

**Academic Services Committee**  
**Monthly Meeting Minutes**  
**October 6, 2010**

**Committee Members Present:** Doug Britton (arrived at 11:54 AM), Amy D’Unger, Nancey Green Leigh, Marlit Hayslett, Peter Hesketh, Margaret Loper, Helena Mitchell, Tyler Walters, David White (Executive Committee Liaison)

**Committee Members Absent:** Student Member (TBA)

The meeting was called to order at 11:06 AM by chair Helena Mitchell and members of the committee introduced themselves.

Because of some travel commitments, the date of the November meeting will have to be changed. The committee agreed upon meeting Tuesday, November 23<sup>rd</sup> from 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM and concurred that the December meeting should also be moved to a later date, so as not to be just one week after the November meeting. The new fall schedule is as follows:

\*Tuesday, November 23<sup>rd</sup>, 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM, Neely Room of the library

\*Wednesday, December 15<sup>th</sup>, 11:00 AM – 12:00 PM, IPST, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor (500 10<sup>th</sup> Street, park out front and please let Helena if you do not have a GT parking pass so that she can give you a guest pass)

Committee members then discussed the overall mission of the ASC and concluded that the committee should have a “voice” on campus and focus on specific action items. Nancey pointed out that, in the past, the committee has written statements of support on behalf of various campus issues such as the Learning Center and the campus cable network. Helena asked if there was follow up on these items, which was not clear.

David, as the interface with the Faculty Senate, shared some of the new provost’s concerns, which might provide some ideas for “action items” to be pursued by the ASC. The provost expressed concern over the following issues:

1. implementation of the new Strategic Plan,
2. the issue of faculty governance,
3. the appropriate amount and depth of international engagement, as well as the need to do risk assessment and management with our international partners,
4. engagement with other local institutions such as Emory University,
5. the CoE dean search, and
6. the possibility that UGA will develop programs in engineering.

David also shared that the president will be announcing the budget in a week or so and is optimistic that there will be no additional significant cuts and no layoffs. There was, however, no mention of a resumption of full time hires.

Amy introduced the idea of a “climate committee,” which is an idea that came out of the Diversity Symposium held on September 17<sup>th</sup>. This would be a committee at either the college or institute level that would assess the working environment in departments across campus and help mediate when problems arise. Other universities have such committees, but Tech does not. Amy stated that her department was in support of this and passed a resolution at their last faculty meeting to support the development of a climate committee for the Ivan Allen College. Amy will obtain a copy of the document discussed at the HTS faculty meeting and disseminate to the rest of the ASC members.

The committee then went on to discuss other issues that could be addressed by the ASC in the coming year. These included the issues of:

- chairs staying for a long period of time (“chair for life,” which David noted was on the president’s radar),
- female faculty members not moving up the ranks as rapidly as their male colleagues,
- hiring new faculty to deal with the problem of the increasing faculty/student ratio,
- the Institute not being a member of the Interuniversity Consortium of Political and Social Research (ICPSR, [www.icpsr.umich.edu](http://www.icpsr.umich.edu)), of which almost every Research I university in the country except Georgia Tech is a member,
- improving the student experience and dealing with the perceived faculty/student divide, and
- the growing division between academic faculty, research faculty, and academic professionals (e.g., renewable contracts, increasing responsibilities without increasing rights/salaries, etc.)

The committee members agreed that all were serious and important issues and concurred that, with regards to ICPSR membership, now would be the time to ask. Nancey suggested that the Dean of the Library come and speak to the ASC about the issue, as it could be a potential action item for the committee.

Helena stated that she has spoken to Steve Cross about the issue of marginalized faculty members, and it is also a concern for him. Nancey asked whether this would be an issue for the ASC or for a committee that dealt with HR and personnel issues (if such a committee exists, which was not clear).

Margaret suggested that, with regards to the issue of the student experience at Georgia Tech, it would be helpful to speak with the undergraduate and graduate SGA presidents about the issues and concerns of their constituents. The February meeting, once the presidents had been in office for at least a semester, was suggested as a good time for them to come and address the ASC.

