA/BS degree system; UGA is in the minority. Dean Anderson concluded by stating that he wasn't optimistic about our chances of prevailing given that A&S has only 26.7% of the voting power on the University Council, but that he'd try his best to win some concessions. He hopes, at a minimum, to strike a deal such that the BA/BS degrees offered by other Colleges would have alternative wording, such as "BS in Agriculture", for example.

5c) Additional Teaching Request of Acting Provost Mace

Although officially part of the Dean's Comments, this portion of the meeting lasted much longer than any others and generated, by far, the most heated argument. Dean Anderson first reviewed the dismal budget situation, noting that the total university cuts over the year amounted to about 11% of the original budget. He also stated that Terry College and Arts & Sciences were suffering less severe cuts than some others, about 2.5%

this August as compared to last August. He noted, by means of comparison, that GA state legislators had voted themselves a 10% pay cut, so they were anxious to see increased teaching around the state's higher educational system. To initiate the discussion, Dean Anderson distributed a version of a memo recently sent to Department Heads in the College asking them to submit plans for the call by Provost Mace for an on-average increase of 0.5 courses/faculty member for the 2003-04 academic year. The original memo listed 8 possible strategies for doing this:

- 1) Enlarge class size of upper-division courses.
- 2) Offer more freshman seminars; 1 per every 3 faculty members is suggested.
- 3) Offer additional seminars and course sections in the Honors Program.
- 4) Divide large sections into two or more smaller sections.
- 5) Assign extra teaching to faculty who are less active in research.
- 6) Convert non-teaching, administrative or other release units to courses.
- 7) Convert low-enrolled seminars & grad classes to needed undergrad courses.
- 8) Ask some faculty to volunteer to teach an extra class in 2003-04.

Dean Anderson stressed that the College was not the instigator of this plan and that he had no intentions of requiring each department to respond in the same way. Since the College's 30+ departments have different sizes, missions, and characters, Dean Anderson felt that it was best to request that each Head/Director submit a plan that was appropriate for his/her unit. He noted that the suggestions listed above were not exhaustive and he said something along the lines of: "Our Department Heads and Division Directors have demonstrated in the past a great deal of resourcefulness when faced with similar challenges. I'm sure that they are also clever enough to handle this problem." Upon completing this report, Deans Anderson and Ruppensburg were besieged by an array of questions from many different senators. The summary below, non-sequential in nature, lists the types of comments and questions, sorted into three categories. No attempt has been made to identify individual senators with specific comments/questions.

A) Inconsistency of Proposed Strategies

- 1) This appears to be a problem of credit hours. Unless students sign up to take more hours, how will any of the solutions above achieve more total credit hours? At best, this will just accomplish a transfer of bodies from some less-popular courses to some more-popular courses. For example, how would option #4 help at all? [Dean Anderson admitted that option #4, while listed on the original suggestion list, was no longer being proposed as a viable strategy for department heads to consider.]
- 2) Most of the proposals above are predicated on the assumption that a department is currently withholding the offering of courses which would 'fill up' if new sections were created. While this may be true for some departments, it is not true for others. Why should a department which is meeting its teaching demand be required to open new sections which will

be largely vacant? Similarly, why should a department which is very popular with students be penalized for this?

- 3) The proposed plans seem to target upper-division and Honors courses, since there is a problem (at the University level) with enough available courses for such students. However, in departments which cater mostly to lower division or graduate students, such strategies will have little effect.
- 4) This plan is fundamentally flawed. More teaching implies less research which implies less money. Whatever marginal gains (if any) made in increasing credit hours by this plan will be more than offset by declines in revenue due to unperformed research.

B) Is the University/College/Department Trustworthy?

