

REVISED August 16, 2000
Faculty Senate
Franklin College of Arts and Sciences

Section I: Senate Policies and Procedures

| | | |
|------|---|--------------|
| I. | Instruction | |
| A. | Requirements, Grading and Student-Related Matters..... | 1 |
| 1. | Grade Changes after course has been completed (5/28/87)..... | 1 |
| 2. | Policies for learning disabled students..... | 1 |
| 3. | Requirements for admitting transfer students into the College (4/20/78 & 2/22/79)..... | 3 |
| 4. | Minimum requirements for admission to Franklin College (4/20/78)..... | 3 |
| 5. | Final examinations or equivalent required (2/19/76)..... | 4 |
| 6. | English standards requirement (viz., refer students with deficient language skills to the English Department for Composition Practicum) (6/6/75)..... | 4 |
| 7. | Procedures for handling student withdrawals from classes (5/7/75)..... | 5 |
| 8. | Policy on final examinations reaffirmed (must be held at the time designated in final exam schedule) (4/9/74)..... | 5 |
| 9. | Instructor initiated "Drop" due to non-attendance (5/27/93)..... | 5 |
| 10. | 182 hour requirement for Bachelors Degrees (5/27/93)..... | 6 |
| 11. | Grade Point Average requirement for majors (1/27/94)..... | 6 |
| 12. | Environmental Literacy requirement for students in the School of Music (4/28/94)..... | 6 |
| 13. | Core requirements for students in the School of Music (5/25/95)..... | 6 |
| B. | Courses..... | 6 |
| 1. | Departments have authority to determine grade prerequisites for all courses (11/30/89)..... | 6 |
| 2. | Normal routing procedures for degree proposals should include Curriculum Committee (4/23/87)..... | 7 |
| 3. | Proposals for course review should be resubmitted when enrollment exceeds original stated capacity (1/30/86)..... | 7 |
| 4. | Non-Laboratory science sequences should be submitted to Senate for approval (6/29/76)..... | 7 |
| 5. | Experimental course policy outlined (5/7/74 & 10/16/74)..... | 8 |
| II. | Professional Concerns | |
| A. | Departmental By-Laws and Procedures required (2/22/90)..... | 8 |
| B. | Scholars evaluating candidate's research record must be informed of candidate's assigned responsibilities (11/30/89)..... | 9 |
| C. | Election procedures for University Council (1/26/89, amended 3/2/89)..... | 9 |
| D. | Eligibility for University Council (5/26/88)..... | 10 |
| E. | Election policy for Faculty Advisory Committee (10/27/94)..... | 10 |
| F. | Principles and procedures for evaluating faculty members for promotion and reappointment (10/21/75)..... | 11 |
| G. | College-wide election procedures (4/29/93)..... | 13 |
| III. | Senate Meetings | |
| A. | Proxies and visitors must be identified (11/10/86)..... | 13 |
| B. | Open to non-Senate members (1/21/74)..... | 13 |
| C. | Standing Committee reporting procedures..... | 13 |
| 1. | Standing Committees should report to Senate (12/4/73)..... | 13 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 2. Treatment of Standing Committee recommendations (9/24/92)..... | 13 |
| D. Rules of order adopted (10/22/73) | 14 |

Section II. Senate Positions and Proposals

IV. General Instruction

| | |
|---|----|
| A. Scheduling..... | 14 |
| 1. Support for Semester System reaffirmed, with full faculty input urged (3/22/90) | 14 |
| 2. Adoption of Early Semester System urged (5/25/89) | 14 |
| 3. Scheduling of courses after 10th period urged (11/10/86)..... | 14 |
| 4. Cancellation of classes during Homecoming Parade opposed (10/85)..... | 15 |
| 5. Reading day before exams recommended (3/28/85)..... | 15 |
| 6. Preferred class schedules under a semester system stated (11/29/83) | 15 |
| 7. Resolution on the scheduling of Fall break (12/2/99)..... | 15 |
| B. Grading | 15 |
| 1. Plus/minus grading system supported (1/26/89 & 1/31/85)..... | 15 |
| 2. Instructors requested to assign grades within guidelines established in the Bulletin (11/17/77)..... | 16 |
| C. Requirements and Prerequisites | 16 |
| 1. Transfer of Credit Committee action, taken October 9, 1986, opposed (11/20/86). | 16 |
| 2. Board of Regents petitioned to confirm statutory authority of faculty to set and enforce admission standards for its degree programs (2/27/86). | 16 |
| 3. ETS area tests should be required before classification as a junior (7/14/77) | 17 |
| 4. Each School or College should determine its own Physical Education requirements (4/30/75)..... | 17 |
| 5. Admissions requirements for Irregular Students (4/27/95)..... | 17 |
| D. Other Issues..... | 17 |
| 1. Improvements in quality of instructional facilities urged (3/2/89) | 17 |
| 2. Georgia recension of Auburn statement about relationship between academics and athletics adopted (3/31/86)..... | 17 |
| 3. Admissions Office and several departments urged to encourage high schools to prepare college-bound seniors to exempt initial college work (5/2/78)..... | 18 |
| 4. Foreign language skills for secondary education and college student recommended (2/22/79)..... | 18 |
| 5. Teaching graduate assistants should be supervised (8/11/77)..... | 19 |
| 6. Reductions in class size recommended (1/26/95)..... | 19 |
| 7. Electronic distribution of Minutes of the Faculty Senate (11/29/95)..... | 19 |
| 8. Opposition to Educational Affairs Committee proposal to impose time limits on declaring a major after completion of core (1/29/98) | 19 |
| 9. Resolution on accepting transfer students into courses for which they are unprepared. (11/96)..... | 20 |

V. Instructional Programs In The College

| | |
|--|----|
| A. Establishment of "Bachelor of Liberal Studies" degree outside the College opposed (4/24/86).... | 20 |
| B. Proposal for General Education Program approved (7/25/81)..... | 20 |
| C. General Studies Division established and curriculum requirements set (5/23/78) | 22 |
| D. General Education program, outlines in Recommendations 12, 13 and 15 of Edwards report, endorsed in principle (7/20/77)..... | 23 |
| E. Establishment of Division of General Studies recommended (7/7/77)..... | 23 |

| | |
|---|----|
| F. Appointment of faculty directors of general education, honors and interdisciplinary programs recommended (10/27/77)..... | 24 |
| G. Appointment of Interdisciplinary Programs Director recommended and responsibilities outlined (7/8/75)..... | 24 |
| H. Proposed Interdisciplinary Studies Program approved (5/7/74)..... | 24 |
| I. Institute of Ecology enters Franklin College (2/25/93)..... | 25 |
| J. Approval of the Artificial Intelligence Center (2/24/94)..... | 25 |
| K. Approval of Southeastern Center for Applied Cognitive Aging Research (2/24/94)..... | 25 |
| L. New Name Approved for Undergraduate Certificate in Latin American and Caribbean Studies (5/25/95)..... | 26 |
| M. New Name Approved for Center for Global Policy Studies (5/25/95)..... | 26 |
| N. New Name Approved for the Center for East-West Trade Policy (5/25/95)..... | 26 |
| O. Deletion of BFA degree in School of Music (10/26/95)..... | 26 |
| P. Establishment of Russian Major (1/25/96)..... | 26 |
| Q. Entomology moves to College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (2/29/96)..... | 26 |
| R. Marine Sciences Major (3/14/96)..... | 26 |
| S. Approval of Undergraduate Certificate Program in GIS (4/25/96)..... | 26 |
| T. Approval of African American Studies Major (4/25/96)..... | 26 |
| U. Semester Conversion..... | 26 |
| 1. Approval of Bachelor of Music Semester Core (4/25/96)..... | 27 |
| 2. Approval of combined Core Curriculum for BA and BS degrees (5/16/96)..... | 27 |
| 3. Approval of BFA Art Degree Semester Core (5/30/96)..... | 27 |
| 4. Proposed changes of degree requirements for the A.B. and B.S. Science Degrees under the semester system (11/96)..... | 27 |
| V. Approval of M.S. degree in Geography (1/21/99)..... | 28 |
| W. Approval of Minor in Asian Language and Literature (1/21/99)..... | 28 |
| X. Approval of A.B. degree in Women's Studies (2/18/99)..... | 28 |
| Y. Approval of Minor in Cellular Biology (9/23/99)..... | 28 |
| Z. Approval of B.S. degree in Mathematics and Computer Science (12/2/99)..... | 28 |
| AA. Approval of Doctor of Philosophy degree in Religion (2/17/00)..... | 28 |
| BB. Approval of Undergraduate Interdisciplinary Certificate in Atmospheric Sciences (2/17/00)..... | 28 |
| CC. Approval of Masters degree in Internet Technology (2/17/00)..... | 28 |
| DD. Approval of Minor in Arabic (4/13/00)..... | 28 |
| EE. Approval of UGA River Basin Science and Policy Center (4/13/00)..... | 28 |

VI. Professional Concerns

| | |
|--|----|
| A. Evaluation of Teaching and Research..... | 28 |
| 1. Student evaluations as one of several ways to evaluate teaching recommended and others outlined (5/25/89)..... | 28 |
| 2. Changes in current tenure policy opposed (2/17/83)..... | 29 |
| 3. Access to annual evaluation letter recommended (1/22/81)..... | 30 |
| 4. Procedures for annual faculty evaluations recommended (5/22/80)..... | 30 |
| 5. Recommendations for evaluating teaching performance of faculty for appointment, promotion and tenure (7/28/77)..... | 31 |
| 6. Committee on Student/Faculty Evaluation Report accepted on guidelines for college-wide system of course evaluations, amended so that Part II of the instrument is included in faculty dossiers (5/19/75)..... | 32 |
| 7. Post-Tenure Review Committee's Policy (11/96)..... | 41 |
| B. Conditions of Employment..... | 44 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Departments encouraged to develop procedures facilitating good faith negotiations over grievances (3/31/88)..... | 44 |
| 2. Board of Regents petitioned to confirm statutory authority of faculty to establish and implement grievance procedures (2/27/86)..... | 45 |
| 3. Quality day care on campus supported (3/29/84)..... | 45 |
| 4. Adoption of AAUP standards for faculty workload recommended (11/29/83)..... | 46 |
| 5. Dean to refer complaints over conditions of employment to Faculty Relations Committee (11/29/79)..... | 46 |
| 6. Sabbatical leave system endorsed (1/15/75)..... | 46 |
| 7. Relationships between persons involved in a grievance suit (1/21/99)..... | 47 |

VII. College Structure And Administration

| | |
|--|----|
| A. Responsibilities of Associate Dean for Instruction outlined (8/11/77 & 7/28/77)..... | 47 |
| B. Dean's proposal for Associate Deanships supported (6/30/7)..... | 47 |
| C. Division of College into smaller schools or colleges opposed (5/23/77)..... | 47 |
| D. Request to the Provost and University Council for Senate involvement in proposed University restructuring involving the Franklin College (2/17/00)..... | 48 |

VIII. University Issues

| | |
|---|----|
| A. University Bookstore..... | 48 |
| 1. University-wide faculty committee on the Bookstore recommended to the President (2/22/90)..... | 48 |
| 2. President's Intervention in Bookstore recommended (4/27/95)..... | 48 |
| B. Change or removal of sexist language in Alma Mater supported (3/2/89)..... | 48 |
| C. Concern expressed over confusion about Centers and Institutes (2/25/88)..... | 49 |
| D. Developmental Studies Program should be placed under faculty of University school or Colleges (2/27/86)..... | 49 |
| E. Library catalogue should be unified and funding approved (11/16/78 & 4/21/77)..... | 49 |
| F. University Council requested to change name and composition of its Library Committee (11/16/78)..... | 49 |
| G. Support the Libraries (3/21/91)..... | 50 |
| H. Teaching Load Under the Semester System (4/27/95)..... | 50 |
| I. Appointment of Faculty Members of the University Appeals Committee (4/27/95)..... | 50 |

Section III. Committee Findings and Recommendations

IX. Guidelines For Standing Committees

| | |
|---|----|
| A. Transmitting Committee records at end of term (9/18/93)..... | 51 |
|---|----|

X. Steering Committee

| | |
|---|----|
| A. Copies on file at Dean's Office shall be official minutes of the Senate (3/30/89)..... | 51 |
| B. Ruling on replacement senators (4/23/87)..... | 51 |
| C. Eligibility for Senate membership interpreted (2/26/87)..... | 51 |
| D. Amendment of Item A (above) (5/30/96)..... | 51 |
| E. Recommendation for College Baccalaureate Exercises (4/30/98)..... | 51 |

| | | |
|--------|---|----|
| XI. | Admissions Committee | |
| | A. Changes in treatment of Developmental Studies Students recommended (12/1/88)..... | 52 |
| | B. Changes in Readmission Standards (4/30/98) | 53 |
| XII. | Ad Hoc Committee On The By-Laws And Statutes | |
| | A. No conflict between By-Laws & Statutes found (1/26/89)..... | 53 |
| XIII. | Ad Hoc Committee On Non-Traditional Students | |
| | A. Recommendations sent to Vice President's Office (4/28/88)..... | 54 |
| XIV. | Curriculum Committee | |
| | A. Resolution on United States Multiculturalism (5/27/93)..... | 54 |
| | B. Approval of GEO (Sic.: Gly) 115-116 as sequence satisfying the Environmental Literacy Requirement (5/25/95)..... | 55 |
| | C. Approval of American Sign Language as fulfilling Language Requirement (3/19/98)..... | 55 |
| | D. Addition of Linguistics to Fine Arts, Humanity, and Religion Distribution Requirement (3/19/98)..... | 55 |
| XV. | Awards Committee | |
| | A. Awards selection guidelines (12/1/92)..... | 56 |
| | B. Awards selection guidelines (2/24/94)..... | 56 |
| | C. Awards selection guidelines (5/24/94)..... | 57 |
| | D. Election of the Awards Selection Committee (1/26/95)..... | 57 |
| | E. Dissolution of the Senate Awards Committee (1/21/99)..... | 57 |
| XVI. | Ad Hoc Committee On Health And Safety | |
| | A. Resolution on Health and Safety (5/30/90)..... | 57 |
| XVII. | Ad Hoc Committee On Faculty Initiated Drop And Withdrawal | |
| | A. Resolution on auto-drop (3/14/96)..... | 58 |
| | B. Recommendations sent to University Council (3/14/96)..... | 58 |
| XVIII. | Committee On Professional Concerns | |
| | A. Amendment to Article II, Section X of By-Laws (4/25/96)..... | 58 |
| | B. Recommendations that University Council investigate Administration Procedures (5/30/96) | 58 |
| | C. Senate nomination of candidates to Promotion and Tenure Committees | 58 |
| | D. Recommendations to Dean on instructions to Promotion and Tenure Committees | 59 |
| XIX. | Academic Standards Committee | |
| | A. Review of Departmental Major Assessment Proposals (10/30/97) | 59 |
| XX. | Ad Hoc Long Range Planning Committee | |
| | A. Creation of <i>ad hoc</i> Long Range Planning Committee (2/26/98) | 59 |

XXI. Committee on Planning and Evaluation
A. Creation of Committee on Planning and Evaluation (9/24/98)60

XXII. Committee On Committees
A. Committee on Committees may recommend Committee Chairs (4/30/98).....60

XXIII. Ad Hoc Committee on Restructuring
A. Creation of *ad hoc* Committee on Restructuring (4/22/99)60

Compiled by: 1988-90 Steering Committees, Martha Meyers, Chairman, June 20, 1990
1992-93 Secretary of the Senate, Marcus Fechheimer, August 31, 1993

Updated by: 1993-94 Secretary of the Senate, Elissa R. Henken and Presiding Officer Pro Tem,
Marcus Fechheimer, August 15, 1994

Updated by: 1994-95 Secretary of the Senate, Alysa J. Ward, August 9, 1995

Updated by: 1995-96 Steering Committee and Secretary of the Senate, Charles Keith and Presiding
Officer Martha Thomas

Updated by: 1997-98 Presiding Officer Charles Keith

Special thanks to the Dean's Office, Vicky Smith, for assistance in word processing this compendium of
senate resolutions.

Updated by: 1998-99 Steering Committee Member Brian Boe
1998-99 Presiding Officer Jonathan Evans, August 25, 1999

Updated by: 1999-00 Steering Committee Member Brian Boe
1999-00 Presiding Officer Malcolm Adams, August 16, 2000

Faculty Senate
Franklin College of Arts and Sciences

Section I: Senate Policies and Procedures

I. INSTRUCTION

A. **Requirements, Grading and Student-Related Matters**

1. **Grade Changes after course has been completed (5/28/87).**

Resolution two: The policy of the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences shall be not to change final letter grades, once a student has completed a course, to either an "I" (Incomplete) or a "W" (Withdrawal).

