

**2012-2013 University Senate  
Minutes for the 15-Feb-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, Ryan Brown, Scott Butler, Jan Clark, Carrie Cook, Ben Davis, David de Posada, Steve Dorman, Toi Franks, Sandra E. Godwin, Maureen Horgan, Amanda Jarriel, Josh Kitchens, Matthew Liao-Troth, Deborah MacMillan, Mary Magoulick, Beth McCauley, Ken McGill, Macon L. C. McGinley, Cara Meade, Julia Metzker, William Miller, Leslie Moore, Brian Mumma, Michael Murphy, Lyndall Muschell, Amy Pinney, Sarah Rose Remmes, Jason Rich, Holley Roberts, Mike Rose, Doreen Sams, Chris Skelton, Susan Steele, John R. Swinton, Craig Turner, Carol Ward, Catherine Whelan, Stephen Wills.

**Absent:** Cody Allen, James Bridgeforth, Jennifer Graham, Indiren Pillay, Amy Sumpter.

**Regrets:** Dianne Chamblee, Bryan Marshall.

**Guests:** Douglas A. Goings *Parliamentarian of the 2012-2013 University Senate (extended regrets)*, Ryan Greene *Manager, Parking & Transportation Services*, Julia Hann *Director for Internal Audit and Advisory Services*, Jason P. Huffman, *Director of Strategic Initiatives*, Stephen Hundley *Vice President, Student Government Association*, Judy Malachowski *Director of Nursing*, Wendell Staton *Director of Athletics*, 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 2:03 p.m.

**Agenda:** A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. A call for amendments from the floor was made by the Presiding Officer. Two amendments to the agenda were offered and accepted: (1) Change the motion number on the link to the second RPIPC motion from 001 to 002 and (2) Replace Dianne Chamblee with Amy Pinney as the presenter of the SAPC report. The agenda was approved as amended.

**Minutes:** A draft of the minutes of the *18 Jan 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 one editorial revision (the removal of an extra period) and was presented (as amended with the extra period removed) to those present for consideration. The minutes were approved as amended.

**Broadcasting Meetings:** Presiding Officer Catherine Whelan noted the presence of a microphone on the podium and reminded the university senators that this meeting of the university senate would be (the first to be) 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. She further noted that Matthew Williams, Graduate Assistant of the 2012-2013 University Senate, was presently holding a second microphone that will be used to facilitate the recording of comments from the floor.

**Committee Reports:** The following committee reports were given.

1. **RESOURCES, PLANNING AND INSTITUTIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE** (RPIPC) – Maureen Horgan  
*Officers: Chair Maureen Horgan, Vice-Chair Jennifer Graham, Secretary Benjamin Davis*  
RPIPC met on 25 January 2013 from 2:00 pm to 3:20 pm in Health Sciences Building 2-11.
  - a. **MOTION 1213.RPIPC.001.P** On behalf of the committee, Maureen Horgan presented the motion: *To recommend the proposed Policy to Address Public Art in the supporting document*

entitled "Policy on Public Art" as University Policy, and to endorse the guidelines and procedural recommendation made therein.

