1. **Attendance:** The following individuals were in attendance at the October meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President(s)/Ex-Officio</td>
<td>Ellen Evans; Scott Ardoin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRG President</td>
<td>Ashley Faris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHDS</td>
<td>Bernadette Heckman, Doug Kleiber*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS</td>
<td>Janette Hill; Roger Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSE</td>
<td>Bethany Hamilton-Jones; Tom Clees*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPSY</td>
<td>Ashley Harrison; Paula Schwenflugel*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETAP</td>
<td>Jim Garrett; Kathy Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KINS</td>
<td>Thomas Baker; Chris Mojock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>Andrew Gitlin; Wendy Ruona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLED</td>
<td>Tisha Ellison *; Amy Heath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE</td>
<td>Julie Luft*; Ryan Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates proxy for Merrily Dunn (CHDS), David Jackson (MSE), Laine Bradshaw (EPSY), Rebecca Lieberman-Betz (CSSE) and Misha Cahnmann-Taylor (LLED)

2. **13SEP16 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes:** A motion to pass the previous meeting minutes of 13SEP16 was made by Julie Luft, seconded by Chris Mojock, and passed.

3. **Faculty Senate Communications:** Ellen continued the discussions from last meeting regarding communications with respect to archived files, "live" active files and the website to arrive at a consensus which was achieved.

   - Archived information will be placed on the S: Drive in a “Faculty Senate” folder [Read Only] and all Faculty Senators on the roster will have access to it.
   - Working of “Live” Information will be available on OneDrive.
   - Basecamp will also be utilized as deemed appropriate for on-going communications.
   - The website housing of Faculty Senate needs to be updated and will be completed after OIT finishes maintenance. A dialogue regarding the relative “public or private” placement of materials occurred. Jim Garrett expressed that Franklin College Faculty Senate documentation is open and public and this was preferred. A vote was not needed as there was consensus that the files should be public. Ellen will meet with the COE web leader Daniel Fowler to advance this task.

4. **COE Administration Interface w/ Faculty Senate & Spring 2017 Meeting Schedule:**

   A. Dean Involvement with FS: Ellen brought it forth that increased Administration participation in our FS meetings has been suggested. Notably in the Franklin College the Dean participates at every Senate meeting. Opinions were sought regarding this level of involvement by the Dean, even if only for a brief visit to each meeting. It was voiced that there should be some protected meeting time for Faculty Senate separate from Administration; however, occasional interface with the Dean/Associate Deans is welcomed with frequency/time as deemed appropriate for salient issues.

   B. Meeting Day Rotation: With standing meeting dates and times typically determined per term by majority availability via Doodle poll, Ellen suggested that maybe we could select the top two meeting dates/times to allow regular participation by more elected Senators. Consensus was given for taking this approach for the next Spring meeting schedule.
C. **Dean Kennedy Visit:** Dean Kennedy will visit the next Faculty Senate meeting in November. Ellen sought input for suggested topics and the main item suggested was “fiscal health of the COE”. She also indicated that she would follow-up with an email reminder to encourage more topics for conversation.

5. **Manual of Procedures (MOP) Clean-Up:** Ellen requested input as to the process of the MOP revision which is currently outdated and 27 pages in length, much of which is committee information that could easily be condensed. Scott Ardoin suggested that arriving at consensus with editing via the complete Faculty Senate would likely prove arduous and inefficient. He further suggested that Ellen draft the changes, bring it to the steering committee and we then provide a relatively clean copy to the full Faculty Senate for comment prior to bringing it to vote. This approach was endorsed.

6. **Project 8000 (minimum enrollment issue revisited; Scott Ardoin):**
   A. **Reminder of Issue:** COE graduate course enrollments are higher than other colleges at UGA and the same or higher than peer and aspirant institutions. The goal was to get them lowered specifically for doctoral courses (8000 level or higher). Faculty Senate was tasked with exploring course enrollments pre- and post the higher course enrollments last academic year. Scott has been the lead of this initiative to lower the doctoral course enrollments.
   B. **Consensus on Issue:** Strong consensus by Senate that minimum enrollment for doctoral level courses should be in alignment with other colleges at UGA and it is worthy of our attention.
   C. **Progress to Date and Going Forward:** Scott indicated that this process of simply looking at pre- to post-policy data would be challenging as there are many confounds beyond enrollment numbers. Roger Hill suggested perhaps we just need to have 4-5 strong cases on how the policy has affected students because there are too many variables to make a really strong argument. If we go forward more work in data collection is needed as some course enrollment data had not been secured through the department heads. Scott would like to have one person from each department to serve on the committee. Consideration was also needed for those courses in which we receive no credit.
   D. **Next Steps:** Ellen and Scott will have a conversation with the Dean to see if he is willing to move on this issue. If this is a battle the Senate cannot win we should consider a redirection away from the issue. Perhaps beginning a conversation on this topic would be a good launch for the use of Basecamp. If we go forth, Scott will lead a sub-committee.

7. **Qual Software: Rivers Crossing Equal Access Issue (Misha Cahnmann-Taylor):**
   This issue was not discussed and is pending further renewal of interest.

8. **Faculty Performance Initiative:** Ellen began a discussion with her personal perspectives regarding the FPI stating that in principle she was in favor of tenure but that it does not give faculty permission to perform work that is not contemporary (i.e. out dated) or to have low productivity. She is also in favor of PTR and a form of the FPI but also strongly felt that the appropriate process needed to be utilized prior to implementation. She also reminded the Senate that it was her understanding that although Senate may on principle reject the FPI, COE was still seeking input as it needed to go forth. No vote was being sought today but rather continued conversation was on the agenda.
   A. **Themes from COEfyi Input:** Ellen stated that in her dialogue with Associate Dean Spangler, Denise indicated that the two main themes from collective input were 1) punitive language and 2) confusion regarding its purpose along with the 5-year PTR process.
   B. **Comments from the Senate include the following:**
      1. Although this document is not attacking tenure, Thomas Baker indicated that this is a slight erosion of tenure.
      2. It was questioned if the FPI policy document had to be voted on by the University Council? Or if the Faculty Affairs Committee was involved in this
issue. Scott indicated that he would contact Janet Frick for clarification regarding Faculty Council, the Faculty Affairs Committee and the FPI.

3. It was stated that other peer/aspirant universities in the South do not really have post-tenure review. This is a change in post-tenure review without faculty oversight or input.

4. This is an annual evaluation, not post-tenure review. Some felt that the erosion of tenure is actually the tenured individuals who are not productive.

5. It was acknowledged that we always have to be accountable for our work.

6. It was asked by Jim Garrett and a few others, how many people would this policy affect in the college? It was recognized that all nine departments have very different ways of conducting the annual evaluation and it does not always align with “does not meet”, “meet”, and “exceeds”.

7. It was questioned, what changes are being made to change the 5-year PTR process? It was stated that the Provost says that our post-tenure review needs to have more teeth; it is just a checkbox (i.e. very few fail PTR).

8. There was a collective concern that the Department Head has too much power if they conduct the evaluation and then also develop the Professional Development plan.

9. It was also stated that it was disingenuous to discuss how positive and supportive this policy is while it is not voluntary.

Jim Garrett moved to adjourn the meeting and Chris Mojock seconded it.