I. Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 12:15 in University Hall 156 on Monday, January 10, 2005. Dr. Edward Thompson, III, presided.

II. Approval of Minutes – The minutes of November 8, 2004 were approved as presented. There were 141 out of 267 faculty members in attendance, with 2 excused absences. The list is on file in the Vice President’s Office with the official minutes.

III. Old Business
   A. Executive Committee
      1. Bookstore Policies

         Vice President Jim Brignati attended the Executive Committee meeting of January 3, 2005. On the issue of special-order books he recommended that faculty give the bookstore as exact an estimate of enrollment as possible since there is a no-return policy on these items.

      2. Task Forces

         The Executive Committee has recommended to the President a better mechanism for keeping faculty informed on the formation and charge of task forces. The committee has asked that the President inform the Executive Committee, so the committee in turn can inform the faculty at faculty meetings. It is noted that some task forces need to maintain a level of confidentiality in executing their charges.

IV. New Business
   A. Executive Committee
      1. Posting of Executive Committee Minutes

         In an effort to keep the faculty more informed on the governance process, minutes of the Executive Committee will be published online after they have been approved by the committee.

   B. Report of the University Curriculum Committee
      (Action items only: please refer to UCC minutes of November 17, 2004 and December 15, 2004.)
I. College of Arts and Sciences

*It was moved, seconded and approved to accept as a block Items under Section J below from the November 17, 2004 minutes of the University Curriculum Committee.*

J. Psychology

1. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:

   **PSYC 2000 Ethics and Values in Psychology** 3-0-3
   
   **Prerequisite or corequisite:** ENGL 1101
   
   **Description:** Selected issues in ethics and values considered from a psychological perspective. Topics discussed may include ethical issues encountered in psychological research and practice.

   **Rationale:** We hope to add a course to the offerings of the university that will provide interested students with knowledge of the difficulties encountered by members of society when science meets practice and public policy.

   **Effective Term:** Spring 2005

   **CURCAT:**
   
   Major Department: Psychology
   
   Can course be repeated for additional credit: no
   
   Maximum number of credit hours: 3
   
   Grading mode: normal
   
   Instruction Type: lecture

2. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:

   **PSYC 3800 Health Psychology** 3-0-3
   
   **Prerequisite:** PSYC 1101
   
   **Description:** Examination of biological, psychological, and social factors that interact with and affect health and illness. Topics discussed may include but are not limited to the psychophysiology of stress and pain, and the recovery, rehabilitation, and psychosocial adjustment of individuals with health problems.

   **Rationale:** We hope to add a course to the offerings of the university that will provide interested students with knowledge in an area of psychology that is viewed by many in the discipline as one of growing importance and influence, especially as the discipline of psychology continues to adopt a more unified biopsychosocial perspective in understanding behavior.

   **Effective Term:** Spring 2005

   **CURCAT:**
   
   Major Department: Psychology
   
   Can course be repeated for additional credit: no
   
   Maximum number of credit hours: 3
   
   Grading mode: normal
   
   Instruction Type: lecture
3. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Modify the Program of study for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in Psychology as follows:

B. Major Field Courses ........................................... .30 hours
   PSYC 3010 - Junior Seminar
   PSYC 3090 - Physiological Psychology
   PSYC 4000 – Measurement
   PSYC 4080 - Learning and Motivation
   PSYC 4100 - History and Systems of Psychology
   One course from:
      PSYC 3070 – Perception
      PSYC 3190 - Animal Behavior
      PSYC 3500 - Cognitive Psychology
      PSYC 5400U - Human Factors
   One course from:
      PSYC 3020 - Psychological Testing
      PSYC 5150U - Conflict Resolution
      PSYC 5200U - Industrial/Organizational Psychology
      PSYC 5300U - Leadership & Group Dynamics
   One course from:
      PSYC 3060 - Behavior Modification
      PSYC 3110 - Theories of Personality
      PSYC 3160 - Clinical Psychology
      PSYC 3280 - Abnormal Psychology
   Two courses from
      PSYC 3030 - Experimental Social Psychology
      PSYC 3050 - Topics in Development
      PSYC 3100 - Human Sexuality
      **PSYC 3800 – Health Psychology**
      PSYC 3900 - Psychology of Self
      PSYC 5750U - Psychology of Aging

II. College of Health Professions

   It was moved, seconded and approved to accept as a block Items under Section F below from the November 17, 2004 minutes of the University Curriculum Committee.

F. Radiologic Sciences

1. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
   **RADS 3501 Principles of Nuclear Medicine I** 3-1-3
   Prerequisite or Corequisite: Formal admission to the Nuclear Medicine track.
   Description: Introduction to the theory and principles of Nuclear Medicine. Basic principles involved in imaging, diagnoses, and therapies are emphasized.

   **Rationale:** This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

   Effective Term: Spring 2005
2. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
RADS 3502 Principles of Nuclear Medicine II     3-1-3
Prerequisite: RADS 3501.
Description: Advanced theory of imaging technologies, diagnostic and therapeutic testing.
Topics include non-imaging in-vivo and in-vitro procedures and radionuclide therapy.

Rationale: This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

Effective Term: Spring 2005

3. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
RADS 3505 Principles of Nuclear Cardiology     3-1-3
Prerequisite: RADS 3501.
Description: An introduction to the theory and principles of Nuclear Medicine cardiac imaging. Topics specific to imaging procedures involving the cardiovascular system, and protocols of the Nuclear Medicine stress lab are emphasized.

Rationale: This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

Effective Term: Spring 2005

4. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
RADS 3510 Nuclear Medicine Instrumentation     3-2-4
Prerequisite: RADS 3501.
Description: Principles of radiation detection equipment and instrumentation employed in nuclear medicine procedures. Topics include detection systems, QC/QA, collimation, tomography, and computer applications.

