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Lyon called the meeting to order at 1:22 p.m.

Approval of minutes

Tymkow moved to approve the minutes from the 2/16/06 meeting. Sanders seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

Provost Report

The Administration wants to create a Master Plan Committee to revisit the plan for the E and F wing renovations. Currently, the available space is low and this issue needs to be examined. John Toughy would head the committee. The committee would consist of approximately 10 people. There would be a representative from the faculty senate as well as the other two senates. Other suggestions for the people on the committee are one academic Dean, one non-academic Dean and someone from Chuck Connolly’s unit. Some of the topics to be discussed are the possibility of using trailers to temporarily alleviate the space issues, re-examining the use of the space for the renovations and approving requests for changes in the floor plan.

Maribeth Kasik has volunteered to be the representative from the faculty senate.

The Institutional Research Position has been posted and the university hopes to fill it quickly.

The university has hired an Interim Director for a grants office. She will begin on April 3. She assists with all supports for obtaining grants. Her name is Mary Watson. She has been at Valdosta State University and has retired. She will be here for a short term and a search for a long term candidate should begin shortly.

Lyon wanted to stop to thank Dr. Keys for all of his work in regards to the Institution Research and Grant Director positions.
Eric Martin’s report on Directed Self Placement

The history of this policy is that up to 1999 the applicants had to complete an exam for writing and math. 60% of these applicants failed on the first attempt. After a workshop, 50% of these students passed. He looked into the exam used and found that the testing service did not use this exam anymore because it was determined that this exam was biased and flawed. Also, due to the results of this exam the students were being forced to take courses which were similar to community college courses previously completed. This generated many problems from the students as well as the community colleges. The university developed an alternative to these examinations and has been using it. The Faculty Senate has asked for the data regarding the performance of the students who participated in this program.

The rationale for doing this is explained in the report. The premise behind it is that the students were unhappy and not performing well in the courses. This procedure of directed self placement allows the students to make an informed decision and empower them to pick their needs. This process is part of the on-line orientation that all undergraduate must complete. This makes the students accountable for the decision on whether or not to take the beginning course in either writing or math.

When examining the data derived from the information gathered from the study, there are two important points. The first point is that 744 out of 4694 (16%) were recommended to take ENGL301 and 657 out of these 744 (88%) agreed to take the course. However, only 276 out of the 657 (42%) students who agreed to take the course actually enrolled in the course. There were many reasons discussed as to possible reasons for this low enrollment rate, among them were not enough sections of the course offered, delivery format of the sections offered (in class vs. online), and agreeing to take it just to gain admission to the school.

A Senator asked if there was a way to survey the students to find out why they did not enroll in ENGL 301 when they said they would. Nugent said that the advisors should determine the problem with the scores and help the students with the decision. A Senator replied that the advisor cannot make them take the course. However, it was agreed that the advisor is in the best position to help with the decision.

Martin also suggested that the students can take the course later if it is deemed necessary by the instructor or advisor but again the student cannot be forced to take it. McCarthy said that if the students refuse to take the course then they are at risk for the quality of the writing. McCarthy also said that they can track what scores the student received, if they were advised to take ENGL 301 and if they actually enrolled in the course, however this currently is not being done.

A Senator asked what they planned to do in light of the information. Martin replied that the most important factor is that communications with the advisors needs to improve. This is difficult because of the high turnover rate with advisors. Zener stated that many time the students don’t meet with the advisors after the decisions are made.

Martin suggested the possibility of creating an advisory board from all of the groups to address this issue.
One senator stated that that the advisors cannot do much either. It’s difficult because students aren’t required to listen. It is very discouraging from the advisors point of view. Martin replied that this is true however if the students are getting the same message from multiple people maybe most will listen.

Another senator stated that the professors also need to send this message to the students because they have more power…the power of poor grades.

A senator added that there may be a problem in some curricula if the consequences aren’t severe enough for poor writing. Not all of the writing intensive courses at the university are the same.