- i. **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS** Supporting documentation for Motion 1213.RPIPC.001.P, accessible in the online motion database, was identified and displayed on the big screen. There were two supporting documents. The first, entitled *Policy on Public Art*, is referenced in the motion statement. The second, entitled *RPIPC and ECUS-SCC Minutes, Policy on Public Art*, provides a history of the development of the proposed policy including its supporting guidelines and procedural recommendations.
  - ii. **CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION** Maureen Horgan provided the following.
    - 1) We have not had a policy on public art, nor do many smaller colleges. As Maureen surveyed COPLAC schools for information, she was asked by several schools to provide feedback on what we achieve.
    - 2) There is an emotional context to this issue. The policy was prompted by the removal of murals, most recently in Kilpatrick Education Center, also in Maxwell Student Union in the past.
    - 3) There is still some misinformation in the community. Maureen would be happy to take questions later or speak individually to answer to the best of her knowledge based on conversations that happened in the course of developing this policy.
    - 4) Interim Provost Matthew Liao-Troth brought a draft proposal to the Executive Committee which was steered to RPIPC for consideration. Throughout the development of this policy, RPIPC and Maureen consulted with Matthew, and with University Architect Michael Rickenbaker and Art Department Chair Bill Fisher.
    - 5) We present a motion here for a recommended policy that would ensure that the putting up or removal of public art is approved by a committee chair, and tied to procedures developed by the committee.
    - 6) We suggest a committee of seven or more people that includes:
      - a. Three standard administrative positions or designees, one for each of the University Architect, Facilities, University Advancement
      - b. One representative from the Art Department
      - c. Two or more representatives (faculty, staff) appointed by University Senate through the Subcommittee on Nominations (SocN)
      - d. One student representative appointed by the Student Government Association (SGA)
    - 7) We suggest that this committee handle all requests relating to public art until it develops the procedures and guidelines on public art.
  - iii. **DISCUSSION** The discussion included only two questions of clarification from the floor fielded by Maureen Horgan
    - 1) **Question** Are there any first amendment implications for what is defined as public art? **Answer** Early on, Interim Provost Liao-Troth provided a definition of public art that is included in the policy document. Public art excludes gallery spaces. Further, posters, flyers, and other event advertisements are not considered public art. Thus, I would say there are no first amendment implications.
    - 2) **Question** Along the same lines, does this include items posted on faculty office doors, some of which might be construed as art? **Answer** That's not considered public art either.
  - iv. **SENATE ACTION** Following the disposition of the two questions of clarification, Motion 1213.RPIPC.001.P was approved with no further discussion.
- b. **MOTION 1213.RPIPC.002.P** On behalf of the committee, Maureen Horgan presented the motion: *To recommend the proposed Shared Sick Leave Policy in the supporting document*

entitled "Shared Sick Leave Policy Procedures" be adopted as University Policy, and to endorse the guidelines and procedural recommendations offered therein.

- i. **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS** Supporting documentation for Motion 1213.RPIPC.002.P, accessible in the online motion database, was identified and displayed on the big screen. There were two supporting documents. The first, entitled *Shared Sick Leave Policy and Procedures*, is referenced in the motion statement. The second, entitled *RPIPC and ECUS-SCC minutes*, provides a history of the development of the proposed policy including its supporting guidelines and procedural recommendations.
- ii. **CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION** Maureen Horgan provided the following.
  - 1) The purpose was to create a policy (and procedures and practices) that bring us in compliance with BoR policy. This was originally proposed as shared leave for sick leave and annual leave but BoR policy does not allow for sharing of annual leave.
  - 2) Important points about this policy that are sometimes misunderstood in the university community:
    - a. Participation in the program is voluntary.
    - b. The program replaces the current practice of people needing leave having to ask others to donate sick leave directly to them. It will no longer be possible to donate your time to a specific individual, but all community members will be able to donate to the pool.
    - c. The program will work like an insurance policy:
      - i. You must "buy in" – i.e. donate eight hours of sick leave to the pool to join (normally during enrollment period) – to be able to request sick leave from the pool,
      - ii. Withdrawing leave from the pool is limited to "serious, extreme, life threatening" circumstances.
      - iii. You may only be granted sick leave from the pool when all other options are exhausted (your sick leave, workman's comp, etc.)
      - iv. There is a procedure calling for a committee to review all sick leave requests to ensure leave from the pool is allocated only if the requester meets the eligibility requirements.
      - v. There is a provision for non-members to donate, in the initial enrollment and when the pool is considered depleted (at 120 hours)
  - 3) RPIPC had extended discussion on "what if" possibilities, realized that we cannot anticipate all issues and resolve all details in advance, but recommends that we proceed with the implementation of the policy now and review it at the end of calendar year 2013 and make changes as needed at that time.
  - 4) Rod Kelly, our Director of Human Resources, arranged for this proposed policy document to be reviewed by one of his colleagues on the University System of Georgia staff for compliance with policies, rules, and regulations of the University System of Georgia and the Board of Regents.
- iii. **DISCUSSION** The discussion on this motion included only two questions of clarification from the floor fielded by Maureen Horgan.
  - 1) **Question** Just out of curiosity, why will we no longer be able to donate sick leave to a particular individual? **Answer** It is not permitted by the policies and guidelines that regulate sharing leave.
  - 2) **Question** The list of example medical conditions provided in the definition of the "life-threatening or emergency medical condition" in the policy document is not meant to be an exhaustive list, right? **Answer** That is correct, it's not meant to be an exhaustive list. There is a committee referenced in the document that is