If a student suffers a hardship before his/her final grade in a course has been assigned, he/she may wish to talk with the instructor about receiving an "I" for the course or with the Office of Student Affairs about receiving a "W". In exceptional cases where the student was unable to bring the hardship to the instructor's attention prior to the assigning of a final grade (e.g., where it is discovered that a student missed a final exam because of an accident), the instructor may wish to take the student's hardship into account in deciding whether or not to change the final grade. The student might, under these circumstances, be permitted to make up assignments that were missed or else were deficient because of the hardship.

In student petitions for such grade changes, the role of the Office of Student Affairs will be limited to verifying [a] that the student's claim of a hardship is truthful, and [b] that the student was unable to find the instructor before the final grade was assigned.

These resolutions shall be circulated to all Faculty of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences, to the Dean of the College, and to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

2. **Policies for learning disabled students**

a. **General Policy (2/26/87)**

1. Students with learning disabilities, those who identify themselves upon admission to or registration in the College, and those identified by the College after admission or registration, are to be advised as early as possible to enroll in degree programs which would not require courses in the area(s) of disability.

2. Students identified as in No. 1 (above) should be referred to the Handicapped Student Office. If initial screening indicates possible learning disability, the student should be referred to the Learning Disabilities Clinic, if further diagnostic assessment and special assistance is needed.

The student thus referred must sign a statement acknowledging the referral.

3. The student, with the aid of the Learning Disabilities Clinic, if appropriate, should apply compensatory strategies already learned, or should develop such strategies as are applicable to the specific learning disability, to enable him/her to undertake the courses required by the College or the degree program.

4. If number 3 (above) demonstrates the compensatory learning strategies are insufficient for the individual student's disability, the student, assisted by a member of the Learning Disabilities Clinic, should consult with instructor(s) and the department head(s) to attempt to modify the course(s) made difficult by the student's disability. This should be done only after alternative learning strategies (see number 3, above) have been exhausted. Should this procedure fail to resolve the problem for the student, the student may appeal to the Committee on Academic Standards of the Faculty Senate.

5. Should the disability relate to the foreign language requirement, the student should attempt to satisfy the foreign language requirement through:

- a. Correspondence courses in one of the languages offered for resident credit through the Office of Independent Study, Georgia Center for Continuing Education.
- b. the study of a language with no oral component if the disability lies in this area.

7. modification of requirements of a conventional language course as provided by the language department and Learning Disabilities Clinic.

6. Failure to fulfil number 5 (above) must be documented by the department, the Learning Disabilities Clinic, and the student before any further accommodations in the foreign language requirement can be considered.

7. Once documentation in number 6 (above) is complete, as a final alternative, course substitution may be considered for the foreign language requirement appropriate to the major (course credit or exemption through the third or fourth semester; cf. <http://ben.franklin.uga.edu/saga/data/numlang.htm>). Students may choose from the following: (List approved 5/24/94)

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------------|
| AFAM 2000 | ANTH 3260 | CLAS 1000 |
| CLAS 1010 | CMLT 2210 | CMLT 2210 |
| CMLT 2220 | CMLT 3150 | CMLT(ANTH) 3180 |
| CMLT 4660 | CMLT 4610 | ENGL 2310 |
| ENGL 2320 | ENGL 2330 | HIST 2501 |
| HIST 2502 | HIST 2601 | HIST 2602 |
| HIST 3220 | LING 2100 | RELI 1001 |
| RELI 4070 | RELI 4072 | RELI 4070 |
| RELI 4072 | RELI 4071 | RELI 4002 |

(The above listed courses may be considered provided these courses are not used to satisfy other requirements for the degree).

b. Policy sight impaired music majors (3/31/94)

The committee forwarded with its approval the resolution that ENGL 3650 be counted as satisfying the fine arts requirement for music majors if the student is declared sight impaired by Disability Services.

c. Foreign language requirements for learning disabled students (5/24/94)

The Franklin College of Arts and Sciences will waive the foreign language requirement for students found unable to complete this requirement by the Learning Disabilities Clinic (LDC) upon notification of the disability by the LDC. Students who waive this requirement must substitute courses from the approved list. The number of substituted courses will be three or four, according to the requirement of the student's major; cf.

<http://ben.franklin.uga.edu/saga/data/numlang.htm>. These courses may not be used to satisfy other requirements for these degrees. Students who waive this requirement must notify the College of the courses used in the substitution.

Routine changes in the list of courses approved for substitution of the foreign language requirement due to course deactivations, new offerings, and modifications of existing courses may be made by the Committee on Academic Standards of the Faculty Senate without consultation with the full Senate.

3. Requirements for admitting transfer students into the College (4/20/78 & 2/22/79).

&

4. Minimum requirements for admission to Franklin College (4/20/78).

For the Admissions Committee, Mr. Whitten moved that the Senate adopt the following minimum requirements for admission to the Franklin College:

1. Freshmen entering on or after the summer of 1979 must have a combined SAT score of 800 and a predicted GPA of 2.0.

Freshmen entering on or after the summer of 1980 must have a combined SAT score of 825 and predicted GPA of 2.2.

Freshmen entering on or after the summer of 1981 must have a combined SAT score of 850 and a predicted GPA of 2.4.

2. All students who transfer into the Franklin College with less than 60 semester hours credit must meet the minimum freshman requirements in effect at the time of transfer.
3. Any and all exceptions to criteria 1 and 2 require the approval of the

Admissions Committee of the Franklin College.

After considerable discussion, the motion carried.

For the Committee on General Studies, Mr. Berrigan reported that a number of the faculty had met with Chancellor Simpson to discuss the proposed new core curriculum. He also announced that the Committee is considering new admissions standards and revised requirements for the B.A. and B.S. degrees. Mr. Berrigan then moved the adoption of new requirements (amended during the discussion) for a transfer student to be admitted to the College as a junior or senior.

- a. The transfer student must possess a GPA of at least 2.5.
- b. He must provide the College with his SAT scores.
- c. He must have passed the Regents' Rising Junior examination at his previous school, if it is a unit of the University System. Otherwise, he will be admitted provisionally, until he has passed the examination, which he must take at each administration until he has passed it.
- d. He must have completed the appropriate course or courses in mathematics for the curriculum for which he intends to enroll in Franklin College, English 1102, and the first two semesters of a foreign language. Any student who has not completed all these requirements will be required to complete them as expeditiously as possible.
- e. Any and all exceptions to requirements a through d require the approval of the Admissions Committee of the Franklin College.

After discussion, the motion passed as amended. Mr. Berrigan then presented a statement (appended) concerning General Studies in the College, but discussion was delayed until a special meeting called for 2 May 1978.

Section a of the requirements for transfer students with more than sixty semester hours as passed by the Senate on 20 April 1978 is amended to read: "The transfer student must possess a predicted GPA of at least 2.5."

5. Final examinations or equivalent required (2/19/76)

A final examination or an equivalent method of final evaluation shall be utilized in courses in the College at the regularly scheduled time each semester. Courses which do not fit the traditional definition of a "course" or for which conventional final examinations are not appropriate are excluded from this policy. Alternate methods of evaluation used in lieu of a final examination shall be approved by the department.

The intent of this policy is to provide all students enrolled in courses in the College an opportunity to demonstrate that they have mastered the content of their courses.

6. English standards requirement (viz., refer students with deficient language skills to the English Department for Composition Practicum) (6/6/75)

If a student's written work in any course is judged by the professor in that course to be deficient, the student may be referred to the English Department for enrollment in the Composition Practicum. Should the professor wish to do so, he may, in conformity with current University regulations, assign the student an end-of-semester grade of "I" until such time as the student's deficiencies in composition have been remedied. After satisfactory completion of the Composition Practicum and any other requirements set by the professor, the student may have the grade of "I" changed by the professor to the appropriate final grade.

7. Procedures for handling student withdrawals from classes (5/7/75)

Implementation of new policy on student withdrawals from classes (passed by Faculty Senate 2/19/74).

The Senate Committee on Academic Standards recommends:

1. That the new policy on "Course Withdrawals" be implemented Fall Quarter, 1974.
2. That the following procedure be used:
 - a. The student obtains the "Request for Withdrawal From Course" card from the Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences.
 - b. If the student withdraws before mid-term, the card, is taken directly to the instructor for assignment of the appropriate grade, "W" or "WF". The card is then returned by the Instructor to the Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences.
 - c. If after mid-term the student needs to withdraw because of health or emergency reasons, the student should take his withdrawal card to the Dean of Student Affairs for confirmation of the reason for withdrawal. The student should then submit his withdrawal card to the instructor for assignment of the appropriate grade, "W" or "WF".
3. That the statement of policy on student withdrawals be distributed to all faculty and be announced at the beginning of each class in the Fall Quarter, 1974.

8. Policy on final examinations reaffirmed (must be held at the time designated in final exam schedule) (4/9/74)

Dr. Frankenberg moved "that the Faculty Senate reaffirm the policy that all final examinations be given at the time designated in the final examination schedule".

Dr. LaFleur seconded the motion. The motion passed.

9. Instructor initiated "Drop" due to non-attendance (5/27/93)

The Registrar be instructed to insert the following statement in to the Schedule of Classes, and that this be the explicit policy of the College. All instructors in the College of Arts and Sciences have the option of dropping students who do not attend

at least one of the first two days of classes. Students may adjust their schedules during Phase III Registration (Drop/Add), which occurs during the first three days of each semester, but this does not exclude students from attending class.

10. 182 hour requirement for Bachelors Degrees (5/27/93)

RESOLVED that the present 192-hour minimum requirements for the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees be reduced to 182 hours. The reduction will be accomplished by dropping 5 hours from the lower division mathematics requirement, through the removal of mathematics credit for Math 102, and by dropping 5 hours of free elective credits. Be it further resolved that the present 192-hour minimum requirement for the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree be reduced to 182 hours by dropping 10 hours of free elective credits.

11. Grade Point Average requirement for majors (1/27/94)

No department within the College may impose grade point average requirements for admission to their major (or minors) which differ from the grade point average requirement established for the College at large.

12. ~~Environmental Literacy requirement for students in the School of Music (4/28/94)~~

~~The Environmental Literacy requirement for students in the School of Music who are pursuing the degree Bachelor of Music in Music Education can be satisfied by either BOT 121-121L or BOT 122-122L or GLY 115-115L and GLY 116-116L. When an alternative method for satisfying the Environmental Literacy requirements along with all the other degree requirements exists, the exception created in this resolution must be reconsidered.~~

13. ~~Core requirements for students in the School of Music (5/25/95)~~

~~The Senate approved the request of the School of Music to modify the Core Curriculum for the Bachelor of Music in Music Education by replacing five hours of Fine Arts with an additional five hours of Social Science to be selected from the following classes: ANT 102, GGY 200-220L, GGY 101.~~

B. Courses

1. Departments have authority to determine grade prerequisites for all courses (11/30/89).

Departments have the authority to determine the grade prerequisites for all courses they offer and for all courses required of their majors. A department may therefore require a grade higher than that considered "passing" by the University (a D grade) in any prerequisite course. A course is a prerequisite only in relation to a second course, however, and a higher grade can be required only if the course is used as a prerequisite.

2. Normal routing procedures for degree proposals should include Curriculum Committee (4/23/87).

The resolution on the agenda offered by the Curriculum Committee was approved after amendment. The amended resolution reads:

Whereas a degree program offered by a department in the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences has many curriculum impacts, both in the department and in other departments within and outside the Franklin College, and whereas the Curriculum Committee for the Franklin College has as its concern the curricular matters of the Franklin College, be it resolved that the normal routing procedure for degree proposals directly affecting departments of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences include the Curriculum Committee of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences, which shall recommend approval (with recorded vote) or prepare a resolution for action by the Faculty Senate to express concern whenever a possible conflict is detected.

3. Proposals for course review should be resubmitted when enrollment exceeds original stated capacity (1/30/86).

Consideration of the following resolution:

WHEREAS one of the items of evaluation of course proposals by the Curriculum Committee is a stated maximum number of students and

WHEREAS many courses now being taught in the Franklin College exceed the originally approved maxima and

WHEREAS the nature of a class is affected by the number of students in it, be it therefore

RESOLVED that those courses in which enrollments presently exceed the approved maxima by 20% or more be resubmitted to the Curriculum Committee for review.

John Hollingsworth, who identified himself as initiator of the resolution, said that a course does change appreciably when its enrollment increases. Because of concern over this change, the Curriculum Committee should review the course. Several senators indicated that implementation could be problematic as expected size is written only on new course proposals; many courses were approved years ago and records no longer exist. Original expected enrollment might have been set for reasons of available space, not the nature of the course. The Dean noted that this is an unanticipated problem and it might be time to set up a mechanism to deal with it. The problem results from a variety of factors. The Senate voted 20-15 in favor of the resolution. Dean Payne will meet with the Chair of the Curriculum Committee to discuss implementation of the resolution.

4. Non-Laboratory science sequences should be submitted to Senate for approval (6/29/76).

The Senate Curriculum Committee submitted the following recommendations:

"In approving non-laboratory science sequences, if the curriculum committee approves two courses that have been requested for a sequence, the department in question will present the courses to the Senate for the Senate's approval of the sequence as a non-laboratory science requirement".

The recommendation was adopted.

5. Experimental course policy outlined (5/7/74 & 10/16/74).

The Curriculum Committee recommends that:

New courses of an experimental nature, dealing with new material or new combinations of material or employing new methods of inquiry, as well as new courses intended to take advantage of a temporary circumstance (such as the presence of a guest lecturer of unique but valuable background) may be given immediate but provisional approval for a 12 month period. In such cases, only a simple statement of the course's intended number, title, description and rationale for offering need be submitted to the Curriculum Committee, and with approval of the committee and the Dean of Arts and Sciences may be offered over a 12 month period. An extension for a second 12 months may be granted upon submission of a letter of request justifying the value in continuing the course on an experimental basis. Permanent approval would be possible, but would require submission according to the usual procedure for new courses. Provisional approval does not guarantee final approval. Submission for final approval should be accompanied by an evaluation of the course in its initial offering supported by any documents the department considers appropriate.

The rationale for this proposal is based on the following points:

1. This provisional approval may generate a spirit of free inquiry, interest, and experimentation in the Arts and Sciences.
2. The procedure will alleviate the pressure on departments and curriculum committee and administration for new course applications, in instances where too many unknown variables are at work to justify permanent approval.
3. It allows a new means for more careful evaluation of certain new courses by all involved.

The new policy on experimental courses in Arts and Sciences established last year through the committee and the senate is now being implemented through the office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences. In the future, departments desiring to submit proposals for experimental courses need not submit the standard new course form, but only a letter describing the nature of the new course and the rationale for offering it as an experimental course.

II. PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS

A. Departmental By-Laws and Procedures required (2/22/90)

1. Resolution on Departmental Faculty Governance:

The Faculty of each department (school) of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences shall develop By-Laws and Procedures that define the administrative structure of the

department (school) and the ways in which business is conducted and decisions made. They shall define the ways in which the Head (Director) consults with the faculty. The department (school) By-Laws and Procedures shall be consistent with the By-Laws of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences, with the Statutes and By-Laws of the University of Georgia, and with all policies of the Board of Regents. They shall be adopted by a majority vote of the faculty of the department (school), and they shall be amendable by a vote of that faculty. The Senate requests the Dean to ensure that this policy is implemented as soon as possible.

Passed as amended.

B. Scholars evaluating candidate's research record must be informed of candidate's assigned responsibilities (11/30/89)

- a. The following resolution from the Steering Committee was amended and passed:
 1. Scholars from whom letters evaluating the candidate's research record are solicited should be informed of the details of the candidate's assigned responsibilities.

C. Election procedures for University Council (1/26/89, amended 3/2/89)

Election of members for the University Council and its Committees. To insure that the faculty of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences is authentically represented, the Faculty Senate of the Franklin College establishes the following procedures for all elections conducted College-wide or division-wide within the College.

