



FACULTY SENATE Est. 1991

Chairperson
Ronald M. Zaccari

Vice Chairperson
Louis Levy

Executive Secretary
Christine James

Parliamentarian
Jim Muncy

Agenda

November 16, 2006

The Faculty Senate will meet Thursday, November 16, 2006 in the MAGNOLIA ROOM at 3:30 p.m.

Items in **bold print** are items that require action by the Faculty Senate. Other items are for information only.

Special Request: At the request of the University President and Executive Secretary of the Senate, any actions from the Senate sent to the Executive Secretary for approval after the Senate votes should be accompanied by a written document with the rationale and purpose of the decision. The Executive Committee requests that these documents be submitted as email Word .doc attachments.

1. Call to Order by Dr. Ron Zaccari
For the benefit of record keeping, senators and visitors will please identify themselves when speaking to an issue during the meeting. Please use the microphones to assist with accurate recording. All senators must sign the roster in order to be counted present.
2. **Approval of the minutes of the October 19, 2006 meeting of the Faculty Senate.** These may be found at: <http://www.valdosta.edu/vsu/facsen/Minutes/061019min.pdf>
3. New business
 - a. Report from the Academic Committee – Louis Levy
 - b. Report from the Committee on Committees – Jay Rickman
(See Appendix A, page 4)
 - c. Report from the Institutional Planning Committee – James LaPlant
 - d. Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee – Marty Williams

- e. Report from the Faculty Grievance Committee – Stephen Lahr
- f. Report from the Senate Executive Secretary – Christine James

(1) Executive Committee review of the Statutes revisions, as linked, and with the assistance of Louis Schmier, an original writer of the Statutes:
With these top two links, scroll down until you find the current revisions links:

<http://www.valdosta.edu/statutes-referenda>

<http://www.valdosta.edu/sra/>

And here are direct links:

http://www.valdosta.edu/sra/VSU_statutes_revision.pdf

http://www.valdosta.edu/sra/VSU_statutes_revision_09252006.doc

The most recent changes by the Executive Committee are in the link below, highlighted in light blue, in the Preamble and the last two pages:

http://teach.valdosta.edu/chjames/VSU_statutes_revision_11022006.doc

(Because this is the last Faculty Senate meeting of the Fall Semester, during today's meeting, we will also announce/discuss the date, time, location of the General Faculty meeting of January 2007 for discussion on the Statutes. The d/t/l were being arranged with the President's office as of the Agenda mailout date 11/9/06.)

- (2) Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee Report (including information from the survey and from other state system schools) (Appendix B, page 5-8)
- (3) Thank you to the Faculty Senators who have attended senate orientation sessions. Bob Williams, Alan Bernstein, Ashok Kumar, Lars Leader, Beverley Blake, Heather Brasell, Peggy Moch, Blaine Browne
- (4) The Technology Committee was asked to study the question of e-rates during the Spring of 2005. In response the Technology Committee has made a suggestion to the Executive Committee regarding their positive disposition toward e-rates. The Executive Committee has determined that the e-rate question should be discussed by Traycee Martin and Jon Sizemore, as it will require further study regarding tuition policies and comparison with other state system schools.
- (5) The next American Association of University Professors Legislative Breakfast will be Tuesday, December 5, 8:00am-10:00am in the Executive Dining Room of the University Center.

4. Old Business

- (a) On Motions to Suspend the Rules and Motions to Reconsider (Michael Noll is interested in recalling a vote on the Calendar we voted on in 2005, which includes the Spring Break of 2008.) Please see Appendix C, pages 9-13, in which Michael consulted with John Samaras, former Parliamentarian, and David Boyd so that we could be clear on the Parliamentary Procedures to be followed, and Appendix D, pages 14-18, a report Michael Noll prepared in anticipation of this item.

5. Discussion

By Laws of the Faculty Senate, Section 7 Item 5.a.

5. During General Discussion, any Senator may bring an issue to the floor for Faculty Senate consideration. a. With approval by vote of a majority of the Faculty Senate, a member of the General Faculty, student body, staff, or administration will be allowed to speak before the Faculty Senate for a specific purpose for no more than five (5) minutes.