One of the guests stated the problem may be the self directed placement could be a bad theory. Some faculty have complained to her that the writing from students is much worse since it has been instituted. Maybe the problem is that writing cannot be tested with multiple choice tests.

Zener stated that this is a much better way for adults to be tested. The university has used essay and multiple choice tests in the past and the results are very similar. If we let the student make the choice there is better participation. Maybe the answer is to fail the students who write poorly.

Martin said that when the student were told they had to take the beginning course, the student were not in a good frame of mind. This made for a very difficult learning environment for everyone in the classroom.

Dean Poole submitted a proposal to present this process as a panel discussion at a national convention. Not only was it accepted but they were also asked to do a poster presentation so more people would hear about the concept. The directed self placement process will also be included in a book titled “Best of the Best Practices.”

One senator suggested that before more sections of the beginning course are offered, perhaps we should find a way to survey the student you did not take it.

Another senator comment that she used to grade the written essays submitted by the new students and it was a labor intensive process. She believes that this new process works. If the quality of writing is poor the student should be sent to the writing center. The mandatory courses may have worked but empowering the students with the decision is a better way to do it.

Lyon stated that if need something from the senate, we are here to help.

Reports
IBHE Faculty Advisory Council (Wojcik)

A written and oral report was presented with some discussion.

A guest asked if the student newspaper has closed down again. No one had a definitive answer. A senator stated that one of her biggest disappointments at GSU is the lack of a student newspaper and student activities.
University Curriculum Committee (Muhammad)

No representative was present and there was no report.

Educational Policies Committee (Tymkow)

The EPC is asking for approval on 4 policies.

Policy 4 is the policy on student conduct. There are a few significant changes. The first is the title of the Dean of Co-Curricular Activities and Services. The second is where will the repository for the records for this policy will be located. Kasik moved that this policy should be approved as amended. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote.

Policy 9 is the English proficiency policy. The only change is the addition of the scores in the table. One senator asked why there was a difference for graduate students and undergraduate students. Hendrickson stated that this is standard practice. The exam iBT is the new format for the English proficiency examination. We are consistent with other schools for our requirements but since it is new, we don’t have the experience with these scores. A senator stated that applicants from non-English speaking universities need to take the TOEFL exam even if they had courses in English.

There were a number of questions regarding the TOEFL exam and the policy. Hendrickson reports that I did not write the exam or the policy but she enforces it. Another Senator said that the policy should be sent back for changes. Tymkow agreed to take it back to the committee for changes.

Kasik motioned to take this policy back to the EPC. Blobaum seconded the motion and it was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

After a brief discussion on Policy 32 (Policy on Continuing Student Status, Klomes moved to approve the changes. Kasik seconded the motion and it was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

Policy 51 (University General Education Requirement) has been an interim policy for a long time. No significant changes have been made. We just need to approve it to take it from an interim policy to a permanent policy. Kasik moved to approve the policy. Lyon seconded the motion and it was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) (Heino)

Representative was not present and there was no report.

University Assessment Committee (UAC) (Wojcik)

The committee received the results of a survey for student satisfaction. There were 54 different items. There was an 18% response rate which was 4% better than last year’s survey. The
committee is sorting through the data. The results will also be compared to the data from other universities. There should be more to report after the next meeting.

Wojcik wanted to thank Lyon for helping getting the institutional research position posted.

**Bargaining Unit (Katz)**

April 5th is the first meeting with the administration negotiating committee. There will be work on smoothing out issues from the old contract. An issue raised by one senator is that there are some people being hired at the same salary as people who have worked here for awhile.

**Faculty Senate Executive Committee (FSEC) (Lyon)**

There was no discussion as many people needed to leave due to time constraints

**Old Business**

None other than which was previously discussed in other sections.

**New Business**

Klomes graciously volunteered to go to the BOT meeting to represent the faculty senate.

**Adjournment**

Tymkow moved to adjourn the meeting, Diers 2nd the motion. There was a unanimous voice vote to adjourn the meeting at 2:55.