- a. All elections shall be conducted by means of written ballots.
- b. Eligible to vote shall be the following:
 1. Faculty members with tenure
 2. Faculty members in tenure track positions;
 3. Other faculty members currently budgeted for more than half time
 - a. who have been recommended for appointment or reappointment by vote of their department's faculty and
 - b. whose appointment or reappointment will extend beyond the date on which the person to be elected will begin the term of office.
- c. In every round of balloting, each eligible faculty member shall be entitled to vote for a number of persons equal to the number of positions to be filled.
- d. The first round of balloting shall be a call for nominations, and the names of all eligible faculty members nominated shall appear on the next ballot.
- e. For the third and each subsequent round of balloting, the ballot shall comprise the names of those persons who on the preceding round of balloting (1) received the greatest number of votes and (2) as a group received more than fifty percent of the individual votes cast in the preceding round of balloting and (3) as a group received a

number of votes in the preceding round of balloting that is closer to fifty percent than any other grouping of the consecutive highest vote-getters. (Each individual finally elected, therefore, shall have received the approval of the majority of faculty members casting ballots in the final round of balloting).

- f. No department, division, or other unit within the College shall impose additional eligibility requirements either for voting or for holding elected positions on the University Council and its committees.

Amendment passed.

Amendment to e.

The amendment provides for the insertion of an additional sentence between the first and second sentences, Subsection E. Subsection E should now read, as amended: "Those nominees receiving a majority of votes cast shall be declared elected. If the number of individuals receiving majority votes exceeds the number of positions to be filled, the individuals receiving the most votes shall be elected. In the event that all the positions are not filled by majority vote on the second ballot, a third ballot shall be prepared consisting of those nominees who received the largest numbers of non-majority votes on the second ballot. The number of nominees on the third ballot shall equal the number of positions to be filled plus one". (See attachment).

Two corrections to the minutes for the 26 January 89 meeting were approved: On page three, section 6c, in the eighth line of the section the word declare was inserted before the word elected, with the complete sentence now reading, "If the number of individuals receiving majority votes exceeds the number of positions to be filled, the individuals receiving the most votes shall be declared elected."; and also on page three, section 6e, in the next-to-last sentence of the section, the clause "and he promised to make them an agenda item for one of President Knapp's cabinet meetings" was deleted. The corrected minutes were then approved.

D. Eligibility for University Council (5/26/88)

To insure that the faculty of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences is equitably represented on the University Council, the Faculty Senate of the Franklin College establishes the following policy (in effect for elections during or after Academic year 1988-89):

- a. The total number of University Council seats allotted to the College shall be distributed among the five divisions of the College in proportion to the number of full-time faculty members in each division.
- b. No more than half of the Council members elected from a division may come from the faculty of a single department.
- c. A faculty member who has served a full term or the major portion of a term shall be ineligible for election to an immediately succeeding term.

E. Election policy for Faculty Advisory Committee (10/27/94)

In accordance with the new procedure for electing four representatives from the Franklin College to the Faculty Advisory Committee, the Faculty Senate rescinded the existing policy (5/28/87) and established the following guidelines:

1. Elections shall be held according to the general procedures for College Wide Elections in the Franklin College (4/29/93).
2. New nominees and representatives shall be selected so that each of the four representatives has his/her home department in a different one of the five Divisions of the Franklin College.

F. Principles and procedures for evaluating faculty members for promotion and reappointment (10/21/75)

I. Review Committees

- A. The tenured faculty of a department shall be the appointment and promotion committee. The head of a department shall be the chairman of the committee.
- B. The tenured faculty shall meet formally at an appropriate time during the academic year to consider members of the non-tenured faculty for promotion or reappointment.
- C. The full professors shall meet separately to consider associate professors for promotion.
- D. When appropriate, ad hoc committees composed of those members of the full committees best qualified to judge a particular candidate's research, creative activity, artistic performance, teaching, and service may be designated by the tenured faculty to review the candidate's qualifications for promotion or reappointment.
- E. A committee selected from the tenured faculties of departments in which a faculty member holds joint appointment or is a candidate for a joint appointment shall be the appointment and promotion committee. The heads of these departments shall appoint members of the committees, and one department head shall be designated by the joint committee as chairman. This procedure shall apply only to individuals budgeted in more than one department.

II. Review Procedures

- A. The tenured faculty shall meet formally to discuss the reviews and to vote on the candidates. Each candidate shall be voted on separately. Ballots shall be secret, and a majority of the votes cast shall constitute the decision of the tenured faculty. If the vote is divided, the minority may submit a report in writing to the head.
- B. The head of the department shall report in writing to each candidate reviewed

for promotion or reappointment the decision and vote of the tenured faculty.

- C. If the department head disapproves a recommendation by the tenured faculty for promotion, he shall so inform the candidate. The candidate may withdraw, in which case no promotion dossier shall be forwarded to the dean. If the candidate chooses not to withdraw, the head shall forward a promotion dossier to the dean and state in a letter of transmittal his reasons for disapproval.
- D. A candidate denied recommendation for promotion by the tenured faculty may appeal to the college review committee. The head of the department shall forward a promotion dossier with the candidate's written statement of the reasons for his appeal.
- E. All letters of appraisal of a candidate's qualifications for promotion or reappointment shall be forwarded to the dean.
- F. Candidates whose promotions are denied at any level shall be advised in writing by the department head of the reason for denial.

III. Review Schedule

- A. Instructors shall be reviewed for reappointment or promotion at the end of their second year in service and annually thereafter.
- B. Assistant professors shall normally be reviewed for promotion or permanent tenure at the end of their third year of service. Assistant professors not awarded permanent tenure shall be reviewed in their fifth and sixth years of service. However, an assistant professor may be reviewed for promotion at the end of his second year of service if he requests early review.
- C. Associate professors shall normally be reviewed for promotion at the end of their second year in service and annually thereafter. However, associate professors may be reviewed in any year they request special review.

IV. Criteria for Promotion

- A. Recommendations for promotions shall be based primarily on excellence in (a) teaching, (b) research, publications, creative activity, or artistic performance, and (c) budgeted university, professional, and public service.
- B. The tenured faculty of each department shall establish uniform procedures and criteria for evaluating teaching. Definition of standards and procedures shall be published in the departments; copies of these definitions shall be included in promotions dossiers and must be taken into consideration by all review committees.
- C. Formal definitions of research, creative activity, and artistic performance, and of criteria for evaluating these activities shall be established for the various fields of study in which the tenured faculties of departments exercise competence and authority. These definitions and criteria shall be published in departments; copies shall be included in promotion dossiers and must be taken

into consideration by all review committees.

- D. In evaluating candidates for promotion, the tenured faculty shall also give consideration to department, college, and university committee service and to other activities which contribute to the professional growth of the faculty member, to the enhancement of professional discipline, or to the general welfare of the university. The tenured faculty shall determine the relative weight assigned to awards, student evaluation of teaching, faculty performance on academic examining committees, classroom visitations, etc.

G. College-wide election procedures (4/29/93)

"Resolved that the ballots for college-wide elections be counted by an ad hoc committee appointed by the Presiding Office of the Faculty Senate, and that elections be decided by a majority vote rather than a plurality."

III. SENATE MEETINGS

A. Proxies and visitors must be identified (11/10/86)

Resolution: At the start of each regular or special meeting of the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall (1) have each proxy for an absent member of the Senate rise, identify himself or herself by name and department, and state the name of the absent member; and (2) have all persons present who are not either members of the Senate, proxies, or deans to raise their hands so that the members of the Senate may know who is eligible to cast votes and otherwise participate in the meeting.

B. Open to non-Senate members (1/21/74)

Regular meetings of the Franklin College Senate shall be open to any non-Senate member of the College community wishing to observe the proceedings.

C. Standing Committee reporting procedures

1. Standing Committees should report to Senate (12/4/73)

Dr. Longman moved that actions and items under consideration by standing committees be reported to the Senate meeting and be circulated among the faculty along with the minutes of the Faculty Senate. The motion was seconded and passed.

2. Treatment of Standing Committee recommendations (9/24/92)

The Senate recognizes that in all cases in which the By-laws instruct a committee to "make recommendations to the Senate", the committee will present its recommendations as agenda items to be voted on by the Senate. Except in the cases where the By-laws authorize a committee to act on the Senate's behalf, committees will attach the proviso "pending approval of the full senate" to any recommendation

they send forward before a vote has been taken in the Senate.

D. Rules of order adopted (10/22/73)

The rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the Society in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with these by-laws and any special rules of order the Society may adopt.

Section II. Senate Positions and Proposals

IV. GENERAL INSTRUCTION

A. Scheduling

1. Support for Semester System reaffirmed, with full faculty input urged (3/22/90)

The Faculty Senate of the Franklin College requests that the University Council provides to Deans and Department Heads the Report of the Semester Feasibility Task Force for them to make available to the Faculty. We also request that the Council encourage faculty response to the Report, as well as faculty participation in its April 19th meeting. The Senate reaffirms its support for the semester system, but considers it essential that the faculty be involved at each stage of the implementation process. Proposals about workload, curriculum planning, and calendar requirements should be implemented only after direct faculty input and approval.

2. Adoption of Early Semester System urged (5/25/89)

Whereas, in a written ballot in April, 1989, approximately three-fourths of the Faculty of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences have expressed their dissatisfaction with the current UGA Quarter System, and whereas eighty-eight percent of those dissatisfied with the current system have indicated a preference for shifting to a Semester System, and whereas an Early Semester System was clearly the first choice on a preferential ranking of alternative calendars,

We respectfully urge the Dean of the Franklin College, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President, and the University Council to take appropriate steps to place the University of Georgia on the Early Semester System, and to initiate, concurrently, appropriate steps toward curriculum revision and adjustment of faculty teaching loads.

3. Scheduling of courses after 10th period urged (11/10/86)

Resolution: To enable students -- especially working or other non-traditional students -- to earn a baccalaureate degree in the College of Arts and Sciences by attending classes wholly or principally in the late afternoon and the evening, and nevertheless to maintain the academic standards and reputation of The University of Georgia, the Faculty Senate of the Franklin College urges department to schedule an appropriate

selection of courses at the tenth period and later.

4. Cancellation of classes during Homecoming Parade opposed (10/85)

WHEREAS the administration's cancelling of classes for the homecoming parade sends a definite - if unintended - message to the students that participation in extracurricular activities justifies absence from class and neglect of studies, be it therefore

RESOLVED that the Senate of the Franklin College states its opposition to the cancellation of university classes for any reasons other than legitimate weather or other emergency conditions.

5. Reading day before exams recommended (3/28/85)

The Faculty Senate of the Franklin College recommends that there be at least one reading day or a weekend between the last day of classes and the first day of final exams.

6. Preferred class schedules under a semester system stated (11/29/83)

RESOLVED: That the Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences favors 50 minute classes on Monday-Wednesday-Friday and 75 minute classes on Tuesday-Thursday in the new semester system.

7. Resolution on the scheduling of Fall break (12/2/99)

The Franklin College Faculty Senate is dismayed by the decision of the University Council to link the timing of a Fall Break to the Georgia-Florida football game. We strongly urge the University Council to reconsider this decision for the following reasons:

1. The existence and timing of a Fall Break should be determined purely on academic grounds. To coordinate a Fall Break with a particular football game does not enhance the image of a serious academic institution that this University seeks to promote.

2. The addition of a two-day Fall break at any point in the term has the detrimental effect on the calendar of creating, along with the existing Thanksgiving break, two partial weeks of classes. The resulting lack of continuity may be more harmful than the potential good of a Fall Break.

3. If a Fall Break is nonetheless deemed advisable, it would make much more sense to schedule it closer to the midpoint of the semester.

B. Grading

1. Plus/minus grading system supported (1/26/89 & 1/31/85)

Resolution from Professor Robert Burton: The resolution, after some discussion, was passed as follows: That the Faculty Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences urge the University Council to seek authorization from the Board of Regents to implement a plus and minus grading system at the University of Georgia. It was left

to Dr. Cosgrove to communicate this resolution to the Council.

"RESOLVED that the secretary of the Senate send to the Executive Committee of University Council the following statement:

The Faculty Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences recommends that the University institute a letter grading system which includes pluses and minuses and ranges from A to F."

2. Instructors requested to assign grades within guidelines established in the Bulletin (11/17/77)

"The University Bulletin contains a statement on the grading system that identifies the letter grades A, B, C, D, and F with the descriptions "excellent", "good", "average", "poor", and "failure", respectively (p. 25).

The Senate, while reaffirming that it is the responsibility of the individual faculty members to make the final evaluation of their students, and recognizing the fact that absolute uniformity is neither possible nor even desirable, does request that instructors make serious efforts to assure that evaluation in terms of a final grade be done within the general context of the Bulletin guidelines."

C. Requirements and Prerequisites

1. Transfer of Credit Committee action, taken October 9, 1986, opposed (11/20/86).

"In view of our conviction that efficiency of transfer of credit within the University System of Georgia should not take priority over an institution's prerogatives to establish its own requirements for degrees, we go on record as opposing the action of the Transfer of Credit Committee on October 9, 1986."

2. Board of Regents petitioned to confirm statutory authority of faculty to set and enforce admission standards for its degree programs (2/27/86).

Be it moved that the Faculty Senate recommend that the Faculty of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences adopt the following motion:

The Faculty of the Franklin College hereby petitions the Board of Regents

- (a) to confirm the statutory authority of the faculty of each of the Schools and Colleges of the University of Georgia to establish and enforce admission standards of each degree program it offers;
- (b) to confirm the statutory authority of the faculty of each of the Schools and Colleges of the University of Georgia to establish and implement comprehensive, binding faculty grievance procedures; and
- (c) to place the University of Georgia's Developmental Studies Program under the jurisdiction of the faculty of one of the University's schools or Colleges.

The responsibility for establishing and implementing (a) and (b) lies fundamentally with the full faculty of each of the Colleges but can be delegated to representative bodies thereof.

3. ETS area tests should be required before classification as a junior (7/14/77)

"Beginning this academic year, the ETS Area Tests should be required of every student in the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences before he or she can be classified as a junior, and that a faculty committee be appointed immediately to study the test for the purpose of establishing a minimum passing score for the following year."

4. Each School or College should determine its own Physical Education requirements (4/30/75)

Be it resolved that each School or College of the University of Georgia determine its own Physical Education requirement.

5. Admissions requirements for Irregular Students (4/27/95)

Effective Fall 1996, students who wish to be admitted to the Franklin College as irregular students must meet the minimum grade point average requirement in place for incoming Franklin College transfer students.

D. Other Issues

1. Improvements in quality of instructional facilities urged (3/2/89)

The Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences expresses its concern over the quality of instructional facilities at the University and over the nature of the infrastructure supporting those facilities. We request the Dean to bring this concern to the attention of the University Administration through the appropriate channels.

2. Georgia recension of Auburn statement about relationship between academics and athletics adopted (3/31/86)

1. College athletics should be a beneficial activity for the University, not only providing a valuable extracurricular experience for the young men and women who participate but also promoting a spirit of community among students, faculty, and alumni, and attracting recognition and support for the University.
2. The participants in intercollegiate athletics are first and foremost students, secondarily athletes. The preeminence of academics in the college experience of the student-athlete should be the guiding principle in decisions concerning the student-athlete, including admission, grading, retention, and graduation.
3. Only academically qualified students -- those judged capable of completing a degree -- should be recruited and admitted to the University. Athletic ability unaccompanied by demonstrated academic ability should in no case be grounds for admission.
4. All student-athletes and (if the student-athletes are legally minors) their parents or guardians should be made aware that the primary reason for attending the University is to receive an education; the primary goal must be to complete a

formal course of study leading to a degree.

5. Athletes may be admitted to the Division of Developmental Studies in the same manner as other students. However, they must not be permitted to participate in intercollegiate athletics until legitimately exiting from Developmental Studies into the regular curriculum of a degree program within a college or school of the University.
6. Upon matriculation, a student-athlete should have a course schedule that will clearly give preeminence to academics. Such a schedule is especially important during the first year. A student-athlete should not, except in a limited and carefully designed way, participate in athletics as a Freshman.
7. Athletic activities such as workouts, meetings, and competitions should be scheduled to avoid interfering with academic activities. No events should interfere with final examinations. The number of contests in a given sport should be set consistent with a priority for academic work.
8. The student-athlete should make normal progress in an area of study and be subject to the standard University policies, regulations, and processes concerning grading and retention.
9. The President of the University must be clearly and specifically held responsible for all activities of the institution, including all athletic programs. It is imperative that the Legislature and the Board of Regents establish and implement whatever policies may be necessary to assign and delegate to the President the authority and the obligation to implement and enforce the preceding tenets.

