
CALL TO ORDER

The chair, President Carl Patton, called the special meeting to order at 3:15 p.m..

PRESIDENT'S COMMENTS

President Patton welcomed Senators and visitors and issued a special invitation to them to come back to any regular Senate meeting. He commented that the meetings are interesting and informative and are open to anyone. He stated that today’s meeting is a special, called meeting to discuss the Strategic Plan.

Patton made two announcements:

(1) The Board of Regents has passed a mission statement for the System. They have also been developing mission statements for the universities and colleges. Initially in this process they were planning to develop mission statements based on the Carnegie classifications for the various institutions. Georgia State University is unique in that we are the only institution in the State that has a Carnegie Doctoral I classification. What this means is that if the Board of Regents had continued with their process, we would have had a stand-alone mission statement. The point that the President was successful in making to the Chancellor and his staff is that we are one of the four research institutions of the State. Therefore, when the System develops the mission statements, the President argued that there should not be one statement that represents the University of Georgia, Georgia Tech, and the Medical College and then a separate one that responds to Georgia State University. There should be one for all four research institutions. The Regents have now passed a mission statement for the System and individual statements for classes of institutions. There is one mission statement for the four research institutions. This will work to our advantage as we move forward in the implementation of our strategic plan.

(2) The Chancellor has been moving forward with the discussion with the Board of Regents to implement the semester plan. Yesterday, there was a vote by the Board to move forward with a study of the process to implement the semester plan. The first step is the development of an implementation plan to analyze what
would be needed to implement the semester system. After this is done, the Board will take another vote, and if the change is approved, the semester system would be implemented in the fall of 1997. Patton thinks that this change would help move the University System in line with the other major institutions in this country, which is the same argument that the Chancellor has been using. He also thinks that it will give us the incentive to revise our curricula and courses. He is pleased to see the Chancellor take the initiative on this, because a decision really needed to be made.

**PURPOSE OF THE MEETING.**

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the Strategic Plan. There was a memo sent out to everyone which points out that the purpose of the meeting today is to give everyone an opportunity for discussion; there will be no formal motions. This is a time for comments and questions. After we have had this opportunity, we would like to have formal motions FAXed to Paula Stephan, the chair of the Senate Executive Committee, before February 23. He emphasized that all motions must be to her before February 23 before 9:30 a.m. The Senate Executive Committee is meeting that day and if all input is to be considered it must be in to Paula Stephan early.

Tim Crimmins, Chair of the Planning and Development Committee, will present the plan; then there will be an opportunity for discussion. After March 2, the date of the next Senate meeting at which we will vote on the Strategic Plan, there will be many things that need to be done to develop the implementation for the plan.

Patton said that he was very pleased that this day had arrived. Much work has gone into the writing of the Strategic Plan by the Provost, by Tim Crimmins, by Paula Stephan, and many, many more. Much of what we need accomplish at this institution and many of the decisions that need to be made hinge on developing a Strategic Plan that we agree on and support. He expressed his thanks to everyone that has been involved up to this point and to those who will continue to be involved in the development and implementation of the plan.

Crimmins stated that the document should be seen as a three-part document. The first ten pages provide an environmental scan of the university -- where we are and where we are going. Then pages 11-21 are the specific things that we need to do to get where we want to go. The final three paragraphs talk about going from the somewhat general approach of this plan to the more specific issue of how we allocate our resources. For example, on page 21, line 16, it says "the success of these strategic initiatives will depend on significant resources. The president must continue actively to seek increased funding from the University System of Georgia." So we begin by laying the weight of the implementation on the president to do what he did with the Regents in having Georgia State University classified with the other research universities in the University System mission statement.

Crimmins said he would go through the process and explain how the process produced the plan. First of all, Provost Ron Henry is the Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee which is a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Planning and Development. Henry and the subcommittee put together three groups last fall: (1) an academic group consisting of senior members of the faculty, (2) a collegial group consisting of chairs and associate deans, and (3) the deans group. He met with those groups during the fall to get the background material to produce the first 11 pages of this draft. Sometime right before Christmas, the Provost's team (Henry, Paula Dressel, and Bea Yorker) crafted a draft of the first eleven pages; that was distributed to the entire university. The university was asked to make suggestions about the environmental scan. So, every member of the faculty should have seen the first 11 pages before this draft appeared in your boxes two weeks ago. Crimmins explained that it is important that the faculty realize the first eleven pages try to capture Georgia State, but these pages can not list everything. The reaction of many of us is to look through the first eleven pages and try to find out where we are. We might not be mentioned there by name and there might be an interest in being mentioned by name. We could have to have 22 pages instead of 11 pages if we were to follow through with that. Therefore, it is important to see the first 11 pages as being representative. The second 11 pages, laying out a number of things the university has to do to advance itself, are more concrete. If
we believe there are specific things the university needs to do and they are not there in the next 11 pages, that's where we might want to propose adding a sentence or paragraph as a way of getting a strategic direction of the university. The second 11 pages have developed in the last two months; this part has worked through the following committees. First, the academic and collegial groups met as a whole; the deans met with the Provost to work out the very specific proposal that you find on these next 11 pages. As a result the Provost team produced a second draft that went to the Strategic Planning subcommittee. The document was debated and a number of amendments were added; the subcommittee approved that draft to be sent on to the whole Planning and Development Committee. At the Planning and Development Committee the second draft was presented, some additional changes were made, and the final draft which appears before you came from that body. We have tried to set up a process from this point that enables changes to be made to this draft, but which follows the direction that we have been taking in producing it. That is, to try to show the big picture rather than the small picture in terms of how we approach it. Knowing the process may facilitate our discussion.