Rationale: This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

Effective Term: Spring 2005

CURCAT:
  Major Department: Radiologic Sciences
  Can course be repeated for additional credit? No
  Maximum Number of Credit Hours: 3
  Grading Mode: normal
  Instruction Type: lecture/lab

5. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
   RADS 3531 Nuclear Medicine Clinical Education I   0-20-2
   Prerequisite: RADS 3501.
   Description: Supervised clinical practice in performing nuclear medicine procedures.

   Rationale: This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

   Effective Term: Spring 2005

CURCAT:
  Major Department: Radiologic Sciences
  Can course be repeated for additional credit? No
  Maximum Number of Credit Hours: 3
  Grading Mode: normal
  Instruction Type: practicum

6. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
   RADS 3532 Nuclear Medicine Clinical Education II   0-20-2
   Prerequisite: RADS 3531.
   Description: Supervised clinical practice in performing nuclear medicine procedures.

   Rationale: This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

   Effective Term: Spring 2005

CURCAT:
  Major Department: Radiologic Sciences
  Can course be repeated for additional credit? No
  Maximum Number of Credit Hours: 3
  Grading Mode: normal
  Instruction Type: practicum

7. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
RADS 4540 Nuclear Medicine Physics 3-1-3
Prerequisite: RADS 3090 and RADS 3510.
Description: Decay modes, half-life, radiation interactions, and radiation measurement as applied to Nuclear Medicine Imaging

Rationale: This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

Effective Term: Spring 2005

CURCAT:
Major Department: Radiologic Sciences
Can course be repeated for additional credit? No
Maximum Number of Credit Hours: 3
Grading Mode: normal
Instruction Type: lecture/lab

8. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
RADS 4533 Nuclear Medicine Clinical Education III 0-20-2
Prerequisite: RADS 3532.
Description: Supervised clinical practice in performing nuclear medicine procedures.

Rationale: This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

Effective Term: Spring 2005

CURCAT:
Major Department: Radiologic Sciences
Can course be repeated for additional credit? No
Maximum Number of Credit Hours: 3
Grading Mode: normal
Instruction Type: practicum

9. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
RADS 4534 Nuclear Medicine Clinical Education IV 0-20-2
Prerequisite: RADS 4533.
Description: Supervised clinical practice in performing nuclear medicine procedures.

Rationale: This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

Effective Term: Spring 2005

CURCAT:
Major Department: Radiologic Sciences
Can course be repeated for additional credit? No
Maximum Number of Credit Hours: 3
Grading Mode: normal
Instruction Type: practicum
10. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
   **RADS 4535 Nuclear Medicine Clinical Education V**  0-20-2
   Prerequisite: RADS 4534
   Description: Supervised clinical practice in performing nuclear medicine procedures.

   **Rationale:** This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

   Effective Term: Spring 2005

   **CURCAT:**
   - **Major Department:** Radiologic Sciences
   - Can course be repeated for additional credit? No
   - **Maximum Number of Credit Hours:** 3
   - **Grading Mode:** normal
   - **Instruction Type:** practicum

11. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
   **RADS 3520 Radiopharmacy and Radiochemistry**  3-1-3
   Prerequisite: RADS 3501.
   Description: Radionuclide production, mechanisms of radionuclide localization, preparation and use of radiopharmaceuticals, quality control of radiopharmaceuticals, and governmental regulations.

   **Rationale:** This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

   Effective Term: Spring 2005

   **CURCAT:**
   - **Major Department:** Radiologic Sciences
   - Can course be repeated for additional credit? No
   - **Maximum Number of Credit Hours:** 3
   - **Grading Mode:** normal
   - **Instruction Type:** lecture/lab

12. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
   **RADS 4561 Nuclear Medicine Synthesis**  0-3-1
   Prerequisite: RADS 4533.
   Description: A discussion of theoretical concepts of Nuclear Medicine.

   **Rationale:** This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

   Effective Term: Spring 2005

   **CURCAT:**
   - **Major Department:** Radiologic Sciences
   - Can course be repeated for additional credit? No
   - **Maximum Number of Credit Hours:** 3
   - **Grading Mode:** normal
Instruction Type: seminar

13. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
   RADS 4562 Nuclear Medicine Seminar       0-3-1
   Prerequisite: RADS 4534.
   Description: A discussion of advanced theoretical concepts of Nuclear Medicine.

   Rationale: This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

   Effective Term: Spring 2005

   CURCAT:
   Major Department: Radiologic Sciences
   Can course be repeated for additional credit? No
   Maximum Number of Credit Hours: 3
   Grading Mode: normal
   Instruction Type: seminar

14. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
   RADS 4570 Introduction to PET       3-1-3
   Prerequisite: RADS 3520.
   Description: The principles of positron emission tomography.

   Rationale: This course is an accreditation requirement for Nuclear Medicine.