<http://www.valdosta.edu/vsu/facsen/bylaws/bylaws2005.pdf>

- (a) Matt Richards requested that the SAVE students be given a short amount of time at the next Faculty Senate meeting to make their presentation on Green Energy. The students have had productive meetings with the President, as well as with Jim Black who expressed interest in exploring the use of alternative fuel sources. They would like to make a request that the campus move toward a Green Energy policy. I suggest that we show the students our support at the next Faculty Senate meeting by seeing their presentation, and that we reinforce the Environmental Issues Committee's current excellent work with Jim Black, Greg Gordon, Bob DeLong, Meredith Lancaster, and Ray Sable on the comprehensive environmental policy for the university. I also believe that this would be an excellent opportunity to invite Ray Sable, the new head of Plant Operations, and Dr. Victoria Douglas, the new university architect, to the Faculty Senate meeting, and introduce him to the faculty. We should encourage and acknowledge the positive work that has been happening between Jim Black, SAVE, University Council, and the Environmental Issues Committee. I have consulted with Jim Black about this, and he is enthusiastically supportive of these events being included in the November Faculty Senate meeting.

Pertaining to the Green Energy issue, please see Appendix E, pages 18-19, Email Regarding the Green Energy Survey Removed from Banner, and Board of Regents Policy on Fee Approval Process

6. Adjournment

APPENDIX A:

Report: Meeting of Committee on Committees, Tuesday, October 24, 2006

Members Present: Jay Rickman (Chair), Lyle Indergaard, Jean Temple, Cindy Tandy, & Elaine Yontz (Past Chair)

Members Absence b/c of other commitments: Shirley Andrews, Cindy Tori, & Anita Hufft

- I. Committee members reviewed information regarding upcoming elections in spring 2007 for Senator slots as well as elected slots on Statutory Committees that will end in July 2007. The Chair will send out emails to deans in early November 2006 w/ e-copies to members of CoCo from that college/division.
- II. Committee members discussed possible application of term limits to non-senators elected to Statutory committees. The members reviewed information on this issue provided by Drs. David Boyd, Elizabeth Derrick, & Jane Elza as well as results of a survey of COBA faculty done by Dr. Tori. After extensive discussion, the Committee decided not to impose term limits on non-senators elected to Statutory committees b/c this would require a cumbersome revision to the Senate By-laws as well as a complex process of exempting current non-senators elected to Statutory committees b/c they would have been elected prior to any new requirement. The Committee decided to revise the current Statutory Roster to include a statement that non-senators elected to Statutory committees do not have any limits on how many times a person can be elected, but CoCo will note on the Statutory Roster how many times a person has been elected to a specific Statutory Committee.

Draft Revision to Statutory Roster:

* finish unexpired term ** elected to second term *** elected to third term, etc.

Note: **No** limit exists as to the number of consecutive terms a General Faculty/non-Senator can be elected to a Statutory Committee.

- III. Committee members discussed possible use of electronic means to increase the efficiency of CoCo communication w/ Faculty and reduce the amount of paper waste. The Committee explored two options.

(A) Starting in spring 2007, CoCo will experiment with sending out the committee assignment request sheet via VSUFAC. Faculty who want to volunteer for a committee assignment will email their response back to the Chair of CoCo.

(B) The Chair also reported on his preliminary discussion w/ Joe Newton of OIT regarding moving university-wide elections to the Grievance Committee to an e-vote via the web. The major problem committee members noted w/ the system proposed by Mr. Newton is that faculty would vote via a massively long Drop-down Menu of several hundred names. As an alternative, the committee members recommended a modified voting process that would significantly reduce the amount of wasted paper. [In the fall 2006 vote via paper ballots to the Grievance Committee, the response rate was about 25%; so 75% of the ballots created were not returned.] Starting w/ the next election to the Grievance Committee, the Chair of CoCo will send out copies of the ballot via email to all departmental secretaries w/ a request that the secretaries forward the ballots to the faculty in their department. Once having received the ballot by email, faculty who select to vote can print off the ballot, circle their selections, and return the ballot to the Chair of CoCo via intercampus mail. Faculty who decide not to vote, can delete the email they receive from their departmental secretary. Prior to sending out the ballot to the departmental secretaries, the Chair of CoCo will announce the upcoming vote via VSUFAC so that faculty members will be aware that they should soon receive the ballot via email from their departmental secretary.

APPENDIX B:

Report from the Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee

The survey of faculty and student satisfaction with new fall and spring break schedules is completed and ready to be shared with the Faculty Senate. This survey was voluntarily undertaken by the Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee after the issue was discussed at a Faculty Senate meeting last spring. Keep in mind that the 2007-2008 university calendar has already been approved by the Senate. The information we are providing here is an attempt to assess satisfaction with the changes for consideration of future calendar preparation. This data is not intended to suggest that changes are needed.