charged to review requests against the eligibility guidelines such as the one you mention. A similar issue was encountered when developing the definition of immediate family. Each of the definitions presented in the document were thought out quite carefully.

- iv. **SENATE ACTION** Following the disposition of the two questions of clarification, Motion 1213.RPIPC.002.P was approved with no further discussion.

c. **Smoking Policy Enforcement**

- i. There are no changes that have not been previously reported, we are exploring options on how best to implement and enforce this policy.
- ii. We have received new information related to enforcement. Ryan Greene, our Director of Transportation, learned at a transportation conference that Towson University (MD) uses a company called “SAFE Management”. Towson structures the smoking enforcement with SAFE Management underneath their Parking department, which is how Ryan learned about it. Kirk Armstrong has already contacted the company to learn more.
- iii. Juawn Jackson, a student government representative, is eager to proceed on an educational campaign and would like to initiate such a campaign this semester. Rachel Sullivan (University Health Educator) has been contacted to see if she would be willing to work with the Student Government Association (SGA) Public Relations Committee on this educational campaign which will include the 3R’s (Reason, Respect, Responsibility).

2. **ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE** (APC) – Macon McGinley reporting for Bryan Marshall

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

- a. **MOTION 1213.APC.002.P** On behalf of the committee, Macon McGinley presented the motion: *We move that the senate adopt the policy which defines the requirements for credit hours at Georgia College. The policy includes definitions for the following course types: lecture, seminar, recitation, laboratory, studio, supervised independent study, research, individual studio, private lessons, practicums, internships, and student teaching. The policy also creates a new requirement that all fully and partially distance courses be reviewed by a formal institutional faculty review process.*

- i. **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS** Supporting documentation or Motion 1213.APC.002.P, accessible in the online motion database, was identified and displayed on the big screen. There was only one supporting document entitled *Credit Hour Definition Policy* that contained the proposed policy.
- ii. **CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION** Macon McGinley provided the following.
  - 1) Jason Huffman, Director of Strategic Initiatives and APC member, is “the man” for this document and is available to field questions.
  - 2) This document will assist in our SACS compliance as SACS requires a clear and formal definition for a credit hour.
  - 3) Given our imminent SACS visit, this issue is time sensitive.

iii. **DISCUSSION**

- 1) Jason Huffman opened the discussion with a couple remarks.
  - a. Not only does SACS require us to have a credit hour policy in place, we must also be able to demonstrate compliance with our credit hour policy in the documentation that we will send to SACS at the end of this summer.
  - b. This is a comprehensive policy that accounts for the variety of courses and delivery methods by which a credit hour is delivered at this institution.
  - c. In short, this is a policy statement of what we currently practice.
- 2) **Question** Does this policy supersede the guidelines for study abroad? **Answer** No, this policy provides minimums and does not supersede those guidelines.
- 3) **Question** In the proposed document there are different categories of courses such as *lecture, seminar and recitation and supervised independent studies*, is there

anything that precludes using the definition from *supervised independent studies* when considering the fourth hour of a GC2Y course? Answer That truly is an implementation question and as such would be handled by the Subcommittee on the Core Curriculum (SoCC).

