

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

MINUTES

Meeting of April 7, 2016

Held in the Poole Board Room of the Wardlaw Building

Members Present: Abrams (Ugrad student), Balsam (Sec of the Faculty, GTRI), Briscoe (GTRI-ATAS), Clark (CoC-CS), Cottle (Architecture), Feron (AE), Foster (Modern Lang), Garcia (AE), Hernandez (Chemistry), Lotempio (GTRI-SEAL), McIntyre (Business), Nation (GTRI-ELSYS), Peterson (President), Riley (Vice-Chair, ECE), Shepler (Chemistry), Simpson (OSP), Williams (USGFC Rep., ECE)

Members Absent: Balch (CoC-IC), Bras (Provost), Canellas (Grad student), Cross (EVPR), Dorsey (Staff Council), Grover (Chair, ChBE), Hall, Bobby (GTRI-CTISL), Hall, Leslie (Staff Council), Powell (OSP), Pusateri (Staff Council), Schumacher (Psychology)

Guests: Berry (Georgia Southern Grad Student), Cozzens (Vice-Provost), Herazy (Asst. Provost), Girardot (Assoc VP Undergrad. Ed), Hughes (Chair, Statutes; Prof ECE)

1. **Prof. George Riley, Vice-Chair**, opened the meeting at 3:05 P.M. He welcomed **Atilia Berry, a Higher Education Administration graduate student** at Georgia Southern University who attended the meeting as a course required field observation.
2. Prof. Riley 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 Vice-Chair next called on **President Peterson** to remark on matters of interest to the Georgia Tech community,
 - a. President Peterson informed the Board of two recent unfortunate deaths of students.
 - b. We have four GT employees that are on Christmas Island which is close to Australia. Kim Cobb is there with a postdoc, undergrad student, and grad student on a research mission. Flights in and out occur once a week. The flights were cancelled. They are safe and all is fine, but they will be there until Fiji Airlines goes back and get them. They are safe and we are continuing to monitor that situation.
 - c. The High Performance Computing building continues to move forward, and should break ground this summer. This will continue our efforts to grow that area.

- d. The Living Building challenge continues to progress (a building with 0 carbon/energy-footprint and 0 water-footprint) Will be the first Living Building in the South, and will house some of our sustainability research efforts, and the QEP initiative.
 - e. Capital Campaign thank-you tour continues, visiting different cities to thank all those who donated in raising 1.812 billion.
 - f. Legislation update: Governor Deal recently vetoed the Religious Freedom Act, but has yet to take action on Campus Carry Bill (has until May 3rd to make a decision). Students ran a poll and were strongly opposed to the Campus Carry bill; as an institution we are opposed to it and are working with the Governor to encourage him to veto the bill. Also discussed the legislation for the Hope Scholarship program; two parts. The current Hope Scholarship payment is tied to the tuition of 2011 for each institution; this will equalize that so that all students will receive the same percentage of the tuition. The second part is additional weight will be given for STEM courses.
 - g. Admission: We have notified the early admits and regular admits. We had 30,500 applicants for 2,800 spots in undergraduate admissions. Discussed the ratio of in-state, out-of-state, and international students. Currently 63% of the undergraduate population is made up of Georgia residents.
 - h. He discussed the Hill renovation. Extensive Renovation of Tech Tower continues, staff should be back in 18 months or so. Also currently working on a \$2.5 million renovation to Carnegie. The Library Project is moving forward. D.M Smith renovation will be next.
 - i. The ACC InVenture Prize Competition took place last night, great way for the ACC to incorporate academics. First place was from Duke, second place was from Virginia, and the GT FireHUD won the people's choice reward.
 - j. Commencement is coming up in the next month. The speakers are Mrs. Mary Rockett Brock, co-chair of the Capital Campaign, is speaker at the morning Undergraduate Ceremony; Penny Pritzer, Secretary of Commerce at the Bachelor's afternoon ceremony;, and Dr. John Holdgren, Assistant to the President for Sciences and Technology, will speak at the PhD and Master's ceremony.
4. The chair called on Prof. Joe Hughes, Chair of the Statutes Committee to share proposed revisions to the *Faculty Handbook (FH)*; (see **Attachment #2** for requests). This is a series of changes coming from the Office of Academic Affairs. This is intended to go to the Faculty on April 19th. None of the changes are Statutes; therefore, only one reading and vote from the faculty is needed to approve the changes.
- a. Section 3.2.2 Academic Professionals: Went over guidelines for appointments and promotions for Academic Professionals. We have had this title for some time, but no guidelines for appointments or promotions for individuals with these titles. Add one additional title of Principal Academic Professional.

Question: Is there a grandfather provision for someone who already holds the provision?

Answer: Yes, there is a general statement that says that if you hold a position, and we change the definition of the position, you're still entitled to the position.

