

**GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
MEETING OF THE FACULTY EXECUTIVE BOARD**

**MINUTES**

**Meeting of March 1, 2016**

**Held in the Poole Board Room of the Wardlaw Building**

Members Present: Abrams (Ugrad student), Balch (CoC-IC), Balsam (Secretary of the Faculty, GTRI), Bras (Provost), Briscoe (GTRI-ATAS), Canellas (Grad student), Clark, Russ (CoC-CS), Cross (EVPR), Dorsey (Staff Council), Foster (Modern Lang), Garcia (AE), Grover (Chair, ChBE), Hall, Leslie (Staff Council), Hernandez (Chemistry), Nation (GTRI-ELSYS), Powell (OSP), Riley (Vice-Chair, ECE), Schumacher (Psychology), Shepler (Chemistry), Williams (USGFC Rep., ECE)

Members Absent: Cottle (Architecture), Feron (AE), Hall, Bobby (GTRI-CTISL), Lotempio (GTRI-SEAL), McIntyre (Business), Peterson (President), Pusateri (Staff Council), Simpson (OSP)

Guests: Butera, (Chair Sub-committee APR Review; ECE), Cozzens (Vice-Provost), Herazy (Asst. Provost), Potts (VP Undergrad Ed), Sharp (Assoc Vice-Provost)

1. **Prof. Martha Grover, Chair**, opened the meeting at 3:05 P.M. She welcomed Leslie Hall as a representative of the Staff council who serves as their Secretary.
2. Prof. Grover directed the Board's attention to the minutes (**Attachment #1**) of their January 26, 2016 meeting. **A motion to approve was seconded and passed without dissent.**
3. The Chair next called on **Provost Bras** to remark on matters of interest to the Georgia Tech community.
  - a. President Peterson is currently attending one of our many celebrations regarding the end of the successful GT Campaign. A couple of the celebrations were held here at the McCamish Pavilion with the rest throughout the country.
  - b. The library project was delayed, but never the less we are continuing the project. The plan is to request the funding for next year, fiscal year '18. The Library Service Center is completed and Dr. Bras invited everyone to visit it. It is an incredible facility. The official opening is March 17<sup>th</sup>.
  - c. Commission on "Creating the Next" on education. I ask you to help make sure all of our colleagues are aware of this initiative. One of the most exciting initiatives since he has been at GT. We need to engage as many people as possible. What is the future of education at GT? How do we offer the content? Who will our peer institutions be, what

our students will look like? The commission will have a complete license to think as broadly as possible. They will be working the next 18-24 months to engage with as many people as possible. The commission is forty people. It is headed by Bonnie Ferry and Rich DeMillo. They will come up with pilots and recommendations. President Clough is also helping and Jeff Delingo, editor of Chronicle are assisting with the effort. Dr. Bras encouraged everyone to participate and spread the word.

- d. SACS COC accreditation reaffirmation has officially come through and we are re-accredited for the next ten years. There are a few items we need to respond to. They have created an Academic Effectiveness and Strategy office working with Catherine Murray-Rust program that has academic effectiveness role. Sandy Bramblett has agreed to coordinate the creation of that office to affirm our direction, answer their report, and to prepare ourselves for a continuing improvements. We have been reaffirmed, but there is work to continue to do and the academic units need to help and cooperate to make sure that those assessment and effectiveness metrics are carried out.
- e. The Task Force on the Learning Environment (put together at the request of the student body) resulted in a white paper they submitted to Dr. Bras. They came out with a very good report with reasonable recommendations. Focused on how to make the learning experience at Georgia Tech not only rigorous, but good experience and enjoyable. We are in an implementation stage that Leslie Sharp is chairing.
- f. The Gender Equity recommendations comes from the listening sessions that President Peterson had that yielded a list of many good ideas. These have been sent to the HR office and the Provost's office. Dr. Bras is in charge of this.
- g. We are in the midst of the legislative session, with about 10 days left, and it has been a very tough year. There are many things in legislation that may affect us directly; some good and some not very good: HOPE Scholarship is being modified to consider STEM classes; this should help our student. The debate on Campus Carry has been opposed by institutions across the state for many years successfully up until this year; his opinion is this is not good for campuses and may be passed. The decision by the BoR was to declare there will be no tuition increases this year across all the campuses; this has been interpreted very broadly and includes professional programs also. The good side of the story when the budget is all done, we should get some money for salary increases.
- h. The High Performance Computing Center is still moving forward, we are currently planning the official utilization of that facility. The official announcement of that development should come in early April.
- i. An exciting and fun happening coming up and encourages all to attend. We are going to have our regular InVenture Prize Competition. There will also be an ACC InVenture Prize Competition will be on April 5-6<sup>th</sup>, which is very exciting. All schools will be participating. The program will be professionally produced and broadcast across many states. This was in direct response to our event. This is good that we have convinced the ACC they can invest more in the academic side of the house. Chris Reef has been planning it. Try to attend, it should be fun.