   Effective Term: Spring 2005

   CURCAT:
   Major Department: Radiologic Sciences
   Can course be repeated for additional credit? No
   Maximum Number of Credit Hours: 3
   Grading Mode: normal
   Instruction Type: lecture/lab

15. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Modify the Radiologic Sciences
   Program of Study as follows:
   Core Area F
   One of the following:
   PHSC 1211/1211L- Physical Environment with lab
   PHYS 1111/1111L- Introductory Physics I and Lab I

   B. Major Field Courses       29 - 35 hours
   RADS 3050 - Principles of Image formation and Evaluation (Radiography and Radiation Therapy only)
   RADS 3150- Radiobiology and Radiation Protection (Radiography, Radiation Therapy, and Nuclear Medicine only)

   C. Nuclear Medicine Track*       34 hours
RADS 3501 Principles of Nuclear Medicine I            3-1-3
RADS 3502 Principles of Nuclear Medicine II          3-1-3
RADS 3505 Principles of Nuclear Cardiology           3-1-3
RADS 3510 Nuclear Medicine Instrumentation           3-2-4
RADS 3520 Radio-pharmacy and Radiochemistry          3-1-3
RADS 3531 Nuclear Medicine Clinical Education I      0-20-2
RADS 3532 Nuclear Medicine Clinical Education II     0-20-2
RADS 4540 Nuclear Medicine Physics                   3-1-3
RADS 4533 Nuclear Medicine Clinical Education III    0-20-2
RADS 4534 Nuclear Medicine Clinical Education IV     0-20-2
RADS 4535 Nuclear Medicine Clinical Education V      0-20-2
RADS 4561 Nuclear Medicine Synthesis                 0-3-1
RADS 4562 Nuclear Medicine Seminar                   0-3-1
RADS 4570 Introduction to PET                        3-1-3

Total Semester Hours for Nuclear Medicine Track       129 hours

*Nuclear Medicine students must complete a general chemistry course. This may be taken as part of the science sequence in Area D or as the approved elective in Area F.

III. College of Education

It was moved, seconded and approved to accept as a block Items under Section C below from the December 15, 2004 minutes of the University Curriculum Committee.

C. Middle, Secondary, and Adult Education

1. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Modify the Program of Study in the B.S. in Middle Grades Education as follows:

   B. Major Field Courses        42 hours
      MGSE 2200 Middle School theory and Practice
      MGSE 3050 Curriculum and Methods (4-8)
      MGSE 3071 Language Arts Theory and Practice
      MGSE 3200 Global and Multicultural Issues in Education
      MGSE 4080 Student Program and Evaluation
      MGSE 4090 Classroom Management (4-8)
      MGSE 4100 Students Teaching and Seminar I
      MGSE 4110 Student Teaching and Seminar II
      MGSE 4280 Teaching and Evaluation of Literacy through Reading and Writing in the Middle Grades Content Areas
      MGSE 4400 Curriculum and Methods, Social Sciences
      MGSE 4500Curriculum and Methods, Science
      Elective
      FOUN 5400U Issues and Practices for Teaching in High-Needs Schools

2. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create a Minor in Middle Grades Education

A student choosing a minor in Middle Grades Education is required to complete the following courses with grades of C or better.
CEUG 1010 Human Growth and Development 3-0-3
MGSE 2000 The Professional Educator 3-0-3
MGSE 3050 Curriculum and Methods 3-0-3
MGSE 3200 Global and Multicultural Issues in Education 3-0-3
EEXE 5100U Educating Students with Disabilities in the General Education classroom 3-0-3

It was moved, seconded and approved to accept as a block Items under Section D below from the December 15, 2004 minutes of the University Curriculum Committee.

D. Special Education

1. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Delete the following course:
   CEUG 3072 Teaching of Reading 3-0-3

   Rationale: This course is being retooled to meet June 2004 certification standards for Special Education teachers.

2. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Create the following course:
   SPED 3010 Constructing Literacy Programs for PK-12 3-0-3
   Prerequisite: None
   Description: An in-depth study of how to construct literacy programs in PK-12 with emphasis on reading strategies, approaches, techniques, and evaluation tools. Course will include strategies for teaching written expression and spelling. This course will satisfy the certification requirement for the teaching of reading and writing.

   Rationale: The Professional Standards Commission changed certification requirements for Special Education teachers June 2004. This course is aligned with the new requirements.

   Effective Term: Spring 2005

   CURCAT:
   Major Department: Special Education
   Can course be repeated for additional credit? No
   Maximum number of credit hours: 3
   Grading mode: normal
   Instruction type: lecture

3. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Change the credit hours for the following:
   a. SPED 2001 The Field of Special Education: Past and Future 2-0-2 3-0-3

      Rationale: The content has expanded to justify the increase in credit assigned

   b. CEUG 2222 Introduction to Research Design 3-4 3-0-3

      Rationale: The content does not justify four assigned credits.
4. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Change the following course title and description:

SPED 4008  Collaborative Procedures Fostering Inclusion and Transition  3-1-3

**Communication Strategies for Professional Collaboration**

Description: Strategies for working collaboratively with paraprofessionals, a variety of support professionals, and parents, guardians, general education teachers, and professional to plan successful inclusion and transition provide appropriate special education services to strategies for students with disabilities individuals in various instructional programs and settings. Emphasizes team planning. Includes practicum.

IV. School of Computing

*It was moved, seconded and approved to accept as a block Items under Section B below from the November 17, 2004 minutes of the University Curriculum Committee.*

B. Information Technology

1. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to Change the following course description:

ITEC 1300 Fundamentals of Information Technology  (3-0-3)

Prerequisite: MATH 1111

Description: Focus on the three components of fluency in information technology: intellectual capabilities involving problem solving, reasoning, complexity management, organization, and communication and troubleshooting; concepts involving computers, information systems, networks, digital representation of information, and algorithmic thinking; skills involving setting up a PC, using an operating system, the Internet and instructional materials for new applications proficiency in using a contemporary computer operating system and applications.

Rationale: To adopt the course description recommended by the IT subject review committee and to be consistent with our current teaching practice.

**Effective term: Spring 2005**

V. Other Business

Nominations for the 2005-2007 terms of the Executive Committee and the University Curriculum Committee must be submitted to the Office of Academic Affairs no later than January 31, 2005. These nominations should be voted on in each department.