Crimmins asked anyone present who was involved in any of the groups that he described or who commented on an earlier version of the draft to raise their hands; a large number of people did so. He said that this did not preclude suggestions about further improving this draft.

Patton reminded the group that both Provost Henry and Tim Crimmins are prepared to take questions. He asked if there were any opening questions or statements people would like to make.

Fred Massey said that the chairs of the Senate committees met recently and discussed a number of changes they would like to make, but they would like to get some feedback from the Senators and others present. Massey was asked to present the changes on the floor of the Senate. These were written up as a memorandum entitled "Proposed Changes In The Strategic Plan From The Chairs of University Senate Committees." The memorandum was distributed at the meeting. He explained that there were eight changes that were listed; he asked Patton how he wanted to proceed; should he discuss each one of these changes individually and briefly?

Patton asked Massey to go through each one briefly and see if anyone has any responses.

Henry commented that he had looked at the changes very quickly and they are very good suggestions. Many of them are of a editorial nature; basically the Executive Committee of Senate will consider editorial changes, but will bring only substantive changes in the form of motions for the next meeting. Henry said, however, that it was important that the changes be presented to the body for discussion to determine if the changes are editorial or substantial. The intent is to have amendments which are substantive and editorial amendments will be taken care of by inserting the language.

Patton determined that items one and two were editorial.

Steve Langston questioned the staff being included as part of the Senate in the document since they are non-voting at this point.

Crimmins replied that the question has to do with staff participation in the Senate, and whether staff should be inserted into the list of groups that are a part of the Senate. As the Senate currently functions, there are staff who are voting members of each of the Senate committees. Therefore, staff members do participate in the Senate at the level of committees. He said that what Langston was pointing out was that staff members do not come to the full Senate with voting rights the way, for example, members of the student government do; so we might consider making that change. In terms of how staff participation is currently described, the staff is participating in the Senate.

Langston replied that he wanted to know if the wording "brings together" is a true statement. He said it did not seem to be true because the passage says those people are actually members of the Senate and are not. It is not a question of principle, its simply a question of accuracy.
Patton said that this is something that the Executive Committee probably is going to have to resolve.

Massey commented that on the various Senate committees that he had been a member of, there had been staff members and they fully participated in the meetings and voted in the meetings.

Patton said that he thought that what Langston was saying is that staff are members of the voting body. He was not sure of the meaning. Does the wording really suggest that staff are in fact part of the voting body? He felt that the Senate Executive Committee could deal with this question.

There were no substantive comments on items three through six.

A comment was made about item seven. It starts off saying "The University Senate is charged with developing and approving action," etc. The word "developing" was questioned. It was felt that developing was a departmental right, and not the Senate's place. The meaning was not clear.

Massey responded that the meaning was concerned with developing and approving actions and processes to implement the goals and priorities of the Strategic Plan. In the last word of that sentence the word "plan" is in lower case, but it refers to the Strategic Plan. This statement is only with respect to the Strategic Plan, not all other actions.

Massey said that the next logical step is the development of what is called an action plan which would include priorities and budget recommendations of costing, making sure we have an understanding of what the cost of the various items are. What is being recommended here is that the Senate would be charged with the responsibility to develop and approve those actions and processes to implement the goals of this plan.

Ahmed Abdelal said that he felt the speaker was thinking more specifically about the large picture. He said that he thought that the meaning here is that the action plan which is going to be a general plan outlining the steps the university will take to achieve its goals. It is not at the level of colleges or departments, which is what you are concerned about. This is a university-level action plan. The speaker felt that the plan should say this specifically.

Patton said that the conversation had been noted and that the Executive Committee will struggle with it. Patton said that there was one other suggestion which was change 8, page 21, deleting four lines which refers to the process as an open one. Massey said that the thought of the Chairs of the Senate Committees was that with the rewriting of the preceding paragraph, embodied in change 7, that the change in item 8, lines 36-39 were taken care of. There were no further comments on this item.

Patton asked if there were any other comments. None were voiced. Patton called on Provost Henry.