- j. In recent news, you may have heard of the Phi Delta Theta fraternity decision reversal by President Peterson. Ultimately, a former GA Supreme Court judge reviewed our process and the decision. Justice Sears came up with an extensive report that is public, which basically said that our judicial process works well, and that due process was given to the fraternity. She also agreed that the incident did happen, however recommended that our decision be vacated because our own policies/procedures state that an organization cannot be punished for the actions of a few, considering that the leadership of the organization was not involved.
4. The Provost asked Dr. Cross if he had any announcements:
    - a) Introduced Professor Fred Quinn from the University of Georgia, Department Chair of Infectious Diseases. He is participating in the USG Executive Leadership Institute where part of the program is to spend time at a different institution and his time with Dr. Cross.
    - b) We have some good news, it has been 20 years since we led a National Science Foundation Engineering Research Center. We have tried every year but haven't made it. There were 184 white papers in the latest round submitted across the country. Last week 17 proposals went forward and two proposals from Georgia Tech were invited back. One led by Krish Roy in Biomedical Engineering and one on Sustainability by led by John Crittenden. The QEP will be a good point for his proposal. We hope we can win one by next fall.
  5. The chair called on Prof. Rob Butera, Chair of the Academic Program Review Subcommittee to share results (**Attachment #2**).
    - a) We changed our policies about two years ago on how we handle academic program reviews. Every five years, an outside panel comes in and issues a report on how well you are doing.
    - b) The reviews used to go to the Graduate/Undergraduate Curriculum Committees. The new method we put into place two years ago involved creating an ad-hoc committee (consisting largely of past and present members of this board) to oversee these reviews.
    - c) The committee also reviewed all action plan updates from all the schools from the 2013-14 and 2014-15 years.
    - d) A main problem we've seen on this committee is resource allocation issues. Staff support is a recurring issue, however, unique this year seems to be the needs and support of the instructional faculty and exactly how they fit in to the culture of the academic unit. Another problem seen was the lack of internal communication. Issues in diversity in student and faculty recruitment also came up, as well as lack of ability to control graduate enrollment in given majors.
    - e) Specific findings included: The school of LMC has a PhD program that is narrower in scope than the research interests of their entire faculty. Physics-wise: Improving the

first year physics experience, and introduce a professional practice course for first year graduate students. The department was somewhat dismissive about these ideas, and we are currently trying to develop a more helpful process for fixing these specific issues.

Dr. Bras explained what happens next. He has the committees report and is preparing a response to it. He believes the process is working well and thinks this new process is working well. This has elevated the whole process and is taken seriously by the Deans and Assoc Deans.

6. Prof Grover then called on Dr. Cozzens, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Faculty Development and Dr. Leslie Sharp, Assoc. Vice Provost to share the Guidance Document on Promotions and Tenure ([Attachment #3](#)).
  - a) Faculty Affairs organizes the logistics of the Promotions and Tenure process.
  - b) Task force was given a broad list of questions to address. It took about a year, but we have worked our way through all the questions.
  - c) Many fine-tuning items came up, such as enormous inconsistencies in the files as they come to the institute committee. The committee has since been given more time to review these files, as they typically receive a large number of files at a time.
  - d) We are trying to standardize the format (of the resumes in particular) in order to make this process easier and more accessible.
  - e) We came out with a report that was shared with the Dean's office, and then made this document. There are some suggestions in it that are directly from Dr. Bras. Everything comes from the *Faculty Handbook (FH)*. Much of what is in the document is meant to remind people of items in the faculty handbook that do not always get attention and are typically forgotten or misunderstood.
  - f) During the review process they get questions about items that are not in the *FH*. They have added some information in the guidelines that help address some of these questions.
  - g) Supplementary to the *FH*. Where the Task Force found need change in the *FH* has been taken to the Statutes Committee. There are some additional information that needs to be added to the *FH*; for example, the role of the College Committees in the process.

