Senate Executive Minutes – July 10, 2001

Members present were President Carl Patton, Provost Ron Henry, Paul Alberto, John de Castro, Fred Jacobs, Charles Jones, John Newman, and Lyn Thaxton.

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. The minutes of the April 16, 2001 meeting were approved.

President’s report: President Patton reported on a series of meetings and conversations that he has had with members of the Georgia Legislature and with the Governor. These conversation suggest that the State’s “hold harmless” allocations to the University System may not be continued and that the University System may have to adjust to a substantially lower State allocation. It was reported that there may be moves to adjust the formula which the State uses to fund the University System. President Patton also reported on efforts to identify a platform donor for a new science teaching laboratory building.

Provost’s report: Provost Henry reported that there were indications that an appropriation to the University System may not be forthcoming in this year’s supplemental budget as has occurred over the last few years. As a result the Provost is recommending that 1% of the non-instructional budgets be held aside until the budgetary uncertainties are resolved. Provost Henry reported that Summer enrollments were up slightly in terms of credit hours, but down slightly in terms of headcount. Fall enrollments appear to be in line with estimates with the number of new Freshman remaining at about last years level while the number of transfer students are increasing. Provost Henry further reported on his trip to Egypt for the graduation of the first MBA recipients from the joint GSU-Egypt MBA program. This was a significant event that received substantial positive publicity in Egypt.

Senate Business:
A. Andrew Young School of Policy Studies Five Year Review: After discussion the Executive Committee passed the following motion unanimously:

The School of Policy Studies began operations on July 1, 1996. As a stipulation in the Senate motion setting up the School, it was agreed that after 5 years the school would be reevaluated. At that time a recommendation would be made to either move the School to a College status or move it into another college. The following is from the motion passed by the Senate on 4/16/96:

"The School will be set up with a two-year appointment for the dean, selected from candidates within Georgia State university. In the second year, a search will be conducted for a dean to be appointed for a five-year term. In the fifth year of its existence (2000/01), the School will be evaluated relative to criteria developed by an interdisciplinary group in Fall 1996, to determine if it should be moved to College status. If it is determined that the School does not meet the criteria, then it should be placed within a College. Criteria will include the establishment of a Ph.D. program in policy studies; interdisciplinary programs that are broader than fiscal policy; an academic mission that differs from but complements other colleges; and development of a five-year strategic plan for the School. This group will be appointed by the Executive Committee of Senate."

The Senate Executive Committee, empowered by the motion, has elected to compose and charge an Ad Hoc Andrew Young School of Policy Studies evaluation committee. The evaluation committee will be chaired by a Vice President and composed of faculty who are representative of the University as a whole. A grouping that was similar to the original Ad Hoc committee would suffice. This group consisted of Sam Dietz (chair), Sid Crow, Hugh Hudson, Fred Jacobs, Fred Massey, Jeff Rupp, and Stephanie Summers. This committee will study the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies and its compliance with the criteria listed below and to make a recommendation to the Senate Executive Committee by Oct. 8. The recommendation
may take a wide range of forms including keeping the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies as a School, moving it to College status, or moving it into another College or Colleges. The recommendation will be distributed for comment to the APACE, Planning and Development, Budget, Faculty Affairs, and Research committees. Comments will be due to the Executive Committee by Nov. 21. The Executive Committee at its Nov. 26th meeting will craft a final recommendation to bring before the full Senate at its Dec. 6 meeting.

B. Committee on Admissions and Standards:
   1. Motion to Require Advisement When Students Receive Many Ws: After discussion the Executive Committee passed the attached motion unanimously.
   2. Motion on declaring Majors: After discussion of the motion the Executive Committee recommended that the motion be sent back to the Committee on Admissions and Standards for clarification and rewording. In particular it was suggested that the motion was worded in a manner that was confusing and unlikely to be understood by the students, that this policy might lead to an increase in undeclared majors, and that since this motion is to put in effect a University policy then it should override college or departmental policies.
   3. Motion on Clustered Final Examinations: After discussion of the motion the Executive Committee recommended that the motion be sent back to the Committee on Admissions and Standards for clarification and rewording. In particular it was recommended that the requirement that the policy be stated on course syllabi be dropped and that a later date than the mid-point of the semester for informing instructors be considered.

C. Committee on Faculty Affairs:
   1. Motion on Items Brought Before the Full Senate: After discussion of the motion the Executive Committee recommended that the motion be sent back to the Committee on Faculty Affairs. The Committee recognized the motivation for the motion. However, it was indicated that the motion as stated replicated the current policy.
   2. Amorous Relationships Policy: The Executive Committee was informed that the statement on Amorous Relationships that appears in the handbook and on the GSU website (Attached) had never been formally adopted by the Senate. The original policy was adopted by the Committee on Faculty Affairs in 1997. But, through some oversight it was never brought before the Full Senate for a vote. The Executive Committee unanimously passed a motion to bring this policy before the Full Senate in its October meeting with a “Do Pass” recommendation.