- 4) Question Is the default category for a course the *lecture, seminar and recitation* category? Answer: No. There are a variety of different examples listed. The intent is to be flexible enough to be applicable to all we are doing, but is not meant to be so prescriptive as to cover every last possible case.
- 5) Question Can different sections of the same course, most notably GC1Y and GC2Y, be considered in different categories? Answer That is a question about the mode of delivery not about the definition of credit hour. The credit hour definition considers the amount of instructional time and not the particular activity or delivery method used in the classroom.
- 6) Question Is what students *learn on their own* included in instruction? Answer Yes, the definition accounts for time allocated to out of class work and time allocated to instruction. The 2250 minute per credit hour is based on the United States Department of Education regulation detailing a credit hour to be a minimum of one hour of class and a minimum of two hours outside of class per week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester. An (academic) hour is 50 minutes so the three (academic) hours (one in class, two out) per week is 150 minutes per week times 15 weeks making 2250 minutes.
- 7) Question How is instruction defined? Answer In terms of the credit hour policy, the term instruction applies to in class time. *The interpretation in use by SoCC is a requirement that the first 750 minutes (instruction or in class time) is “supervised instruction.”*
- 8) University Registrar, Kay Anderson, reiterated that the proposed credit hour policy was informed by a consultation with every department chair and dean on campus as it captures what we are currently doing. The policy in every way matches our current practice. We are trying to codify the definition of credit hour so that we can appropriately cite this definition in our SACS documentation.
- 9) Question If in the future there is some other form of credit hour awarding that is determined, could this credit hour policy be revised? Answer The way this is written is to capture exactly what it is we are doing right now with enough examples to cover most of the major modes of delivery but to leave the flexibility for all the modes of delivery of how a lab course (or studio course or internship or lecture course) might take place.

10) **MOTIONS TO AMEND:**

- a. **MOTION 1** “To insert the word *supervised* immediately prior to the word *instruction* in the category of *Lecture, seminar, and recitation courses* category.” was made and seconded.

- i. **DISCUSSION**

1. Inserting adjectives like this limits our flexibility, I recommend we do not make this insertion. This position was supported by other speakers.
2. There was a clarification question seeking the identification of where the two different meanings of the word instruction were realized. After clarification was given, the position expressed was to not “adjectivize” unnecessarily.
3. A “friendly amendment” was offered to strike the words *of instruction* immediately following 2250 in the *Laboratory*

*and studio courses* category. This amendment was not seconded.

4. An attempt to withdraw Motion 1 was made but a point of order indicated the opinion that once seconded, a motion could not be withdrawn but could be voted down.
5. The Presiding Officer agreed that a seconded motion could not be withdrawn, and required a vote.

ii. **SENATE ACTION** Motion 1 was not approved.

b. **MOTION 2** “To strike the words of *instruction* immediately following 2250 in the *Laboratory and studio courses* category.” was made and seconded.

i. **DISCUSSION**

1. I speak against the motion and find it confusing to introduce an unadorned 2250 minutes when every other occurrence of minutes is adorned with phrases such as “of instruction” or “of out of class work.”
2. University Registrar, Kay Anderson, stated that there are realizations of courses in this category that have two hours of class and one hour of homework (the 1500 minutes of instruction and 750 minutes of out of class work) as well as other courses that have all three hours of class and no homework (the 2250 minutes of instruction). In fact, there are courses in this category that have one hour of class and two hours of homework (750 minutes of instruction and 1500 minutes of out of class work).
3. Presiding Officer Catherine Whelan reiterated the comments of the Registrar and sought clarification on whether the intent was to include all three options in this *lab and studio courses* category where there were presently only two. She noted this would mean the words of instruction should remain.
4. As Motion 2, having received a second, could not be withdrawn, a vote was needed.

ii. **SENATE ACTION** Motion 2 was not approved.

c. **MOTION 3** “To insert *A minimum of 750 minutes of instruction (excluding final examinations), with a minimum of 1500 minutes of out of class work, for each semester credit hour earned, OR* as the first of three options in the *Laboratory and studio courses* category.” was made and seconded.

i. **DISCUSSION**

1. There was a brief discussion to clarify the idea of the minimum in the minds of some present.

ii. **SENATE ACTION** Motion 3 was approved.

11) **Question** In Mass Communication, they have a three hour internship that requires three hundred hours of contact time with the sponsor in the field. Does this meet the internship requirement? **Answer** Yes, the minimum number of forty hours per credit hour earned would translate to a minimum of one-hundred twenty hours per three credit hours. The three hundred hours exceeds this minimum.