3. Admissions Office and several departments urged to encourage high schools to prepare college-bound seniors to exempt initial college work (5/2/78)

1. We suggest the taking of the Regents Exam as a required part of the admissions procedure. The results will be considered as part of the English placement process.
2. We urge the admissions office and the faculties of Mathematics, Sciences, English, and the several foreign languages to encourage the high schools of this state to use the senior year of high school in preparing their college-bound students to exempt as much initial college work as possible.

4. Foreign language skills for secondary education and college student recommended (2/22/79)

The following resolution:

"Believing that all Americans should have the opportunity, either in school or college or as adult learners, to acquire competence in foreign languages and understanding for foreign cultures, we urge support for the following resolutions:

- * The secondary schools of the United States must offer every student the opportunity

to learn a widely used international language, in addition to English, by providing a full sequence of foreign language study. To develop existing language resources, the schools should offer students from non-English-speaking backgrounds the opportunity to study their home language.

* Students wishing to acquire full proficiency in languages and international studies should have access to district-wide or regional "magnet" schools that provide such instruction. These international schools would be supported primarily by local funds, but federal funds should be made available for planning and development.

* Institutions of higher education have a special responsibility to provide instruction in less commonly taught languages and in area studies, in addition to the widely used languages. Existing federal programs must be expanded to provide effective support to institutions committed to offering instruction in languages important to the national interests of the United States.

* Institutions of higher education must ensure a supply of competent foreign language teachers to meet needs at all levels of education, and must assist in creating programs to upgrade the skills of experienced teachers.

* International exchange and study-abroad programs should be strengthened and made more accessible in order to provide the experience of foreign study and residence to qualified students and researchers.

* National data on the acquisition of competence in foreign languages must be collected each year and made available to educators and the general public.

5. Teaching graduate assistants should be supervised (8/11/77)

All teaching by graduate assistants should be closely and regularly supervised by experienced faculty members. Such supervision duties should be explicitly assigned and taken into account in regard to faculty teaching loads.

6. Reductions in class size recommended (1/26/95)

The Senate encourages the University to adopt, as a primary element in the plans for improving instruction over the next several years, the objective of reducing individual class size; and that it consult with the teaching faculty to determine the methods and procedures for best accomplishing this objective.

7. Electronic distribution of Minutes of the Faculty Senate (11/29/95)

The Senate unanimously approved electronic distribution of minutes to members via a List Server, and the electronic posting of approved minutes in a publicly accessible manner.

8. Opposition to Educational Affairs Committee proposal to impose time limits on declaring a major after completion of core (1/29/98)

Resolved that the Arts and Science Senate is opposed to the UC Educational Affairs Motion to Impose time limits on students declaring majors. We recommend that action

be delayed until it can be discussed by the University Community.

9. Resolution on accepting transfer students into courses for which they are unprepared. (11/96)

Bill Davis rose to ask whether the authority of Board of Regents committees preempts the principle of faculty governance. After discussion of the anomalies of the Regents system, which forces University of Georgia departments to accept many transfer students into courses for which they are unprepared, Barry Palevitz offered the following resolution:

Resolved that the Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences decries the top-down management of the curriculum embodied in the new core curriculum process so far. The Senate strongly feels that it is the faculty of the Franklin College that should set the standards for its various degree programs in the best interests of its students. Therefore, the Senate believes that the process of constructing a new core curriculum must be altered to more fully incorporate local autonomy over academic standards.

The question was called and passed unanimously on a voice vote.

V. INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS IN THE COLLEGE

A. Establishment of "Bachelor of Liberal Studies" degree outside the College opposed (4/24/86)

The Faculty Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences deplores any attempt by University Administrators to institute a new curriculum and new degree, "Bachelor of Liberal Studies", outside the college specifically established for liberal studies, the Franklin College.

The Senate calls on the President of the University and the Chancellor of the University System to suspend plans for the degree until the advice and approval of the faculty of the Franklin College are sought and obtained.

B. Proposal for General Education Program approved (7/25/81)

Introduction

The major purpose of a General Education Program should be to broaden the perspective of a student in such a manner as to provide that student with both depth of knowledge and a measure of expertise in areas other than the major. The General Studies Committee believes this can be done best by offering and requiring a special set of courses which are specifically designated as "General Education Courses." We define such a course as follows:

A General Education Course affirms a discipline's place in the Liberal Arts Curriculum. Its primary concern, therefore, should be to present a rigorous study of the discipline's subject matter that

- (1) explains and critically examines the discipline's philosophy and methodology,

- (2) locates and defines the discipline's relationship to the subject matter, philosophy, and methods of other disciplines,
- (3) involves students directly and personally with the philosophy, methods, and subject matter of the discipline.

It is important to note that the General Education Program is not a replacement for, or an addition to, the Curriculum presently prescribed by the Franklin College. The Program is a subset of courses in the curriculum that is specifically designed to introduce students to the various ways knowledge is acquired and applied.

Specifics of the program:

- (1) Each student should successfully complete at least 25 hours of course work chosen from a list of courses specifically designated as General Education
- (2) Only courses outside the Department of the student's major will be counted toward satisfying the 25 hour requirement.
- (3) Within the 25 hour requirement, no more than 15 hours may be in the same Area. The Areas are:
 - I. HUMANITIES including the departments of Art, Classics, Comparative Literature, Drama, English, Germanic and Slavic Languages, History, Music, Philosophy, Religion, and Romance Languages.
 - II. SOCIAL SCIENCES including the departments of Anthropology, Economics, Geography, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Speech Communication, and courses in Linguistics.
 - III. NATURAL SCIENCES including the departments of Biochemistry, Botany, Chemistry, Entomology, Genetics, Geography (physical), Geology, Mathematics, Microbiology, Physics and Astronomy, Statistics, Computer Science, and Zoology.
- (4) It is recommended that the 25 hour requirement be fulfilled during the first 90 hours of course work. In all cases, however, the student will be allowed until graduation to complete the requirement.
- (5) Transfer students will be required to take specifically designated General Education courses according to the following schedule:
 - (a) students entering with 30 hours course work or less should take 20 hours General Education courses.
 - (b) students entering with 31-60 hours course work should take 15 hours General Education courses.
 - (c) students entering with 61-or more hours course work should take 10 hours General Education courses.
- (6) After three years the Program shall be reviewed by the following procedure. The General Studies Committee shall consult with a) the Associate Dean for Instruction and his staff, b) the Department Heads, c) the Academic Advising Coordinator and the advising staff and d) the Senate in an effort to determine how the Program is functioning. The General Studies Committee shall take into account the concerns and counsel of the above named groups and prepare a report on the program to be

presented to the Senate. After consideration of this report, the Senate shall then vote on the disposition of the Program. The consultations and preparation of the report shall be done within a period of six months.

Guidelines for General Education Courses

1. Approval of courses for listings as General Education is the responsibility of the General Education Committee. Currently this is being done by review of a Nomination Form together with supporting materials.
 - 1a. In cases where a nominated course is not approved and after a reasonable effort at reconciling differences has been made, a department may appeal the decision of the General Studies Committee. Appeals shall be made through the Office of the Associate Dean for Instruction who shall preside over the appeal proceeding. The Associate Dean shall call together both the General Studies Committee and the Curriculum Committee of the College. The membership of these committees shall review the course and decide whether the course shall be given "special designation" as General Education.
2. All courses are approved for a period of three years. If a department wishes a course to continue as part of the General Education Program, the course must be re-nominated including a sampling of student and, in certain cases, faculty evaluations of the course. A letter stating any changes the course has undergone should also be included in the re-nomination.
3. Courses taken to satisfy the General Education requirement should also satisfy a curriculum requirement other than the major. In no case should it be necessary for a student to take more than 195 hours of course work in order to satisfy the requirements of both the bachelors degree and the General Education requirement.
4. Departments may nominate both lower and upper division courses for designation as general education. In most cases, however, the department is encouraged to nominate an introductory course which the department views as serving the needs of the student who is not a major in the department.

C. General Studies Division established and curriculum requirements set (5/23/78)

The division of General Studies is hereby established within Franklin College. It shall consist of the first two years of the degree program for each student. Students will remain with this division until they have successfully completed ninety hours of course work towards their degree, as determined by the faculty within that degree program. A maximum of one hundred and twenty hours shall be allowed everyone for the fulfillment of this General Studies requirement. At the end of this time, the student shall be dismissed if he or she has not accomplished this task, with a GPA of 2.0.

All students who satisfactorily complete the curriculum of the General Studies division may receive an A.A. or A.S. if they so desire and request the dean's office of the appropriate certificate.

For admission to an upper division major, every student must have satisfactorily completed the Regents Rising Junior examination, the appropriate course or courses in mathematics and logic, English 102, and should have completed the first two quarters of a foreign language. Furthermore, a GPA of not less than 2.3 will be required for admission.

Students, then, who achieve a GPA between 2.0 and 2.3 will be granted an A.A. or A.S. and be dismissed from the College no later than the completion of 120 hours.

We endorse the Edwards Committee's concept of a set of broad courses in general education, but we feel that they should be spread through the four years of each curriculum rather than clustered in the first two years.

D. General Education program, outlines in Recommendations 12, 13 and 15 of Edwards report, endorsed in principle (7/20/77)

"The Senate endorses in principle a general education program along the lines indicated by recommendations 12, 13 and 15 of the Edwards Committee. The Associate Dean for Instruction and the Faculty Committee on General Studies are charged to develop detailed proposals for the implementation of such a program. These proposals will be presented to the Senate for its approval." After discussion, the motion passed.

E. Establishment of Division of General Studies recommended (7/7/77)

RECOMMENDATION 3. That a Division of General Studies be established within the Franklin College.

This new division would be, in some ways, similar to the recently established Division of Interdisciplinary Studies. Students would be enrolled in the Division of General Studies, but the Division would not have its own faculty members -- the faculty of the College will continue to reside in the 26 academic departments alone. The Division of General Studies would utilize the courses and programs of the academic departments and disciplinary division, rather than set up competing programs. It should be supervised by a Faculty Committee on General Studies, similar in function to the Faculty Committee on Interdisciplinary Studies.

In particular, all Franklin College freshmen and sophomores should be enrolled in the Division of General Studies, and before admission to upper level (junior-senior) status in the College should require certification by the Division as having

1. Passed an appropriate English usage test
2. Made satisfactory progress towards completion of the general education requirements (see Section 5)
3. Satisfied appropriate credit hours and grade point average requirements

When a student does not qualify within an appropriately specified period of time for admission to upper level status -- under retention standards established by the Franklin College -- then his/her enrollment in the College should be terminated. The possibility of offering Associate of Arts and Sciences (A.A. or A.S.) degrees, for award to students who complete appropriate lower level general education requirements, should be investigated. This step would enhance the feasibility of maintaining rigorous standards for upper level students in the Franklin College.

The ensuing discussion helped to clarify several issues. The student who chooses a major while he is in the Division of General Studies would not need to delay work on his major and would have no less counseling from an advisor in his prospective major field. Indeed, it was

hoped, he would have more. In the discussion of the administrative structure needed, the general opinion was that the changes should not entail the creation of an administrative division, but that most of the policies and decisions would be in the hands of the faculty. The motion then carried without dissent.

F. Appointment of faculty directors of general education, honors and interdisciplinary programs recommended (10/27/77)

RECOMMENDATION 10. That faculty directors of the general education, honors, and interdisciplinary programs within the College be appointed.

G. Appointment of Interdisciplinary Programs Director recommended and responsibilities outlined (7/8/75)

That a Director of Interdisciplinary Programs be appointed by the Dean in consultation with the committee on Interdisciplinary Studies;

that this Director proceed immediately to establish an interdisciplinary A.B. Criminal Justice degree program;

that the Director in consultation with the Committee on Interdisciplinary Studies coordinate present interdisciplinary programs in the College;

and that formal application for interdisciplinary bachelors degree programs be made in accordance with the motion passed by the Senate on May 7, 1974;

that the Director appoint a committee to oversee and coordinate each presently existing interdisciplinary program and appoint an appropriate committee for each further proposed interdisciplinary program;

that the Director be guided in these tasks by the basic principles approved by the Senate on May 7, 1974, and the future recommendations of the Committee on Interdisciplinary Studies and the College Curriculum Committee on the implementation of these programs.

H. Proposed Interdisciplinary Studies Program approved (5/7/74)

The Curriculum Committee recommends that the Senate approve the creation of a Program in Interdisciplinary Studies in the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences in accordance with the following principles: that the proposed Program in Interdisciplinary Studies

- (1) be an open structure that would be capable of encompassing all expressed interdisciplinary interests and endeavors within the College;
- (2) be incorporated into the existing university and college structure on a supra-departmental level;
- (3) have a director, an adequate administrative staff, and an annual operating budget;

- (4) have the authority to approve a non-departmental major in specific interdisciplinary study programs;
- (5) have the authority to propose and offer some upper and lower division non-departmental interdisciplinary courses, but
- (6) work largely within the framework of the existing College curriculum, and
- (7) operate largely with voluntary participation of existing College faculty.

In short, the proposed Program in Interdisciplinary Studies would not be a paper organization, but rather would be firmly built into existing university structure above the departmental level and thus be a visible, operating structural entity. On the other hand, it would not represent a thing apart with entirely its own students, curriculum, major and faculty, but would utilize to a maximum extent existing college resources. The Senate is urged to establish, in principle, the proposed Program in Interdisciplinary Studies before the end of the 1973-74 academic year, calling for beginning steps to be undertaken as soon as possible toward definition and implementation of this program; this includes

- (1) appointment by the Dean of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences of (a) a Director of the Program in Interdisciplinary Studies and (b) a small faculty working committee who together would be charged with developing detailed plans for implementing the program.
- (2) once formulated, the detailed plans for implementing the Program in Interdisciplinary Studies are to be considered by the College Curriculum Committee which will report its recommendations to the Senate.

I. Institute of Ecology enters Franklin College (2/25/93)

The substitute motion included in the agenda was amended to read: "The Faculty Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences approves of the Institute of Ecology assuming academic responsibilities within the Franklin College. These responsibilities are all those usual to Departments and Schools in the Franklin College, including the development of instructional programs, the appointment and promotion of a faculty, the awarding of tenure and degrees, participation in the Franklin College and University governance, and participation in public service."

J. Approval of the Artificial Intelligence Center (2/24/94)

The Curriculum Committee presented the recommendation that the Artificial Intelligence Program be transformed in to the Artificial Intelligence Center.

K. Approval of Southeastern Center for Applied Cognitive Aging Research (2/24/94)

The Curriculum Committee presented the proposal that the federally funded Southeastern Center for Applied Cognitive Aging Research, housed in the Department of Psychology, be given University Center status.

L. New Name Approved for Undergraduate Certificate in Latin American and Caribbean Studies (5/25/95)

The Senate approved a request by the Center for Latin American and Caribbean Studies to change the name of their undergraduate certificate to Certificate in Latin American and Caribbean Studies.

M. New Name Approved for Center for Global Policy Studies (5/25/95)

The Senate approved a request by the Center for Global Policy Studies to change its name to the Center for Study of Global Issues, GLOBIS.

N. New Name Approved for the Center for East-West Trade Policy (5/25/95)

The Senate approved the request of the Center for East-West Trade Policy to change its name to the Center for International Trade and Security.

O. Deletion of BFA degree in School of Music (10/26/95)

The Senate approved a request from the School of Music to delete the BFA degree.

P. Establishment of Russian Major (1/25/96)

The Senate approved a request for the establishment of an AB Russian Major.

Q. Entomology moves to College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (2/29/96)

The Senate approved a proposal to move the Department of Entomology to the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.

R. Marine Sciences Major (3/14/96)

The Senate approved a proposal for an undergraduate major in Marine Sciences.

S. Approval of Undergraduate Certificate Program in GIS (4/25/96)

The Senate approved a proposal for an undergraduate Certificate Program in Geographical Information Systems.

T. Approval of African American Studies Major (4/25/96)

The Senate approved a proposal for an undergraduate A.B. major in African American Studies.

U. Semester Conversion

1. Approval of Bachelor of Music Semester Core (4/25/96)

The Senate approved the Semester Conversion Core Curriculum for all three Bachelor of Music degrees: Bachelor of Music in Composition, Performance, and Music Theory; Bachelor of Music in Music Ed.; and Bachelor of Music in Music Therapy.

2. Approval of combined Core Curriculum for BA and BS degrees (5/16/96)

The Senate approved a proposal for the combined core curriculum for the BA and BS degrees under the semester system.