Henry said that it had been pointed out to him that in certain parts of the document we referred to public policy and that is potentially restrictive since a lot of the policy initiatives that we are involved with in the University can also apply to the private sector as well as the public sector. He said that what he would propose is the word "policy" be used instead of "public policy" so that we are not in fact restricted. He recommended this as an editorial change.

A senator asked a question for clarification concerning page 13 under "faculty," beginning on line 14. On line 16., it says "after careful analysis of the available models of faculty performance, etc...there will be established with promotion and tenure and graduate faculty status and faculty workload." She wanted some explanation of what was meant by that because some schools do not have graduate faculty status.

Henry said that what was meant by that is that we think all colleges should have graduate faculty status, and we need to look at that from a university standard point of view, and also from the various colleges.
Dee Baldwin commented that she might have missed the debate on her question, but she would like to ask Provost Henry how this document fits into Boyer's concept of scholarship. She felt that we have certainly moved away from Boyer's definition. She wanted to know what Henry thought about this document because she said that she remembered when Henry came aboard he said that he advocated or subscribed to this definition. She asked him to address the question.

Henry said that the document in its current form does not specifically state the Boyer definition and that she was quite correct. It is something which was in an earlier version, and it was taken out after discussion with a number of faculty groups. He said that personally he subscribes to the Boyer model. He said, however, that what is being misinterpreted right now, and what has to be worked on as a community before the community is ready to accept the Boyer model, is that some people hear "Boyer" they look upon that as a softening of the standards of the university. He does not believe that. There are not enough people, however, convinced of that at this point. In particular, what came across in the first six months in discussion with the various groups was that Georgia State University does not consider itself quite strong enough as a research university, and that by moving to the Boyer model before we establish ourselves as a research university is perhaps the wrong signal to send. He said this was his rather blunt statement about what he heard and that he bowed to those pressures. He does think that eventually we will want to recognize the Boyer model -- that while we are a darn good research university, we also can do other things and we should be doing other things as an urban research university.

Baldwin responded that when she read the document, in her personal interpretation of it, it looks like, given her background in higher education, that we are back to this old debate of whether we are going to be a colonial type institution versus following the German model of scholarship. She said that she saw that we gave language to being very student centered as the colonial model would advocate, but yet in the German model we really do want the faculty centered to focus on the research. She sees that in this document and feels from the language that perhaps it is moving us toward the faculty-centered model.

Henry said that he did not think that it is moving to the faculty centered model; we must recognize that research is very important, and that we expect all of our non-tenured faculty to be involved in some substantive research. Having said that, Henry said that if you look in the document, one of the things we will be moving toward is more of a departmental centered model where there are certain departmental expectations that within that will give us significant flexibility to be both student centered as well as disciplined centered. We have to get away from the narrow German model of only being interested in the disciplines. This is a good blend. Particularly, what he likes in the document is the very fine line that we walk basically at the beginning of the document in the mission statement under research and the urban type of mission. We have a responsibility, given our location and our position in the State of Georgia, to be able to do this. We are in a position to do it. That will require people to do nontraditional research, as well as traditional research. We will find as we develop our documents, particularly with respect to the standards for faculty graduate status, for promotion and tenure, and workload, that we will move toward something which may not be called the Boyer model, but it will be much closer to that than the traditional research dominated model.

Patton asked if there were other comments on this or other topics covered in the Strategic Plan.

Barbara Ray said she would like clarification of a couple of points because she would like to draft one sentence to go in the early pages. In the area of interdisciplinary programs, she said that she understood from participation in the Senate and from careful reading of this document that we are going to embrace increasing efforts at interdisciplinary education, research, and service. Having been a participant in this effort for more than 20 years at this university, she said that she knew that we have a checkered past when it comes to interdisciplinary program and educational effort. We are looking ahead, but at the very same time in talking about interdisciplinary programs we have to acknowledge some of the efforts of the past. If we are going to build on what we have done and not repeat the same mistakes we need to acknowledge some of those
programs. They are missing here. She represents a college, Public and Urban Affairs, that has been at the heart of a lot of the interdisciplinary kind of efforts of the university. She asked if there were any comments on any of those issues.

Patton said that, first, that no one should feel that they are in any way prohibited from submitting anything to the Senate Executive Committee. He asked if there was a particular paragraph to examine.

Ray said that she was referring to was what she would insert on page 7, line 44, under Interdisciplinary Programs, Innovative Perspectives. The interdisciplinary program section is rather short. She would like to mention some of the past involvement of GSU.

Patton said that he would reiterate what Tim Crimmins had said -- that in eleven pages you can not cover everything; but the committee will consider anything that you send over.

Patton thanked everyone for their participation.

ADJOURNMENT.

The meeting adjourned at 3:55.

Barbara Buffington, Recorder

University Senate
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