GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
WINTER MEETING OF THE FACULTY
FACTULY SENATE, AND
ACADEMIC FACULTY SENATE

Tuesday, February 14, 2017, 3:00 pm
Student Theater

MINUTES

1. **President Peterson** opened the meeting of the Academic Faculty Senate at about 3:00 PM.

2. President Peterson asked for the minutes of the November 15, 2016 meeting to be approved. He indicated that the minutes were posted on the faculty governance web site and no additions or corrections had been received. (See Attachment #1 below for web site reference). **The minutes were approved without dissent.**

3. Dr. Peterson provided the following remarks on matters of interest to the campus:

   a. Project Engage: a group of ten companies each of who have pledged $1.5M over 4 years to support startup companies here in Atlanta. This will be run in collaboration with ATDC. Blake Patton will manage the funds. Project Engage is the result of an organization Atlanta Committee for Progress, a group of leading CEOs, university presidents that meets with the mayor on a regular basis to advise him on ways to move Atlanta forward. This should not to be confused with Project Engages which Bob Nerem runs that provides an opportunity for high school students to work on research while still in high school.

   b. BoR met today. OMS Analytics was approved. This is similar to the OMSCS program that has graduated ~290 and expect about 300 students will graduate in May. We submitted a second OMS program in Analytics to start in the fall with cost just below $10,000.

   c. Legislature is in session: there are some bills that we saw last year that have reappeared.

      i. Guns on Campus – one bill has been introduced to allow guns on campus whether they have a permit or not; it is not clear how that would pertain to individuals under 21. The bill from last year has resurfaced with some modifications that includes prohibiting guns in child care centers.

      ii. HB 51 that has been introduced that would prohibit universities from investigating sexual assaults unless the victim files criminal charges with the District Attorney; this has been in committee.

      iii. Religious Freedom bill is probably going to resurface.

      iv. There is tuition cap legislation that would take the ability to change tuition away from the Regents and put it with the Legislature and cap increases with inflation.

      v. Our number one priority is Library Funding of $47M; the Regents recommended it and it was in the Governor's budget. We do think it will be approved in the

house budget and then it will go to the Senate. This is a two phased project with $47M this year and $35M next year.

vi. Early Action Decisions: news continues to be good. Applications continue to increase year after year. We received 15,700 applications for early admission and 33,000 total applications. The number of applications has doubled in the last five years. For this year's freshman class we will accept less than 25% acceptance rate.

d. Washington: Executive Order on Jan 27 on Immigration. We have been watching that closely. Office of International Initiatives is trying to work with our international students, faculty, and staff in order to understand what is going on. We have about 150 individuals on campus. We are working on a workshop for faculty to help them understand how to help students.

e. The consolidation of institutions with the USG is continuing. The most recent is Armstrong University with Georgia Southern into a single institution. Abraham Baldwin and Bainbridge will merge.

f. Ivan Allen Prize – on Friday we will recognize President and Mrs. Jimmy Carter with a $100K case prize for their life long efforts.

4. Next, the President called on Susan Cozzens, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Faculty Development and Dr. David Bamburowski, Director of Graduate Studies to introduce Three Minute. This is the second year for a Three Minute competition where students have three minutes and one PowerPoint slide to present a synopsis their research. There were 40 students that participated this year. Our winner will go on to regional competition for Southern Conference of Graduate Schools. Today, we have two or the four winners. Thesis presentations (Attachment 2) from two of the four student winners

a. Second place winner: Tesca Fitzgerald, Interactive Computing, *Teaching Robots to Learn Skills*. Tesca is currently in her fourth year in the Computer Science program and comes from Portland, OR.

b. Third place and People's Choice: Bharath Hebbe Madhusudhana, Physics, *Reading out the Geometry from an Atom's Memory*. Bharath post-grad student in the Physics Department and comes from India.

Dr. Bamburowski said this was a quick look at the Three Minute thesis and that videos of all ten finalists can be seen on the Graduate Studies website. The competition is currently for PhD students and they are looking at incorporating master's students.

5. The President called on Student Government Association representatives Ms. Nagela Nukuna, Undergrad SGA President, and Ms. Lindsey Eidson, SGA VP of Academic Affairs to share information about the Undergraduate Course Critique. They used the presentation materials (Attachment #3).

