AGENDA & MINUTES:

1. **Attendance & 22FEB17 Meeting Minutes Approval:** Roger Hill moved to approve the minutes, Jim Garrett seconded the motion and minutes were unanimously approved.

2. **Scholarship Committee [Proposed: Increase by 1 (from 4 to 5) due to workload]**
   - Workload is difficult for the 4 faculty members who serve on the committee because there are approximately 50 applications.
   - **Motion to increase the Scholarship Committee by 1 member:** Andrew Gitlin
   - **Second:** Laine Bradshaw
   - **Discussion:** None
   - **Motion Passed**

3. **COE & Graduate Council Elections:** Ellen provided an update regarding the committee election process for 1) University Council Standing, 2) Graduate Council and 3) COE Standing Committees. Some memberships will require a nomination and election process run by the Departments and others will require a COE faculty-wide nomination and election process which will be administrated by Ellen (Faculty Senate) using COEfyi announcements. Senators are encouraged to email their colleagues asking them to serve. The COE Faculty Senate web page has been cleaned up and each committee will eventually have its own page.

4. **President’s Faculty Advisory Committee (PFAC) Membership**
   - Ellen spoke with Denise Spangler about the issue of a clinical faculty member being elected to serve on the PFAC but not being allowed to serve because its members must be tenure-track. Denise agreed that the issue is important and one worth investigating and fighting. She asked we keep the Dean’s office in the loop. Denise and Ellen wondered if this particular committee was the correct target.
The senate discussed the possibility that other committees may also be restricted only to tenure-track faculty and we should bring this issue to the attention of the Statues, Bylaws and Committees committee (SBCC) because they have the power to make changes to who can serve on the committees. Roger Hill said this is good advice and we should go to the SBCC and show this case because they are the ones who can do something about it.

Janette Hill serves on PFAC and she said members do not vote; members listen and give input and suggestions. Janette said she could bring up the issue and see what happens. She could ask to put it on the agenda, but it would be more of a FYI. We would bring the issue as a point of information. The April meeting is last opportunity to have it on the agenda.

A suggestion was made to reach out to the College of Pharmacy and College of Veterinary Medicine to gain their support because they have a large population of clinical faculty. It was also suggested to reach out to Franklin College as well.

Roger Hill suggested to send the letter as soon as possible because elections are on people’s mind. If we wait it will be old news.

Laine Bradshaw suggested we should provide the SBCC the opportunity to review who serves on which committee rather than telling them who should serve.

Strategy is as follows: 1) Revise letter to go to the SBCC and broaden the language to review where career-track faculty can and cannot serve and provide example of our election of a clinical faculty member to PFAC. We would encourage the SBCC to review other committees. 2) Also cc the Chair of PFAC, and COE administrators. 3) Ellen will reach also reach out to the College of Pharmacy, College of Veterinary Medicine, and Franklin College to gauge their support.

**Motion:** To approve the above strategy put forth

**Second:** Roger Hill

**Discussion:** Jim Garret made the point the letter should be declarative and strongly advocate for our clinical faculty but also recognize that it is possible that with the recent increase of clinical faculty on our campus, that this may be an oversight. Other senators suggested we go to the faculty senates of other college and ask them to join us. The point was made that we want this committee (PFAC) changed but we want all to be reviewed.

**Motion Passed**

5. HB 280 The Campus Carry Law

A new version of the Bill is currently on GA senate floor. It will have to go back to the House since the senate changed it. If the House approves the revised bill it then goes to the Governor.

Janette Hill said the Faculty Senate crafted a letter last year in opposition to this bill and sent it forward to the Governor when the bill hit his desk.

Department vote? Last year, given the urgency, the faculty senators had votes within the department and then the representatives to Faculty Senate voted. This year, we could portray the vote faculty wide more accurately by using a Qualtrics survey.

The question was raised whether we, the COE Faculty Senate, want to politicize ourselves. Currently, the President, Board of Regents, and other layers above us are indicating they are opposed to HB 280. Because of the vulnerable populations that regularly visit UGA’s campus, we thought we are in a unique position to argue why this bill should fail.
• It was suggested that stronger language should be used in the letter by providing examples of vulnerable populations (especially children) on campus including 1) Kathy Thompson said that 14 Fridays each year, we have kindergartners in Aderhold; 2) Bethany Hamilton-Jones said there were 40 – 60 school age children who are served in the School Psychology clinic every year and 3) The Office of School Engagement sponsors Experience UGA which brings numerous Clarke County School District students to UGA’s campus each year.
• It was suggested that we send the letter to Athens’ representatives in both the House and Senate. A suggestion was also made to send the letter to advocacy groups who share the same position. It was anticipated that Dean Kennedy would communicate his opposition from the COE perspective.
• Strategy: It was decided to 1) Revise the 2016 letter based on feedback, strengthen language inserting more factual information with regard to vulnerable populations, 2) Use Qualtrics to survey the entire COE faculty collectively and 3) Send the letter directly to the Governor’s office from the COE Faculty Senate.
• **Motion:** A motion was made to enact the strategy described above.
• **Second:** Merrily Dunn
• **Discussion:** None
• **Motion Passed** with 1 abstention

• Ellen provided an overview of changes to the MOP with a categorizing of changes as a) Minor (typos/grammar errors); b) Moderate (errors based on facts such as titles of Associate Deans and processes such as COEfyi) and c) Major (substantive policy or procedure issues requiring Senate vote).
• The MOP has been amended from 26 pages to 9 with 3 appendices (Appeals Committee, Curriculum Committee, P&T Committee) & 1 table (Elections)
  a. Ellen’s Plan includes: a) Revise MOP, b) Review with Associate Deans and Dean Kennedy, c) Distribute to Senators for feedback from faculty, d) Senators vote on revised MOP
• Major Changes for Vote:
  1. Administrative feedback committee absorbed by Steering committee
  2. Dissolve nomination committee. Senators and Steering committee work with colleagues and department heads for nominations.
  3. Minutes Process
     1. Recorder records minutes and sends to President
     2. President edits the minutes.
     3. President sends edited minutes to Steering Committee for approval so they can be posted on the web within 2 weeks.
• **Motion:** Approve the three items above under major changes: Andrew Gitlin
• **Second:** Misha Cahnmann-Taylor
• **Discussion:** None
• **Motion Passed**

7. **Faculty Load (EFT): Service Component**
• Ellen provided an overview of the issue of EFT for service providing that a) Colleges control budgeted faculty time and b) Dean Kennedy was supportive of service EFT.
• The challenge lies in the math in that a standard course load per year for COE for tenure-track faculty is typically 4 courses (2/2). A 3- credit hour = 12.5% of workload
which is university policy. This means teaching will have to be 50% of a typical tenure-track faculty member’s EFT. In order to have service, the budgeted time for research has to decrease. This is an anticipated problem as many faculty members may not want to give up their research time for service, although it was recognized that many faculty members are already giving up research time for service.

- Merrily Dunn asked how this would be reflected in P&T guidelines.
- Kathy Thompson made the point that there are different kinds of service (e.g. service to the profession, service to the department, college, and university, outreach) and asked how that would be taken into account in the budgeted time.
- Ellen assigned the Senators homework: Take this issue to the department and begin to have conversations as this topic would be priority AY17-18.

8. **Other New Business or Comments/Questions/Concerns?**
   A. April Meeting (preliminary items on the agenda)
      1. Elect Faculty Senate Steering Committee
      2. AD Neuharth-Pritchett (course evaluations)
      3. Approval of revised MOP
      4. Planning Agenda for AY17-18

Faculty Senate meeting was adjourned at 1:55pm; delayed due to good conversations.