Q (Canellas): Is there any consideration for including qualitative measures like CIOS scores for advising?

A (Cozzens): It is actually requested in the guidelines document, but is not in the *FH*. One item is if the students are published, but not on the quality of the advising.

Q (Nation): Early in the document there is a reference to feedback to the faculty member be redacted. How much is actually redacted?

A (Cozzens): Only thing that is redacted is reference to the external letters. They encourage faculty to request their file. A little more openness if helpful to all of us.

Statement (Balch): I think the existence of this document is great. Need to let junior faculty know about it to understand the process. There are some ways I think it could be improved. I would like faculty to be engaged in taking a look at the document and making recommendations; for example, we know that the *FH* may need some modifications. A difference between UGA and our process is the faculty is advised early in the process and provided the opportunity to rebut issues that have come up. In our process that is published, the faculty is not provided an opportunity to rebut until the process is complete.

Response (Bras): The Task Force did include faculty and did a tremendous job looking at everything. Tenure and promotion are probably the most important things we do for the future of the Institution. To make sure those that will be here for life are those that we want here for life. The improvement we have is mostly procedural and we have a consistent format that even includes the letters we request. The process this year was extraordinarily good. The engagement we see at every level is really satisfying. The Institute committee has high level discussion and everyone listens for the strengths and weaknesses; everyone votes their opinion. They spend two whole days together. The checks and balances we have built into the process is meant to keep everything consistent and fair.

Statement (Grover): This guideline is mainly for the reviewers. Should this or a different document be for the reviewees? Is this being distributed?

Response (Cozzens): This is on the Promotion and Tenure website. We were looking at needs of the individuals doing the reviews and may need to look at the view of the reviewees.

Statement (Balch): I would like to see a Task Force that looks at report and the *FH* and policies and make some recommendations. MOTION: I move that a committee be appointed by the Chair. Seconded by Canellas, but he is a non-voting member of the FEB. No one else seconded the motion.

Response (Bras): I am happy with that. Let's make sure that we don't mix policy with procedure.

Statement (Balsam): The date on this is Jan 31<sup>st</sup>. Has this just been posted? Maybe a need is a good communication plan.

Response (Cozzens): We could take that on to communicate the information.

7. The chair asked Prof. George Riley, Vice-Chair, to provide status of the Nominating Committee for the spring 2016 elections.

- a) We have a vacancy on Faculty Services Committee. Denise Johnson has stepped down. Dr. David Godfrey is the runner up from the last election and is willing to serve the remainder of the term.

**Motion:** Appoint David Godfrey from IEN to fill the unexpired term of Denise Johnson on the Faculty Services Committee. The motion was seconded and passed.

- b) Interviewed those at the end of their first term on a committee, roughly half wanted to stay, some wanted to leave, and others wanted to change committees. There are a few openings who don't have nominations yet, and are waiting on responses from department chairs. This fulfilled many vacancies.
  - c) Contacted those on the Senate that could be nominated to the FEB. Many were happy to be nominated.
  - d) He has many openings that still need to be fulfilled. He has emailed Department Chairs to make them aware of vacancies for representation of their units.
8. Prof. Riley discussed the Periodic Peer Review process and changes it may need to be more successful. Last year, Bob Kirkman wanted to study the PPR process. Opinion has been that the committee has no teeth. He and Bob have met several time and made a few tweaks to the process and presented to the Deans Council. Recommendation was that sometime in this process, the local committee can pass on to the Dean for further action. The Deans wonder what they can do at that point. Decision was to step back and review what other Institutions do with within USG and across the country with faculty reviews that are not up to par. They will look at that and get back to the Deans.

Dr. Cozzens pointed out that our *FH* is much more vague than the Board of Regents policy that does use the term dismissal. May need to look at the GT *FH* language.

