

To: Faculty Senate

I began my tenure on the Classroom Upgrades Committee during the fall of 2006. The committee met approximately once a month in the fall semester to consider classroom upgrade requests. The requests came from multiple sources and changes to general use space are fully funded by the initiative whereas changes to special use space (e.g., department-controlled) are cost-shared. The committee includes three faculty representatives and numerous members from the organizations that actually do most of the work (e.g., IT, Physical Plant). My experiences were uniformly positive during the fall semester and decisions were consistent with my perceived priorities.

The biggest issue arose in the spring semester when the committee's work was put on hold by upper administration. We were already operating on a reduced budget relative to earlier years, and the remaining budget was frozen part way through my tenure. Thus, we held no meetings during the spring of 2007 and the committee has not met during 2007-2008; the future of this committee is uncertain. I think we should all be justifiably concerned that investments in the university's infrastructure are again taking a backseat. Given the importance of increasing enrollment, creating better classroom experiences for students is critical. When students must take classes in rooms with antiquated equipment, poor lighting, leaks, and generally poor aesthetics, this reflects badly on our beloved institution.

I encourage the Senate to support the continued operation of this committee. An upgrade to a single, general use classroom that seats 80-100 students has an impact that reaches far beyond a single course or instructor. Even those classrooms that are usually used by a single department can provide a significant impact on the student body and often affect the teaching quality of five to ten faculty within the department. This committee needs to be fully funded and continue its work for at least 3 to 5 more years.

Cheers,

Michael Young  
Professor of Psychology

DATE: May 5, 2008

TO: Becky Molina

FROM: Regina Glover

RE: Faculty Senate Representative Report

In response to President Stockdale's request, my duties as the Faculty Senate representative to the search committee for the new Director Health Services has come to an end. It is my understanding that Dr. Dietz has made his selection and forwarded his recommendation to Affirmative Action for approval.

The search committee met as whole only twice. The first was to hear from Dr. Dietz the plan of action for the search and the second was our discussion and ranking of the candidates. Search committee members were invited to meet with the three candidates brought to campus. I met with two of them over lunch with some fellow search committee members and attended the open session of the third. At all three meetings, I was able to ask questions. The process was open and fair. There are no issues or concerns to bring to the attention of Faculty Senate.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions or need other information.

## **Report on the Undergraduate Student Assistantship Committee April 15, 2008**

The following is the report of the Faculty Senate Representatives on the Undergraduate Student Assistantship (UGA) Committee for 2007-2008:

### **Committee Processes**

The Undergraduate Student Assistantship (UGA) Committee met three times in the Spring. Terri Harfst, Academic Scholarship Coordinator in Enrollment Management, chairs the committee and processes the applications. This year there were approximately 200 applications for assistantships submitted. This year the committee had approximately \$740,000 to distribute in the form of UGAs for Academic Year 2008-2009.

The first meeting of the committee was to discuss the process of reviewing and scoring the applications for UGAs that have been submitted. The committee was divided into two groups and each group scored half the applications. Copies of all applications were sent to each committee member by campus courier. Committee members had approximately two weeks to review approximately 100 applications and enter their scores on a spreadsheet that was sent to Terri Harfst for collating. Prior to the second meeting, all the scores were tallied and rank ordered for committee review.

At the second and third meetings, the committee discussed merits of the applications, the number of assistantships requested in each application, the number of hours requested for the assistantships, the ratings received from the committee, and the amount of money available. Through candid deliberations, it was decided which assistantships would be granted, how many (where multiple positions were requested), and for how many hours. The committee was mindful of the number of requests from each college or department, the variety of majors who were eligible for the assistantships, and the number of students enrolled in those majors. The committee also took into account the previous track record of faculty mentors and supervisors who had received assistantships in prior years.

This year the committee approved 136 UGA applications (162 positions) in 18 colleges or administration departments, totaling \$742,122.30.

### **Issues and Concerns**

The increases in the minimum wage that are occurring are causing a compression effect with UGA salaries. UGAs earn \$10.00 per hour. In past years, this was a significant premium over the amount earned by undergraduate student workers employed elsewhere across campus. If the desire is to restore that premium by raising the amount paid to UGAs, it will be necessary to infuse the program with more money or reduce the number of assistantships that can be granted. Faculty Senate input into that decision process may be warranted.

Respectfully submitted,  
Howard Carter, Faculty Senate Representative  
Gregory Whitledge, Faculty Senate Representative