3. Approval of BFA Art Degree Semester Core (5/30/96)

The Senate approved a proposal for the Semester Conversion Core Curriculum for the BFA Art degree.

4. Proposed changes of degree requirements for the A.B. and B.S. Science Degrees under the semester system (11/96)

James Whitney's Memorandum of November 7, 1996 informed the Senate that "the Arts and Sciences Core Curriculum forwarded to the Board of Regents by the University of Georgia does not contain a number of course requirements passed by the Senate last year (June 1996). Among the items deleted are the language requirement and second Fine Arts/Philosophy/Religion requirement in Area B and the specification of one course in bioscience and one course in physical science in Area D." With a view to maintaining the academic quality of the College's programs, Whitney introduced two proposals.

Proposal A reinstates the requirement in the Core Curriculum already passed. Item 1 reemphasizes that the multi-cultural requirement remains in effect on the semester system. Item 2 reinstates the third semester of foreign language originally in Area B. Item 3 reinstates the second course in the areas of Fine Arts/Philosophy/Religion originally in Area B. Item 4 reinstates the distribution of science courses originally included in a footnote to Area D in the Core Curriculum.

Proposal B was means to supplement Proposal A by reinstating the present laboratory sequence to differentiate between the A.B. and B.S. degree under the semester system. After Whitney drafted the proposals, however, the University of Georgia received notice that the Council on Undergraduate Education, chaired by Martha Nesbitt of Dekalb College, had totally rejected its Core Curriculum Concept. The Board of Regents wants the same form of Core that each institution must have the same Core Curriculum for all degrees within all its Schools and colleges with the exception of Area F (which is major specific) and certain math courses in Area A and D for specified and approved majors. Area B must be the same for all programs at all institutions, no matter how diverse their missions. It is Whitney's understanding, however, that institutions and their units are still allowed to have degree requirements unique to their programs as long as they conform to the above (and other) parameters. Given the Nesbitt Committee's action, however, the A.B. and B.S. requirements approved last spring (as modified [weakened] by the University) are now without force. Given this drastic change, Whitney has chosen to limit his proposal to

fundamental changes (Proposal A) and leave the A.B./B.S. refinements (Proposal B) for later action. Whitney moved that the Senate adopt Proposal A in its entirety.

The Whitney motion carried unanimously on a voice vote (11/96)

- V. Approval of M.S. degree in Geography (1/21/99)**
- W. Approval of Minor in Asian Language and Literature (1/21/99)**
- X. Approval of A.B. degree in Women's Studies (2/18/99)**
- Y. Approval of Minor in Cellular Biology (9/23/99)**
- Z. Approval of B.S. degree in Mathematics and Computer Science (12/2/99)**
- AA. Approval of Doctor of Philosophy degree in Religion (2/17/00)**
- BB. Approval of Undergraduate Interdisciplinary Certificate in Atmospheric Sciences (2/17/00)**
- CC. Approval of Masters degree in Internet Technology (2/17/00)**
- DD. Approval of Minor in Arabic (4/13/00)**
- EE. Approval of UGA River Basin Science and Policy Center (4/13/00)**

VI. PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS

A. Evaluation of Teaching and Research

- 1. Student evaluations as one of several ways to evaluate teaching recommended and others outlined (5/25/89)**

The following proposal from the Committee on professional concerns was adopted with the changes indicated:

The Faculty Senate recommends to the Dean of the Franklin College that the various departments continue to use student evaluations as a way to evaluate teaching

effectiveness, but that more emphasis be placed on other methods. In general, overall teaching effectiveness should be evaluated annually for non-tenured faculty and every three to five years for tenured faculty. The overall evaluation of teaching should include multiple sources of information. In addition to student evaluations, this information may include -- but it need not be limited to -- evaluations by peers, to include Department Heads and other colleagues; evaluations by alumni and graduating majors; the nature and range of the courses taught; class sizes; the levels/ages of the students; whether courses are required or taken as electives; and grades assigned. Departments should be encouraged to use the resources of the Office of Instructional Development in their efforts to evaluate and improve teaching effectiveness.

2. Changes in current tenure policy opposed (2/17/83)

A statement to the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia from the Faculty Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Georgia.

We, the Faculty Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Georgia express our thanks to the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia for delaying consideration of proposed changes in tenure policies so that the faculties of the various institutions of the System could study and react to them. After extensive discussion of the proposed changes and evaluation of their potential effects, the Senate voted on February 17, 1983 to recommend strongly against the changes, and adopted the following resolution by a vote of 38 to 0.

The Faculty Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences is opposed to any change in the current tenure policy. The present policy incorporates the guidelines established in 1940 by the AAUP. The interests of college and university faculties and administrations are protected in all situations by these guidelines, which have served effectively for over four decades; there is every reason to believe that they remain viable. We believe that the questions recently raised by the Board regarding the ability of our institutions of higher education to respond to changing needs and conditions can be effectively resolved by rigorous administration of the policies already established by the Board. This goal can best be attained when there is broad consultation, dissemination of information, and a spirit of cooperation among all concerned parties.

We see great danger in the proposal to add "program modification" to the list of reasons for dismissing tenured faculty. Universities and colleges have a unique place in our society in that they are institutions wherein the truth as determined by human intelligence and effort takes precedence over all other considerations. Academic freedom assures a faculty that, in its pursuit of the truth, will not be hampered by those in positions of political or religious authority or by popular opinion. It is possible that "program modification" might, at some future time, form a basis for terminating tenured faculty members for exercising their academic freedom in unpopular ways.

Academic tenure has been recognized historically as a necessary condition for academic freedom of inquiry. Faculty members who, after completing an appropriate probationary period, can be removed from their positions for anything less than adequate cause related directly to their professional fitness, as established via due process, will often be cautious in the classroom and timid in the pursuit of truth.

We share your belief that the people of this state and the students who matriculate at these institutions deserve a highly qualified and productive faculty of scholars, teachers, and researchers. Toward this end, we have established an effective system of continual peer evaluation. We recognize that the responsibility for attracting and maintaining such a faculty is one which we bear in conjunction with the Board of Regents and the administration of the University System and its component institutions. We believe, however, that we can fulfill this responsibility only if our tenure policy recognizes beyond question the necessary function of tenure as a safeguard of academic freedom.

We support judicious modification of programs. It is the duty and responsibility of the Board of Regents, in consultation with administration and faculty, to update programs as needed. If a program is modified under genuine financial exigency, then the present tenure policy allows for reassignment or termination of tenured faculty. If the modification is for other reasons, then we believe that simply releasing the affected faculty members would be an inappropriate action. Instead, we recommend that alternate measures be taken which would result in a slower reduction in the size of the program. New hiring could be frozen. Non-tenured faculty might be released. Tenured faculty could be reassigned, where appropriate, to other programs. If graduate work were involved, it could be phased out in stages. Under such approaches, a program destined for elimination would disappear eventually in an orderly manner.

Regarding the proposed two-track tenure system, we believe that there is no reason to make the hiring of non-tenure track or temporary faculty a matter of System or institutional policy. The present policies are sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of individual departments.

Thank you for receiving this statement and for giving it your consideration.

3. Access to annual evaluation letter recommended (1/22/81)

Be it resolved by the Senate that we recommend to the Executive Committee that the official policy of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences be that each faculty member shall be given a photocopy of the signed original of his/her department head's annual evaluation letter within three days after the faculty member has read and signed that letter.

And be it recommended further that if any additional or amended annual evaluation letter is forwarded by the department head to any higher authority, the faculty member must first be provided an opportunity to read and sign that letter and within three days thereafter be provided a photocopy of the signed original.

4. Procedures for annual faculty evaluations recommended (5/22/80)

Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Evaluation as approved by the Senate for forwarding to Vice President Trotter

1. The essential, basic responsibility for conducting annual faculty evaluation resides in the departments of the College;
2. The department head, in consultation with and with the approval of the

tenured faculty, shall design explicit, written criteria and procedures consistent with professional standards of that discipline and the College;

3. A written statement of departmental criteria and procedures shall be provided each member of a department;
4. These evaluation criteria and procedures shall be filed with the Dean by September 1, 1980, and shall be available to any member of the College, and shall include a description of the manner in which the tenured faculty of a department participated in the formulation of the criteria and procedures;
5. All department heads shall inform faculty of the pertinent deadlines in the evaluation process, and shall provide adequate time and resources for the preparation by faculty of required evaluation information;
6. All evaluations of individual faculty shall include a personal interview with the department head;
7. All faculty shall have the opportunity to witness, by signature, the final written evaluation submitted by the head to the Dean;
8. Each department shall provide all faculty an appeals procedure when the faculty member and department head differ with regard to content, or conclusions, of the evaluation, and this appeals procedure shall involve faculty members from the same department and one other chosen by these members from outside the department;
9. All faculty retain the right to submit a written response to the Dean in the instance that fundamental disagreement continues between the head's evaluation and the faculty member's self-evaluation.

5. Recommendations for evaluating teaching performance of faculty for appointment, promotion and tenure (7/28/77)

RECOMMENDATION 16. That every new appointment recommendation forwarded to the Dean should include a careful review of the candidate's previous teaching experience and record. If such teaching experience is lacking, the appointee's teaching potential should be evaluated.

In addition to the usual review of the candidate's scholarly stature and research accomplishments, such recommendations should give attention to his/her general talents and knowledge as well as expected contributions to the instructional programs of the department and the College.

RECOMMENDATION 17. That every promotion, tenure and/or merit raise recommendation forwarded to the Dean should include a careful review of the individual's teaching performance and contributions.

In particular, each promotion recommendation, which upon initial examination

appears not to include such a review, should be returned to the Department for additional documentation before being forwarded to the faculty promotions committee. It is generally believed that a faculty member's contributions in research and creative scholarship are more easily identified, and are therefore likely to be automatically included.

It should be emphasized that a "review of the individual's teaching performance and contributions" ought not to be based solely on student questionnaire data. Any such review should include other resources of information that the department regards as pertinent. The final section below touches on the problem of reviewing and evaluating teaching contributions.

RECOMMENDATION 18. That each untenured teaching faculty member's performance be reviewed no later than the latter part of his/her second year at the University. Reappointment for a fourth year should require convincing evidence of the individual's teaching effectiveness.

Since several years may be required to develop a productive program of research and scholarship, a review of an individual's total contributions during the second year might often be premature. However, inadequate teaching by a faculty member can cause immediate damage to students, and therefore should not be allowed to continue. Departmental reviews of teaching effectiveness should be coupled with attempts to assist faculty members in the development of their teaching skills.

6. Committee on Student/Faculty Evaluation Report accepted on guidelines for college-wide system of course evaluations, amended so that Part II of the instrument is included in faculty dossiers (5/19/75)

The Faculty Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences met in special session at 3:30 p.m. on May 19, 1975, in Room 67 in Park Hall. Dean Stephens presided.

Dean Stephens announced that the meeting had been called for the purpose of discussing and acting on the Report of the Committee on Student/Faculty Evaluation.

Following a brief summary of the background of the development of the report, Dean Stephens requested Dr. Robert Ellis, Chairman of the Committee, to discuss the report with members of the Senate.

After extensive discussion by Senate members, Dr. Berrigan moved to accept the report with the provision that a review of the evaluation be made in two years. Dr. Atyeo seconded the motion.

Dr. Hollingsworth moved to amend the motion to stipulate that Part II of the instrument shall be included in the faculty member's dossier. Dr. Pomeroy seconded the motion. The amendment was adopted.

The original motion, as amended, passed.

Accepted by the Senate on May 19, 1975, with the provision that Part II of the instrument be included in the faculty member's dossier.

University of Georgia
Franklin College of Arts and Sciences
Committee on Teaching Evaluation (September 1974-January
1975)

Final Report

Submitted to Dean John C. Stephens - February 1975

Committee Members

| | | |
|------------------------|---|------------------|
| Dr. James H. Buck | - | History |
| Dr. Oliver M. Coleman | - | Art |
| Dr. Edward F. Krickel | - | English |
| Dr. Grace J. Thomas | - | Zoology |
| Dr. Kenneth W. Whitten | - | Chemistry |
| Dr. Robert A. Ellis | - | Sociology, Chmn. |

Introduction

Over the past six years the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences has had a succession of committees consider the problem of teaching evaluation, the most recent being the committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Dirk Frankenberg that was in existence from 1972-1974. While these earlier committees have invariably recommended introduction of a college-wide system of teaching evaluation, no such system has yet been adopted.

A fresh impetus for taking positive action in this area resulted from the proposal by the Advisory Committee on Goals of the University that each teaching unit in the University take steps to enact a formal system of course evaluations. This recommendation was accepted by the Academic Affairs Advisory Committee, which stipulated that:

... systems for the evaluation of teaching be developed and implemented at this university for at least two purposes: (1) as a basis for rendering judgment on all individual teacher's effectiveness as a part of the total assessment of his competence as a faculty member; and (2) to afford the teacher the means for developing his own skill. The intent of this recommendation is to give meritorious teaching increased weight in consideration of individuals for promotion, for salary increases, and in other matters affecting the status of the faculty.

This committee affirms the principle that the responsibility and prerogative for selecting techniques for the evaluation of teaching lies at the local level. A policy statement should be drawn up outlining the evaluation system to be developed and administered within each teaching unit. This statement should be filed with the dean responsible for that unit, and the vice president for instruction.

This resolution has served as a mandate for the present Committee on Teaching Evaluation, which was appointed by Dean John C. Stephens in September 1974. The committee was charged by Dean Stephens to move as expeditiously as possible in

setting up a college-wide system for teaching evaluation with the understanding that a proposal detailing the policies and procedures involved should be brought before the Faculty Senate by the beginning of the Winter Quarter 1975.

Given the time constraints under which it is operating, the present committee could not undertake a full inquiry into the merits of instituting a formal system of course evaluation. Nevertheless, out of the discussion that took place, it became evident the committee viewed as worthwhile any steps which might be taken to facilitate the documentation of good teaching and to help faculty members assess and improve their own teaching skills. Besides these benefits, it was felt there could be occasions when the availability of course evaluations might afford teachers protection against undue criticism from a vocal minority of students.

At the same time, it was recognized there are important limits to what can be accomplished by gathering information from students on how they rate their instructors. First of all, proper documentation of good teaching requires taking into account factors that lie outside the expertise of the student, including how well the course actually succeeds in covering the topic at hand, the extent to which pertinent ideas and theories are properly analyzed and interpreted, and whether the reading materials assigned are current and appropriate. Secondly, student ratings of classroom instruction fall short of providing a full assessment of the contribution a faculty member makes to the teaching process. Much teaching takes place outside the classroom, particularly at the graduate level where faculty members participate on thesis committees, direct research, conduct informal seminars, and give individual reading courses. Any overall assessment of an individual's teaching contribution would need to encompass these activities as well as such collateral endeavors as departmental colloquia, participation as guest lecturer in other courses, student advising, and involvement in the development of new courses or in the improvement of methods and materials for existing courses.

Obviously, the existence of these limitations suggests caution needs to be exercised in the use made of student ratings of classroom instruction. It does not, however, negate their value. When augmented by other dependable sources of information, teaching evaluations can provide a much-needed input into administrative decisions affecting faculty and, in this way, serve as a positive force for promoting good teaching on campus.

The present report, in keeping with the committee's mandate, will recommend a set of policies and procedures for establishing a formal system of teaching evaluation in the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences. In the next section, we shall summarize the considerations that entered into our selection of an evaluation instrument. In subsequent sections, we shall suggest procedures for administering the program and indicate some safeguards which are needed to protect the rights of the faculty and student involved.

Selection of an Evaluation Instrument

The committee began its work by carefully examining the several reports on teaching evaluation submitted over the past year to the President's Advisory Committee on Goals as well as the report of the Frankenberg Committee which was submitted last spring to Dean Stephens. An informal effort also was made to canvass departments in

the College of Arts and Sciences to ascertain what kinds of procedures, if any, were being relied upon for assessing students' opinions of their classroom instruction.

This survey revealed little consensus about what arrangements prove most suitable. In the College of Arts and Sciences alone, at least six distinctly different student opinion questionnaires are in use or have been proposed for use, with considerable variation found in the policies governing their administration and the use to which the resultant information is put.