9. Prof. Grover polled committee liaisons for any reports of matters that should come to the Board's attention. The following were significant highlights not covered elsewhere:
  - a. **Debbie Dorsey (Staff Council):** Just kicked off quarterly information sessions that is open to students, faculty, and staff. They were very successful with standing room only. Have the next Town Hall scheduled for March 17<sup>th</sup>.
  - b. **Doug Williams (USGFC rep):** University System Faculty Committee has scheduled spring meeting for Friday, April 15<sup>th</sup>. There has been a lot of email this week about Campus Carry. There has been a lot of campus faculty senates that have sent resolutions against Campus Carry. Faculty Council is waiting to this weekend to determine if anything. In 2013, they passed a resolution against Campus Carry; not much that has changed since then. Recommend individuals send recommendations to representatives as probably more effective.
  - c. **Jen Abrams (Pres, Undergrad SGA):** Discussed the Campus Carry Bill, we did a survey for undergraduate and graduate students, with the overwhelming majority not wanting guns on campus. She has worked with student presidents at other USG

institutions to have surveys. Talked about the Phi Delta Theta report mentioned earlier, and talked about how Greek organizations are trying to work together to prevent any further issues on this. President Peterson is trying to meet with our black students. Some black students feel like they are not welcome on this campus; it is a hard issue to address. It is mid-terms and a very stressful time; SGA is on top of mental health initiatives to make sure students know where to go if they have an issue.

- d. **Marc Canellas (President, Grad SGA):** Reiterate Jen's report that it has been a rough spring semester. Campus carry: the international population is about 90% against and the rest of the demographics is about 80% against. Special Institutional fee will not be going down this year which is what we fought for this year, but understand the results and ask our leadership to fight for this in the future. Used **Attachment #4** to share the current status of the Graduate Student Experience Survey Results. So far, the response is going very well; we have over 40% of the on campus graduate students that have responded to this survey. They have more responses to this survey than the undergraduate survey. The results will be coming back to the schools. People want to make positive change on this campus. We have one more week and ask you to encourage your graduate students to complete the survey.
- e. **Tucker Balch (IGCC):** We have a new PhD program in Ocean Science and Engineering.
- f. **Erica Briscoe (Stud Grievance and Appeal):** Nothing to report.
- g. **Russ Clark (Faculty Services):** Nothing to report. Next meeting March 14.
- h. **Mark Cottle (SAFAC):** nothing to report.
- i. **Paul Foster (Academic Integrity):** Met a few weeks ago, discussed possible merger between the Student Honor Committee and the Student Integrity Committee; there have been more cases to consider this year so may not want to merge the committees. Need to make sure the Statutes Committee is aware of changes that may affect the recommendations.
- j. **Eric Feron (Student Activities):**
- k. **Elena Garcia (liaison to Staff Council):** Quarterly informational series that is open to student's faculty and staff, next one will be on governmental issues. Next Town Hall is March 17<sup>th</sup>. Currently accepting applications for our committees.
- l. **Bobby Hall (Statutes):**
- m. **Rigoberto Hernandez (Faculty Honors):**
- n. **Johanna Lotempio (Student Computer Ownership):**
- o. **John McIntyre (FSGC):**

- p. Doug Nation (Student Regulations):** The SRC will be revisiting the Student Conduct Investigation and Disciplinary Policy. The BoR/USG has sent a uniform minimum policy that we must fold into our GT Policy and pass back to them for review and approval. They have also published draft Sexual Misconduct Policy.
- q. Michelle Powell (Benefits):** Continued conversation about leave policies (maternity, paternity etc.), as well as balance of teaching and research responsibilities.
- r. Eric Schumacher (Student Honors):**
- s. Carrie Shepler (IUCC):** Nothing to report.
- t. Dana Simpson (Welfare & Security):**

10. Prof Grover asked if there was any additional business and hearing none adjourned the meeting at about 5:10 pm.

Submitted by Jeanne Balsam, Secretary  
March x, 2016

#### **Attachments**

1. [Minutes](#) of the January 26, 2016 Faculty Executive Board meeting.
2. [Review](#) of APR report
3. [Guidance](#) on Promotion and Tenure Process
4. [Status](#) of Graduate Student Experience Survey