1. **President Peterson** opened the meeting at about 3:05 PM.

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

   a) Freshman applications continue to go up about 20-25% every year. The year we went to the Common App, we saw about a 45% increase. We are estimated to have almost 31,000 applications for the freshman class this fall, with only about 2,800 spots. Graduate applications are up about 3%, but it is still early.

   b) In the fall we had about seven different listening sessions on gender equity, and we were very impressed with the input we received from faculty, staff, and students. There were about 50 suggestions and ideas that came from these sessions; there was some overlap between the faculty, staff, and students and also some ideas unique to each group. VP Archie Ervin is starting some workshops on innate bias. The strategic plan advisory group is tracking the progress on this.

   c) The legislative session continues; they are discussing many controversial issues such as sexual violence legislation, campus carry, religious freedom issues, and controlled tuition.

   d) Ivan Allen Jr. Prize for Social Courage was awarded to Nancy Parrish, Founder and CEO, Protect Our Defenders, for her project devoted to the cause of sexual assault in the military.

   e) There will be an ACC InVenture Prize competition this year with all ACC schools competing.

3. President Peterson turned the meeting over to **Provost Bras**; he shared comments:

   a) SACSCOC reaccreditation is complete and we are officially re-affirmed/reaccredited for the next 10 years.

   b) The Task Force on the Learning Environment looks at the relationship of students/teachers and students with their classroom environment. We received a very good report with a fair amount of recommendations. There is an implementation group that is currently prioritizing those recommendations.

   c) The Commission on Creating the Next in Education. This will be an 18 month long effort or more chaired by Bonnie Ferri and Rich DeMillo. About forty members across the Institute participating. They were asked to think of 30 years from now and how the
education of GT should look so we can move forward in a fast moving world and in a fast moving education.

4. The Provost asked for the minutes of the November 17, 2015 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.

5. Provost Bras called on Prof. George Riley, Chair of the Faculty Nominations Committee to discuss the upcoming opportunities to run for elected faculty governance positions in the spring elections. Prof. Riley used Attachment #2 to show the positions open for election. He asked for nominations to be sent to the email address on the attachment.

6. The Provost asked Dr. Susan Cozzens, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Faculty Development to share the recommendation for Mutual Expectations between Research Advisors and Advisees. See Attachment #3a and b for the presentation and draft expectations document.

   a) We will be having a “Best Practices” forum featuring advisors who work well with their students on Thursday, April 28th.

   b) We had forums concerning advisor/advisee relationships, one for advisors and the other for advisees. We frequently hear from advisees, but were very interested to hear from the advisors.

   c) Respect and open and clear communications are central themes from both advisors and advisees.

   d) Some major themes were heard: Students want respect in what they are bringing to the table. Advisors want accurate, frank, reports on progress. They also want students to understand that they need reasonable time expectations for response.

   e) She asked Marc Canellas, President of the Graduate Student Government Association on the status of graduate students’ review of the document. He announced that just today has passed the document by unanimous consent.

   Question: How will these expectations be dispersed/implemented? Are there resources available for this?
   Answer: There will be a joint working group with Grad SGA working on this and how to get these guidelines shared with the faculty and the students.

   Dr. Cozzens asked for a motion to adopt the guidelines. The motion was seconded and passed.

7. Provost Bras asked Mr. Marc Canellas, President, Graduate SGA to talk about the Graduate Student Survey. He used Attachments #4a and b.

   a) This is the first ever comprehensive survey of the graduate experience at Georgia Tech. We tried to pull from the best graduate surveys we could find, including the Berkeley survey on health and well-being and the well-known Princeton surveys and adapt to here at GT.
b) We really wanted to focus on the important issues of graduate student life. Issues including but not limited to: Advising and mentoring, finances, quality of academics, qualifying exams, student fees, sources of stress and support.

c) The results of this survey will benefit all parties involved, both students and faculty. There are multiple opportunities for open-ended questions, and the survey is confidential.

d) Summary results by school will be distributed after the survey is complete.

e) In 7 days, we were able to capture 18% of 9,800 graduate students. This is impressive. The goal is 50%.

f) The survey is open for another week. He requested everyone encourage their graduate students to participate.

