

Armstrong State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of January 23, 2017
Student Union, Ballroom A, 3:00 p.m.

- I. Pre-Senate Working Session (3:00–3:30 p.m.)
- II. Call to Order by Senate President Padgett at 3:32pm (Appendix A)
- III. Senate Action
 - A. Approval of Minutes from [November 28, 2016](#) Faculty Senate Meeting (Approved, 34-0)

 - B. Brief Remarks from Dr. Linda Bleicken, President

Let me talk about the elephant in the room, the consolidation announced January 6th. I am heart-broken about it. I thank those who attended the town hall last week. The attendance at our town hall was larger, more diverse, and livelier. I think you picked up on the fact that the town hall was tightly scripted. There were talking points for everyone. That follows a system that has been in place for 7 prior consolidations. We will have convocation on Wednesday. What I would like to do is to have it follow a town hall process, one that is not as tightly scripted. I will be debunking some myths. What has appeared in Savannah Morning News has appeared without consultation with our administration or the USG. One rumor is that we needed to be rescued. The facts are that during the past 5 years, Armstrong's enrollment has dipped, but then stabilized and has grown. During that same period, Georgia Southern's enrollment went from 20,574 to 20,674. They also experienced declines from year to year. One myth is that Armstrong's financial situation is poor. Our financial health is actually very strong. Our cash position was 23.4 million as of December, 2016. The occupancy in our residence halls is high and auxiliaries are doing well. Another rumor is that Armstrong's president was complicit in the consolidation decision making. The reality is that I was notified January 5th – the day before it was announced to the world. The other myth is that I planned my retirement around knowledge of the consolidation. The reality is that I had heard the rumors over the years as many had, but submitted my letter of intent to the chancellor several months before I announced it here and well before the consolidation news came out to me and the world. That is a matter of record. The important thing is how are we putting ourselves in the strongest position to deal with what is. We have very little say on who is on the consolidation committee. But, the bulk of the work will be done by the work groups and we have a say in who serves on those work groups. In the meantime, we need to prepare ourselves factually. Faculty are comparing curricula and planning for creating something that is better than that available at either institution. There is hard work ahead. This is not how we planned to spend our semester.

Question: Who is on the consolidation committee? Answer: I cannot announce that as it's not my committee. It's the usual suspects. We didn't have much say so.

C. Brief Remarks from Dr. Robert Smith, Provost and Vice-President of Academic Affairs

We have a tremendous amount of work ahead of us. Much of the work will involve meshing our curricula. That will involve many of you. There will be 60-80 operational work groups. Each of these committees will have equal representation from Georgia Southern and Armstrong. Each will be co-chaired by someone from Armstrong and someone from Georgia Southern. None have been formed at this time. What I would urge you to do is to take a look at your corresponding curricula at Georgia Southern, where there are similarities and differences. Go to the consolidation webpage and look at the information there. Look at the information about the most recent consolidation in the USG (Albany State), including the prospectus that was presented to SACS. You'll see listings of the operational work groups, memberships, and reports. In the meantime, we have the usual tasks ahead of us for Spring, including recruitment of students for Fall and retention of our current students. We need to reassure students that we are not pulling rugs out from them and their curricula.

Question: Any idea on the timeline for announcement of the CIC membership and when the workgroups will start moving forward?

Response: February 1st: Implementation committee will meet for the first time.

D. Brief Remarks from Dr. Elizabeth Desnoyers-Colas, USGFC representative

I attended the first meeting with the new chancellor and the council representatives. I was given the opportunity to make an observation to him about the lack of transparency in the consolidation process. Relatedly, several presidents have been hired without faculty involved in a search process. We at Armstrong have not heard anything about the search for our next president. And, this is in the midst of the rumors about consolidation with Georgia Southern. At the time, he didn't really address the issue, but acknowledged that there is usually a national search for university presidents. We felt that faculty had very few seats at the table when it came to decision making about consolidations and we communicated that to the chancellor. We heard from colleagues at other universities who have gone through consolidation that it is a rough process. High level administrators and faculty members are at risk when there is a duplication of programs. He also gave an update on campus carry and the religious law, which are expected to pass. He emphasized that faculty should not write the house or the senate, which I argued against as a taxpayer. Another update he provided was that instead of being paid 10 months out of the year, a process may be in place for being paid over 12 months – not more money, just a different pay schedule. He didn't really address the comments about the desire for more transparency.