- 1) How do we know this is for one year only? If we faculty agree to this for one year, what is to prevent the administration from implementing it permanently? [Dean Anderson stated that there was no guarantee. He believes the forecast of Dean Benson of Terry College that the economy is slowly turning around, so that 2003-04 is likely to be our worst year. If the economy continues to falter, of course, things could be much worse in the future. If that were to happen, the need for layoffs and unfilled staff positions, which this proposal seeks to obviate, would become regular occurrences.]
- 2) If the university wants us to trust them on this, why don't they allow faculty who agree to teach an extra course in 2003-04 to 'course bank', so that those who are magnanimous enough to help the University in its hour of need will receive some guarantee of future benefit? [Dean Anderson explained that 'course-banking' was a College option, so the University couldn't guarantee such a plan. With respect to the College, Dean Anderson explained that the current course-banking system couldn't assume the liability which would be imposed upon it if a significant number of faculty decided to course bank in 2003-04, hoping to be 'repaid' in 2004-05, for example.]
- 3) The proposed plan may not seem too severe to those with established careers or those with Department Heads 'clever' enough to beat the system. Even assuming a fair and clever Head, these proposals would seem to fall unfairly on junior faculty; one year for them is a very significant span of time. [Dean Ruppensburg noted that no one group is to be targeted unfairly and that junior faculty should not be taken advantage of. He also noted that the teaching load at UGA has gotten much better in the past 25 years (from an average of 6 courses/yr in 1977 to 4 courses/yr in 2002-03). Dean Ruppensburg further noted that the current financial crisis was the worst that the University had faced since the 1930's, so that he didn't feel that a small temporary teaching increase was an unreasonable price to pay.]

C) Whom Does This Affect? What Can We Do?

1) Whose idea is this, anyway ? Is this a University system regulation or just something being implemented by UGA ? How was the '0.5' value determined? [Dean Anderson stated that Acting Provost Mace had established the policy in response to a request from the University System, which as a government agency, had been requested to formulate a budget savings plan so as to avoid layoffs and hiring freezes. Other institutions in the system have been required to submit similar plans, although their methods of implementation may be different. Dean Anderson didn't comment on how/why Provost Mace had chosen 0.5 courses/faculty member as the average increase.]

2) Does this increase affect everyone ? Will administrators teach ? [Dean Anderson stated that administrators in Franklin College already had the same teaching load as a Department Head, and that this proposal might spur some other colleges into requiring their administrators to teach more.]

3) Would this be a good time for our department to finally start getting credit for all the 'unofficial' instruction which we do, such as Directed Readings, Independent Study, Freshman Seminars, Seminar Courses, etc. ? [Dean Anderson: "Yes, this would be a very good time to count such things, provided that they are legitimate instructional duties. I suspect this may be the most commonly used method to address Provost Mace's request."]

4) As a follow-up to the above, would it be permissible to count activities such as Maymester Teaching, Study Abroad, or Summer Independent Study ? [Dean Anderson: "If any of those are conducted during the academic year, your department may count them. However, most of those just listed are considered part of the Summer budget, and, hence, can't be included in a Department Head's plan for increasing instruction in the academic year."]

5) Given that many of the proposed strategies wouldn't really increase total credit hours, and given that many departments will attempt to fulfill their quotas by counting "what they were already doing", wouldn't it be fair to characterize this entire request as a political ploy just to make UGA look good on paper ? [Dean Anderson: "I think that is too cynical. These requests will require sacrifices on the part of every department. Each Department Head must submit an acceptable plan to his/her relevant Associate Dean. We must be able to measure responses in terms of extra seats, extra teaching, and extra credit-bearing classes. Let's all work together on this. Furthermore, let's move on to other topics, so we can conclude by 5 PM!]

6. Committee Reports:

6a) Academic Standards Committee (Chair: Barbara McCaskill; English):

The committee met on Thursday 2/06/03. There were 11 petitions; 8 were approved, 2 were denied, and 1 was tabled pending further information. The Committee announced that Prof. McCaskill would remain as Chair for the remainder of Spring 2003 semester, contrary to what had been reported at the January Senate meeting.