The diversity found in these arrangements prompted the committee to reexamine the rationale for having a uniform set of evaluation procedures for the entire college. It was thought perhaps a better alternative might be to follow the precedent already established and let each department judge what kind of evaluation instrument best suits its needs. Although initially sympathetic to this idea, the committee came to realize its disadvantages outweighed whatever advantages it might have. Its major drawback is it would serve to perpetuate the vagaries in documentation of teaching effectiveness that to now have been one of the main barriers to having good teaching recognized and rewarded in administrative decisions affecting faculty. The end result, therefore, would be to defeat one of the primary purposes behind requiring course evaluations. In addition, a shift of responsibility for course evaluations from the College to individual departments would complicate considerably the task of maintaining proper safeguards to protect the rights of students and faculty involved.

Having decided upon the necessity of having a core college-wide program of course evaluations, the committee turned its attention to choosing an appropriate set of procedures for doing so. Among the alternatives available, the one given major consideration was the student opinion questionnaire developed by Dr. Lyle Schoenfeldt for use in the Department of Psychology and subsequently recommended by the Frankenberg Committee to serve as the core of any evaluation program undertaken in the College of Arts and Sciences.

A key feature of the Schoenfeldt procedure is its reliance on a "critical incidence technique" for eliciting students' responses to their classroom instruction. This entails having students judge the frequency of occurrence of 26 aspects of classroom behavior identified in past researches as concomitant of good teaching. While raw frequency scores are reported for each of the 26 items, Schoenfeldt has also drawn upon the technique of factor analysis to group the information obtained into five general dimensions of instructor effectiveness. In addition, the scores instructors receive on individual items, as well as on the five general dimensions of teaching effectiveness, have been statistically standardized so scores for any one instructor can be evaluated relative to the total distribution of scores obtained within a given teaching unit, such as a department. Finally, it should be noted that all the data and statistical operations are directly amenable to computer analysis, with the consequence that relatively quick feedback of a full set of results is possible.

Like the Frankenberg Committee, we were impressed by the care and technical competency that went into the development of the Schoenfeldt questionnaire. Nevertheless, we could not help but be struck by the paucity of information available to substantiate the advantages claimed for this set of procedures. For example, there still is a need to determine whether the items used to assess teaching effectiveness can be applied equally well to the various types of classroom settings in which instruction

takes place in the College. Much work also needs to be done to establish the reliability and validity of the five summary dimensions of teaching effectiveness statistically derived from the questionnaire responses. Until a systematic testing program directed to these issues has been undertaken, the present committee thought it would be premature to recommend adoption of the Schoenfeldt questionnaire as the core instrument in a program for evaluating teaching effectiveness in the College.¹

¹ There are two other aspects of the Schoenfeldt procedures about which members of the committee expressed serious reservations. One is the reliance placed on the critical incidence technique, which appears to result in emphasis in the evaluation effort being given to the form rather than the content or effect of good teaching. Aside from the validity of the findings obtained, this practice raises some policy implications that merit close scrutiny. A second area of concern involves the practice of standardizing teaching effectiveness scores so that half the faculty within a teaching unit fall above the average and the other half fall below the average. Given the purpose behind requiring teaching evaluations, the assumption of a non-normal distribution of teaching talent would seem to make better sense. This way, if all teachers in a given unit are doing outstanding work in the classroom, they can be given credit for doing so. Conversely, if most teachers in a given unit are not carrying out their roles effectively, there would seem to be little benefit to scoring half of them as above average just to satisfy the laws of probability.

The results proved to be no better when consideration was given to other approaches to student ratings now in use in the College. Those examined either suffered from serious technical flaws or else lacked the wide range of applicability required of a general-purpose instrument.

By default rather than design, the committee found itself in the situation of having to develop its own student opinion questionnaire. A copy of this instrument, which we have designated the Course Reaction Survey, is attached. As can be seen, it consists of three main parts: (1) An opening section containing a check-list of reasons for taking the course, which can be used for determining when the effects of student selection are seriously modifying the results obtained; (2) a closing section providing space for written comments to open-ended questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the course; and (3) a section of seven forced-choice questions to assess students' opinions of the quality of the instruction they have received. Four of the latter items require fairly specific judgments about how well the instructor has organized and presented course materials. One item is concerned with the teacher's fairness in holding the class. The remaining two items require students to make summary judgments about how satisfied they are with the learning experience they have had and how they rate the overall teaching ability of the instructor.²

² In constructing the Course Reaction Survey, we endeavored to select only items thought to be directly pertinent to the task of assessing teaching effectiveness. Therefore, by design the present instrument does not contain: (a) background information shown in past researches to be of doubtful use for interpreting students' ratings; (b) information which may be of value to students who are "shopping" for a course, but which is of itself germane to the evaluation of good teaching (e.g., amount of homework required); (c) rating tasks that cannot be applied to the full range of classroom situations found in the College of Arts and Sciences; and (d) rating tasks requiring students to render judgments that lie beyond their area of expertise.

Preliminary tests conducted with this set of procedures yielded results generally favorable to its use. They show:

1. It is easily administered.
2. Students are willing to take advantage of the open-ended section of the Survey to write in comments they want directed specifically to the instructor.
3. They find the rating tasks reasonable and behavioral meaningful.
4. All the items being evaluated can be applied to the full range of classroom situations found in the College.
5. The ratings obtained can be easily scored for computer analysis.
6. The results are clearly capable of differentiating the levels of teaching competency students perceive among their instructors.

In addition, the brevity of the Survey operates as an important factor in its favor. It permits augmenting the questionnaire with other evaluation items (or even another evaluation instrument), thus giving it a flexibility longer instruments lack. It also makes it less tedious to take and, in doing so, reduces the chances for a "saturation effect" being created when the questionnaire is repeatedly mass-administered in all courses in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Major Recommendations

The committee would like to recommend the following guidelines for establishing a college-wide system of course evaluations:

1. Course evaluations should be required of all persons including graduate teaching assistants, responsible for instruction in undergraduate or graduate courses having 10 or more students enrolled.³ Course evaluations would not be required for seminars or for the guidance of independent study or research.

³ In courses having split undergraduate and graduate enrollments the rule of having a minimum of 10 students would apply to each section.

2. Course evaluations should be administered during the last week of scheduled classes in each academic semester. Courses running for more than one semester should be evaluated each semester.
3. The Course Reaction Survey described above should serve as the core of the evaluation program which is put into effect, with the understanding the Survey questionnaire can at the discretion of individual instructors or departments be augmented by supplementary questions or supplementary evaluation instruments.
4. A person to be appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences should serve as coordinator of the evaluation program. The coordinator would serve as intermediary between the College and the Testing and Evaluation Center and would also have responsibility for maintaining records and dispensing information.
5. Each department head should have responsibility for administering course evaluations

within each academic department. His/her responsibility should include:

- a. supplying evaluation forms and instructions to all participating faculty.
 - b. setting up procedures for having someone other than the instructor collect the forms, put them in a sealed package and return them without delay to the departmental office.
 - c. checking to make sure course evaluations are conducted in each class for which they are appropriate.
 - d. transmitting sealed packages of course evaluation forms to the College coordinator for processing and analysis.
6. Course evaluations should be processed at the Testing and Evaluation Center with the understanding that:
- a. student ratings contained in the first two parts of the Course Reaction Survey would be machine graded and copies of the results returned to both the department head and the faculty member involved,
 - b. a record should be made of the number of sheets on which students have written answers to open-ended questions in the third part of the Survey and the complete set of open-ended questions returned to both the instructor and the department head,
 - c. answers to supplementary questions or supplementary instruments used by an individual instructor would be returned to the instructor and not to the department head.
7. Student ratings gained from course evaluations should be augmented by at least one other source of information on teaching effectiveness when used as a basis for administrative decisions.⁴

⁴ This collateral information could include one or more of the following: (a) subsequent evaluations by students one or more years after they had taken a course, (b) peer evaluations by other faculty who have sat in and observed the teacher's performance in the classroom, (c) external judgments gained from experts in the teacher's field as to how well an instructor covers the subject matter, (d) the course syllabus, (e) participation in thesis committees and in the direction of research, (f) participation in departmental colloquia, (g) contributions made to the development of new courses or to the improvement of methods and materials for existing courses, and (h) effectiveness in student advising.

8. Plans need to be made for establishing a central depository for storing students' ratings for a three-year period so to provide a data base for future research which might be undertaken.

Safeguards to Protect Faculty

The committee has taken cognizance of the need to have safeguards to protect the rights of faculty whose instructional effort is being evaluated. Among other things, it would

recommend:

1. No results of course evaluations should be placed in administrative files unless a faculty member has had a chance to see those results and have a copy for his/her own file.
2. Each faculty member should have the right to introduce alternative evidence on his/her teaching effectiveness.
3. When used for administrative decisions, course evaluations should be augmented by at least one other source of data so that student ratings will not be the sole basis for judging a faculty member's contribution to the instructional program.
4. All departments should be required to incorporate in their annual report to the College of Arts and Sciences a statement summarizing the use which has been made of course evaluations.

Safeguards to Protect Students

There are also safeguards needed to protect the rights of students who participate in course evaluations. Among other things, the committee would recommend:

1. The results of course evaluations cannot be returned to faculty until after the academic semester is completed and grades for the course determined.
2. The identity of students filling out course evaluations should be protected. To this end, we recommend that: (a) course evaluations should be unsigned and (b) information that might identify students should be eliminated from student rating forms (e.g., question on sex).

COURSE REACTION SURVEY FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

COURSE _____
PERIOD TAUGHT _____

INSTRUCTOR _____
SEMESTER & YEAR _____

The College of Arts and Sciences is interested in improving the quality of its instructional program. You can help by answering this questionnaire as candidly as possible. Your response will not be available until after final grades have been turned in. DO NOT sign your name to any of the forms.

Your Class Standing: FR _ SOPH _ JR _ SR _ GRAD _ OTHER
Are you a major in the department offering this course?
___ Yes ___ No, but plan to be

What is your present grade point average: 1. less than 2.0
2. 2.0-2.49 3. 2.5-2.99 4. 3.0-3.49 5. 3.5-4.0

Part I: (Please check either "Yes" or "No" for each question)

Reason for taking this course:

1. Course is required __yes __no
2. Course was recommended by advisor __yes __no
3. Subject was of interest to me __yes __no
4. Excellent reputation of the teacher __yes __no
5. Thought it was a "crip" course __yes __no
6. Was a course still open at registration __yes __no

Part II: (Please check the most appropriate answer)

7. Did the instructor present ideas and information in a clear, understandable way?
 1. Yes, extremely well
 2. Yes, very well
 3. Yes, adequately
 4. No, not very well
 5. No, extremely poor
 6. Can't decide

8. Did the instructor appear to be well-informed about this subject?
 1. Extremely well-informed
 2. Well-informed
 3. Adequately informed
 4. Barely informed
 5. Inadequately informed
 6. Can't decide

9. How would you rate the fairness of the instructor?
 1. Excellent
 2. Good
 3. Average
 4. Poor
 5. Very poor
 6. Can't decide

10. Did the instructor appear to be prepared for the class?
 1. Always
 2. Most of the time
 3. About half of the time
 4. Infrequently
 5. Almost never
 6. Can't decide

11. How profitable were the classroom sessions?
 1. Very profitable
 2. Profitable
 3. Satisfactory
 4. Slightly profitable
 5. Unprofitable
 6. Can't decide

12. To what extent did you have a satisfactory learning experience?
 1. Extremely satisfactory

2. Very satisfactory
3. Satisfactory
4. Unsatisfactory
5. Very unsatisfactory
6. Can't decide

13. How would you rate your instructor in general overall teaching ability?

1. Outstanding
2. Very good
3. Good
4. Adequate
5. Poor
6. Can't decide

COURSE REACTION SURVEY
FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

COURSE _____
PERIOD TAUGHT _____

INSTRUCTOR
SEMESTER & YEAR

Please respond to each of the questions below. You are encouraged to be frank and honest. No effort will be made to identify your handwriting. However, if you wish, print or otherwise disguise your writing, as long as it is clearly legible. Your response will not be available to your instructor until after final grades have been turned in. Do not sign your name to any of the forms.

Part III:

1. Were there any features or strong points of this course which particularly appealed to you?
2. Can you suggest ways in which this course may be improved?
3. Are there any other comments you wish to make?

7. Post-Tenure Review Committee's Policy (11/96)

Dan DerVartanian discussed two drafts of the Post-Tenure Review Committee's Policy on Review of Tenure Faculty. He explained that since the Committee had been unable to agree on which draft to adopt, he set both drafts (Draft A and Draft B) before the Senate as an information item.

Bill David moved that Draft A be amended to ensure that faculty development plans for unsatisfactory performance be unanimously approved by a peer review committee. Davis's proposed revision of Section F, Draft A is underscored:

F: If a faculty member's performance is deemed unsatisfactory in the review, the promotion/tenure unit head, in consultation with the faculty member, must establish a formal plan of faculty development. This plan must be unanimously approved by the

peer review committee to be established in accordance with the procedure determined by the institution. The plan should a) define specific goals or outcomes to be achieved; b) outline activities that will be undertaken to achieve the goals or outcomes; c) set appropriate times within which the goals or outcomes should be accomplished; and d) indicate appropriate criteria by which the faculty member will monitor progress...A progress report, which will be included in the annual review, will be forwarded each year to the appropriate administrative officer at least one promotion/tenure unit above the faculty member's promotion/tenure unit.

It will be the responsibility of the promotion/tenure unit head and the peer-review committee to ~~[delete: to be established in accordance with procedure determined by the institution]~~ determine if, after an appropriate time, the faculty member, whose performance was deemed unsatisfactory, has been successful in completing the faculty development plan; the promotion/tenure unit head will report that finding to the appropriate administrative officer at least one level above the faculty member's promotion/tenure unit.

Dino Lorenzini moved that the Senate adopt the revised version of Draft A. (See Attachment D below.) His motion was seconded. The motion that the Senate approve Draft A, as amended, was then put to a voice vote and passed.

POLICY ON REVIEW OF TENURED FACULTY

Each promotion/tenure unit shall establish written criteria and procedures governing the periodic review of each tenured faculty member.

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of the review will be to examine, recognize, develop and enhance the performance of tenured faculty members at the University of Georgia.

II. CRITERIA

- A. The criteria should reflect the overall mission of the promotion/tenure unit and should be sufficiently flexible to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities. The criteria should be congruent with the current faculty review procedures. The review should not involve the creation of unnecessary additional bureaucracy.
- B. The promotion/tenure unit shall ensure that the criteria governing faculty review do not infringe on the accepted standards of academic freedom of faculty, including the freedom to pursue novel, unpopular, or unfashionable lines of inquiry. Nothing in the criteria or application of these policies shall allow the review to be prejudiced by factors proscribed by applicable state or federal law, such as race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, and handicap.

III. PROCEDURES

- A. Reviews shall be conducted once every five years unless delayed because the faculty member is on leave or because his or her promotion to higher rank is

scheduled for the following year. These reviews may be combined with annual reviews or combined with other reviews including but not limited to nominations for chaired professorships, major teaching awards, graduate faculty appointments, and national professional honors or awards. In the case of combined reviews, the promotion/tenure unit may require supplementary documentation from the faculty member, which meets the procedures of C.1 below.

- B. Each review, as determined by each promotion/tenure unit, shall be carried out by one or more tenured faculty member of the promotion/tenure unit. If needed, faculty may be appointed by promotion/tenure unit head from other units. An individual faculty member may opt for review by his/her promotion/tenure unit head at the time of the annual review. No individual shall serve as a reviewer if the faculty member under review formally objects to his or her service in that capacity. Such formal objections will be kept confidential.
- C. Review procedures shall include:
 - 1. A review of qualitative and quantitative evidence of the faculty member's performance over the at least the previous five-year period. The evidence may include annual reviews by the promotion/tenure unit head, a current curriculum vita, annual activity reports, teaching evaluations or summaries of evaluations, and other materials providing evidence of the faculty member's accomplishments and contributions that the promotion/tenure unit or the faculty member feel are relevant to the review. The faculty member may submit a concise summary of accomplishments and future plans not to exceed two pages in length.
 - 2. Discussion with the faculty member about his or her contributions to the profession, the promotion/tenure unit, and the University if either the reviewers or the faculty member so desire.
 - 3. Appropriate consideration of a faculty member's contributions outside the promotion/tenure unit to interdisciplinary and other programs, governance, and administration.
- D. If a faculty member's performance is deemed satisfactory, the report may consist of a single sentence: "Professor X is performing satisfactory work." The reviewer (s) shall prepare and provide a more detailed report to the faculty member if described by him/her. The faculty member shall have the opportunity to prepare a written response to the summary. A copy of the summary and any written response to it shall be given to the promotion/tenure unit head and shall be placed in the personnel file of the faculty member. Any recommendations for action in response to the results of the review should be forwarded by the promotion/tenure unit head to the appropriate individuals or bodies.
- E. The promotion/tenure unit shall also maintain in the faculty member's personnel file all documents that played a substantive role in the review (other than documents such as publications that are readily accessible elsewhere), and a record of any action taken as a result of the review.