12) **Question** What constitutes an hour of instruction for on-line courses? **Answer** The answer to that question is being developed by a group of faculty working with Associate Provost Tom Ormond and Director of IDEAS Wesley Smith and will be forthcoming.

- iv. **SENATE ACTION** Motion 1213.APC.002.P was *approved as amended* by Motion 3.
- b. Informational updates.
  - i. **Distance Education Course Review Process** We are trying to formalize the review of all distance education courses. The formal policy comes about as part of the SACS review.
  - ii. **4999 Faculty Compensation** We are investigating the possibilities of compensation for faculty for delivering 4999 courses during the summer. Currently, this work is typically uncompensated.
  - iii. **Summer Academic Calendar Proposal** We will be discussing a proposal to make the summer sessions equal in length.
  - iv. **Midterm Grades Reporting Proposal** This is a proposal to include a more refined description of the midterm reporting terms, and proposes replacing the “U” grade designating unsatisfactory with the following options:
    - UA – Unsatisfactory attendance
    - UG – Unsatisfactory grade(s)
    - UP – Unsatisfactory participation
    - UAGP – Unsatisfactory, multiple concerns.
- 3. **CURRICULUM AND ASSESSMENT POLICY COMMITTEE** (CAPC) – Susan Steele  
*Officers: Chair Susan Steele, Vice-Chair Julia Metzker, Secretary Cara Meade*
  - a. **MOTION 1213.CAPC.007.C** On behalf of the committee, Susan Steele presented the motion *Approval of the MAT in Early Childhood Education*.
    - i. **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS** At the time it was presented, this motion had one supporting document entitled *College of Education proposal for MAT in Early Childhood Education* that documented the details of the proposal.
    - ii. **CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION** Susan Steele provided the following.
      - 1) This proposal had been approved by the 2011-2012 CAPC in January 2012.
      - 2) Since then, it has been revised.
      - 3) This is a program for which there appears to be a lot of demand.
      - 4) CAPC has vetted it and finds it to meet all the university requirements.
      - 5) We are asking for the approval of the University Senate so that this can be advanced to the Board of Regents.
    - iii. **SENATE ACTION** Motion 1213.CAPC.005.C was *approved* with no further discussion.
  - b. We continue to look at the core curriculum. SoCC continues to crank out proposals for GC1Y and GC2Y sections.
  - c. **An announcement from the floor of the University Senate** Please let the faculty in your constituency know to watch for advertisements of campus-wide conversations to discuss the core curriculum and how important it is to our liberal arts mission.
- 4. **SUBCOMMITTEE ON CORE CURRICULUM** (SoCC) – John Swinton  
*Officers: Chair John Swinton, Vice-Chair Mary Magoulick, Secretary Kay Anderson*
  - a. Since the last University Senate meeting SoCC has:
    - i. Approved three GC2Y sections: *Seeing like a State, AIDs Pandemic, Water and Society*
    - ii. Approved one Global Overlay – SOCI 1131
  - b. We have been kept up to date on CORE Assessment progress by Cara Meade.
  - c. We are awaiting revisions to numerous GC1Y and GC2Y sections.
- 5. **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE** (ECUS) – Catherine Whelan  
*Officers: Chair Catherine Whelan, Vice-Chair Lyndall Muschell, Secretary Craig Turner*
  - a. **MOTION 1213.EC.001.O**: On behalf of the committee, Catherine Whelan presented the motion *To endorse the term limits recommendation as outlined in the attached document*.