The committee would like the results with the comments and information about breaks at other Georgia colleges and universities, presented and accessible to the Faculty Senate for the November meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Barnett
Chair of Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee

Question 1

Last year, spring break occurred nearer to midterm than it has in recent years.
Do you prefer the new midterm spring break?

Question 2

Last year, a fall break was initiated to provide a break nearer to midterm.
Do you prefer the new fall break?

| | Question # | Answered Yes | Answered No | Answered Do Not Care | Total | Yes | No | Don't Care |
|--------|------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| 18-Sep | 1 | 344 | 295 | 298 | 938 | 36.7% | 31.4% | 31.8% |
| | 2 | 469 | 272 | 159 | 900 | 52.1% | 30.2% | 17.7% |

Data above is total responses

| | Question # | Answered Yes | Answered No | Answered Do Not Care | Total | Yes | No | Don't Care |
|--------|------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| 18-Sep | 1 | 87 | 76 | 29 | 192 | 45.3% | 39.6% | 16.9% |
| | 2 | 80 | 92 | 22 | 194 | 41.2% | 47.4% | 11.3% |

Data above is for faculty

| | Question # | Answered Yes | Answered No | Answered Do Not Care | Total | Yes | No | Don't Care |
|--------|------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| 18-Sep | 1 | 243 | 205 | 237 | 685 | 35.5% | 29.9% | 34.6% |
| | 2 | 374 | 175 | 124 | 673 | 55.6% | 26.0% | 18.4% |

Data above is for students

Participation

| | |
|------------|-----|
| Responses | 963 |
| Complete | 882 |
| Incomplete | 69 |
| Declined | 12 |

41% of faculty and 9% of students responded to the survey.

| School | Spring Break (2007) | Public School Break | Local School System | Source of Break Data |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|
| Research Universities | | | | |
| Georgia Tech | Mar 19 - 23 | Apr 2 -6 | Fulton County | Note 5. |
| Georgia State | Mar 5 - 11 | Apr 2 -6 | Fulton County | Note 6. |
| Medical College of GA | Apr 2 - 6 | Mar 30 - Apr 6 | Richmond County | Note 7. |
| University of GA | Mar 12 - 16 | Mar 12- 16 | Clarke County | |
| Regional Universities | | | | |
| Georgia Southern | Mar 12 - 16 | Apr 2- 6 | Bulloch County | |
| Valdosta State University | Mar 12 - 16 | Apr 2 - 6 | Lowndes/Valdosta | |
| State Universities | | | | |
| Albany State | Mar 5 - 9 | Apr 2- 6 | Dougherty County | |
| Armstrong Atlantic | Mar 12 - 17 | Apr 2 - 6 | Chatham County | |
| Augusta State | Mar 8 - 9, Apr 2- 7 | Mar 30 - Apr 6 | Richmond County | Note 8. |
| Clayton State | Mar 5 - 11 | Apr 2 - 6 | Clayton County | Note 9. |
| Columbus State | Mar 5 - 11 | Apr 2 - 6 | Muscogee County | |
| Fort Valley State | Feb 26 - Mar 2, Apr 6 | Apr 2 - 9 | Peach County | Note 10. |
| Georgia College & State Univresity | Mar 26 - 30 | Apr 2 - 6 | Baldwin County | |
| Georgia Southwestern | Mar 5 - 10 | Apr 2- 6 | Sumter County | |
| Kennesaw State | Mar 3 - 9 | Apr 2 - 6 | Cobb County | |
| North Georgia | Mar 12 - 16 | Apr 2 - 6 | Lumpkin County | |
| Savannah State | Mar 12 - 16 | Apr 2 - 6 | Chatham County | |
| Southern Polytech | Mar 4 - 10 | Apr 2 - 6 | Cobb County | |
| Univ of West GA | Mar 19 - 23 | Apr 2 - 6 | Carroll County | |
| State Colleges | | | | |
| Dalton State | Mar 5 - 9 | Apr 16 - 20 | Whitfield County | Note 11. |
| Gainesville State | Mar 5 - 11 | Apr 2 -6 | Hall County/Gainesville City | Note 12. |
| Macon State | Mar 5 - 10 | Apr 16 - 20 | Bibb County | Note 13. |

Notes:

- Information not presented for 2 year, junior colleges
- Only 3 schools (those shaded) have concurrent spring breaks with local schools
- MCG and Augusta State are reported to coincide because of National Golf Championship held annually (April 2 - 8 in 2007)
- Note that Clark County schools match UGA rather than UGA matching a traditional K-12 holiday schedule