Ms. Nukuna said there are here to speak about a critical issue on the effectiveness of CIOS Surveys and future use. They have two main points to share and request support and feedback; one to request CIOS numerical data be released to students and the second request

for CIOS comments to be released to School Chairs and/or Deans, depending on the structure of the school.

The second request comes from a recommendation from the Task Force on Learning Effectiveness. The other request comes from discussions with students and SGA committee chairs.

They explained that the Course Critique is an SGA sponsored tool specific to GPA's for certain courses and professors and is housed on the CIOS website. CIOS is a survey managed by the Office of Assessment and is a survey done at the end of a semester. Three stakeholders when looking at CIOS data is instructor, administrators, and students.

Numerical data is supposed to be released to students, but the link is broken, probably because the current implementation system does not allow for this. There is additional information the students would like to add to the Course Critique system (a. hours spent on course, b. how prepared you were, c. whether activities facilitated learning, d. whether this was an effective course); in order to add this information, they would need access to the CIOS survey results. The first request is to have numerical data available for the students.

The second request is for CIOS comments to be released to School Chairs and/or Deans. Currently, administrators have access only to the numerical results and not the comments. Students feel the free-form text comments are a way to keep professors accountable for their actions in the classroom and are the best way to get a glimpse into the classroom environment that the professor has created. Most students thought that when they complete the free-form text comments that someone other than the professor saw the comments. Students spend a lot of time each semester completing the survey and it would be best if more than the instructor saw the comments. In addition, one of the criteria for promotion is superior teaching. SGA proposed the CETL prepare a standardized procedure of working through free-form text comments for course instructors and deans/school chair.

Statements:

- I don't mind being held accountable for what I do, but I do not want to be held accountable for behavior of other faculty. The current CIOS system does not handle survey well for some types of classes. For example, our Senior Design sequence last fall, I had over 200 students in the class and there were at least a dozen other faculty members involved with that class for team projects. With over 200 students, there were many comments. When I looked at the comments I could quickly identify that a comment was for an issue with the project instructor or that was a problem with the project assignment. Out of that list of comments only half were about me and I don't mind my School Chair seeing those comments, but CIOS does not set up the comments that way so that needs to addressed for a department chair to understand all the comments. As an instructor, I can have a meeting with my school chair and discuss the comments.

- When you get to a course that you must take and students can see GPAs and statements about an instructor, the students may start a class and already have an

opinion that may not be accurate. For example, instructors may have improved because of the comments, but the system can't reflect that. Comments from three years ago may not be indicative of what the instructor's class is like at this time.

- Numerical data is not too much of a problem. When you look at effectiveness of a course, a student may not fully understand the effectiveness until they have graduated and are in the working world and may then see how effective a course was.

President Peterson suggested we send this topic to the Faculty Executive Board for their consideration and suggestions for steps forward to address these requests. This is a decision that is a faculty decision that needs to go through the faculty process. Dr. Susan Cozzens was supportive of this approach and said she wants the Center for Teaching and Learning to involved.

6. Next, the President asked Dr. Leslie Sharp, Assoc. Vice-Provost, Graduate Education and Faculty Development to discuss the upcoming Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) faculty satisfaction survey. She had a presentation (Attachment 4a) and provided a handout (Attachment #4b) and said Georgia Tech is participating in this. It is a national effort coordinated through Harvard Graduate School of Education. It is a faculty satisfaction survey. The academic faculty tenured-track and some non-tenured track will receive a survey from a COACHE address and will take about 25 minutes to complete. We are participating so we can look at what is happening on our campus and compare it to our national peers. Group from Harvard will do the analysis and provide a confidential report to the Provost. We do hope to find good information for growth and comparison with how we are doing compared with our peers. From there, we will look at any concerns and how to make improvements for our campus. Participation is voluntary and anonymous, but we do know the higher the participation then we obtain the best data.

7. President Peterson asked Dr. Elena Garcia, Chair of the Faculty Nominations Committee to share information about the upcoming spring election and opportunities to run for elected faculty governance positions in the spring elections. She used Attachment #5 to show the positions open for election. She asked for nominations to be sent to the email address on the attachment. There will be announcements in the Daily Digest and in the Whistle.