- i. **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION** At the time it was presented, this motion had one supporting document entitled *Recommendation for consideration of University Senate term limits* that provided the resolution proposal
  - ii. **CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION** Catherine Whelan provided the following.
    - 1) The motion requests that academic units give some consideration to the creation of term limits for their elected faculty senator positions.
    - 2) This is not a one-size-fits-all.
    - 3) It is an encouragement for academic unit faculty to have a conversation on how they want to be represented.
    - 4) We are not requiring term limits.
    - 5) The choice of term limits is entirely up to your academic unit.
    - 6) All we are asking is that academic units consider whether they want term limits for their elected faculty senator positions.
  - iii. **DISCUSSION**
    - 1) **Question** Is the motion recommending term limits or not? **Answer** The motion is to endorse the term limit recommendation. The recommendation is asking academic units to consider term limits for their elected faculty senator positions. In the document, there is language to indicate the 2012-2013 University Senate recommends that academic units have a conversation about term limits. Without the endorsement of the 2012-2013 University Senate, this claim would be false. We're endorsing a recommendation. We're not creating a policy for term limits.
    - 2) **Question** Why do we not propose a policy for term limits? **Answer** Within the discussion at the Executive Committee, there was an indication that there is a great deal of diversity across the university with respect to service on the university senate. Some areas have individuals clamoring to get onto the university senate, while other areas find most running away from the opportunity. Given this diversity, the feeling was to apply a one-size-fits-all policy for term limits for all elected faculty senator would not be advisable.
    - 3) **Question** Do you have a sense that this would change anyone's opinion? How will this help? **Answer** We assume that the colleagues within each unit could have a rationale discussion about the introduction of term limits.
    - 4) **Question** What is the goal of the motion? **Answer** The goal is to ask academic units to have a discussion on the introduction of term limits.
    - 5) **Question** Will units be required to report that they have had these conversations? **Answer** If an academic unit chooses to introduce term limits for their elected faculty positions, they would indicate that as part of their election procedure.
  - iv. **SENATE ACTION** Motion 1213.EC.001.O was endorsed.
  - b. **SCoN Report** Lyndall Muschell will provide the Subcommittee on Nominations (SCoN) report.
6. **SUBCOMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS** (SCoN) – Lyndall Muschell
- Officers: Chair Lyndall Muschell, Secretary Craig Turner, No Vice-Chair position for this committee.*
- a. **MOTION 1213.CN.004.O**: On behalf of the committee, Lyndall Muschell, SCoN Chair, presented the motion: *To adopt the slate of nominees for 2012-2013 University Senate officers and committee members as proposed in the supporting documentation.*
    - i. **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION** Supporting documentation for Motion 1213.CN.004.O, accessible in the online motion database, was identified and displayed on the big screen. The proposed revisions to the 2012-2013 university senate committee memberships were reviewed in detail. The supporting documentation provides justification for the revisions.
    - ii. **CONTEXTUAL INFORMATION** The changes to the slate of nominees to be voted on by the University Senate were described by Lyndall Muschell as follows.



- 1) Jessica Rehling resigned her position at Georgia College and notified Staff Council of her subsequent resignation as Staff Council Appointee to the Resources, Planning and Institutional Policy Committee (RPIPC) on January 7, 2013. Anita Jones was selected by Staff Council to complete her term of service as Staff Council Appointee to RPIPC.
- 2) Staff Council Chair Toi Franks notified Presiding Officer Catherine Whelan on January 16, 2013 of Greg Mahan's resignation as Selected Staff Senator and member of RPIPC. Carol Ward was selected by Staff Council to complete his term of service as both a Selected Staff Senator and RPIPC member.
- 3) No other changes were made to committee memberships.

iii. **SENATE ACTION:** Motion 1213.CN.004.O was *approved* with no further discussion.

7. **FACULTY AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE (FAPC)** – Leslie Moore

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

- a. **Post-Tenure Review Policy/Procedures** The original workgroup has resumed work on the Post-Tenure Review Policy. FAPC will be discussing the policy at our next meeting and will bring the motion to the University Senate should it pass in FAPC.

8. **STUDENT AFFAIRS POLICY COMMITTEE (SAPC)** – Amy Pinney reporting for Dianne Chamblee