VI. Announcements

A. Faculty Lecture Series

Dr. Jacquie Fraser

Meg Walworth and Jacquie Fraser will present “Literacy and Health: Photovoice, a Qualitative Study in the Community” on Friday, January 14 at 12:15 p.m. in University Hall 158.
B. Governor's Teaching Fellows Symposium Program  
Dr. Richard Nordquist

Applications are being accepted for the Governor's Teaching Fellows Symposium Program. The program is conducted over six weekends during the academic year or for two weeks in May, and is compensated. AASU’s most recent participants are Todd Hizer and Suzanne Carpenter. Applications may be obtained from Dr. Nordquist.

C. Smoking Cessation Program  
Dr. Marilyn Buck

The Chatham/Effingham Tobacco Use Prevention Coalition is subsidizing a smoking cessation program for AASU faculty, staff and students. There will be a small fee to offset the cost of medication. It is hoped that there will be at least twenty participants. It is asked that this information be shared with students. For more information, call Counseling Services or the Office of Student Affairs.

D. Introduction of new faculty and staff.

The following new faculty members were introduced by their department heads: Professor Myka Campbell, Professor Bonnie Tobias, Dr. Britta Swanson, Dr. David Taylor, Professor Jennifer Rinalducci, and Dr. Ed Meister.

Dr. Thompson introduced Mr. John McGuthry, Director of Computing Information Services and Chief Information Officer.

It was announced that Phyllis Panhorst is new Coordinator of Faculty Information.

VII. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Phyllis L. Panhorst  
Coordinator of Faculty Information
Bylaws, Article VII, Section B.4. University Curriculum Committee

The University Curriculum Committee shall consist of the dean of faculty as chair and twelve other members of the Faculty. At the beginning of the first meeting of the academic year, the committee shall elect a vice chair by private ballot. At the discretion of the chair, reports of the committee may be made by the vice chair at faculty meetings. No more than one member from any one department/program may serve at one time on the committee. There shall be four faculty members selected from the College of Arts and Sciences (including the library), two members elected from the College of Education, two members elected from the College of Health Professions, one member elected from the School of Computing and three members elected from the Faculty at-large with no more than two members elected from any one college/school. Faculty terms shall be two years; no more than two successive terms shall be served by any person.

PLEASE MARK SIX CHOICES

☐ Stephen Primatic  Art, Music & Theatre
☐ Alex Collier  Biology
☐ Suzanne Carpenter  Chemistry & Physics
☐ Mary Ann Sullivan  Communicative Disorders
☐ Jose da Cruz  Criminal Justice, Social & Political Science
☐ John Hobe  Early Childhood Education
☐ Andrew Weinbach  Economics
☐ Cameron Coates  Engineering Studies
☐ Lynn Roberts  Health and Physical Education
☐ Jacquie Fraser  Health Sciences
☐ James Todesca  History
☐ Frank Katz  Information Technology
☐ Beth Howells  Languages, Literature & Philosophy
☐ Dale Kilhefner  Mathematics
☐ Hassan Aziz  Medical Technology
☐ Patrick Thomas  Middle, Secondary & Adult Education
☐ Lynn Stover  Nursing
☐ Lee Braswell  Radiologic Sciences
Bylaws, Article VII, Section B.1.a. Membership

(1) The Executive Committee of the Faculty shall consist of the dean of faculty as chair and twelve other members of the faculty. The Faculty shall elect six members each year for two-year terms, each term lasting from June 1, following the election, to May 31, two years hence. No more than one member from any department or program and no fewer than two members from each of the following: the College of Health Professions, the College of Arts and Sciences (including the library), and the College of Education. No fewer than one from the School of Computing may serve at one time on the Committee. Members of the Faculty are not eligible to serve during their first year of faculty membership. Committee members are not eligible to succeed themselves within one year after a term of service.

Note: No two faculty members may be elected from the same department. There are no other restrictions on the list of candidates.

PLEASE MARK SIX CHOICES

☐ Kevin Hampton  Art, Music & Theatre  ☐ William Deaver  Languages, Literature & Philosophy
☐ Randy Reese  Art, Music & Theatre  ☐ Erik Nordenhaug  Languages, Literature & Philosophy
☐ Donna Brooks  Communicative Disorders  ☐ Teresa Winterhalter  Languages, Literature & Philosophy
☐ Mark Burge  Computer Science  ☐ Hassan Aziz  Medical Technology
☐ Daniel Liang  Computer Science  ☐ Jennifer Lander  Physical Therapy
☐ Daniel Skidmore-Hess  Criminal Justice, Social & Political Science  ☐ Anne Thompson  Physical Therapy
☐ Bettye Anne Battiste  Early Childhood Education  ☐ Keith Douglass  Psychology
☐ Thomas Murphy  Engineering Studies  ☐ Vann Scott  Psychology
☐ June Hopkins  History  ☐ Sharon Gilliard-Smith  Radiologic Sciences
☐ Jim Todesca  History  ☐ Elwin Tilson  Radiologic Sciences
☐ Kam Lau  Information Technology  ☐ Rhonda Bevis  Respiratory Therapy
☐ Chris Freeman  Lane Library  ☐ Joyce Bergin  Special Education
☐ Robert Loyd  Special Education
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In April 2004, the Executive Committee established the Task Force on Faculty Governance, with members selected to represent each of the university's colleges and schools. Four persons selected for membership on the Task Force had served as vice chairs of the Executive Committee, one person is a current member of the Executive Committee, and another has been a member of several standing committees of the faculty and has served as chair of a standing committee of the university.

The Task Force was charged with evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the current governance structure and making recommendations to the Executive Committee about any changes to the structure that might be considered. In response to this charge, the Task Force studied the current bylaws, statutes, and regulations of the university that apply to faculty governance as well as such data as attendance counts for university faculty meetings (see Appendix A). The Task Force secured information on the governance structures of Armstrong's sister institutions as well as some noteworthy institutions located in other states. Seven of the sister institutions have faculty senates. Additionally, the Task Force conducted a survey (see Appendix B) which was distributed to all full-time and part-time faculty at AASU.