Source of data for colleges/universities:

<http://www.usg.edu/academics/calendars/calendars.phtml?showCal=4>

5. http://www.fultonschools.org/media-bin/documents/2006_Calendars.pdf

6. http://www.fultonschools.org/media-bin/documents/2006_Calendars.pdf

7. <http://www.rcboe.org/www/rcboe/site/hosting/Calendars/RCBE%20Full%20Calendar-2006-2007.pdf>

8. <http://www.rcboe.org/www/rcboe/site/hosting/Calendars/RCBE%20Full%20Calendar-2006-2007.pdf>

9. <http://www.clayton.k12.ga.us/administration/calendars/schoolcal0607.pdf>

10. <http://www.peachschools.org/docs/SchoolCalendar0607%20Final.pdf>

11. <http://www.whitfield.k12.ga.us/uhome/startup/startup2.pdf>

12. <http://www.gcssk12.net/downloadables/calendars/Traditional06-07.pdf> <http://www.hallco.org/main/calend.asp>

13. http://www.bibb.k12.ga.us/Front%20Page%20Files/Instructional%20Calendar%2006_07.pdf

2007 Schedule of Spring Breaks

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| | Albany State | | | | |
| | Atlanta Metro | | | | |
| | Bainbridge College | | | | |
| | Clayton State | | | | |
| | Coastal Georgia | | | | |
| | Columbus State | | | | |
| | Dalton State | Armstrong Atlantic | | | |
| | Gainesville State | East Georgia College | | | |
| | Georgia Perimeter | Georgia Southern | | | |
| | Ga. Southwestern | North Georgia | | | |
| | Georgia State | Savannah State | | | |
| | Gordon College | UGA | ABAC | | |
| | Kennesaw State | Univ West Georgia | Georgia Highlands | | |
| | Macon State | Valdosta State | Georgia Tech | | Augusta State |
| Fort Valley State | Southern Polytech | Waycross College | South Georgia | Ga Coll & State Univ | MCG |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| Feb 26 – Mar 2 | Mar 5-10 | Mar 12- 16 | Mar 19 - 23 | Mar 26- 30 | Apr 2 - 6 |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|------------------|

APPENDIX C:

Date: Mon, 30 Oct 2006 11:14:19 -0500
From: John Samaras <jsamaras@valdosta.edu>
Subject: Re: One more favor about the Motions under consideration
To: Christine A James <chjames@valdosta.edu>
X-Mailer: Microsoft Outlook Express 6.00.2900.2869
Original-recipient: rfc822;chjames@valdosta.edu

Christine,

I don't really know what (is meant) by "open motion", as there is no such formal term in parliamentary procedure. That said, the motion to Suspend the Rules is renewable (i.e., it can be reintroduced for the same reason) at the next regular business meeting. It can not be renewed in the meeting in which it is made and voted down by the group. The motion to Reconsider the 2008 calendar is completely out of order at this time, without suspending the rules (which is why the subject of suspension has even come up). Hence a motion to Reconsider can not itself be reconsidered, thus it can not be introduced over and over again until people get sick of hearing it.

A motion out of the blue to Remand "everything" (which I take to mean the 2008 calendar issue) back to committee would be out of order. A motion to Remand can not legitimately be made until AFTER Michael has made his motion to Suspend AND that motion has been voted upon favorably by the Senate.

The portions of Robert's Rules which underlie the above opinions are these: From *The Scott, Foresman Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised*, 9th ed., (c) 1990: Article 25, Suspend the Rules, pp. 259 - 265; and Article 36, Reconsider, pp. 309 - 329.

Regards,
John

John M. Samaras
Assistant Professor
Mathematics and Computer Science
Phone/Voice Mail: 229 333-5781
email: jsamaras@valdosta.edu

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2006 12:31:39 -0400
From: Michael Noll <mgnoll@valdosta.edu>
Subject: Re: [Fwd: Re: question on parliamentary procedure]
To: John Samaras <jsamaras@valdosta.edu>
Cc: Christine James <chjames@valdosta.edu>, dboyd@valdosta.edu

Dear John.

Thanks so much for your input and as Christine already said last Friday, this is above and beyond the call of duty!

I very much appreciate, and I will follow your advise by using this procedure, should the survey indicate that a significant amount of interest on our campus exists for such a motion.

Regards, Michael.