8. The Provost then called on representatives of Standing Committees of the Academic Faculty to present minutes and action items requiring approval, found in Attachment #5. 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:
   Minutes 12/08/15, 01/12/16, 01/19/16, 02/09/16. See presentation in Attachment #5a. Action items: From 01/19/16: LMC – deactivate courses; Scheller CoB – new course, minor modification Engineering and Business, new minor (Technology and Business); From 02/09/16: Biology – new course; ISyE – degree modification; International Education – add 3 courses; CoE – new course; Public Policy – certificate modification; minor modification; City and Regional Planning, 2 new courses, new minor in Sustainable Cities.
   Dr. Mayor moved the action items be approved; they were seconded and approved without dissent. He then moved to approve the minutes that were seconded and approved without dissent.

b) Institute Graduate Curriculum Committee – Prof. Victor Breedveld, Chair, Minutes 12/03/15, 01/14/16. He used the presentation in Attachment #5b to explain the following action items. Action Items: From 12/03/15: Business 2 new courses; ECE 1 new course; Civil and Environmental Engineering 2 new courses; School of Building Construction new subject code. 01/14/16: College of Computing – one new course and degree modification; School of ECE – one degree modification; Schools of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Biology, and School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences new PhD Program in Ocean Science& Engineering (OSE); School of Earth and Atmospheric Sciences – four new courses.
   Dr. Breedveld moved to approve all the action items, it was seconded and approved without dissent. He then moved to approve the minutes that were seconded and approved without dissent.

c) Student Regulations Committee – Prof. Al Ferri, Chair. Minutes 11/19/15, 01/28/16, 02/04/16. Presentation in Attachment #5c was used to explain the action items.

Dr. Ferri made a motion to approve all action items that was seconded; then discussion.

Question: Absences: some syllabi are saying only one institute absence is allowed. But this is not allowed. Is the committee aware of the burden this might be on the class professors? Can assistance be provided for the really large classes to help with the extra support needed to handle multiple absences?

Answer: There is no doubt that extra work may be needed. Other institutions are supporting this. Advise instructors to look in advance at religious holidays as they prepare their syllabi for the semester.

Statement: Graduate Senate voted to pass this policy. Many did have similar concerns about how to implement the changes about attendance.

Statement: The list of religious holidays could be large. There are some that could take advantage of this.

Response: The students must inform the instructor within the first two weeks of the holiday absences they will observe. It is important to have the Honor Code that can be used if a student is abused.

Response: SAFAC will be looking at the requested absences also.

Concern: Burden of record keeping. Which body is the petition? I think the IUCC will hear about this. Issue could be something like “the semester was biased”; then who has the records and proof of what was being handled. Is it the instructor, the TA, the individual units? Suggest that the committee consider the implementation for this policy.

Motion for a friendly amendment to the motion: Modification: “conflicts with first week reading period and final exams.” This motion for a friendly amendment to the motion was seconded and approved without dissent.

After discussion and the friendly amendment, the motion passed without dissent. Dr. Ferri then moved to approve the minutes that were seconded and passed without dissent.

d) Student Academic and Financial Affairs Committee Minutes – Dr. Anne Pollock, Chair, Minutes: 11/11/15, 12/09/15. No action items. The presentation in Attachment #5d was used for the motion. She stated that a lot of what the committee has heard has been about absences and about excuses for religious holidays. There are no action items as the actual wording went through SRC so only minutes need to be approved.

Dr. Pollock made a motion to approve the minutes which was seconded and approved without dissent.

9. Provost Bras then asked if there was any other business. Hearing none, he mentioned that there was a bill that passed the House and is now in the Senate. Bill 801 states that undergraduates taking STEM classes will be provided ½ point more for a STEM class when calculating the HOPE scholarship. The legislature did not want to affect students being willing to take STEM courses; this would certainly benefit our students. The Provost then
adjourned the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at about 5:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeanne Balsam
Secretary of the Faculty
April 18, 2016
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