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

- a. **Adderall Abuse** The educational sessions on this were a rousing success. Undergraduate nursing cohorts developed the teaching plan, the educational flyer, and the pamphlet. Both cohorts were involved on Feb 5-6. They worked from 11am to 5pm on each of these days around the fountain and in addition, from 6pm to 8pm on Feb 5. They handed out over four hundred pamphlets distributing their entire supply. Faculty, staff, and students were engaged and asked many appropriate questions.
- b. **Student Emergency Fund** The Student Government Association is engaged in continuing fund-raising efforts for this fund. SAPC continues to strategize on how to get the information regarding the opportunity to contribute to this fund to potential donors.
- c. **Student Retention** The strategy of asking seniors why they stayed (rather than exclusively asking departing students why they left/are leaving) has been pursued. One common theme has been the faculty to student ratio. Students consistently indicate that they liked the small faculty to student ratio and did not want to transfer away and risk not having the same level of attention at their next institution. While not a surprising reason, it was heartening to see student confirmation.
- d. **Military Student Support** SAPC discussed the importance of support for military students and there is a committee that is working on that right now.
- e. **Next Meeting** Our next SAPC meeting is Friday February 22 in Health Sciences Room 209.
- f. **Question from the floor** Could we receive an electronic copy, say in pdf format, of the educational literature on Adderall? Answer Yes, we will make that happen.

9. **STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION (SGA)** – Stephen Hundley reporting for Cody Allen

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

- a. **West Campus Shuttle** The Thursday night West Campus shuttle is a success.
- b. **Student Emergency Fund** The SGA Emergency Fund Committee is working hard, and has developed an aggressive fund-raising plan including community outreach programs, such as spirit nights at local businesses.
- c. **Upcoming Events** Homecoming and the 2013-2014 SGA Officer Elections are next week and have been demanding much of our attention. This year's election will feature a polling station on front campus, headed up by SGA Vice President Hundley and SGA Treasurer Ethridge, and made possible with support from the IT department and their iPads.
- d. **Appropriations** The SGA Appropriations Committee has allocated approximately \$6000 thus far this semester.

**President's Report:** President Steve Dorman

1. **Budget Update (FY 2013)**

- a. You may remember in early August, Dr. Paul Jones provided a budget message informing the university community that the Governor had issued a 3% budget reduction to all state agencies. At that time, we were also advised by the USG Staff to plan for an additional 2% reduction. We have been notified that the Governor has officially recommended a 5% reduction for the University System of Georgia (\$83.7 million). This means we will be implementing the additional 2% budget reduction for FY 2013. This will bring our cumulative reductions to \$1,429,716 for FY 2013.
- b. To protect the core academic functions and services, which directly impact students, we used a significant portion of its carry-forward funds to cover the 3% budget reduction. Our plan for the additional 2% reduction is to use institutional reserves. At this time, while the 3% reduction is a permanent reduction, we are not anticipating that the 2% reduction will carry forward to FY 2014. While this short-term approach will continue to minimize the impact on our university community, this approach further underscores the budget reality I discussed during my *State of the University Address*, making it even more important for the university to engage in the Academic Program and Academic Support Program prioritization process this spring. As I mentioned during the address, our current model and approach is not sustainable and will cause more long-term harm for us as a university if we don't act now.

2. **Budget Update (FY 2014)**

- a. As you may have seen in recent news, Governor Deal released his recommendations for FY 2014. His recommendations included \$1 million for Furniture Fixtures and Equipment (FF&E) for the Ennis Hall renovations. Please know that there are several weeks until the end of the legislative session and that we will continue to work hard to keep the FF&E funding in the budget. In fact, I was at the legislature Tuesday and Wednesday of this week and visited with several representatives and mentioned this issue of importance to us.
- b. It is far too early to speculate about the final budget outcome for FY 2014. However, our next step in the budget process will be to present our institutional priorities during the USG Budget Forums in early March and we are preparing for that. Utilizing the information derived from our fall budget hearings, the senior leadership team and I will discuss these priorities challenges and opportunities with the USG Staff.

3. **Prioritization Process:** I am encouraged about the Prioritization process that we will be engaged in this spring. We will be using a model that has been used in other places around the country. As you know I asked you to nominate individuals who would serve on two task forces which would lead the process. One task force will focus on academic programs, the other on support (non-academic) programs. They will be asked to lead a process (using the Dickeson Model) that will allow us to have a discussion about the "history of a program; the external demand for a program; the internal demands for a program; the quality of program inputs, processes and outcomes; the size, scope and productivity of a program; revenues and other resources generated by a program; costs and expenses associated with a program; impact and overall essentiality of a program and future opportunities presented by a program." (from: Robert C. Dickeson, *Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services*, Jossey-Bass, 2010).