Date: Mon, 23 Oct 2006 10:59:08 -0400
From: John Samaras <jsamaras@valdosta.edu>
Subject: Re: [Fwd: Re: question on parliamentary procedure]
To: Michael Noll <mgnoll@valdosta.edu>
Cc: Christine James <chjames@valdosta.edu>, dboyd@valdosta.edu

Michael,

This note is to follow up on our discussion last Friday. I suggested that an avenue for reconsidering the academic calendar, specifically for Spring, 2008, would be to ask the Senate to suspend the rules. The particulars of the process, according to Robert's Rules, are these:

1. The motion to suspend the rules "must state its specific purpose, and its adoption permits nothing else to be done under the suspension."* For example, you might make the motion thus: "I move to suspend the rules in order to reconsider the question of the academic calendar for Spring, 2008."
2. The motion must be seconded.
3. The motion is neither debatable nor amendable. (Christine, this is where you come in. You would have to squelch any discussion or questions and move directly and immediately to a vote.)
4. The motion to suspend, under these circumstances, requires a 2/3 majority to approve, hence a show-of-hands vote would be necessary.

In moving to suspend the rules, it is not necessary to specify which rules are to be suspended.
John

John M. Samaras
Assistant Professor
Mathematics and Computer Science
Phone/Voice Mail: 229 333-5781
email: jsamaras@valdosta.edu

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2006 11:36:37 -0400
From: John Samaras <jsamaras@valdosta.edu>

Subject: Re: [Fwd: Re: question on parliamentary procedure]
To: Michael Noll <mgnoll@valdosta.edu>, Christine A James <chjames@valdosta.edu>
Cc: David Boyd <dboyd@valdosta.edu>

To All:

In researching the subtleties of motions to Reconsider in Robert's Rules of Order, I found that the maker of the motion to reconsider must be one of those who voted on the prevailing side. There are also time limits which basically restrict the making of a motion to Reconsider to the same session (in the case of a one day meeting or convention) in which the vote to be reconsidered was taken . The specifics can be found on page 309 & 310 of the Scott, Foresman Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised 9th edition, 1990. (Sorry, but I don't have the most recent edition.)

I must also acknowledge, Christine, that you were right yesterday in what you thought Robert's Rules said on the matter. I just could not find it at the time.

So, I'm with Michael. Let's put the issue to bed and get ready for the weekend.

John

John M. Samaras
Assistant Professor
Mathematics and Computer Science
Phone/Voice Mail: 229 333-5781
email: jsamaras@valdosta.edu

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2006 12:11:28 -0400
From: Michael Noll <mgnoll@valdosta.edu>
Subject: Re: [Fwd: Re: question on parliamentary procedure]
To: Christine James <chjames@valdosta.edu>

So what do we do now, completely ignore the issue?

Michael.

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2006 10:46:41 -0400
From: Michael Noll <mgnoll@valdosta.edu>
Subject: Re: [Fwd: Re: question on parliamentary procedure]
To: Christine A James <chjames@valdosta.edu>
Cc: John Samaras <jsamaras@valdosta.edu>, David Boyd <dboyd@valdosta.edu>

Hi Christine.

Nobody ever said that agreeing on certain issues on the Faculty Senate would be easy, but just because some issues are contentious, does not mean they shouldn't be discussed or brought up at all. I have good reasons why I am considering such a motion (and there can only be one such motion) and I will explain this in detail at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Thus, if the situation is as such that a) based on the survey results and b) based my own research it seems appropriate to make a motion to reconsider the way we schedule our Spring Breaks (and Spring Breaks are my major focus) such a "motion to reconsider" should and ought to be brought up to the floor. At that time, both sides can make their arguments as to why "their" scheduling is better, so that the Faculty Senate can make an educated decision and vote on the issue.

By the way, based on the unexpected delay of the survey report you will notice in my last e-mail to you and members of the scheduling committee, that I have already shifted my focus on Spring Break 2008 at this point. The issue of Fall Break 2007 has been out of the question ever since I learned that we will not be able to discuss the survey results at our October meeting (yesterday).

Regards, Michael.

Date: Fri, 20 Oct 2006 08:50:12 -0400
From: Michael Noll <mgnoll@valdosta.edu>
Subject: [Fwd: Re: question on parliamentary procedure]
To: Christine James <chjames@valdosta.edu>

Hi Christine.

FYI the response I got from John, which confirms my understanding that parliamentary procedure does allow to reconsider motions or votes, provided, of course, that such reconsideration is also practical and gets the majority vote.

Michael.