E. Old Business

1. Recurrent Updates

- i. Joint Leadership Team Summary
- ii. Faculty and Staff Vacancy Reports for December and January

2. Other Old Business

- i. SmartEval, Student Comments

Senate President Padgett: As you know, SmartEvals with the signed vs. signed comments did not occur. You can read the email from Angeles Eames about the options they proposed (Appendix B). I was going to let you take this back to your departments about how you'd like to proceed. We will forward this information to you for discussion at your department.

Comment: This says deans, but not department heads.

Comment: There is nothing about listing your name.

Response: These could likely be reworded. If there are suggestions for re-wording these items, bring them back to the next senate meeting, along with other input and suggestions from your departments.

ii. Tenure and Post-Tenure Review

Committee chair Bob LaFavi: Merger or not, we need to lead with our best foot. We want to go into those negotiations with this finalized. The most important charge was to review current policies and suggest changes for faculty handbook. We looked at other institutions, USG, and each college guidelines. I leave the document in your hands. We wanted to standardize terminologies and policies across the university, but balance that with the autonomy of each college. For example, in COLA, they may define scholarship in a particular way. We wanted to standardize terminologies in terms of how people are rated and evaluated. The USG uses the term "noteworthy", we re-define those as "exceeds expectations", "meets expectations", and "does not meet expectations". That allows us to use what the USG refers to as "noteworthy" and put it in our context. We were also very clear that Armstrong is Armstrong. We have a statement that teaching is the most important criterion. Too often we can become bean counters on scholarship. There may be other things that are very important in the department, and we wanted to emphasize teaching. We wanted to standardize the evaluation process in this way – we felt the department evaluation should be based on substantive qualities and the president's evaluation should be based on process. We also tried to streamline it. We also tried to come up with standard portfolio guidelines. We had another charge for suggestions on professional development and a charge to come up with a suggestion for post-tenure review. With regard to professional development, we felt that was best decided in the department/discipline. With regard to post-tenure review, we liked the suggestions that already came out of the senate for post-tenure review, but made some suggestions for wording changes.

Statement from Senate President Padgett: Review this with your department and send in comments to senate email.

Question: Can the file of just this document be shared with senators?

Response: Yes, it will be emailed, although it is also in the senate agenda as an attachment.

iii. Summer (Profit-Sharing) Committee

Report from senate committee member: We have not met.

Statement from Provost Smith: We need to meet and discuss whether it makes sense to make summer recommendations given the merger.

3. Old Business from the Floor

F. New Business

1. Merger – Role of Faculty Senate

Senate President: Review your curriculum and that of Georgia Southern.

Question: Would it be possible to have institutional research pull together a fact book comparison of our two institutions?

Response from Provost Smith: We have been working on that.

Question: Would that be a website or a google document?

Response from Provost Smith: That hasn't been decided.

Question: Timeline?

Response from Provost Smith: Not sure. There is some teasing apart of CIP codes when making these comparisons.

2. Committee Reports

i. University Curriculum Committee

December:

College of Education

Childhood and Exceptional Student Education (items 3-8):

Approved

College of Liberal Arts

Art, Music, and Theatre – Art (items 1-25): Approved (33-1)

Art, Music, and Theatre – Music (items 1-15): Approved (33-0)

History (items 1-7): Approved (30-3)

Interdisciplinary Programs (1-15): Approved (33-0)

College of Science and Technology

Biology (items 1-3): Approved (32-0)

Computer Science and Information Technology (items 1-6):

Approved (30-1)

Psychology (items 1-18 and items 22-46): Approved (30-1)

January:

College of Education (items 1-11): Approved (31-2)

Childhood and Exceptional Student Education (items 10-11):

Approved (30-2)

Childhood and Exceptional Student Education (items 1-2):

Approved (31-0)

Secondary, Adult, and Physical Education (items 1-2): Approved (32-0)

College of Liberal Arts

Criminal Justice, Social, and Political Science (item 1): Approved
(31-2)

College of Science and Technology

Computer Science and Information Technology (item 1): Approved
(30-1)

ii. Governance Committee

No report

iii. Academic Standards

The committee met and reviewed 39 appeals.

iv. Education Technology

No report

v. Faculty Welfare

We've been serving as the ad hoc faculty evaluation committee.