8. Pres. Peterson then called on representatives of **Standing Committees of the Academic Faculty** to present minutes and action items requiring approval, found in Attachment #6. The following provides an outline of the material presented showing the representatives that appeared to make the presentations. Where presenters utilized additional presentation materials, they are noted below and provided as attachments.

   a) **Institute Undergraduate Curriculum Committee:** Prof. Rhett Mayor, Chair: 11/29/16, 12/13/16, 01/10/17, 01/24/17, 02/07/17. See presentation in Attachment #6a. **Action items: From 12/13:** School of Biological Sciences: new course; School of Mod Lang: add course attribute; Dept of Naval Sciences: add course attribute; Vertically Integrated Project Program: new subject code VIP. **From 01/24/17:** Industrial Design: 4 new courses; ECE: posthumous degree. **From 02/07:** Dept. of Naval Sciences: new course,

deactivate course; LMC: 2 new courses; CEE: 3 new courses; degree mod; Center for Serve-Learn-Sustain: new subject code SLS.

It was moved to pass all actions that was approved.
It was moved to pass the above minutes.

b) **Institute Graduate Curriculum Committee** – Prof. Victor Breedveld, Chair: 12/01/16, 01/12/17, 02/02/17. He used the presentation in Attachment #6b to explain the following action item. **Action Items: From 12/01:** College of Business: degree modification; CoC-IC: new course; CoD-School of Building Construction: degree modification, 2 new courses. **From 01/12:** Bio Sci: 1 new course. **From 02/02:** ECE: new certificate in BioRobotics; ISyE: new course.

Q: IGCC is proposing to change the degree requirements only for the evening MBA program. Are the full-time MBA and evening MBA programs listed as different programs with USG? Key is modification is only for the students on the evening MBA program.
A: Yes, each program is registered with the USG.

It was moved to approve the action items that were approved without dissent. The minutes were also approved without dissent.

c) **Student Regulations Committee** – Prof Al Ferri, Chair: Minutes: 09/28/16, 11/16/16, 11/30/16. Using the presentation in Attachment #6c he shared information from SRC meetings. **Action Items: From 11/30/16** Leave of Absence Policy added to Withdrawal from School and Readmission Policy.

> Q: The Leave of Absence Policy states the student is not allowed to take classes. I can see there may be an issue for a student that has an Incomplete because now they cannot actively do classwork to resolve the Incomplete. It is possible the student could go on probation when not here and then have a conflict when the Leave of Absence allows them to have readmission when the Leave is completed. Depending upon the Incomplete, it is possible the incomplete could be completed while on the Leave.
> A: Yes, this scenario could happen. This probably would happen very rarely. Students are encouraged to have as much as possible in order prior to going to leave.

> Q: Page 10, what is meant by "enroll for one single term" in the statement: "A student who is on academic warning or academic probation and who does not enroll for one single term may have a registration hold placed on their account."
> A: That is not needed so we can have a friendly amendment to change that to "enroll for one term".

It was moved and passed without dissent to approve the above minutes and action items.

d) **Student Academic and Financial Affairs Committee** – Dr. Anne Pollock, Vice-Chair: 10/31/16, 11/21/16, 12/05/16, 01/17/17. Using the presentation in Attachment #6d she shared items of interest from the SAFAC committee. She shared recommendations they have suggested to the Student Regulations Committee. There are no action items so only minutes need to be approved. **Dr. Pollock made a motion to approve the minutes which was seconded and approved without dissent.**

e) **Student Activities Committee –** Ms. Jeanne Balsam, Secretary of Faculty for Prof Christophe Ippolito, Chair. 12/02/16. There are no action items so only minutes need to be approved. **Ms. Balsam made a motion to approve the minutes which was seconded and approved without dissent.**

9. President Peterson asked if there was any other business. Hearing none, the meeting was adjourned.

The meeting was adjourned at about 5:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanne Balsam
Secretary of the Faculty
April 14, 2017

Attachments:

1. Minutes of the November 15, 2016 meeting of the Academic Faculty Senate, Academic Faculty, and Faculty.
2. Three Minute Thesis presentations
3. SGA presentation
4. COACHE presentation and handout
5. Spring elections nominations committee information
6. Minutes of Standing Committees
   a. IUCC presentation
   b. IGCC presentation
   c. SRC presentation
   d. SAFAC presentation