- F. A faculty member may request reconsideration of the post-tenure review recommendation of the faculty review panel by submitting a letter and additional documentation. The recommendation after the reconsideration will be final.
- G. Actions or decisions that result from disagreements over a faculty member's post-tenure review are subject to the University's existing grievance processes.

IV. ACCOUNTABILITY

B. Conditions of Employment

1. Departments encouraged to develop procedures facilitating good faith negotiations over grievances (3/31/88)

Resolutions of the Committee on Professional Concerns

Whereas a grievance case was heard by a duly constituted panel in the Spring of 1987 in the case of faculty member X vs. Department head Y, and
 Whereas the panel made a recommendation to the Dean of the College stating that minimal raises do not appear to have been justified, and that certain adjustments should be made in X's salary, and
 Whereas neither the Dean nor the department head has filed an appeal with University Council contesting the findings of the hearing panel, and
 Whereas the Senate of the College has requested a statement in writing from the Dean as to his reasons for not implementing the findings of the hearing panel, and
 Whereas the Dean has declined to furnish such statement, and
 Whereas the Committee on Professional Concerns has investigated the matter and has studied documents received from the Department head and the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs commenting on the procedures adopted by the College for hearing grievance cases, and has found nothing amiss, therefore, be it resolved, that the Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences supports the procedures as carried out by the Committee on Professional Concerns and the hearing panel and calls on the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the President of the University to implement the findings of the hearing panel.

The Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences hereby petitions the University Council to recognize the grievance procedures of the College as the appropriate method for settling grievances of faculty members of the College, and asks the Councils to establish grievance policies consistent with ours and to encourage other colleges and schools of the University to implement similar grievance procedures.

In order to improve the academic and professional working environment in the Franklin College and to encourage greater faculty participation in the setting of goals and the pursuit of excellence, the Senate hereby requests

- 1. The faculty of each department in the College to examine its departmental bylaws and operating procedures or to adopt bylaws if

these do not exist, and to consider making changes which would enable grievances to be settled within each department wherever possible.

2. The Senate representatives of each department to bring to the attention of the Committee on Professional Concerns problems which may arise in implementing departmental bylaws designed to involve the faculty in the decision-making processes of each department.

2. Board of Regents petitioned to confirm statutory authority of faculty to establish and implement grievance procedures (2/27/86)

The Faculty of the Franklin College hereby petitions the Board of Regents

- a. to confirm the statutory authority of the faculty of each of the Schools and Colleges of the University of Georgia to establish and enforce admission standards of each degree program it offers;
- b. to confirm the statutory authority of the faculty of the University of Georgia to establish and implement comprehensive, binding faculty grievance procedures; and to place the University of Georgia's Developmental Studies Program under the jurisdiction of the faculty of one of the University's schools or colleges.

3. Quality day care on campus supported (3/29/84)

A motion was passed to take the following resolution off the table:

Resolved:

That convenient access to quality child day-care is of great concern to a significant portion of the University community and that the University should therefore assist those concerned faculty and staff to establish child day-care on campus.

Limited discussion on the resolution focussed on these issues:

1. The need for campus day-care. It was noted that day-care facilities are available in the community and that in the past University personnel have used these for satisfying their day-care needs. Some senators argued, however, that existing facilities are inadequate for very young children and for all children after school hours. A campus facility would also help new people working at the University, since information on local child-care takes some time to collect. A campus facility would be convenient and time-saving for staff and faculty.
2. Existing campus child-care services. Dean Payne earlier distributed information on the McPhaul Child and Family Development Center. Unfortunately, the Center does not have the capacity to offer child-care service to all potential University users.
3. The need for Senate action on the child-care issue. It was argued that the Senate could go on record as supporting University assistance for expanded child-care facilities on campus and alert other units within the University of that.

The resolution passed without a dissenting vote.

4. Adoption of AAUP standards for faculty workload recommended (11/29/83)

Resolved:

That the Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences endorse and recommend the adoption by the College of the standards for faculty workload set forth by Committee C of the American Association of University Professors in its "Statement on Faculty Workload" (1969; see attached).

After a brief discussion the resolution passed.

5. Dean to refer complaints over conditions of employment to Faculty Relations Committee (11/29/79)

Resolution on the Faculty Relations Committee (passed 29 November 1979)

Whereas, it is the duty and function of the Faculty Relations Committee of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences to consider faculty petitions in relation to conditions of employment, therefore, be it

Resolved, First, That the Dean refer to this committee all written and formal complaints on the condition of employment arising in the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences;

Second, That the Faculty Relations Committee investigate each case to the degree it deems necessary to make a recommendation to the Dean;

Third, That the Dean take the recommendation of the Faculty Relations Committee into consideration when making his decision on each case.

6. Sabbatical leave system endorsed (1/15/75)

Motion: The Faculty Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences requests that the University Council initiate action necessary to amend the Statutes of the University of Georgia to provide for sabbatical leave.

Specifically, it is suggested that the following paragraphs be added to Section 7 of Article IX of the Statutes:

Members of the instructional, research, and service staff on full-time regular academic tenured appointment, who have completed six consecutive years of service, are entitled to sabbatical leave for study, research, or other pursuit, the object of which is to enable them to increase their professional efficiency and usefulness to the University. Acceptable plans for each sabbatical leave must be stated in each request and a report of the accomplishments under each leave granted shall be made to the appropriate administrative officer promptly upon return. Sabbatical leaves will be for a duration of twelve months with one-half pay or six months with full pay.

The period of service required for eligibility for sabbatical leave must be consecutive and must be completed before each grant of sabbatical leave. Such leave shall be granted on the approval of the President and the appropriate dean or other administrative head. A member of the academic staff who is granted sabbatical leave shall be required to return to his university duties for at least a year or to refund the full amount of compensation he received while on leave.

An administrative procedure, such as taking into account seniority, may be required

during the first few years to allow for a smooth transition to a sabbatical program.

7. Relationships between persons involved in a grievance suit (1/21/99)

Persons with close personal and professional relationships with individuals involved in a grievance must not serve on a grievance committee. Individuals with close personal and professional relationships with a party to a grievance who are consulted about the matter must disclose these relationships to the grievance committee. Faculty serving in college-level administrative positions must not supervise the handling of grievances at the college level if they originate from a department in which the administrator currently is, or formerly was, appointed.

VII. COLLEGE STRUCTURE AND ADMINISTRATION

A. Responsibilities of Associate Dean for Instruction outlined (8/11/77 & 7/28/77)

Recommendation 22. That the Associate Dean for Instruction serve as a member of all college-level promotion committees.

This would provide him/her with at least one specific context in which to serve as a "constant advocate" of excellence in teaching. As previously remarked, the process of promotion is a principal means of rewarding excellence in faculty performance, and it is generally thought that good research is more easily recognized, and therefore more likely to be rewarded, than is good teaching. As a perhaps temporary means of seeking a proper balance between rewards for teaching and research, it is proposed that the Associate Dean for Instruction merely be present to offer assistance in the identification of teaching excellence. It may be noted that the former Vice President for Instruction served as a (voting) member of the University-wide promotions review committee.

Recommendation 25: That the responsibilities of the Associate Dean for Instruction should include the development and coordination of appropriate orientation and training programs for teaching assistants. In this connection, departments should give continued and careful attention to the instructional qualifications and preparations of their teaching assistants. It may be appropriate for many departments to develop organized programs for the training and supervision of teaching assistants.

B. Dean's proposal for Associate Deanships supported (6/30/7)

The "Associate Dean proposal" should be implemented as proposed in the Edwards report, with the Associate Deans serving not as independent authorities, but as staff persons. They would supervise the following areas:

- A. Instruction, with a subordinate staff member to head student advising and possibly another to direct a Division of General Studies.
- B. Administration
- C. Faculty Affairs, including personnel matters.

C. Division of College into smaller schools or colleges opposed (5/23/77)

That since there is no compelling academic justification for dividing the college and since, on the contrary, there are strong academic reasons for preserving the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences as one unit, the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences not be separated into smaller schools or colleges.

D. Request to the Provost and University Council for Senate involvement in proposed University restructuring involving the Franklin College (2/17/00)

In accordance with Dr. Adams' State of the University address, the Franklin College Faculty Senate requests that the Provost's Office consult with the Faculty Senate concerning any proposed restructuring involving the College, and that if the University Council receives any such proposal, it will submit said proposal to the Franklin College Faculty Senate for comment prior to taking any final action.

VIII. UNIVERSITY ISSUES

A. University Bookstore

1. University-wide faculty committee on the Bookstore recommended to the President (2/22/90)

The Faculty Senate of the Franklin College recommends that President Knapp name a university-wide faculty committee specifically charged with advising the University Bookstore on meeting the needs of the academic community. The committee should develop a mechanism for faculty input in the review and updating of inventories of books and supplies. Faculty advice is warranted when policies of immediate interest to the faculty are developed or modified. The Senate recommends that the committee survey bookstores at comparable universities as a means of appraising current services and guiding their improvements.

2. President's Intervention in Bookstore recommended (4/27/95)

Since the earlier resolution of the Senate (2/14/90), recommending that President Knapp constitute a university-wide faculty committee charged with advising the University Bookstore on meeting the needs of the academic community, failed to lead to action [the issue died in a University Council subcommittee], the Senate requests that President Knapp intervene directly in the matter and encourage the University Bookstore to survey bookstores at comparable institutions (e.g., UNC-Chapel Hill, UT-Knoxville) and to participate fully in the Association of University Bookstores. The Senate feels that **ad hoc** faculty requests are really not the means to an overall improvement in the quality of the bookstore's stock, nor should faculty have to function as book buyers.

B. Change or removal of sexist language in Alma Mater supported (3/2/89)

The Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences supports changing or removing inappropriate gender-specific language from the official alma mater of the University.

C. Concern expressed over confusion about Centers and Institutes (2/25/88)

The substitute motion was taken from the table, amended, discussed, and passed in the following form:

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate express its concern about confusion with respect to centers/institutes at the University of Georgia and applaud Vice President McBee's appointment of a University committee to formulate comprehensive guidelines governing interactions between departments and centers/institutes.

D. Developmental Studies Program should be placed under faculty of University school or Colleges (2/27/86)

The Faculty of the Franklin College hereby petitions the Board of Regents

a. to confirm the statutory authority of the faculty of each of the Schools and Colleges of the University of Georgia to establish and enforce admission standards of each degree program it offers;

b. to confirm the statutory authority of the faculty of each of the Schools and Colleges of the University of Georgia to establish and implement comprehensive, binding faculty grievance procedures; and

c. to place the University of Georgia's Developmental Studies Program under the jurisdiction of the faculty of one of the University's schools or colleges.

E. Library catalogue should be unified and funding approved (11/16/78 & 4/21/77)

We, the members of the Faculty Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences, wish to express our deep concern over the recent statement by University Libraries Director Warren Boes that unless additional funds become available, the Library will begin to cancel subscriptions to journals and to curtail book purchases in order to reduce its budget. During the past 15 years great progress has been made toward bringing the University Libraries to the level of a major research library, which has now become the backbone of our research efforts. To cut back acquisitions at this time will damage irreparably the Library and will reduce it once again to a second-rate facility incapable of supporting the research programs of the University. This, in turn, will affect adversely the services we provide the students and citizens of Georgia. We strongly urge you to make the Library one of your highest priorities and provide the funds needed to maintain the Library at its present level.

Resolved, that the Library maintain a central card catalogue to include holdings in all collections, including the Law Library.

F. University Council requested to change name and composition of its Library Committee (11/16/78)

Resolved, that the University Council be requested to amend its by-laws to change the name of its "Library and Instructional Aids Committee" to "Library Committee" and to change the composition of the committee to seven members elected at large by the University Council plus one undergraduate and one graduate student appointed by the Student Government Association.

G. Support the Libraries (3/21/91)

The Libraries of the University of Georgia are an indispensable resource for research and teaching. The quality of our research journal collection is one of the unique assets of our university. The maintenance of this collection is essential if we are to become one of the leading state universities in the country. We are therefore alarmed by the prospect of significant reductions in the budget for acquisitions of journals and books caused by inexorable inflation in prices and shrinking state revenues. We support the assignment of a high priority to library funding in the University's Strategic Plan. The strength of our libraries' holdings is a powerful aid in recruiting new faculty; thus the libraries are an investment in the future of the University.

Our Libraries give University scholars an edge in the ever new faculty; thus the libraries are in investment in the future of the University.

Our Libraries give University scholars an edge in the ever increasing competition for grant support in the sciences and the humanities.

If our libraries' current holdings are allowed to decline, it will be much more costly to rebuild them in the future. The value of our pre-1990 holdings will decrease if our post-1990 holdings are incomplete.

We need to improve the salaries of library staff. The important tasks of preserving aging books and of continuing to modernize our electronic library resources require expertise and significant funding. We applaud the thoughtful efforts of the Library administration to manage budget reductions and to educate the faculty and administration of the University about the difficult long-term issues involved in maintaining our library's national ranking. The Faculty Senate is ready to assist in the difficult budgetary planning necessary to preserve the preeminence of the University libraries.

H. Teaching Load Under the Semester System (4/27/95)

The Senate asks that (a) the University administration adhere to earlier commitments not to use the semester conversion as an opportunity to increase faculty teaching loads; and (b) that the University Council take action to ensure that the present teaching load, defined in terms of the number of class-meetings per year, be reduced to a level that is commensurate with the semester system's increased examining and supervision responsibilities. The Senate Curriculum Committee recommends a reduction of ten percent.

I. Appointment of Faculty Members of the University Appeals Committee (4/27/95)

To restore the faculty's diminished representation in the review process of tenure and promotion grievances, the Senate adopted the following measure:

The Senate requests that the University Council, in consultation with the Vice President, take action to revise the *University of Georgia Guidelines for Appointment, Promotions, and Tenure* to specify that the University Council's Faculty Affairs Committee appoint all faculty members of the University Appeals Committee.

Section III. Committee Findings and Recommendations

IX. GUIDELINES FOR STANDING COMMITTEES

A. **Transmitting Committee records at end of term (9/18/93)**

Resolved that the last official act of every committee chair will be to turn over all files relating to the committee's business to a member of the Committee on Committees. The presiding officer will be responsible for reminding all chairs of this responsibility. The chair of the Committee on Committees will be responsible for handing out the collected files to the new committees during the first meeting of the fall term.

X. STEERING COMMITTEE

A. **Copies on file at Dean's Office shall be official minutes of the Senate (3/30/89)**

Concern was expressed that policy statements passed by the Senate do not find their way into a policy book for the College. The Steering Committee therefore has tentatively decided to cull policy statements from the Minutes of the Senate. It was also decided in consultation with the Dean's Office that the copies of the Minutes of the Senate on file in the Dean's Office shall be considered to be the official Minutes of the Senate.

B. **Ruling on replacement senators (4/23/87)**

Steering Committee: The committee had ruled that 1) a department may elect a representative to replace one on the Senate removed for absenteeism and 2) that a member may be reelected to a committee if he/she had served only a minor portion of a prior term.

C. **Eligibility for Senate membership interpreted (2/26/87)**

At the suggestion of the Dean's Office, the Steering Committee, in accordance with Article III, Section I.6 of the Bylaws, has been asked to interpret Article IV, Section I.3 of the Bylaws.

The question was whether an individual classified Temporary Part-Time Instructor, who had not been recommended for appointment or Instructor, who had not been recommended for appointment or reappointment by vote of the department faculty, is eligible to vote in the faculty's assessment of candidates for the headship.

The Steering Committee decided the individual is not eligible.

D. **Amendment of Item A (above) (5/30/96)**

The Steering Committee will work with the outgoing Presiding Officer and the outgoing Secretary of the Senate to update policies and procedures in accord with current university policy. This shall be done every summer, following the conclusion of the academic year.