D. Committee on APACE:
   1. Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics: After discussion the Executive Committee passed the attached motion unanimously to approve the proposed new Ph.D. program in Applied Linguistics conditional upon the Provost being able to resolve the budgetary implications of the proposal with the College of Arts and Sciences.

The Executive Committee adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

Motion to Require Advisement When Students Receive Many Ws
Passed by Admissions and Standards, 4/23/01

Motion:

1. Any student who earns 4 or more Ws and/or WFIs in a single term shall have an advisement hold placed on his or her record. The hold will be removed after the student has seen an academic advisor.
2. Any student who earns 8 or more Ws and/or WFs in his/her academic career at GSU shall have an advisement hold placed on his or her record. The hold will be removed after the student has seen an academic advisor.

3. The Enrollment Management Committee, upon recommendation of the Director of the Student Advisement Center, is authorized to adjust the number of Ws and/or WFs in an academic career at GSU which triggers an advisement hold.

4. This policy shall go into effect the semester that the Banner module necessary to enforce it comes on line.

Rationale:
Some students, because they are not aware of the progress to degree requirements for financial aid, attempt to preserve their GPA by withdrawing from many classes. To help retain these students, they need to be informed of the financial aid rules. The data indicate that this will not be a substantial burden on the advising system.

Number 3 is needed because the current computer system does not allow us to get good data on the number of Ws/WFs that students typically earn in an academic career.

Of the 23,492 enrolled for Fall 99:
- 4237 students (18%) withdrew from at least one course. Of these students:
  - 1087 students (25.7%) withdrew from 2 or more courses.
  - 680 students (16.0%) withdrew from 2 courses.
- 186 students (4.4%) withdrew from 3 courses.
- 145 students (3.4%) withdrew from 4 courses.
- 63 students (1.5%) withdrew from 5 courses.
- 13 students (0.3%) withdrew from 6 courses.

and

- 399 (1.7%) students had WFs. Of these students, 60 (15%) had 2 or more WFs. (37 with 2 WFs, 13 with 3, 9 with 4 and 1 with 7.)

Of the 492 undergraduates who graduated Fall 99:
- 23 (4.6%) exceeded the academic career threshold.

Potential Conflict Of Interest In Amorous Relationships

Introduction
People in positions of authority within the university community need to be sensitive to the potential for sexual harassment (see Section 206.03 of the Faculty Handbook, Section 6-1 in the Classified Employee Handbook, and p. 18 of the GSU General Catalog for the Sexual Harassment Policy of the university) as well as conflict of interest in amorous relationships with people over whom they have a professional power/status advantage.

The individual in authority bears the primary responsibility for any negative consequences resulting from an amorous relationship. It is in the interest of the university to provide clear direction and educational opportunities to the university community about potential professional risks associated with consensual amorous relationships between members of the university community where a power/status advantage exists.

Status/Power Advantages
Faculty Advantage. A faculty member always will be treated as having a power and status advantage when that faculty member has authority to assign grades; serves on thesis, dissertation, or scholarship awards committees; provides research and/or training.
opportunities, etc. Status and power advantages also can occur between junior and senior faculty and faculty
and administrators.  

Staff Advantage. A staff member will always be treated as having a power advantage when the staff member
has the authority to evaluate, determine salary, and/or make employment decisions.

Professional Risks

Conflict of interest. Relationships that the parties involved view as mutual and consensual may be viewed by
others as exploitative and may adversely affect the work environment in that serious conflicts of interests may
be perceived to exist. In particular, the parties to an amorous relationship should be aware that such
relationships often create general conflicts of interest and the fear from co-workers or other students of unfair
treatment in terms of promotions, grades, etc.

Individuals entering into amorous relationships where power/status advantages exist must recognize
that:
- the reasons for entering, maintaining, or terminating such a relationship may be a function of the
  power/status advantage;
- it often is the case that the individual with power or status advantage in the relationship will be held
  responsible if the relationship ends and sexual harassment is claimed.
- it is almost always the case that the individual with power or status advantage in the relationship will bear
  the accountability.

Any university employee who enters into an amorous relationship with a student or subordinate
employee where a power/status advantage exits must realize that, if a charge of sexual harassment is
subsequently lodged, the fundamentally asymmetric nature of the relationship will make it exceedingly
difficult to prove mutual consent. A defense based on mutual consent under such circumstances has not been
well received in national lititigation.

Therefore, Georgia State University strongly discourages such relationships.