The Task Force distributed a survey to all faculty (full and part-time) in November 2004. According to the Office of Academic Affairs, the University employs 267 full-time and 195 part-time faculty. One hundred twenty-seven faculty members responded to the survey. Of that number 110 were designated full time faculty. The survey return rate for full-time faculty respondents was 41%. The results of the survey are presented in tables in the appendices of this report (see Appendix C). Comments taken from the surveys are
printed verbatim with no corrections or editorial changes. Comments can be found in the appendices of this report (see Appendix D through F).

The Task Force noted the following areas of concern:

- **Decreased Attendance at Faculty Meetings**
  Though not keeping up with the rapid growth of the student population, the size of our faculty is increasing, and more faculty are engaged in off-campus satellite programs or laboratory experiences remote to campus. High levels of attendance at monthly meetings are becoming more difficult to sustain. A review of the data on attendance at faculty meetings shows that attendance is down from 2003. Notably, the period August 2004 through November 2004 showed a drop from 78.9% attendance to 50%.

- **Change in the tenor of faculty meetings**
  The tenor of the monthly faculty meetings has changed, and few issues are brought to the attention of the faculty from the floor. Rarely is faculty input solicited at these meetings, and rarely do faculty engage in the kind of discussion required to ensure that the duties and jurisdiction of the faculty as presented in the bylaws (Article IV, Section A) are being met. That section of the bylaws states that

  *The Faculty (subject to the approval of the president, chancellor, and Board of Regents) shall make rules and regulations for its governance and procedure, and for that of students; provide such committees as may be required; prescribe regulations regarding admissions, dismissal, discipline, scholarship, classes, courses of study, and requirements for graduation; and make such other regulations as may be necessary or proper for the maintenance of high educational standards. The Faculty shall prescribe rules for regulation of student publications, athletics, intercollegiate and intramural games, musical, dramatic, and literary clubs, fraternities and sororities, and all other student activities and affairs. The Faculty may also make recommendations concerning the policies governing the aforementioned affairs of the university.*

- **Lack of Reports from Standing Committees of the Faculty**
  The monthly meetings of the faculty have strayed from the description in the AASU bylaws regarding presentations from Standing Committees of the Faculty, whose chairs "shall submit reports from the floor at regular meetings of the Faculty. Committees shall give special attention to exceptions to standing policies and regulations, to actions of administrative officers contrary to committee recommendations, and to the substance of both previous and pending business and activities. Committee reports which include any recommended change in policy shall
be circulated in writing to the Faculty and the president with the agenda for the meeting at which the report is to be presented" (Bylaws, Article VII, Section A.3). The only two committees that consistently provide reports at faculty meetings are the Executive Committee and the University Curriculum Committee. Even with the provision of online reporting of minutes, few standing committees provide up-to-date minutes of their meetings.

➢ **Failure to foster a sense of faculty involvement**

The current structure does not foster a sense of faculty involvement in key decision making that affects both faculty and students. According to the bylaws (Article VII, Section B.1.b)...the chair (or when the vice-chair is not available, any other member of the Executive Committee) shall-at the invitation of the president-attend the monthly meetings of the president's staff, and shall at the invitation of the vice president and dean of faculty attend the monthly meeting of the Dean's Council. At these meetings, the vice-chair (or his or her designee) will report on the activities of the Executive Committee and will serve as a representative of the faculty. Attendance by the vice-chair of the Executive Committee is by invitation only. There is no standing obligation. Nor are these specific meetings decision-making in their intent. Both are primarily reporting mechanisms. With few issues being discussed at faculty meetings and few efforts being made to solicit faculty opinions at the regular meetings of the faculty, it is difficult to see how faculty input on key issues is solicited.

➢ **Task Forces bypassing Standing Committees of the Faculty**

The standing committees of the faculty are often bypassed by administratively appointed task forces that often appear to overlap with—if not duplicate—the work of those committees. The president has stated that he believes the current committee structure is too ponderous and slow-moving to respond effectively when change is needed. Unlike Standing Committees of the Faculty, administratively appointed task forces are not governed by university bylaws and are not required to be identified nor to report directly to faculty. Additionally, the use of task forces that overlap or duplicate the work of Standing Committees of the Faculty further erodes the important roles of these committees and adds to the perception that they are not viable.

**Items of interest/concern revealed by the survey results**

➢ **Faculty perceive a need for a different faculty governance structure**

When survey results of all respondents are combined, two items stand out:

(1) Eighty-three respondents agree or strongly agree that “the faculty needs a different governance structure” as opposed to 35 who disagree or strongly disagree.
(2) Eighty-nine respondents agree or strongly agree that “professional relationships among faculty and academic administrators are supportive and cooperative,” in contrast to 35 who disagree or strongly disagree. Responses to the other questions are more evenly divided, perhaps suggesting a couple of things:

(a) On the positive side, the majority of faculty do not perceive their relationship with the administration to be confrontational. One might interpret item #4 to mean that the perceived faults in the current governance structure are neither a result nor a symptom of deliberate efforts on the part of the administration to disenfranchise the faculty.

(b) On the other hand, whatever the cause or the reason, a clear majority of the faculty have voiced the need for “a different governance structure.” One might conclude that we are considering these issues at precisely the right time. The system as it stands may not be broken (to all other questions, a small majority of the faculty found elements of the current structure to be “effective”) but in light of the university’s growth and the expanding roles of external boards, the current faculty governance structure designed for a much smaller college may be proving ineffective.

➢ Lack of representation for part-time faculty

The university employs 195 part-time faculty (i.e., over 40% of the total number of faculty). Currently, these faculty members have no representation in faculty governance.