- a. I am pleased to announce the individuals who will serve on these task forces:
  - i. **Academic Task Force:** Carlos M. Herrera, Tsu-Ming Chiang, Robert Blumenthal, John Sirmans, Charles Ubah, Jennifer Flory, Josh Kitchens, Lyndall Muschell, Cynthia Alby, Lisa Griffin, Jeff Turner, Gita Phelps, Nick Beadles, Tanya Goette, Kalina Manoylov.
  - ii. **Non Academic Task Force:** Lindy Ruark, Ginger Chaffinch, Toi Franks, Matt Mize, Cathy Crawley, Joe Windish, John Bowen, Judy Malachowski, Rene Fontenot, Stephanie McClure, Stacy Schwartz, Kirk Armstrong, Bruce Gentry, Karen Berman, Walter Dudley.
- b. These groups will be meeting with the consultant for the process, Dr. Larry Goldstein, over the next few weeks to prepare for the process that will engage faculty and staff in this very robust discussion.

- c. While I am not happy about the financial stress that higher education is under, I am encouraged by what I see happening at our institution. We are not facing some of the dire impacts that some institutions have to employ. We now have the opportunity, through this prioritization activity to thoughtfully and methodically engage in a discussion about our future and how to finance it. As I have continued to say, it is my belief that the character of the faculty and staff of this institution will lead us forward as we pursue these discussions of important budgetary significance. The solution to our financial model will emerge as we engage in this discussion and the good will and concern for the institution will prevail.
4. **Questions?** I am happy to take any questions you might have.

**Provost's Report:** Interim Provost Matthew Liao-Troth

1. **Public Art Policy:** Thanks to Maureen Horgan and RPIP for their work on the Public Art Policy.
2. **NLNAC Visit:** Congratulations to the School of Nursing for a successful visit from the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC). Informally our accreditation visit went very well with no problems.
3. **NCATE Recognition** Congratulations to College of Education for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) nationally recognized programs in
  - a. Early childhood at undergraduate and graduate levels
  - b. Special education at undergraduate and graduate levels
  - c. Middle grades at undergraduate and graduate levels
  - d. Library media at the graduate level
4. **International Education**
  - a. Visit by Arlene Jackson of American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU).
  - b. The search for the AVP of International Education is starting, and Catherine Whelan has agreed to chair that search.
5. **Announcement on Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) – Q&A Sessions** Please come and enjoy some coffee and light refreshments as we meet to discuss the proposed QEP goals and ideas for activities to support the goals. If you have some feedback or questions on the proposed QEP goals, if you have an idea for a program or activity to support the QEP topic “Building a Culture of Engaged Learning,” or if you are simply interested in learning more about the QEP, please come join us at either of the following “drop-in” sessions:
  - a. **What:** QEP Q&A
  - b. **Where:** Pat Peterson Museum Education Room (LITC – Clarke St. entrance)
  - c. **When:** 10a-12noon, Monday, Feb. 25 and 2p-4p, Tuesday, Feb. 26
  - d. **Who:** Anyone and everyone interested in Engaged Learning at Georgia College

**Unfinished Business:** There was no unfinished business.

**New Business:**

1. **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.
2. **AT-LARGE ELECTION** Catherine Whelan announced that the election for the at-large elected faculty senator position will be conducted next week. There are three confirmed nominations at the moment and there are two more nominees to contact to see if they are willing to accept the nomination and be placed on the ballot. The ballot should be released on Monday, February 18 and the vote will go through Thursday, February 21. Please vote and encourage your colleagues to vote.
3. **MUSICAL** Amy Pinney encouraged those in attendance to come and see the musical *I Love You, You're Perfect, Now Change* next week. Performances are Wed Feb 20 through Sun Feb 24. Friday, Feb 22 is a *faculty and staff bring a friend for free night*, that's how bad we want you to come!

**Adjourn:** As there was no further business, a motion to adjourn was made, seconded, and approved. The meeting was adjourned at 3:19 p.m.