Question: At the big picture view, how does this compare with the guidelines for tenure or tenure-track faculty? This seems very detailed compared to other titles.. It seems we should want the guidelines to be consistent in detail.

Answer: This is similar to what we have for research faculty. There are multiple sections in the FH that this would be very similar.

Question: The statement "Any promotion denied for budgetary reasons alone shall be considered as deferred until sufficient funds become available." Let's be careful that this statement does not keep someone from receiving a promotion because of budgetary concern; or have a person believe they did not receive a promotion because of a budget.

Answer: This is already in the FH for one of the other titles. We should look at the wording and make sure this is consistent.

- b. Section 3.2.2 Lecturers/Senior Lecturers: Went over changes to "Lecturers and Senior Lecturers". Specifies what is required in order to hire these people, and added a whole section on promotion and evaluation.

Question: There are references to course portfolio and teaching portfolio. This may be confusing.

Answer: we will look at this and make sure it is clear and consistent.

- c. Section 3.3.8: Clarified language about the waiver form where you waive your right to know who the external reviewers are. The old wording made it seem like you had to waive your right, the new language specifies that you have the option to waive this right.
- d. Section 3.3.8 Feedback to Faculty members: clarify that feedback is provided after the process finishes and a final decision has been made and communicated in a letter from the President.
- e. Section 3.3.10. Regarding 5-year-reviews of school chairs, the Dean has a lot of flexibility in what will be asked in the review. New language specifies that if there are specific things that must be included, then that list will be on the Faculty Affairs website to avoid ambiguity and increase consistency across the colleges.
- f. There was a recommendation for a new section (3.2.3) for "Adjunct and Clinical Appointments". Thought it was important to define the term adjunct, because the term has a special meaning at Georgia Tech (an honorary, unpaid, affiliation). Discussion on the purpose of "Clinical Adjunct positions"; the Statutes committee has questions about this and is currently trying to find a better solution.

Professor Riley stated this group needs to endorse this and recommend this go on to the Faculty at the April 19 meeting. **There was a motion to endorse the recommended changes and seconded.**

Discussion:

Prof Hernandez said he could not endorse this with the issue of “course portfolio and teaching portfolio.” Prof Hughes said that could be addressed prior to taking to the Faculty.

What else has to be done for approval prior to going to the faculty? Suggestion that the presentation to the Faculty show a comparison of the guidelines and promotion between the titles to show consistency between the titles. Is there urgency to get this to the Faculty? Dr. Cozzens said we have waited a while so a little longer is acceptable. Some discussion about tabling the motion and handling later.

Prof Riley requested a vote on the motion: If you are ready to endorse the recommended changes with two friendly amendments (1) to correct the “course/teaching portfolio” and (2) clarification of promotions with budget, raise your hand. The motion passed.

5. Prof Riley then asked Prof Hughes and **Dr. Steven Girardot, VP Undergrad Education**, to report on the Classroom and Academic Scheduling Task Force. They provided a handout (**Attachment #3**) for their status.

Dr. Girardot reminded the board last year there was a task force that looked at the Academic Calendar that were implemented by the faculty. Main change was eliminating dead-week and implementing a reading period. One of the recommendations from that group was to look at classroom-scheduling. Dr. Bras and Steve Swant appointed a second task force with Prof Hughes as the Chair and Dr. Girardot as Vice-Chair; it included all the colleges and consultants, undergrad and grad student representatives, the experts from the Registrar’s Office and Capital Planning and Space Management, and Enrollment Services. Prof Hughes provided status of the task force.

- a. Task force is still working, has not made any official recommendations.
- b. We have grown as an Institution with more degree programs, more students, more faculty, but little growth in classrooms.
- c. Major scheduling issues: we need to make better use of the classrooms we have (regarding size and location). Students are having issues getting the classes they need, when they need them (which can have an effect on graduation).
- d. Regarding the classroom-scheduling grid, giving 15 minutes as opposed to 10 minutes between classes. (Which requires us to have an extended day)
- e. The task force developed a set of guiding principles. It will not solve everything, but will provide a way of framing the discussion when we find there are competing forces of how we do things.
- f. There have been three sub-groups looking at three specific areas:

- Daily scheduling template: Can we go to a 15 minute between classes schedule. Yes, we can do it. It comes easily on Tuesday/Thursday classes. Monday-Wednesday-Friday is a little more difficult, there will be fewer class times. If we look at an extended day between 8 am and 6:15 pm, we have the same number of opportunities we now have between 8 and 5. We think the schedule will work, but we must use the extended day and we must follow the template.
- Policies by which we actually do scheduling: The most important is identifying the anchor classes that every undergrad student needs and have these classes have a time slot that remains the same so students can do better long range planning. For example, we would not want Calculus II and Physics I to be scheduled at the same time.
- Long range planning: better resources for students to plan ahead and for academic units to plan. Example: If we bring in 400 extra freshmen this year, academic units will need to know that in two years, they will be juniors, and more classes and classrooms may be needed. We need to drive towards data driven decision making.

