

**Minutes  
Faculty Senate  
October 15, 2009**

The SPSU Faculty Senate met on Thursday Oct. 15 in J-152 with Faculty Moderator Mark Stevens presiding.

1. **Quorum:** declared at 12:32pm;

P/A	Senators	P/A	Ex-Officio
P	Laura Ritter, MATH (secretary)	A	Lisa A. Rossbacher, President
A	Hazem Ziada, ARCH	P	Zvi Szafran, VPAA
A	Joyce McGriff, BA	A	Jeff Ray, Dean ETM
P	Mike Thackston, BCP	A	Alan Gabrielli, Dean A&S
P	Jeff Wagner, ECET	P	Han Reichgelt, Dean C&SE
A	Hussein Abaza, CM	P	Bill Barnes, Dean ACC
P	Orlando Karam, CSWE	P	Andrew Coen, SGA President
A	Barbara Bernal, CSWE	P	Tom Currin
P	Fatih Oncul, CET		
P	Scott Larisch, ECET		<b>Visitors</b>
A	Glenn, Allen, ENGR	P	Joel Fowler, MATH
A	Terry Carter, ETCMA	P	Steve Hamrick
P	Kami Anderson, ETCMA	P	Mark Nunes, ETCMA
P	Walt Thomas, IET	P	Betty Oliver, ETCMA
P	Becky Rutherford, IT		
P	Aaron Wimer, LIB		
P	Bronne Dytoc, ARCH		
P	Greg Conrey, MET		
P	Thomas Nisley, SIS		

**2. P&P 803.075 Faculty Activities**

This document went through the senate last year. There was an issue raised concerning the definition of the terms “satisfactory” and “noteworthy” with respect to the expectation of faculty for tenure and post-tenure review.

Motion: The Senate accepts the document with the wording changes regarding “satisfactory” and “noteworthy”.

Passed.

Motion: Motion to change the service language throughout the document from “service to the institution” to “service”.

Discussion: The question was posed as to whether such a change would be consistent with other documents regarding faculty activities and expectations. It was determined that this is the seminal document regarding faculty activities.  
Passed.

Motion: The Senate moves to approve the amended document.  
Passed.

### **3. P&P 803.0905 Post-Tenure Review**

The terms “satisfactory” and “noteworthy” have been defined. The term “noteworthy” was replaced with the term “satisfactory”.

Motion: The Senate moves to strike the terms “to the institution” throughout to make the document consistent with P&P 803.075.  
Passed.

Motion: The Senate moves to change the term “Philosophy” (of post-tenure review) to “Purpose”.  
Passed.

Motion: The Senate approves the amended document.  
Passed.

### **4. P&P 304.0 Course Objectives, Grading, and Evaluation of Students' Performance**

Motion: The Senate approves the document.

Discussion:

The final exam schedule, which is on this meeting's agenda, is part of the P&P. It was discussed. Steve Hamrick noted that if we intend to institutionalize the process of scheduling final exams, it should be included in a P&P and in this P&P in particular. The argument that inclusion in a P&P means that future changes cannot be made was offered against institutionalizing the process.

Reasons for the late posting of the exam schedule were requested. These included: (1) We have only three days of final exams as opposed to five, (2) We award “live” diplomas, (3) We do not have uniform class scheduling across the campus, and (4) We have no Thursday exam day for final exams. Here, final exam schedules are based on individual student schedules. The resolution of conflict is time consuming and must follow the drop/add deadlines.

It was noted that not having the final exam schedule available early in the semester creates a hardship for non-commuter students especially international students. These students typically purchase airline tickets to see their families. The travel takes place during the peak holiday travel time. The airfare costs are lower when the tickets are purchased early.

A comment was made that the University did have early posted schedules in the past. Steve Hamrick noted that since that time, the student body has grown considerably. Hybrid courses have been added and these cause exam scheduling conflicts.

It was suggested that the final exam study day be eliminated and that day be added to exam days, which would eliminate most scheduling conflicts for individual students.

It was suggested that rather than having formal final exam days, the current exam days be added to the regular instruction schedule. Final exams could then be conducted during the additional instruction time.

It was suggested that live diplomas be eliminated. It was noted that the students have expressed appreciation of live diplomas.

It was suggested that a subcommittee be formed to address the issue of final exam scheduling.

Motion: The Senate moves to table consideration of this P&P.  
Motion withdrawn

Under the section ***Administration of Final Examinations*** appears the language "Prior written approval must be obtained from the Vice President for Academic Affairs in order to change the time for administering a final examination from the published schedule."

Motion: The Senate moves to delete the aforementioned language.  
Passed

In the section on Academic Dishonesty, a grammatical error was removed.

In the last paragraph, "Statement of Course Objectives", it was proposed that the language specifying what feedback must be given by a faculty member prior to the seventh week of the semester be removed. It was suggested that this was too limiting and may be impractical for some classes. The argument for keeping the language, that students require feedback prior to the drop date, was offered.

Regarding academic dishonesty, Steve Hamrick was asked if Fs received for academic dishonesty can be so indicated on the student's transcript. Steve answered that this is not acceptable according to USG guidelines.

A subcommittee was formed to investigate the scheduling of final exams. The members are Senators Laura Ritter, Jeff Wagner, Aaron Wimer, and Becky Rutherford, and assistant to the VPAA Steve Hamrick.

Motion: The Senate moves to table consideration of this P&P.  
Passed.

#### **6. Old Business:**

- a. Continuation of Discussion About Final Exam Scheduling  
This was discussed under item 5.
- b. Plans for P&Ps still in the pipeline  
Mark Stevens is still working with Mary Phillips to get the upcoming 10%.

#### **7. New Business**

- a. Letter of Intent for B.A. in Media Arts  
Mark Nunes: The school of English Technical Communications and Media Arts is proposing a Bachelor of Arts in New Media Arts. The letter of intention was presented to the senate. This degree is intended to address the need for a focus on graphic arts, fine arts and technology and fits well with the mission of the University and the priority of becoming more comprehensive.

It was asked how this degree will differ from the BS in Technical Communications. This degree would differentiate the concentration in media arts and multimedia.

It was asked why the degree will be a BA as opposed to a BS. This would align it with a Bachelors of Fine Arts.

Several questions arose regarding the title "Media Arts." It was noted that the terms Media Arts and New Media Arts are used to describe this emerging field. Andrew Coen (SGA President) stated that students are familiar with this terminology.

Motion: The Senate approves the Major in concept.  
Passed

- b. Workload Proposal document  
The Workload Proposal has been submitted to the faculty by the Deans' Counsel for feedback.
- c. Academic Integrity document  
These will be discussed at the next meeting.
- d. Other New Business

#### **8. Adjournment 1:29pm**

Next Senate meeting: Thursday November 12, 2009

Respectfully submitted: Laura Ritter

Approved by: Mark Stevens