

East Georgia State College Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes

March 2, 2022

12 p.m. Meeting being Zoomed to all Faculty Senate members

Addendum 1. Email Discussion – Senator Simmons on faculty concerns about teaching a CATS class and possible handbook changes.

Addendum 2. Email discussion – President Chambers on faculty concerns about “override authority.”

Addendum 3. Email discussion – President Chambers provided a list of questions for the AVPAA concerning the changes in the Faculty Annual Report.

Addendum 4. Email discussion and motion. President Chambers requested the Senate consider a request by the President, Dr. Schecter to allow him additional time to review promotion and tenure dossiers.

Addendum 5. Email discussion. Senator Boudreaux suggested a survey be taken of the Faculty through “SurveyMonkey” asking for input on two discussions under consideration by the Senate.

Addendum 6. Email discussion. Senator Simmons made a motion to delay Senate elections until the faculty has reviewed and approved the changes to the bylaws.

Addendum 7. Email discussion. Senator Boudreaux reminded the Senators that a review of the bylaws must be made.

Addendum 8. Email discussion. Senator Boudreaux requested guidance on the form and completeness of the bylaws to be distributed to the faculty.

Type of meeting: Regular Meeting

Meeting Facilitator: Laura Chambers, President

- I. Open Pre-meeting discussion
- II. Call to order (12:00 p.m.) – regular meeting – fifth meeting of 2021-22 academic year
- III. Roll call –

Present: Laura Chambers (President), Armond Boudreaux, Deborah Lee, Darlene Dickens, and John Gleissner (Secretary), Sue Bragg, and Breana Simmons (Parliamentarian).

Having 7 of 7 members present this represents a quorum and normal business may take place.

- IV. Greeting of Visitors – Mike Moran (In the absence of Chief Seckinger, Mike has agreed to answer our questions about the CBI Policy since Mike is the Chair of the Background Investigation Committee.)

Mr. Moran talked to the Senate about the overall process for handling background checks of students requiring the investigation.

These included students enrolled in the Teacher Education programs, Corel Scholars, and Housing, among others.

Other students were investigated/background check requested when indicated on the admissions form for history of judicial involvement.

The committee used a series of previously set precedents to determine admittance or rejection. The student was required to provide the background check using the school's vendor.

After the committee collected its findings, the student was asked to appear and answer/explain the circumstances mentioned in the findings.

A process of appeal is followed as per the college's statutes.

The President thanked Mr. Moran for his discussion and answers to the Senators' questions.

- V. Approval of minutes from February meeting and Adoption of Agenda

Typographical errors were corrected and approved by unanimous consent.

- VI. Committee Reports – APCC (Chambers)—None—APCC Did not meet.

- VII. Open Issues

- VIII. New Business

- a. Faculty Concern: Requirements for Syllabi (Boudreaux)

There was a motion to request the VPASA remove extraneous information indicated by the Senate.

Discussion was held to determine the concerns of the Senators regarding the amount of information and the extent to which the information had to be replicated on every class's syllabus.

After discussion, the motion was voted on and unanimously rejected.

There was a motion to create a subcommittee of the Senate to propose a new standardized template for the syllabus.

Discussion was held to determine the scope of the syllabus material. Senators suggested a return to individualized class syllabus, with material pertaining to overall college policy, procedures and notifications be provided by the administration to the students directly using the EGSC website, student email, student portal announcements and other direct dissemination.

Senator Boudreaux volunteered to chair the subcommittee and would be contacting other Senators for their input.

Discussion was closed and the motion was approved unanimously.

b. Faculty Concern: Changes in Annual Faculty Report Form (Simmons)

There was a motion to request the AVPAA provide more information concerning the changes in the format of the Faculty's Annual Self-reporting instrument.

Discussion was held to determine the Senator's concerns. Questions about authorization to create the template, origination of the document, chain of authority to make changes to the information requested and the format for the report. The Senator reviewed the statutes of the college and provided that the report needed faculty governance and compliance.

After discussion, the motion was voted on and unanimously rejected.

There was a motion to create a subcommittee of the Senate to propose a new standard template for the Faculty's Annual Self-reporting form.

Senator Simmons volunteered to chair the subcommittee and would be contact other Senators for input and participation in the work of the subcommittee.

Discussion was closed and the motion was passed unanimously.

IX. Unfinished Business

a. Faculty Concern: Membership of APCC and Who Votes? (Chambers)

President Chambers reported that with the new positions and reorganization, the By-law review subcommittee would need to take into consideration the number and authority of the members of the APCC.

A motion was made to move the discussion to email correspondence between now and the next Senate meeting.

Senator Boudreaux (chair of the subcommittee) agreed to move forward with the analysis and provide the Senate with updated By-laws during the email discussion.

Discussion was closed and the motion was passed unanimously.

b. Faculty Concern: Appointment of Academic Administration Positions (Chambers)

President Chambers reported on a reply she received from Mary Smith (College Chief of Staff and Legal Affairs)

President Chambers reported that after discussion about the chain of authorization for the appointments, Ms. Smith reported that the changes were considered an “administrative” decision and fell under the President’s office authority.

Senator Bragg discussed the possible need for a formal request of explanation on the reasons for the change and the purpose of such reorganization of authority.

President Chambers agreed to write a letter of “concern” to the VPASA and to request any archival information showing the progression of previous reorganizations, their path of authorization and Faculty governance involvement.

c. Faculty Concern: Overrides without Permission (Chambers)

A motion was made to table this discussion to allow the AVPAA to respond to previous questions and return to this topic during the next Senate meeting.

