The meeting was called to order by the chair, Murray Brown, at 2:05 p.m. The first item of business was the approval of the January minutes. The minutes were approved with no changes.

There was some discussion as to whether or not there was a quorum for today’s meeting. As the meeting progressed other members came in and Dr. Brown determined that there was a quorum.

George Rainbolt presented the first item of business. Admissions and Standards had approved a motion to give that committee final action authority. This motion was sent to the full Senate on March 14, 2002 for approval and the Senate sent it to the Statutes and Bylaws Committee for review. Dr. Rainbolt stated that the draft presented today included an additional statement that allowed the Senate to rescind any motions that Admissions and Standards had passed. Discussion began with a review of Admissions and Standards’ duties as stated in the Senate Bylaws. Amy Lederberg stated that the University Statutes gives the Senate the authority to make educational policy and Statutes and Bylaws cannot pass a motion that takes away that power. A change like this would be very sweeping. She suggested that only those proposals that fall under the Admissions and Standards Committee’s first or second duties as stated in the Bylaws could be approved by that committee in lieu of the full Senate. Dean Abdelal agreed that it would be ill advised to pass a policy that will keep items from coming to the full Senate for review. Not bringing issues to the full Senate would make the Senate less effective in the long run.

Discussion continued. Dr. Brown suggested that perhaps a mechanism could be put in place that could streamline the process at the level of the Executive Committee rather than at the level of the full Senate. Dr. Lederberg observed that this process doesn’t really streamline the review process for the Executive Committee because they will have to review all the proposals anyway. It appears it will only streamline the full Senate review process. Dr. Brown will form a subcommittee to review this proposal and to make recommendations to the full Statutes and Bylaws Committee. Dr. Rainbolt volunteered to serve as a non-voting member of the subcommittee.

The next item of business was a discussion of the proposal to add Staff Council representation to the Senate. Christine Gallant, chair of the Cultural Diversity Committee, reviewed the history of the current motion. Committee members asked for clarification on certain points as Dr. Gallant summarized the history of this proposal. Dean Abdelal clarified one item on the handout of the history of the motion. He stated that the March 2002 notation was unclear because it gives the impression that Hugh Hudson sent an email to the Arts and Sciences senators in his position as Associate Dean. Dr. Hudson addressed all the A&S senators in his role as an elected senator from the History Department.

Dr. Gallant stated her position on the motion as it stands. The motion calls for 19 Staff Council members elected by the various districts and the SAC president to be added to the University Senate. She feels that it should be 10 staff members elected at large. She stated that the motion as it stands is flawed, however, it is no longer in the hands of the Cultural Diversity Committee. The floor was opened for discussion. Dr. Lederberg asked why the SAC needs a voice in the Senate. Tracy Van Voris stated that the Senate governs the affairs of the university. Dean Abdelal stated that he feels it is important for the staff to feel empowered regarding their own affairs. The question is how to accomplish that. The Senate deals primarily with academic issues and it would bring a certain randomness to have Staff Council members who are not familiar with the academic issues voting on these issues. He feels that ways of empowering staff need to be found that can reach those staff who don’t feel empowered. If the Staff Advisory Council in its present form isn’t reaching those staff members, then the SAC should be reviewed and changed to address that issue rather than trying to add Staff Council members to the Senate to meet those needs. The structure of SAC needs to be examined to see why it’s not effective in making the staff feel empowered to bring their issues to the university administration.

Dr. Abdelal distributed a proposal for consideration. He stated that the College of Arts and Sciences determined that it
needed to have regular college staff meetings to discuss issues that are important to the staff. Recently the college
determined that it would be advantageous to have an elected staff advisory committee which would advise the Dean
on issues that are important to the college staff. This proposal came out of his college's discussions. This could be a
model that could be applied to all colleges and divisions in the university. If this structure were set up across the
university by college and division, it would provide an avenue for staff to raise issues and thus empower staff within
their domain. Dr. Abdelal offers this as another approach to empowering staff rather than adding Staff Council
members to the University Senate.

Discussion continued on this issue. Dr. Gallant stated that staff has expertise that can benefit Senate committees. Dr.
Abdelal stated that Faculty Affairs is really the only committee that deals with issues that could affect staff. Dr.
Lederberg observed that while some staff may have certain expertise that would benefit the Research Committee, for
example, that same staff person would not have knowledge regarding all the business of the Senate. Faculty, on the
other hand, have been through a rigorous Ph.D. program, teach at Georgia State, and are familiar with how academe
works. They are better prepared to vote on issues before the Senate. It was suggested that if issues come up that
would affect staff, the Faculty Affairs Committee could routinely ask the SAC for input. There are other ways for staff
to get input on issues that are important to them other than giving them the privilege of voting on all matters before
the Senate.

Dr. Brown stated that the motion as it stands would most likely not be approved by the full Senate. He stated that a
subcommittee will be formed to review this discussion and it will forward any recommendations. There was more
discussion about staff currently serving on Senate committees. There are some staff members that serve on Senate
committees as appointees by the chair. For example, the Research Committee has a staff member who works in the
Research Office and the Admissions and Standards Committee has several staff members from various academic
assistance offices on that committee. They provide expertise and information from their work areas. There are also
SAC members on those committees. All of these staff members, whether from SAC or appointed by the chairs, have
voting rights in the committee. Dr. Lederberg stated that some committees have faculty who aren't senators serving
on committees. These faculty are allowed to vote in committee but do not have voting rights on the floor of the
Senate. Those staff members serving on Senate committees, either appointed by SAC or by the chair, aren't the only
committee members without Senate voting rights. Tazar Gissentanner reiterated SAC's position that the SAC members
on Senate committees should be allowed to vote on the Senate floor. Dr. Abdelal agrees that staff should be involved
in the governance of their own affairs. This can be done by having a more empowered Staff Council. He feels that
staff who do not feel empowered get this feeling from where they work and that allowing them to be involved in the
discussion of their affairs will improve the situation. Dr. Brown closed the discussion. A subcommittee will be formed
to review this proposal, however, it was agreed to wait until the 2002-2003 committee convenes to appoint a
subcommittee.

The two remaining agenda items will be put on the agenda for the April meeting. The chair adjourned the meeting at
3:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Nell Stone,
Committee Assistant