Other ideas for action items were then generated based on the goals and initiatives of the strategic plan, as well as committee members' involvement in SP efforts. Marlit is currently involved in the SP initiative to plan policy centers, while Margaret is involved in the virtual campus initiative. Nancey suggested that we think about how we, as either individuals or the ASC, learn about how we can best be engaged in and supportive of the mission of the strategic plan, and Helena suggested that Chet Warzynski (Executive Director of the Office of Organizational Development) might be invited to a future ASC meeting to discuss the SP and its implementation.

The committee then continued to discuss other issues that could be addressed by the ASC, with regards to the SP, in the coming year. Additional issues included:

- an update on the Marcus Nanotechnology Building (Peter),
- space planning and the crunch for classroom space (Peter), and
- software access for instructors teaching in certain buildings (Nancy gave the example of access to GIS software in buildings that do not have site licenses).

Committee members agreed that the intersection of space planning and OIT is an area of concern that could be pursued further by the ASC, though Margaret cautioned that we must be sure that ASC can actually contribute to the discussion and problem solving (i.e., that the problem is within the domain of this committee). Other committee members suggested that they did feel it was within the purview of the ASC, but that we should tackle *specific issues* at the intersection of OIT and space planning. Peter suggested that faculty and students should get access to the same programs and the same **versions** of programs, and Nancey further stated that the process should be seamless so that faculty do not have to deal with issues such as classrooms in which the professor cannot access needed computer software. David suggested that, with the change in leadership, now would be a good time to engage OIT in a discussion about these issues.

Margaret suggested that the development of umbrella centers across campus, under which current centers would fall (e.g., "Future Media"), might be an area of engagement for the ASC. She suggested that the ASC support student involvement in the process of center development.

Discussion then returned to the divide between academic faculty, research faculty, and academic professionals. David stated that at CMU there is a research faculty track with a clear career path, unlike for some of the research faculty or academic professionals here at Tech. Margaret added that, in some departments, there is not an infrastructure to support research faculty (hence the importance of GTRI in providing that structure), and that the issue of joint appointments also can create problems for research faculty.

David then introduced a project that he is involved with that might be of interest to the ASC. He is concerned with the gap between the information technology needs of the units and the infrastructure that is provided to them. He has been working on a project with the Office of the Registrar to create a graduate (Ph.D.) student services system.

The system was designed by the CoC, based on a program used in ECE to monitor graduate admissions. The project began in January 2010 and they are currently working on creating a module for graduate student evaluations. This system has potential to be a unit-specific student services program to provide an infrastructure for monitoring graduate admissions and evaluating graduate students once admitted.

Doug suggested that another issue of importance related to facilities use is the issue of free speech. Ron Bohlander had previously stated that this would be a good topic of discussion for the ASC, though no specific incident of free speech violation was mentioned. David said that this topic had been discussed in the Executive Committee and that a free speech policy that included both *policy* and *procedure* was being drafted and to be combined with the policies on business and finance. Because the EC viewed this combination as problematic, it was sent back to the Statutes Committee. Margaret suggested that this issue might also intersect with the OIT issues discussed previously, such as the problems associated with having an open website (e.g., a blog). The issue could also relate to the creation of applications for computers and mobile devices, as it's unclear what the screening process for this would be. David stated that the president is interested in drafting a comprehensive plan that includes four major components: the faculty handbook, the catalog, human resources materials, and general policies and procedures.

The meeting concluded with a discussion of the major themes that had emerged as well as the creation of a list of "action items." The following major themes were identified:

1. Library issues (ICPSR)
2. Graduate and Undergraduate Student Experience
3. The Strategic Plan
4. The Nanotech Building
5. The Intersection of Space Planning and OIT
6. Free Speech
7. The Creation of New Centers and Relationships Among Faculty

Helena suggested that our November speaker could be related to the Strategic Plan (e.g., Chet Warzynski) and that we could then select other speakers for subsequent meetings, providing the speaker with points on which we want them to speak and action items for the ASC. During the meeting on OIT-related issues, David and a representative from the registrar's office can demonstrate the graduate student services system that he created. In addition, Amy reminded those who are teaching to check their exam schedules to make sure those exams don't conflict with the 12/15 meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:16 PM.

Minutes Respectfully Submitted by,

Amy D'Unger  
Secretary, Academic Services Committee