We've also researched number of lecturers at Armstrong.

vi. Planning, Budget, and Facilities

No report

vii. Student Success

No report

3. New Business from the Floor

None

G. Senate Information and Announcements

No announcements

1. Send Committee Meeting Dates and Minutes to

faculty.senate@armstrong.edu

2. Send Changes in Committee Chairs and Senate Liaisons to

governance.senate@armstrong.edu

3. Announcements (from the floor)

None

IV. Adjournment at 4:27pm

V. Minutes completed by:

Wendy Wolfe

Faculty Senate Secretary 2016-2017

Appendices

A. Attendance Sheet

B. SmartEval options for designating signed vs. unsigned comments

Appendix A
Faculty Senators and Alternates for 2016-2017 (Senate Meeting 1/23/2017)

Department	College	# of Seats	Senator(s) and Term Year as of 2016-2017		Alternate(s)	
Adolescent and Adult Education	COE	2	Brenda Logan (1)	x	Anthony Parish	
			Greg Wimer (1)	x	Rebecca Wells	
Art, Music and Theatre	CLA	3	Rachel Green (3)	x		
			Emily Grundstad-Hall (1)	x	Mia Merlin	
			Benjamin Warsaw (1)	x	Pamela Sears	
Biology	CST	4	Jennifer Broft Bailey (2)	x	Sara Gremillion	
			Brian Rooney (1)	x	Michele Guidone	
			Aaron Schrey (3)		Michael Cotrone	
			Jennifer Zettler (3)	x	Jay Hodgson	
Chemistry and Physics	CST	3	Brandon Quillian (2)	x	Catherine MacGowan	
			Donna Mullenax (3)	x	Lea Padgett	
			Clifford Padgett (3)	x	Will Lynch	
Childhood and Exceptional Student Education	COE	2	LindaAnn McCall (1)	x	Jackie Kim	
			Robert Loyd (1)	x	John Hobe	
Computer Science & Information Tech	CST	1	Hongjun Su (2)	x	Frank Katz	
Criminal Justice, Social and Political Science	CLA	2	Dennis Murphy (2)	x	Michael Donahue	
			Kevin Jennings (1)	x	Laura Seifert	
Diagnostic and Therapeutic Sciences	CHP	2	Shaunell McGee (3)	x	Rhonda Bevis	
			Pam Cartright (3)	x	Christy Moore	
Economics	CLA	1	Maliece Whatley (1)	x	Yassi Saadatmand	
Engineering	CST	1	Wayne Johnson (3)	x	Priya Goeser	
Health Sciences	CHP	2	Lesley Clack (2)	x	Joey Crosby	
			TimMarie Williams(1)	x	Rod McAdams	
History	CLA	2	James Todesca (2)	x		
			Michael Benjamin (3)	x	Allison Belzer	
Languages, Literature and Philosophy	CLA	5	Jack Simmons (1)	x	Will Belford	
			Carol Andrews (3)	x	Carol Jamison	
			Jane Rago (3)		Annie Mendenhall	
			Christy Mroczek (2)	x	Julie Swanstrom	
			James Smith (3)	x	Rob Terry	x
Library	CLA	1	Aimee Reist (2)	x	Ann Fuller	
Mathematics	CST	3	Selwyn Hollis (2)		Sean Eastman	
			Sungkon Chang (1)	x	Duc Huynh	
			Kim Swanson (1)	x	Greg Knofczynski	
Nursing	CHP	3	Sherry Warnock (2)	x	Carole Massey	
			Gina Crabb (2)	x	Luz Quirimit	
			Katrina Embrey(1)	x	Jill Beckworth	
Psychology	CST	1	Wendy Wolfe (3)	x	Nancy McCarley	
Rehabilitation Sciences	CHP	2	David Bringman (2)	x	AndiBeth Mincer	
			Jan Bradshaw (1)	x	April Garrity	

Appendix B

After many emails with the company, I want to summarize where we are.

1. The presentation that I made to faculty senate was based on discussions we had had with the company so that the survey format could be modified to add 2 questions:

"Do you want to identify yourself to allow the department head for this class to view your comments?" (yes,no)

If so, "Please enter your name."

2. The company went through some internal reorganization and assigned different people to work on the change and they have come up with alternative suggestions:

First alternative: "Would you like your written opinions to show for deans?"

Then regardless of their response, students would answer two questions that are currently in the survey, namely

"What aspects of this course contributed most to your learning? Please be as as specific as possible." and "What aspects of the course detracted from your learning?"

Second alternative: Have two duplicate sets of questions that elicit comments. Above the first two insert a header that notes: "Comments you are willing to share with Deans"

Above the second set of the same 2 questions, insert a header that says "The following comments will be hidden from the Deans"

Let me know your thoughts-

Thanks,

Angeles