➢ Ignorance of faculty governance

Comments gathered from the survey indicate that new faculty and part-time faculty believe they are ignorant of the AASU faculty governance system: if new faculty do not understand the process, it is clear that their involvement will be limited or non-existent. One new faculty member asked that an explanation of the governance structure become part of faculty orientation process.

➢ No clear reward for service

Comments from the survey indicate that some faculty perceive a general lack of interest on the part of faculty in the kind of involvement required by faculty governance. Perhaps service in general is being viewed as less valuable than teaching and scholarship. During times of economic stress, time spent in service on committees may not seem as rewarding as time spent pursuing a grant, engaging in research, or writing for publication. A key question becomes, how much does the university value service? University statutes and departmental guidelines require that teaching, scholarship, and service be evaluated for promotion and tenure. However, without departmental, college, and university-wide support and rewards for service, faculty may place emphasis on scholarship and teaching, both of which produce more tangible rewards.
A change in governance structure may not ensure more faculty involvement
Significant numbers of comments taken from the survey question whether a change in faculty governance will stimulate faculty to become more involved or simply further disenfranchise faculty, leaving the governance to a few who are willing to do the work required.

Recommendations

Adhere to the bylaws as they are written
Whatever the governance structure, it is imperative that the bylaws be followed as written to ensure that entities such as the Executive Committee and Standing Committees of the faculty understand and conduct themselves within the roles faculty have assigned them. Additionally, it is important that all faculty members be informed of their roles and responsibilities as presented in the bylaws. New faculty must be mentored and welcomed into the governance process.

Sponsor meetings to help faculty determine the future governance structure
The Executive committee should sponsor one or more meetings where the issues put forth in this report can be discussed with the intention that at the April meeting of the faculty, all full-time faculty will be able to vote on the following resolution:

The Armstrong Atlantic State University faculty will move to a senate form of governance.

Conclusions
It is important that faculty have open forums to fully explore the ramifications of moving to a faulty senate. Perhaps a process of exploration will help faculty fully articulate their underlying dissatisfactions with the current system and come forth with suggestions for the kind of governance structure that will be inclusive for all faculty, while encouraging productivity, good will, and open communication.
*Attendance at Faculty Meetings*

N= 267 full time faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number attending</th>
<th>% of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 10, 2004</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 20, 2004</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 11, 2004</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 8, 2004</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data courtesy of the Office of Academic Affairs*
APPENDIX B
Faculty Survey
11/04

Conducted by the Task Force on Faculty Governance

Instructions: The task force on faculty governance is studying the effectiveness of the current faculty governance system at AASU. We believe that faculty opinions are a key piece of the data necessary to our study. We ask that you complete this brief, three-part survey and return it to Dr. Joyce Bergin, Department of Special Education, University Hall, 208, no later than 5 p.m. on December 8, 2004. Data will be compiled in summary form only. Participation in the study is voluntary.

I. The following questions are necessary for analysis purposes. Please circle your response.

A. How many years have you been a member of the Armstrong faculty?
1. less than 5 years
2. 5 to 10 years
3. 11 to 20 years
4. more than 20 years

What is your faculty rank?
1. Instructor
2. Assistant Professor
3. Associate Professor
4. Full professor

What is your role/position at AASU?
1. Full-Time Faculty
2. Part-Time Faculty
3. Department Head
4. Administrator

II. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following items by circling the response of your choice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The faculty has an effective role in governance at AASU.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The faculty needs a different governance structure (such as a faculty senate) in order to represent itself more effectively within the university.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The university’s central administration fosters a climate that supports faculty governance.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Professional relationships among the faculty and academic administrators are supportive and cooperative.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>AASU has established an effective mechanism that ensures a faculty voice in all matters pertaining to academic programs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>The current governance structure allows for reasonable and appropriate opportunities for faculty to participate in institutional decision-making.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The current structure of the Standing Committees of the Faculty is effective.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>The current structure of the Standing Committees of the University is effective.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Please use the following space for any comments you wish to make that you believe will be helpful to the work of the Task Force.
APPENDIX C
Survey Results

N= 127  \hspace{1cm} (127 = 110 full-time faculty and 17 part-time faculty)

Note: In some cases faculty declined to respond to one or more items on the survey thus the percentages will not add up to 100%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Results</th>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The faculty has an effective role in governance at AASU.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The faculty needs a different governance structure (such as a faculty senate) in order to represent itself more effectively within the university.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The university’s central administration fosters a climate that supports faculty governance.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Professional relationships among faculty and academic administrators are supportive and cooperative.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. AASU has established an effective mechanism that ensures a faculty voice in all matters pertaining to academic programs.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The current governance structure allows for reasonable and appropriate opportunities for faculty to participate in institutional governance and decision making.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The current structure of the Standing Committees of the Faculty is effective</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The current structure of Standing committees of the University is effective.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis

The four response categories were collapsed into two agree/disagree categories and analyzed for significant differences in responses by length of service, rank, and position among the full-time faculty. Full-time faculty respondents differed significantly (p<.05) in their responses to six questions.

