The meeting was called to order by the chair, Amy Lederberg, at 9:34 a.m. The first item of business was a proposal to amend the University Statutes (Article VI, Section 1) to add “institutes” and delete “divisions”. An amendment was made to the proposal sent with the meeting announcement. The proposal as amended was approved.

The next item of business was a proposal to change the name of the Staff Council in the University Statutes and Senate Bylaws from the Staff Advisory Council to the Staff Council. The motion was seconded and approved.

The next item of business was the Senate self-study. Dr. Lederberg gave a summary of the self-study to-date. Committee members had been sent a copy of all the responses that have been received so far. There was discussion on how to proceed from here. The discussion revolved around whether an overarching framework should be decided on first before reviewing the committees’ responses or not. There was discussion about the significance of some of the changes in the various committees’ duties. On first glance the changes may seem small, but some of the changes will result in more far reaching consequences. Dr. Crimmins suggested that a narrative on the structure of governance at Georgia State would be useful. He agreed to work up a draft for the November S&B meeting.

The committee decided to review the responses that have been sent back so far. The first one reviewed was Admissions and Standards. Issues that come out of this discussion focused on number of staff, whether or not the Provost should stay on the committee, and how the duties are listed. It was unclear whether A&S or APACE handled faculty workload and there were questions about how involved the committee actually was in the SACS accreditation process.

The Athletics Committee was reviewed next. There was discussion about the advisory nature of this committee and the Athletics strategic plan. Next, the discussion turned to the Athletics Association and its relationship to the university. The Cultural Diversity Committee had recently revised its duties and as a result had only one recommended change to its membership. There was a discussion of the various models of committee representation across the Senate.

The next committee reviewed was Faculty Affairs. One recommendation was to add three new (by virtue of office) members as non-voting. The committee also added “evaluation processes” to its list of duties. There was discussion about the various types of evaluation processes that go on across campus and which processes Faculty Affairs deals with. The IS&T Committee’s recommendations were reviewed next. It recommended changing how the at-large faculty are appointed. Discussion then turned to the size of standing committees.

The committee briefly discussed what would be on the agenda for the October meeting. Since there was no further business, the chair adjourned the meeting at 11:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Nell Stone,
Committee Assistant