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Re: question on parliamentary procedure
Date: Thu, 19 Oct 2006 13:15:25 -0400
From: John Samaras <jsamaras@valdosta.edu>
To: Michael Noll <mgnoll@valdosta.edu>, David Boyd <dboyd@valdosta.edu>

Michael,

The type of motion to which you refer is a motion to reconsider. Such a motion is debatable, if the motion to be reconsidered was debatable, and requires a simple majority to pass. Debate may go into the merits of the issue being reconsidered. There can only be one such reconsideration of the same motion. A motion to reconsider can not itself be reconsidered.

Hope this helps,
John

John M. Samaras
Assistant Professor
Mathematics and Computer Science
Phone/Voice Mail: 229 333-5781
email: jsamaras@valdosta.edu

----- Original Message ----- From: "Michael Noll" <mgnoll@valdosta.edu>
To: "David Boyd" <dboyd@valdosta.edu>; <jsamaras@valdosta.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, October 18, 2006 7:59 PM
Subject: question on parliamentary procedure

Hi David and John.

I have a quick question for you and I hope that one of you can answer it.

It is my understanding that parliamentary procedure does allow for the reconsideration of both votes and motions. Or in other words, a "motion to review a previous decision" can be brought to the floor and (assuming that it finds the necessary support) can be voted on again. This reconsideration, however, can only be made once on the same vote. Is that correct?

Cheers, Michael.

APPENDIX D:

Date: Tue, 31 Oct 2006 16:31:44 -0500
From: Michael Noll <mgnoll@valdosta.edu>
Subject: Report for the November meeting of the Faculty Senate
To: Christine James <chjames@valdosta.edu>
User-Agent: Thunderbird 1.5.0.7 (Windows/20060909)
X-PMX-Version: 5.2.1.279297, Antispam-Engine: 2.4.0.264935,
Antispam-Data: 2006.10.18.132442
Original-recipient: rfc822;chjames@valdosta.edu

Hi Christine.

Please find attached the promised report on my findings in regard to the spring and fall break question. Thanks so much for putting the issue on the agenda.

Here are some thoughts of what I would like to accomplish at our meeting, so that there is no confusion:

1) I would like to have the opportunity to briefly address general concerns of our current spring and fall break arrangements based on my research (see attached report). The timing of my report seems appropriate, as it connects with the survey that will be presented the same day. It also seems important, since the Faculty Senate will soon vote on a new academic schedule (as early as February) depending on how quickly the Academic Scheduling Committee will be able to finish its work. Based on both reports given at our next meeting, we then will be able to discuss the merits or shortfalls of the current scheduling system, so that when the next academic calendar(s) come around, we can make a better decision of whether we want to keep it as it is, or if we perhaps should change it.

2) If the survey presented by the Academic Scheduling Committee indicates that a majority of students and faculty are stating that they "do not like" the current set-up or "don't care" about the current set-up, I also think it would be appropriate to "reconsider" the scheduling of (and only of!) the 2008 Spring Break. (The breaks of 2007 are out of the question at this late point in time.) This, of course, is a bit more tricky as we already decided on this issue in the past. However (as clarified by John Samaras), Robert's Rules provide for such a situation in that the Faculty Senate can "reconsider" such things as the Spring Break of 2008 if (and only if!) a "motion to suspend the rules" has been approved by a 2/3 majority of the Faculty Senate. Only when that "motion to suspend the rules" carries with the required 2/3 majority, will we be able to reconsider (and discuss) the fall break of 2008.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns about this.

Thanks, Michael.

Observations Concerning the Scheduling of Spring & Fall Breaks at VSU and Local Schools

1) When did VSU and the local schools schedule their spring break since the year 2000?

| <u>VSU</u> | <u>Local Schools</u> |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| March 27 - 31, 2000 | same as VSU |
| March 26 - 30, 2001 | same as VSU |
| March 25 - 29, 2002 | same as VSU |
| March 31 - April 4, 2003 | same as VSU |
| April 5 - 9, 2004 | same as VSU |
| March 28 - April 1, 2005 | same as VSU |
| March 13 - 17, 2006* | April 3 - 7, 2006 |
| March 12 - 16, 2007* | April 2 - 6, 2007 |
| March 10 - 14, 2008* | March 31 - April 4, 2008 |

* Based on a recommendation by the Academic Scheduling Committee and a vote of the Faculty Senate in April 2004 (35 - 22), a new academic calendar was approved which practically disaligned VSU's spring break from the spring break of local schools. The same vote also approved an amendment introduced by Ken Stanley, creating the new fall break.

Note: It appears that representatives of the local schools have not been invited anymore to meetings of the Academic Scheduling Committee since 2004. This lack of communication has, among other things, led to this year's fall break dilemma, a break which could have easily been aligned with the local schools.