Discussion: Need recognition of how students actually function (including realities such as traffic and oversleeping), as well as faculty functioning beyond convenience.

They have send information to academic faculty members to solicit information. They are meeting with Academic Deans and School Chairs. Want to share status at the Faculty Meeting. Eventually will get to the Provost and Steve Swant. They would like to come back to FEB when they have a final set of recommendations.

6. The vice-chair provided status of the nominations for the spring 2016 elections. He encouraged the FEB members to help identify individuals willing to be nominated to fill the remaining vacancies on the ballot. When a ballot is ready, it will be sent by email to request a vote of approval from the FEB. When approved, the electronic election will begin. See addendum 1 for the email vote.
7. **Ms. Balsam** shared the proposed agenda (**Attachment #4**) for the upcoming meeting of the Academic Faculty and Academic Faculty Senate combined with a Called Meeting of the Faculty scheduled for April 19, 2016. **The motion for approval was seconded and passed without dissent**
8. Prof. Riley 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. **Doug Williams (USGFC rep):** University System Faculty Committee has scheduled spring meeting for Friday, April 15th. He announced that Prof. George Riley would attend the next meeting.
 - b. **Jen Abrams (Pres, Undergrad SGA):** Undergraduate elections going on right now, next Undergrad President will be announced next Wednesday. The two deaths have caused us to make sure we have mental health resources available to everyone (especially chemistry

students). International Welcome coming up where SGA takes our international students on the football field and teaches them how to play football; it is one of the best events of the year.

- c. **Erica Briscoe (Stud Grievance and Appeal):** Nothing to report.
 - d. **Russ Clark (Faculty Services):** Nothing to report.
 - e. **Mark Cottle (Student Academic & Financial Affairs):** Nothing to report.
 - f. **Eric Feron (Student Activities):** Nothing to report.
 - g. **Paul Foster (Academic Integrity):** Nothing to report.
 - h. **Elena Garcia (liaison to Staff Council):** Nothing to report.
 - i. **Rigoberto Hernandez (Faculty Honors):** Nothing to report.
 - j. **Joanna Lotempio (Student Computer Ownership):** Updated the requirements, the Student Computer Ownership Guide will be on the website.
 - k. **John McIntyre (Faculty Status & Grievance Committee):** Nothing to report.
 - l. **Doug Nation (Student Regulations):** The SRC is meeting now. They met last week, discussed limiting student's ability to request and be granted changes of major. Up to 500 changes per semester, can cause turbulence in colleges with students applying with a certain major just to change immediately.
 - m. **Carrie Shepler (IUCC):** Recently approved an interdisciplinary program in neuroscience.
 - n. **Dana Simpson (Welfare & Security):** Recently had a consolidated meeting with Staff Council Campus Physical Environment. Both groups wonder if their efforts are having an impact.
10. Prof Riley asked if there was any additional business and hearing none adjourned the meeting at about 5:00 pm.

Submitted by Jeanne Balsam, Secretary
May 8, 2016

Attachments

1. [Minutes](#) of the March 1, 2016 Faculty Executive Board meeting.
 2. *Faculty Handbook* modification [requests](#)
 3. [Status](#) of the Classroom and Academic Scheduling Task Force
 4. [Agenda](#) for April 19, 2016 meeting of the Academic Faculty Senate
-

Addendum #1

The Secretary sent the following electronic ballot to the Executive Board on April 12, 2016:

Dear members of the Faculty Executive Board (FEB) –

Our Nominations Committee has completed their work and propose the attached ballot. Please note there are more unopposed elections than normal, but only one nominee could be found. In addition, we have two committees (Student Activities, Student Computer Ownership) that were scheduled for two to be elected, but only one candidate could be found; therefore, those elections are unopposed and the committees will be short one member. On the other hand, those two committees are planned for modifications from the Task Force on Standing Committees. This shortfall may not be an issue. If needed, the FEB could appoint someone to fill a vacancy.

We must get this election started in order to be complete this term.

Please let me know by return email if you approve this ballot.

Yes No My concern is _____

Please try to send your response back to me by the end of Thursday, April 14th so we can get these names in the online election system and be prepared to hold this election. Plans are to run the election Monday, April 18th thru Monday, May 2nd.

May I also take this moment to thank George Riley and Russ Clark for leading this nominations team, and to thank the rest of the team as well for a wonderful job: Ada Gavriloska, David Goldsman, Margaret Loper, Paul Neitzel, and Matthew Miller.

Thanking you in advance for your speedy response.

A quorum of the Faculty Executive Board members having responded, the question was answered in the affirmative without dissent.