Significant differences in responses according to length of service were noted with respect to four of the eight questions. A finding of some concern shows that agreement that faculty has an effective role in governance declines markedly as length of service increases. Full-time faculty with less than five years of service at AASU were significantly more likely to view opportunities for faculty governance in a positive manner than were full-time faculty with more than five years of experience. Responses indicate that 69 percent of faculty with less than five years at AASU agreed that faculty has an effective role compared to only 33 percent of faculty with five to ten years at AASU, and 48 percent of faculty with over ten years of service. A little over 68 percent of faculty with less than five years of service sees the central administration as fostering a climate supportive of faculty governance, compared to almost 44 percent of faculty with five to ten years of service, and 43 percent of faculty with more than ten years of service. Almost 80 percent of full-time faculty who have been at AASU less than five years agree that AASU has an effective mechanism ensuring faculty voice in academic program matters compared to only 42 percent of faculty with more than five years of service. Similarly, 64 percent of faculty with less than five years of service at AASU see the current governance structure as allowing reasonable and appropriate opportunities for faculty participation compared to 46 percent of faculty respondents with five to ten years of service and 35 percent of faculty who have been at AASU over ten years. These figures are shown in the following table
**Significant Differences* in Responses by Length of Service at AASU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>&lt; 5 years</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>5-10 years</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>11-&gt; 20 years</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The faculty has an effective role in governance at AASU.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university’s central administration fosters a climate that supports faculty governance.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASU has established an effective mechanism that ensures a faculty voice in all matters pertaining to academic programs.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current governance structure allows for reasonable and appropriate opportunities for faculty to participate in institutional governance and decision making.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05

Full-time faculty who responded to the survey also differed significantly in responses to two questions according to their position. Full-time faculty who are also department heads and other administrators are significantly less likely (p<.05) to see the structure of the standing committees of the faculty and university as effective compared to full-time faculty who are not in administrative positions. In fact, only five of the 20 department heads and administrators see the structure of faculty standing committees as effective. Well over half of the full-time faculty respondents see the structure of standing committees of the faculty (60%) and university (62%) as effective. Figures are shown in the following table.
### Perceptions of Effectiveness of Standing Committees by Position at AASU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Administrator/Dept. Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current structure of the Standing</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees of the Faculty is effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current structure of Standing</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees of the University is effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While differences in responses to the second question concerning whether a different governance structure is needed at AASU were not significantly different across various groups, it is informative, nonetheless, to look at these responses by rank. Full professors were more likely to "strongly agree" with this statement, and their responses were significantly different (p=.04) when compared to a combined category of all other ranks. A majority of full professors (85%) agree that a different governance structure is needed compared to 63 percent of associate professors, 73 percent of assistant professors, and two-thirds of instructors. The next table shows the breakdown of all four response categories by rank.
Item: “The faculty needs a different governance structure (such as a faculty senate) in order to represent itself more effectively within the university.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Full professor</th>
<th>Associate professor</th>
<th>Assistant professor</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
Comments in favor of changing the structure of faculty governance

- Although I have long favored our current system of faculty governance, it may be time for a change. From my perspective, the current culture of the Armstrong faculty is largely disinterested in governance issues. This detachment may be the result of the current emphasis on scholarship as a route to tenure and promotion; and it also reflects the climate of most graduate schools and their influence on our new and recent hires. This faculty disinterest finds a parallel at the administrative level, which also seems inclined to the efficiency of administrative decision-making without cultivating faculty involvement. The library-expansion-renovation would be a good example of an issue that should arouse the energy of faculty and administrators alike, yet somehow it has fallen flat. Alas, the library committee has not seemed to be able to be effective on this issue either. Where is the campus outrage on the subject of our library?! I applaud the current Executive committee's 'charge' to several committees of the faculty to pursue specific issues. My experience has been that many faculty committees suffer from disinterested members and a few faithful stalwarts, who deserve our rich appreciation. The current practice of electronic year-end reports may be efficient, but it eliminates any effective public accountability. Does anybody read the reports? Does anybody know what these committees do or do not do?

Committee service does not connect well with the rewards system of the University, and in many instances it is not deserving of rewards because it is simply an item to be added to an APAR without any real meaning behind it. Some committees seem to work hard and well: the curriculum committee obviously processes a lot of business! Admissions and Advisement deal with serious issues. Bottom line: maybe it is time for a Faculty Senate, with open meetings and a clearly announced, detailed agenda. Thanks for asking.

- Current governance structures & processes foster too much institutional inertia on many issues. The democratic approach to governance has become too unwieldy as AASU has grown. Would strongly support looking at developing a faculty senate as an alternative.

- I like the nearly full faculty involvement of current faculty meetings. But, we a (sic) very near a critical mass where we need to go to some type of representative governance. The risk is that a large portion of the faculty will become uninvolved. You could do something like faculty senate with short term limits.

- The faculty voices will be heard best through a faculty senate. How can all faculty especially non-tenured faculty be free to speak out in front of administrators who are running faculty meetings?
Joyce:
In view of stresses created by budget shortfalls and enrollment windfalls, I believe we have remarkably robust communications between administration and faculty. However, I believe that our faculty has grown to that point that we should replace “whole-university” faculty meetings with a faculty senate designed to reflect the strengths of our current governance structure while addressing weaknesses.

Ed Wheeler

- We need a faculty senate. The quality of faculty meetings is at an all-time low. Thanks for trying to fix this severe problem.
- Senate like CA.
- I believe that Armstrong needs to develop a stronger voice for the faculty such as may be obtained through a Faculty Senate, or a similar structure.
- I am more used to a faculty senate as part of governance structure.
- The university has grown and needs to give serious consideration to establishing a Faculty and Staff Senate. The senate will make recommendations regarding all university policies or changes in existing policies concerning all issues that are of general university interest as distinguished from BOR policies and procedures; make recommendations to the President and President’s Cabinet; serve as the primary forum for the other university committees; Act as a forum for other university committees regarding matters of general interest to university community; Reaffirm or reconsider decisions made by other standing committees when asked by the President; sponsor organized discussions of issues; membership will be elected and have representatives from full-time faculty, administrative faculty, staff and students— who serve two year terms.
- I believe the current governance system probably worked well when Armstrong was much smaller, but a faculty senate would better serve the university and its faculty with our large numbers,
APPENDIX E
Comments that are opposed to changing the structure of faculty governance

➢ I do not support a Faculty Senate at this time. We are still small enough to have a "committee of the whole" in which each faculty member has a full & equal vote. We may not utilize our governance structure to its fullest extent, but the mechanism in place allows us to do so.