2) What are some side-effects of a disaligned spring break, or the creation of our new fall break? Here are some voices:

"I teach Nursing for VSU and we utilize the high schools and Head Start for clinical sites. If they have a different spring break than we do, that is two weeks we cannot have clinicals at those sites."
(Gayle Taylor, College of Nursing)

"Our students in the COMD program missed many more contact hours in their practicum due to the difference in spring breaks. Many of our students either do their practicum in the schools or see school-aged children here in our speech and hearing clinic. Because we close one week and the schools another, the loss of contact / services to the clients was doubled.... The fall break was also a problem as we must inform all of our clients about our holidays when they differ."
(Tish Consolini, Communication Disorders Program)

"For all education students doing field experience and/or school observations, the non-aligned schedules of K-12 schools and the university limits the students' opportunities to complete these assignments."
(Lynn Corbin, Music Department)

"I have two sections of Human Anatomy and Physiology this semester. Out of 36 students, 8 used the fall break to take off the entire week, and 5 of them could ill afford this. The same thing happened last year in my Zoology class of 72 students with a very high percentage of the poorest students taking the full week off. Last year the same students in Zoology also then took off the entire week of Thanksgiving.... As to offering labs in the sciences, here the problem becomes more difficult. When

breaks are split between two weeks such as fall break and Thanksgiving, we have to then start shifting the labs around so that we start a lab on a particular topic one week and then finish it the next week. This becomes problematic for giving tests as it provides students more time to pass information around between those that have already taken the test and those that still are going to take the test... If you are working with a lab that requires live organism with limited life expectancies, then you find that as you go into the second week of offering a lab, the animals start dieing out and students taking the lab after the weekend do not get the same experience as those that took the lab prior to the weekend... Also, we have a certain number of students that live in other states or counties. Why not give them more travel time at Thanksgiving to get home and spend time with their families? The current split break schedule discriminates against these students.”
(David Bechler, Biology Department)

3) Approximately how many members of the VSU community are negatively impacted by the current scheduling of our spring break?

Although the results of the recent survey were not known at the time this report was written, my research leads to the following estimate:

- a minimum of 30% of the faculty (or 150 faculty members)
- a minimum of 10% of our students (or 1000 students)
- a minimum of 5% of our staff members (or 40 staff members)

These estimates are based on e-mail surveys, conversations with students, faculty & staff, a consideration of students in the Nursing School, COMD, and the COE, and interpolation.

Negative consequences of disaligned breaks are:

- loss of clinical, service & observation hours for students in the COE, and programs like Nursing and COMD
- daycare issues for parents among all three groups at VSU (students, staff, & faculty), with the resulting extra costs
- loss of quality time for parents at VSU with their children.

4) Two issues that need to be addressed in regard to the spring break question:

A) A statement was made during the discussion of the new academic calendar at the March 2006 Faculty Senate meeting that a survey in the past had shown that “60% of our students support a Midterm Spring Break.”

This statement was actually referring to a 2004 survey asking students what they thought of the idea to get rid of “dead day”. (See minutes of the November 2004 meeting.)

B) In the recent survey on spring and fall breaks, staff members at VSU were not included because the belief exists that “*they* don’t get spring or fall break anyway”. Technically speaking this may be correct, but practically speaking this is misleading.

Certain staff members with children now have difficulties to get annual leave days approved because their children are on spring break when VSU is in session. Here are some who have verified this in conversations, and who have agreed to have their names listed:

Lisa Wagner (Assistant Clinic Director / Communication Disorders Program);

Janice Inman (Secretary / Mathematics Department);
Valerie Holton (Secretary / Music Department);
Barbara Gilbert-Jones (Secretary / Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies)
Karen Jarvis (Secretary / Department of Kinesiology & Physical Education)
Patricia Mincy (Secretary / History Department)
Bonnie O'Steen (Secretary / Department of Marketing & Economics)
Diane Guess (Assistant Director / Student Advising Center / COBA)
Regina Lee (Secretary / Office for Employee & Organizational Development / UC)
Terry Morton (Secretary / Art Department)
Tina Muncy (Secretary to the Dean / College of the Arts)
Patricia Stone (Secretary / Department of Modern and Classical Languages)

5) What stipulates the timing of spring breaks for local schools?

Two tests, the GHSGT (Georgia High School Graduation Test) and the CRCT (Criterion-Referenced Competency Test). Local schools must place their spring breaks between these two tests. The GHSGT comes first, takes 5 days to administer, and has to be scheduled within a two week window. The CRCT comes last, but is not truly a scheduling problem, since it can be administered within a four week window.