6b) Admissions Committee (Chair: HyangSoon Yi; Comparative Literature):

The committee met on Friday 2/07/03 and reviewed some petitions. They will meet again in March and will report the results of both meetings at the March Senate meeting.

6c) Curriculum Committee (Chair: Nina Hellerstein; Romance Languages):

The committee met on Wednesday, 1/08/03, as reported in the previous minutes. It will meet again on Fri. 2/21/03, with results presented at the March Senate meeting. The Committee did act, as requested, in submitting a letter expressing the Senate's opposition to the "Proposal for Universalization of BA/BS Degrees" to the University Council prior to its meeting of 2/06/03. It was presented there by Associate Dean Ruppensburg.

6d) Planning Committee (Chair: Glenn Galau; Botany):

There was no report presented from this committee.

6e) Professional Concerns (Chair: Robert Rumely; Math):

The Professional Concerns Committee met on Friday, 2/07/03. They discussed:

- 1) A grievance case, which has since been withdrawn.
- 2) The recommendation made by Elissa Henken and John Culvahouse regarding procedures for electronic balloting in University elections:
 - * The procedure must maintain anonymity.
 - * The procedure must assure that a voter can vote only once.
 - * The procedure should assure that only eligible faculty vote.It appears that all of these conditions can be met by the system which Christine Miller (Director of Information Technology for the College) envisions implementing. However, funds to implement the system are currently unavailable, so its initiation will probably be delayed until Fall 2003, with a possible small-scale test vote this Spring.
- 3) The committee discussed the SEVIS fee, a \$50/semester fee being assessed of all international students and researchers, so that UGA can maintain its data base thereof in compliance with recently imposed INS regulations.

The committee recommends that the electronic balloting procedure be

adopted and that the SEVIS fee be reconsidered, both with respect to magnitude and with respect to more equitable sharing of burden throughout the university. Specific motions on both of these items will be introduced at the March Senate meeting.

6f) Steering Committee: (Chair: Nancy Felson; Classics):

The Steering Committee met prior to this meeting to prepare the agenda for today's meeting. No other meetings have taken place since January.

6g) Committee on Committees: (Chair: Elissa Henken; English):

There was no report presented from this committee.

7) Action Items

There were no formal action items to be voted upon. However, a question was raised on behalf of Kristin Griffin, who is conducting the elections for University Council for the Senate. In one of the 5 divisions, a purported nominee had not given his/her permission to be nominated and was inadvertently included on the ballot which was sent out. A few, but not many, of the responses from that Division have now been received. The question was how the elections should proceed, given that there is a late February deadline for informing the University Council of the identity of the A&S representatives. After some discussion, a straw vote was held, with the following motion passing by a 29-3-1 margin: "An e-mail should be sent to all faculty members in the affected division, informing them that their current University Council ballot is invalid and that a new ballot will be sent (by campus mail) in the very near future. The results obtained from the new ballot will be considered official."

8) Old Business

8a) Promotion/Tenure Revision Committee

We've given our Ad-Hoc Committee's report to the University Committee, but haven't yet heard from them.

8b) Visits of Provost Candidates

Dean Anderson is on the search committee. He reported that he felt that all 5 finalists were excellent candidates who would respect Arts & Sciences. Two are currently A&S Deans, and all, including the inside candidate, have ties to Arts and Sciences.

9) New Business

9a) Would it be useful to invite Acting Provost Mace to discuss his teaching proposal at the March Senate meeting?

After some discussion, it was decided that this was NOT a very good idea, since it might be viewed as a confrontation. It was suggested that faculty who had concerns about the new policy should inform the Professional Concerns Committee, and let them contact Provost Mace after formulating a carefully worded question or statement.

10) Next Meeting:

The next meeting of the Faculty Senate will occur Tue. 3/11/03 at 3:30 PM in Room B-2 of the Main Library. Agenda items are due to the Steering Committee by Tue. 3/04/03.

11) Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 4:59 PM.

Submitted by Jaxk Reeves, Statistics