E. **Recommendation for College Baccalaureate Exercises (4/30/98)**

The Franklin College Senate requests that the Dean's Office develop a plan to conduct baccalaureate or similar exercises beginning in the 1998-99 school year to recognize individual undergraduates for commencement

XI. ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

A. Changes in treatment of Developmental Studies Students recommended (12/1/88)

Letter to William F. Prokasy:

At its meeting on December 1, 1988, the Faculty Senate of the Franklin College approved by a large majority a motion to send to you the accompanying communication. As presiding officer of the Senate, I am charged by the By-Laws of Franklin College with "arranging for necessary communication in the name of the Senate", but I wish to emphasize that as a faculty representative in the Senate, I support completely the substance of this communication. During the debate on this motion, it became apparent that many members of the Senate consider that the Registrar's Office exceeds the limits of its proper responsibilities, takes actions which are appropriately faculty actions or require specific faculty approval and insufficiently sensitive to the confidentiality of student records.

As a faculty member concerned that the University of Georgia be a respected and admired academic institution and as a member of the Franklin College Committee on Reform, I have kept a keen interest in the effect the Committee's investigations and report may have had on entities outside the Franklin College. So I have examined the published statements on registration for courses and on the Division of Developmental Studies (University of Georgia Bulletin 1988-89 Undergraduate Study), the Statutes of the University, the By-Laws of the University Council, the Policies of the Board of Regents and pp. 11-14 of the Developmental Studies Guidelines. (I have not been able to obtain a complete copy of this document). In none of these documents do I find justification for the instruction to the Registrar of these documents to remove a student in Developmental Studies from a course in which he was legally registered, as judged by his appearance on two Confirmation Rolls, on the grounds that the course was not approved by Developmental Studies.

In the course of investigating this complaint, the Senate Committee on Professional Concerns generated a substantial file of copies of correspondence on this and other alleged administrative abuses. I am confident that the committee will be pleased to share this information with you if doing so will hasten resolution of this aggravating matter; Professor William D. Davis, School of Music, is chair of the Committee.

This summer Brian Arthus Gaynes was enrolled in Drama 312, taught by Professor Charles V. Eidsvik. After the Second Confirmation Roll was published, the Registrar's Office "dropped" Mr. Gaynes from the course at the request of Developmental Studies because Developmental Studies policy prohibited him from taking the course. Nonetheless, Mr. Gaynes continued to attend class until the end of the quarter, and he earned a grade of B.

Professor Eidsvik was never notified that Mr. Gaynes had been removed ("dropped") from the course. He continued to teach the student; he had no reason to do otherwise. Mr. Gaynes's name appeared on each roll, including the Second Confirmation Roll, but it simply disappeared from the final grade roll.

The Registrar's Office has informed the Franklin College Senate Committee on Professional Concerns that this will not happen again; in the future professors will be notified of all "drops" or "withdrawals".

Nonetheless, questions of serious academic import remain unresolved; an illustrative, incomplete list follows.

What mechanism is in place to prevent the recurrence of this allegedly inadvertent failure to notify the instructor?

Does this mechanism also adequately guard against changes in class rolls for reasons which have no academic validity?

Do the regulations covering changes in courses and withdrawals from courses authorize "dropping" a student in this fashion without a grade of WF after midpoint of the quarter; if so, where?

Should anyone have authority to remove a student from a class roll when the student has properly enrolled in the course and paid the required fees for any reason except proven illegal, unethical or disruptive behavior in class?

If students in Developmental Studies are not permitted to enroll in Drama 312, how was Mr. Gaynes able to register for the course and appear on both confirmation rolls?

Are the registration procedures fundamentally flawed so that it is possible for students to enroll in whatever courses they wish?

Is there basis for academic good practice and regulations of the University or the Board of Regents for Developmental Studies alleged authority to decide, without consultation with the departments involved, which courses outside of its own program are available to its students?

B. Changes in Readmission Standards (4/30/98)

The standards for readmission of students petitioning to return to school after First or Second Academic Dismissal were modified to account for the hours conversion between quarters and semesters. Modifications to the Standards are as follows:

- (a) The current requirement for having completed at least 10 hours in one term with a 2.5 GPA was changed to having completed 9 hours with a 2.3 GPA.
- (b) The requirement that students complete 30 quarter hours with a minimum GPA of 3.0 was changed to 15 semester hours for students on First Academic Dismissal and 20 semester hours for students on Second Academic Dismissal.

XII. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE BY-LAWS AND STATUTES

A. No conflict between By-Laws & Statutes found (1/26/89)

The Ad Hoc Committee on the By-Laws and Statutes met on January 24, 1989. Members could find no conflict between the By-Laws of Franklin College and the Statutes of the University. Consequently, committee members enjoyed each other's company over lunch and adjourned to seek other dragons to slay. If any member of the faculty can find conflict in the provisions of those documents, the committee will be happy to reconvene.

XIII. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON NON-TRADITIONAL STUDENTS

A. Recommendations sent to Vice President's Office (4/28/88)

"What accommodations should the University of Georgia make to better meet the needs of the non-traditional student in the Athens area?," with the further change to examine, "as one way to respond to those needs", the advisability and feasibility of the Georgia Center for Continuing Education's proposed College of Continuing Studies in light of the response to the first question, and "to consider strategies to build faculty involvement and institutional support" of any programs we might recommend.

The committee unanimously presented to Dr. McBee the following interrelated and mutually reinforcing series of recommendations:

1. We recommend that the University extend its traditional class day, together with appropriate academic support services, to permit non-traditional students the opportunity to pursue and complete baccalaureate degree requirements within a reasonable number of quarters or semesters.
2. We recommend that individual departments and colleges be asked to survey their current offerings to determine which upper-level courses would need to be offered frequently enough to permit a student to complete degree requirements in the evening, and that appropriate academic units then be encouraged to set up such scheduling.
3. We recommend that, to the extent feasible, the fees charged and the range of services and facilities available to non-traditional students be made comparable to those presently offered to day students. We have in mind the need for parity in, for example, academic advising and financial aid, as well as access to health services, transportation, the bookstore, and the business offices.
4. We recommend that an existing administrative unit be made responsible for coordinating and/or providing University services appropriate to the implementation of these recommendations and for encouraging academic departments to continue full responsibility for curricular offerings and teaching assignments.

XIV. CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

A. Resolution on United States Multiculturalism (5/27/93)

1. Resolutions 2 and 3, adopted November 7, 1991, will be replaced with the following:
"The Faculty Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences recommends that courses with a significant focus on African American, Asian American, Hispanic American or Native American cultures be added to the curriculum of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences."
"All undergraduates in the College of Arts and Sciences will be required to complete (grade of D or better) at least one full credit course (3 or more semester credit hours) with a significant focus on African American, Asian American, Hispanic American or Native American cultures."

"Candidates for the A.B., B.S., and B.F.A. degrees may fulfill this requirement for a course with significant focus on African American, Asian American, Hispanic American or Native American cultures as part of their core requirements, major requirements, or electives. The total number of hours required in each area for each degree will not be increased, nor will any courses be deleted from the current curriculum as a result of this resolution."

2. The significant focus of a course on these four cultures will be described in the course description in the Undergraduate Bulletin.
3. This requirement may be fulfilled by transfer credit for a course clearly identified by its course description as having a significant focus on one or more of these four cultures.
4. Undergraduates may not fulfill this requirement by testing out of an appropriate course where the instructor of department provides such an option.
5. Courses which do not a priori fulfill the requirements specified above include the following:
 - a. courses which focus only on the source cultures for these American cultures
 - b. introductory or skill oriented language courses
 - c. survey courses that include African American, Asian American, Hispanic American or Native American cultures as one of many topics.
6. Implementation of the requirement specified in the above resolutions will take place upon the recommendation of the Franklin College Curriculum Committee to the Dean of the Franklin College that sufficient seats are available in courses that meet this requirement. At that time, the Franklin College Curriculum Committee will provide a list of courses that meet this requirement to the Dean (cf. <http://ben.franklin.uga.edu/saga/data/mcreqs2.htm> for the current list). Amendments of this list will be made by the Franklin College Curriculum Committee at the request of the departments of the Franklin College and the approval of the Senate.

B. Approval of GEO (Sic.: Gly) 115-116 as sequence satisfying the Environmental Literacy Requirement (5/25/95)

The Senate, acting in the stead of the dissolved Ad Hoc Committee on Environmental Literacy, approved GEO 115-116 as a sequence satisfying the Environmental Literacy Requirement.

C. Approval of American Sign Language as fulfilling Language Requirement (3/19/98)

The Senate approved American Sign Language as a means of fulfilling the College Language Requirement.

D. Addition of Linguistics to Fine Arts, Humanity, and Religion Distribution Requirement (3/19/98)

Resolved to add linguistics to distribution requirements in humanities, fine arts, philosophy,

and religion.

XV. AWARDS COMMITTEE

A. Awards selection guidelines (12/1/92)

Amendments of the Awards Selection Guidelines. The Committee on Awards of the Faculty Senate recommends to the Faculty Senate the adoption of the following set of resolutions. Some background, rationale and further information appears on the following pages.

1. Whereas the Meigs Award has been substantially enhanced with a permanent \$5000 salary increase, the Faculty Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences recommends to the Vice President for Academic Affairs that it should be viewed as the University's top award for a career of distinguished contributions to teaching, and that a faculty member be eligible to win it only once.
2. A winner of the Michael Award shall be ineligible to reapply for a period of five years.
3. A winner of the Special Beaver Award shall be ineligible to reapply for a period of five years.
4. A winner of the Beaver Professorship shall be ineligible to reapply for a period of six years from the expiration of the previous appointment. Furthermore, the case for reappointment shall be based upon the time period subsequent to the expiration of the previous appointment.
5. Guidelines for the General Sandy Beaver Teaching Professorship are hereby amended to conform to the following statement: Course loads for Beaver Professors shall be established through appropriate combinations of regular 3 or 4 hour courses, team-teaching in 2 or 2-1/2 hour units, thesis or dissertation supervision, or supervision of independent study.
6. The terms of the Beaver Professorships will be staggered.
7. March 1 will be the deadline for the applications for the Michael and Special Beaver Awards, and for the Beaver Professorship to be submitted to the Franklin College. The deadlines for the Meigs and Richard B. Russell applications to be submitted to the Franklin College will be 4 weeks before the Franklin College nominations are to be forwarded to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
8. Members of the Awards Selection Committee shall refrain from all votes and from discussions relating to awards candidates from their own departments.

B. Awards selection guidelines (2/24/94)

Moved: That the Faculty Senate of the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences recommends to the Dean of the College that the following changes be made in the awarding of General Sandy Beaver Teacher Professorships and the Special Sandy Beaver Awards.

1. That the salary supplement for the three year General Sandy Beaver Teaching Professorships be raised from the current \$7500 per year to \$7850 per year.
2. That the travel grant for General Sandy Beaver Teaching Professorships be raised from the current \$400 per year to \$560 per year.
3. That the Special Sandy Beaver Awards be raised from the current \$2500 to \$2800.
4. That 5 General Sandy Beaver Teaching Professorships be awarded for three year terms starting in 1994 and that 3 new General Sandy Beaver Teaching Professorships be awarded for three year terms every year thereafter.
5. That 8 Special Sandy Beaver Awards be given in 1994, 1995 and 1996. That 6 Special Sandy Beaver Awards be given in 1997 and that starting in 1998 the number of Special Sandy Beaver Awards returns to 5 annually.

C. Awards selection guidelines (5/24/94)

That the Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate Awards Selection Guidelines be amended so that the Awards Selection Committee is instructed to refer all queries concerning procedure, precedent, and matters of interpretation to the Senate Standing Committee on Awards.

That the Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate Awards Selection Guidelines be amended so that copies of all correspondence addressed to the Awards Selection Committee, with the exception of the dossiers of faculty nominated for awards, be sent to the Chair of the Senate Standing Committee on Awards.

D. Election of the Awards Selection Committee (1/26/95)

1. The Senate Awards Committee will provide to the Senate a list of nominees for election to the College Awards Selection Committee for the subsequent academic year.
2. Standard biographies of all nominees should include information about their awards for teaching, research, and service. Each biography should be approximately one-half page in length.

E. Dissolution of the Senate Awards Committee (1/21/99)

1. The duties of the Awards Committee shall hereafter be absorbed by the Committee on Committees.

XVI. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND SAFETY

A. Resolution on Health and Safety (5/30/90)

In the interests of efficiency and economy and to demonstrate that the health and safety of University of Georgia Faculty, Staff, and Students are of paramount importance, the following is proposed:

That all campus safety operations, including radiation, public, fire and bio-safety, be combined in the existing Public Safety Division under one designated head officer.

That, as prior to 1985, the head of the division would report directly to the president of the university.

That this division receive, act on, and keep, and periodically review, comprehensive records of all health and safety related reports.

That the division be given the authority and budget to implement its recommendations

That a broadly based faculty and staff committee be created to advise the division.

PASSED.

XVII. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FACULTY INITIATED DROP AND WITHDRAWAL

A. **Resolution on auto-drop (3/14/96)**

The Senate approved the resolution that the college continue auto-drop through summer quarter of 1998 (prior to semester conversion) in specific cases where the process is cost effective for high demand, lower division courses which in the aggregate have a large number of seats.

B. **Recommendations sent to University Council (3/14/96)**

The Senate recommends that the University council abolish the pre-midpoint grade of WF as part of the conversion to the semester system and make no change in current policies concerning post-midpoint grades of WF or pre-midpoint grades of W.

XVIII. COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL CONCERNS

A. **Amendment to Article II, Section X of By-Laws (4/25/96)**

The wording of Article II, Section X of the By-laws was amended to replace the wording "implementation of his decisions" with "implementation of the Dean's decisions".

B. **Recommendations that University Council investigate Administration Procedures (5/30/96)**

The Senate voted that the University Council should review procedures followed by the Presidents and Vice Presidents of the University in present and past investigations involving Administration Officials and faculty, personnel, and occurrences within the College of Arts and Sciences and make recommendations on further procedures to be followed in such affairs.

C. **Senate nomination of candidates to Promotion and Tenure Committees**

The Senate approves the development of a written Policy for the Nomination of Candidates to Promotion and Tenure Committees. Candidates nominated by the Senate under such a policy shall be IN ADDITION TO, NOT IN EXCLUSION OF candidates nominated for such service by the College's Department Heads.

D. Recommendations to Dean on instructions to Promotion and Tenure Committees

The Senate recommends to the Dean that, as part of the Charge to Committee, the Dean instructs each Promotion and Tenure Committee to seek further verbal input and consultation from candidate's department head, in cases where the Committee is considering a negative evaluation, prior to finalizing such a negative evaluation. The Senate also recommends that, each year, the Dean instruct all department heads of this policy well in advance of candidates' dossier submission deadline.

XIX. ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

A. Review of Departmental Major Assessment Proposals (10/30/97)

The Academic Standards Committee is charged with reviewing departmental major assessment proposals before they are submitted to the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Committee should report regularly to the Senate concerning the proposals received and approved.

XX. AD HOC LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

A. Creation of *ad hoc* Long Range Planning Committee (2/26/98)

The motion was made to Create an Ad Hoc Long Range Planning Committee with membership determined as described in the proposed bylaws amendment scheduled to be presented the faculty, and for the Committee on Committees to bring forth a slate of candidates for this committee by the next meeting.

(Amendment of bylaws, as approved 11/18/97, and approved by the Franklin College Faculty 6/2/98:

Committee on Planning and Evaluation.

The Senate shall elect from among its members five senators, one from each division, to serve on a Committee on Planning and for a term of one year. In any given year the committee should have at least two members who have served the previous year. No member shall serve more than two consecutive years. Another three members shall be appointed by the Dean of the College. The Committee shall annually elect a chair from its Senate members.

The duties of the Committee shall be:

1. To advise the Dean and the Senate in (a) formulating long-range plans for the College of Arts and Sciences and (b) including such plans in the University ' s Strategic Plan.
2. To advise the Dean in formulating and analyzing major policy initiatives to improve the College.
3. To issue an annual report to the Dean and the Senate evaluating the College ' s success in achieving its goals and fulfilling the University ' s Strategic Plan.
4. To report on such issues relating to the long-term development of the College as the Dean or the Senate may refer to the Committee.

XXI. COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND EVALUATION

A. **Creation of Committee on Planning and Evaluation (9/24/98)**

(Committee purview, duties, and procedures as described above [XX.A] for *ad hoc* Long Range Planning Committee [2/26/98].)

XXII. COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

A. **Committee on Committees may recommend Committee Chairs (4/30/98)**

The Committee on Committees is enjoined to suggest an appropriate nominee to serve as chair of each Senate committee.

XXIII. AD HOC COMMITTEE ON RESTRUCTURING

A. **Creation of *ad hoc* Committee on Restructuring (4/22/99)**