In general, the GHSGT is administered in the last two weeks of March, while the CRCT is administered throughout April. Thus, local schools (as seen in the past) like to schedule their spring break in the last week of March or the first week of April, depending on the exact test dates given by the BOE, which may vary slightly from year to year.

(In 2007, the GHSGT can be administered March 19 - 30, and the CRCT April 2 - 27.)

6) When do other institutions in the University System of Georgia have spring break?

Anywhere from the beginning of March to the beginning of April. Most institutions, however, have their spring break within the first half of March. Some examples for 2007:

March 5-9: Georgia State University
March 12-16: University of Georgia
March 19-23: Georgia Institute of Technology
March 26-30: Georgia College & State University
April 2-6: Augusta State University

7) What were/are some common reasons given to justify a change in the scheduling of our spring break?

a) Academic relevance: Students benefit from an earlier spring break.

The question is, how important is this academic relevance for students when looking at the side effect of our new fall break (i.e. students taken off two weeks in the fall)? Moreover, based on conversations some of my colleagues and I had with students, there doesn't seem to be a consensus among them of what (academically speaking) the best time would be for a spring break. Later, so that they can write their term papers? Earlier, so that they can have a break closer to midterm?

- b) Student desire: Students want an earlier spring break, so that they can be with their friends from other USG institutions at the beach or elsewhere.

Based on the information above, the question is: what friends, from what institution?

APPENDIX E:

Date: Mon, 30 Oct 2006 11:06:19 -0500

From: Russell Mast <rmast@valdosta.edu>

Subject: RE: Faculty Senate item SAVE VOTE (message has been edited and sent to SAVE email list also)

To: 'Christine James' <chjames@valdosta.edu>

Cc: "'Thressea H. Boyd'" <thboyd@valdosta.edu>,

'Melinda Cutchens' <cutchens@valdosta.edu>,

'Kurt Keppler' <kkeppler@valdosta.edu>

Christine,

I have met with the president of SAVE, Seth Gunning, and explained the proper process to request a student activity fee increase. Listed below is the policy from the Board of Regents Policy Manual which states how fee increase proposals are to be handled. There is a Student Activity Fee Budget committee that hears all mandatory fee increase proposals. Dr. Keppler chairs the committee and there are six students and five faculty/staff members. SAVE wants to use the VSU home page to garner support to raise student activity fees for the purpose of making VSU more energy efficient. There is a process to follow and it appears that SAVE wants to follow a different process. We cannot have student organizations using the resources of Information Technology to support or push their personal programs. We have approximately 160 registered organizations and if we do for one, we have to do for all. As I stated earlier there is a process to follow to request fee increases and that information has been shared with the SAVE students. Please don't hesitate to call me if you have any further questions.

Russ

Russell F. Mast
Dean of Students
University Union
1500 North Patterson Street
Valdosta State University
Valdosta, GA 31698
rmast@valdosta.edu
Phone (229) 333-5941
Fax (229) 245-6481

704.021 MANDATORY STUDENT FEES

Mandatory student fees are defined as fees which are paid by all students as required by the Board of Regents or as required by the institution subject to approval by the Board of Regents. Mandatory fees shall include, but not be limited to, intercollegiate athletic fees, student health service fees, transportation or parking fees (if the latter are charged to all students), student activity fees, and technology fees. All mandatory fees shall be approved by the Board of Regents at its meeting in April to become effective the following fall semester. Exceptions to this requirement may be granted upon recommendation of the Chancellor and the approval of the Board of Regents.

An institution may waive mandatory fees for students who are enrolled for fewer than six credit hours. Alternatively, institutions may prorate mandatory fees on a per credit hour basis for students

taking less than 12 credit hours. Institutions may elect to reduce Board-approved mandatory fees for students enrolled in summer courses.

Proposals to increase mandatory student fees and proposals to create new mandatory student fees, submitted by an institution shall first be presented for advice and counsel to a committee at each institution composed of at least 50 percent students. Students shall be appointed by the institution's student government association.

All mandatory student fees collected by an institution shall be budgeted and administered by the president using proper administrative procedures, which shall include the advice and counsel of an advisory committee composed at least 50 percent students. Students shall be appointed by the institution's student government association. All payments from funds supported by student mandatory fees shall be made according to approved business procedures and the appropriate business practices of the institution (BR Minutes, 1999-2000, p. 364).