

Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate Documents

1-30-2012

Proposed language on Planning at Georgia Southern (Section 111) of the Faculty Handbook.

Candace Griffith
Georgia Southern University

Provost's Office

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Griffith, Candace and Provost's Office, "Proposed language on Planning at Georgia Southern (Section 111) of the Faculty Handbook." (2012). *Faculty Senate Index*. 516.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/516>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Approved by the Senate: 2/4/2012

Not Approved by the Senate:

Approved by the President: 2/16/2012

Not Approved by the President:

Proposed language on Planning at Georgia Southern (Section 111) of the Faculty Handbook.

Submitted by: Candace Griffith

1/30/2012

Motion:

The Provost's Office requests Faculty Senate approval on the proposed language for the Planning at Georgia Southern section of the Faculty Handbook.

Rationale:

The current version of Section 111 (Planning at Georgia Southern) of the Faculty Handbook does not reflect the model of planning in place at the University. The proposed language is submitted to update this section.

Response:

8. A Motion from the Office of the Provost to Revise the Language about Planning at Georgia Southern (Section 111 of the Faculty Handbook): Jennie Dilworth (CHHS): The rationale is that the current version of Section 111 (Planning at Georgia Southern) of the Faculty Handbook does not reflect the model of planning in place at the University.

The proposed language is submitted to update this section. However, Dillworth had an amendment to the last paragraph of the proposed changes to Section 111, which she passed around. Moderator Krug noted that the amendment was the result of an SEC meeting with the Provost.

Dilworth read the amended paragraph: “Periodically, members of the President’s Cabinet, members of the Provost’s Council, deans, department chairs, faculty members, and representatives of various offices convene to discuss and develop action items that advance the University’s vision and goals. Deans and department chairs share information from these discussions with faculty members, staff, and students. Administrators record this information in print and disseminate it broadly for review and comments. The Provost meets periodically with the Senate Executive Committee to discuss issues. He reports on the content of these meetings to the Faculty Senate; his report appears in the minutes of the Faculty Senate. Action steps emanate from these discussions; study teams move these action steps forward. These teams consist of faculty members, staff, and, where appropriate, students. Members of all constituencies are welcome and are encouraged to participate in the University’s planning process.” She moved acceptance of the friendly amendment.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) called the changes laudable, better reflecting what we do, and also expanding the number of folks and constituencies that have a say in our strategic planning process. In that vein, at the end of Section 105, it states “Several of these officers serve on the President’s Cabinet, which provides operational decision making including the operating budget. The President’s Cabinet is comprised of the following individuals . . .” She asked if we could add some Faculty Senate representative or other faculty representative.

Moderator Krug said no, you have to have your amendments in writing. This was posted and if Haberland had wanted to make that suggestion she could have made it. Haberland could suggest that for the next meeting. Further, this was not part of the amendment now under discussion.

Christina Belge (SGA Vice President of Academic Affairs) recommended making the wording “he/she reports or his/her report,” so if the Provost is a female, we won’t have to change it.

Dilworth accepted the revision.

Chris Geyerman (CLASS) objected to “periodically”, preferring “whenever.” Krug noted that made no sense. Someone suggested “frequently,” but that was nonsense too. Krug suggested just leaving out a time-descriptor entirely. John O’Malley (CIT) noted the word needed to be removed at another point, too. Removal of both adverbs was accepted, with relief. Dilworth moved acceptance of the now-amended motion. Rob Yarbrough (COST) asked the Provost or the President to speak to the role in the past of the Strategic Planning Council; he had assumed it still existed until this motion. Moderator Krug asked Candy Schille if she had anything she’d like to say about the Strategic Planning Council.

Candy Schille (CLASS) had served on it and “found it essentially a meaningless exercise and a time waster.”

Moderator Krug added, “It did absolutely nothing as far as we could tell.”

Provost Moore added that planning is very near and dear to him and was very interested in seeing and learning how the process was working here, and his fears when he came to GSU were justified in that the process in the Handbook was so complex, just defining who’s on it required a computer algorithm. And very little of substance came out of it, and there’s a reason for that: “Planning does not have to be that complex. The more complex it is, the more guaranteed to fail.” Not only that, it placed in the hand of one central coordinating committee all strategic planning of GSU: academic planning, space planning, budget planning, and on and on. This proposal is a highly decentralized approach to planning.

Ming Fang He (COE) felt we might be derogating the efforts of those who had served on the SPC. At least in their early days a lot of faculty members worked very hard on it and made a lot of changes.

Michelle Haberland (CLASS) asked again if we could recommend to the President that his Cabinet include a faculty representative, given that planning will be so laudably decentralized.

Moderator Krug that would have to be a motion for the March meeting. It has to be posted and discussion of the idea now was out of order.

Krug and Haberland sparred for a while until Candy Schille (CLASS) suggested that Haberland just wanted a straw poll. Krug ran the poll and it passed by majority.

The motion was finally Approved.