The discussion was closed, and the motion was passed unanimously.

d. CBI Policy Discussion Revisited (Chambers)

As noted in section IV, discussion was held with Mr. Moran concerning this topic.

e. By-Laws Revision Committee Report and Discussion (Boudreaux)

Senator Boudreaux reported that the subcommittee would be meeting during the next weeks to finalize the draft of the changes for Faculty Senate Review. This would take place through email discussion. The Senator mentioned that this had an “Urgent” need to meet timeline considerations for the Fall.

X. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:25 pm by unanimous consent.

Addendum 1. Email Discussion – Senator Summons on faculty concerns about teaching a CATS class and possible handbook changes.

A discussion was held concerning adding an agenda item to discuss the assignment of overload classes to faculty. Dr. Cadle had made the suggestion through email that if a faculty member did not have a “full” course load, the college could offer the faculty member the opportunity to teach a CATS course. Otherwise, the administration would ask the faculty member to perform some needed administrative tasks within their areas to fulfil the applied teaching time for the college.

It was felt that this completed the discussion and not added to the agenda.

Addendum 2. Email discussion – President Chambers on faculty concerns about “override authority.”

A discussion was held concerning the process for granting overrides to students. President Chambers asked AVPAA Dr. Chevalier about the process. Dr. Chevalier requested specific occasions so he could address them specifically.

Discussion continued with Senators Simmons and Gleissner suggesting they would request if any faculty member could provide specifics on students being granted overrides to their classes. Should such faculty be unwilling to submit the specifics, the President would request additional information without specifics to determine the extent that “other than instructor’s signature” was provided for the override.

Addendum 3. Email discussion – President Chambers provided a list of questions for the AVPAA concerning the changes in the Faculty Annual Report.

The questions were part of an email to Dr. Chevalier from Dr. Yelena White.

1. Where did this form come from? It is new and does not match the form that we have in Faculty Handbook. Has this form gone through and been approved by APCC and Faculty Senate?
2. While the form is new, it still uses very old language, such as "division chair" - not a question, just an observation.
3. The form asks for "Summary of Year's Academic Classes (numbers after midpoint)" - what is that? We have not been given the "midpoint" date to track the number of students throughout the year, each semester.
4. Professional development seems to be tilted towards humanities. Even the way we have to list articles is very different from how one would cite a scientific/math publication.
5. Part (I) on Professional Development has been changed from "Professional Meetings Attended" to "Professional Membership Presentations/Panels." So does attending a meeting or a workshop not count as professional development? We have to now present or be panelists? When was this introduced? This significantly reduces professional development that we can list, especially given that most of us were only able to attend something virtually in the past year.

President Chambers suggested this be added to the April agenda for continued discussion. A motion to add this discussion was made and since there was no further discussion, passed unanimously.

Addendum 4. Email discussion and motion. President Chambers requested the Senate consider a request by the President, Dr. Schecter to allow him additional time to review promotion and tenure dossiers.

From email 3/4/2022 via President Chambers

“President Schecter has asked us to allow him extra time to review promotion and tenure dossiers since he just officially came on board in January. The policy states that the president will have the reviews and recommendations done by January. Obviously, he has not had time to get this done. He wants us to recommend an extension with a due date.

He says that he can be done by the end of this month, so may I get a motion to recommend Dr. Schecter be allowed an extension on his review of promotion and tenure dossiers with the due date of March 28th?”

A motion to permit the President time to review the dossiers was made, voted and passed unanimously.

Addendum 5. Email discussion. Senator Boudreaux suggested a survey be taken of the Faculty through “SurveyMonkey” asking for input on two discussions under consideration by the Senate.

The three concerns were:

1. the issue of override authority.
2. the issue of administrative reorganization and the creation of administrative positions with extended authority.
3. The perception of some faculty that the Senate was not conducting “its business” with appropriate actions and review.

The discussion was held. Dr. Boudreaux provided further explanation of item 3 from above:

The criticisms that I’m hearing from faculty have to do with how we conduct our meetings more than with elections. The specific issue that struck me the most is that some faculty wish that we made it clearer that our meetings are public and can be attended by anyone—also that we haven’t done things like providing our agendas to the faculty so that they can offer input to us about the items that we’re considering.

A motion to table the discussion until the next meeting was made and further discussion could take place after the Senator could review the items. Since there was no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Addendum 6. Email discussion. Senator Simmons made a motion to delay Senate elections until the faculty has reviewed and approved the changes to the bylaws.

A discussion was held concerning the timing of the vote and who constituted “faculty” for the fall of 2022. It was agreed that all current “faculty” should be considered eligible for voting on the bylaws.

Senator Simmons, making the point that March 15 (deadline for elections) had passed, the Senate must vote to delay elections till an accurate list of those qualified to be nominated and serve be given the Faculty.

Having no further discussion, the motion was passed unanimously.

Addendum 7. Email discussion. Senator Boudreaux reminded the Senators that a review of the bylaws must be made.

A motion was made to accept the bylaw revisions and move the revisions before the entire faculty for discussion and vote.

Hearing no further discussion, the motion to approve the changes was made and passed unanimously.

Addendum 8. Email discussion. Senator Boudreaux requested guidance on the form and completeness of the bylaws to be distributed to the faculty.

After discussion, it was decided the bylaws would be sent to the faculty for their review with changes highlighted and a “draft” watermark.