➢ I am frustrated enough by the poor relations between faculty and administrators on issues of governance, (particularly in the past 3-4 years), but no one has explained to me how or why a senate system would be more effective. Proponents of the model should make their case.

➢ SACS was impressed at our culture and communication. Please don’t mess with the current system that is working so well!!!

➢ Given the current economic problems facing higher education nationwide, I feel our current governance approach is as good as could be expected—faculty can’t be involved in all budgetary issues impacting the university.

➢ You can and should (try to) improve faculty involvement in governance. You cannot make the faculty care about it; however. (sic) Apathy on the part of the faculty is the biggest problem...or perhaps it is fear. The current regime, I mean administration, certainly fosters an atmosphere of apprehension. And what’s with this “roll taking” at faculty meetings?

➢ The problem is not so much the structure, but with the participation and effective use of the current structure. Creating a faculty senate will have no beneficial effect if faculty are unwilling to participate in a meaningful manner and accept responsibility for engaging in constructive committee work. At the same time, administrators must encourage, recognize, and reward faculty effort expended on committee work. The same 12 people who serve on Executive Committee being elected to a Senate are still only 12 people. They cannot do the work of 200.

➢ I am really quite ambivalent about the need for a faculty senate rather than the old way of the faculty meeting as a whole. It may be that faculty has become so large that a faculty senate would make sense, although the executive committee now serves somewhat in the role of a faculty representative body. However, I have no confidence in the present administration as regards faculty governance. I don’t think they really understand the concept of faculty governance, particularly as it has been practiced in the past at AASU. These is little communication from the administration, and even less leadership. It seems that faculty governance is
considered something to which lip service must be paid, but is otherwise ignored. Committees, particularly university committees, appear to be stacked to produce desire results. As long as the present administration remains and continues with these practices, I don’t think it is worth the time or effort to revamp the faculty governance structure since any structure will be ignored and ineffectual.
APPENDIX F
Other comments

➢ The problem with faculty governance is not its structure. The problem is that the current administration prefers to make its decisions without the nuisance of independent or opposing opinions. They are the administration, after all, and they know best. The VP of academic affairs is in a position to at least moderate this tendency in the administration, but he appears to operate in the same top-down mode. He has made it plain that dissent is not only unwelcome, but actually injurious to the university.

➢ If the administration is not better prepared to listen—really listen—to what the faculty needs in the way of support how can the Task Force hope to succeed? If we were to institute a policy in which the minimum preparation for admission was the ability to read, write, and spell at the 6th grade level, we could vastly improve classroom conditions. I am not being ironic—it’s depressing to have 1/3 to 1/2 of a survey class that cannot take notes, don’t read anything and cannot think its way through a 1 paragraph essay questions.

➢ Humanities receive short shrift while the technical programs take precedence in our “vision.” We are turning into a vtech school and should change our name to reflect our current status. I also believe that semester conversion has created several hurdles for our students that quarters alleviated. First, under quarters they took fewer classes to maintain a full load. Second, they had more contact hours per course. Finally, with class everyday they had better retention. Please suggest reverting to quarters to ensure better learning because the technical students we get in humanities are not prepared for college level work that involves writing and critical thought.

➢ Since I have been at AASU, the same faculty are always involved in the decision making process. I agree that we need seasoned viewpoints, but we need to have an array of different opinions. If a Senate is voted in, please find ways to get a solid mixture of faculty across, colleges and schools. If we continue with the same structure, please find ways to make some of the committees more effective and relevant. Maybe we need different committees.

➢ The survey should have been a 5 point rubric on many questions I would have liked to have a neutral opinion.

➢ This survey is missing any reference to the budget. If budget does not become more transparent and if faculty has no voice in the allocation of resources, then faculty governance of any type will mean very little. What does “professionally supportive” mean without financial support?
Unable to accurately respond to questions. Only part-time with no involvement with faculty governance.

As a new faculty member, I don’t believe I have enough knowledge to answer you survey accurately. I do know that I enjoy the cooperative and supportive atmosphere among faculty here at AASU.

Although I may have stated I “disagree” to many of the questions in section II, I do understand universities are a business. As more universities adopt a business model—corporation—the less faculty will have governance. I don’t see this as a problem. What I do see as a problem is the “waffling” of messages sent by some in administration.

A new VP would help.

I believe the VP and Dean of Faculty is more than just ineffective. I feel he is a racist and is anti-faculty governance.

I’ve only been here a few months & everything seems to be fine, maybe this time next year I will have a different opinion. Everything has been effective so far.

As all universities I have worked at there are too many committees. Many rarely meet and don’t serve much purpose. Curriculum issues should terminate with the UCC. The vote by full faculty is a waste of time and is not done at any other university I have worked at.

$ allocation from the top down needs F.time faculty input. The Executive Committee needs to be introduced to the faculty each year at orientation. Please organize a web cite (sic) and in box contact for the Executive Committee for ready contact from all faculty.

I suppose the faculty has a voice through the Executive Committee. The general faculty meetings are more like a rubber stamping politburo than an actual body that does business.

Governance is always related to faculty willingness to be active participants.

If you had a column for neutral, I would have chosen it for several questions.

Because I am only teaching one class and have been at the college only a couple of years, I really do not know how to respond, except to say I do not have enough information to answer appropriately.

Need to consider departmental enrollment as you determine faculty representation in governance. Nursing has nearly 1000 students (in both core/last 2 yrs) and has little representation in governance, but we keep the rest of the campus “in business” with our enrollment.