

Armstrong Atlantic State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of January 23, 2012
UH 157, 3:00 pm

- I.** Call to Order: Senate President LeFavi called the meeting to order at 3:05 pm (see **Appendix A** for attendance roster).
- II.** Senate Action
- A. Approval of Minutes from November 21, 2011, Faculty Senate Meeting (minutes available at: http://www.armstrong.edu/Departments/faculty_senate/senate_minutes). A motion was approved to accept the November minutes.
- B. University Curriculum Committee Items (January 11, 2012, minutes available at: http://www.armstrong.edu/Departments/faculty_senate/senate_minutes). All UCC items were approved without modification.
- C. Faculty Welfare Committee Items (**Appendix B**):
1. Resolution from Senate charge on eFace
 2. Bill from Senate charge on eFace
- Both the bill and resolution were approved without modification following a general Senate discussion regarding the problems faced by the university in administering the course evaluations online. The Faculty Welfare Committee commented on two difficulties with the current evaluations: (1) poor student response rates and (2) the complexity of the language utilized in the questionnaire. The latter has apparently resulted in confusion concerning exactly what is being assessed in certain questions. The general discussion emphasized the need for a change in campus culture in order to increase the quantity of student responses.
3. Report from Senate charge on Summer Schedule. The Faculty Welfare Committee provided its report on the viability of the summer schedule. The report was accepted with a minor adjustment to item 6 to read: “summer FY 2011 schedule.”

- D. Bill on Summer Teaching Assignments (**Appendix C**). Dr. LeFavi introduced the bill, indicating that its intention was to provide full-time faculty with the right of first refusal when courses are offered in summer. Its focus was neither to determine course offerings nor to address faculty compensation. Following a discussion about such matters as the USG's current classification system of part-time and adjunct faculty, the potential for the bill to hamper departmental attempts to meet financial expectations, and the importance of demanding policy changes to existing practices, the bill was approved with one amendment: the designation of "part-time faculty" was chosen as the appropriate classification to be used at the end of the bill.
- E. Resolution on Faculty Activity/Planning Period (**Appendix D**). Following Dr. Mateer's introduction of the resolution, a motion was approved to accept it without modification.
- F. Bill on Presidential Approval of Philosophy Major (**Appendix E**). Dr. Erney presented a motion from the Department of Language, Literature & Philosophy, which the Senate approved as a bill in response to its previous bill on undergraduate curricular items (FSB 052.11/12). Prior to the vote the Senate considered the viability of the bill and asked President Bleicken to comment. She indicated that she would consider the bill and clarified that the BOR has encouraged universities to scrutinize current programs before sending forward new proposals.

III. Senate Information

- A. Charge to Planning, Budget, and Facilities Committee on financial issues discussed Fall 2011. Both faculty and the administration noted that a positive exchange between the Planning, Budget, and Facilities Committee and its Ex Officio members had occurred following a failed initial attempt. The committee noted that a report from the meeting was forthcoming, and that an additional meeting was planned.
- B. Update on FSB 051.11/12: Graduate Assistant Allocations. Speaking on behalf of the office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs, Dr. Kraft explained that the office would like the new provost to consider the matter when he arrives on campus later in the year, but that current university practices have generally fallen in line with the measures proposed in the bill. While President Bleicken added that she could not

respond to the bill prior to adequate consideration by Academic Affairs, Dr. LeFavi emphasized that she had not followed the established protocol by responding in writing within 30 days.

- C. Referral of FSB 054.11/12: Graduate Curriculum Committee Minutes (November 2, 2011) to President Bleicken (for the full GAC report from November 15, 2011, see: http://www.armstrong.edu/Departments/faculty_senate/senate_minutes). The referral of the bill was indicated without substantive comment.
- D. Charge to Constitution & Bylaws Committee to prepare policy on recalling senators. In light of the fact that departmental policies for removing senators have not been established as per Senate bylaws, the committee was tasked with addressing the matter.
- E. Update on Faculty Handbook. In his ongoing effort to solicit faculty feedback, Dr. Kraft was given the opportunity to hear additional comments from the Senate floor. Much of the discussion related to matters concerning the faculty ranking system and whether or not advisement will be categorized as teaching or service. Dr. Kraft indicated that he would speak with the VPAA about the latter and that during his time in the office, no faculty members have been demoted in rank.

IV. Announcements. Announcements were made regarding forthcoming Senate elections, a university blood drive, and the February deadline for the Governor's Teaching Fellows Program.

V. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 4:51 pm.

Respectfully submitted,



Jason R. Tatlock
Faculty Senate Secretary

Appendix A – Senate Attendance Roster

Dept.	Name	Present	Alt.	Present
AAED	Regina Rahimi		Rona Tyger	X
AAED	Ed Strauser	X	Lynn Long	
AAED	Ellen Whitford		Lynn Roberts	X
AMT	Angela Ryczkowski Horne	X	Randall Reese	
AMT	Stephen Primatic		Rachel Green	X
AMT	Pamela Sears	X	Deborah Jamieson	
BIO	Alex Collier	X	Sara Gremillion	
BIO	Austin Francis	X	Kathryn Craven	
BIO	Scott Mateer	X	Traci Ness	
CESE	Beth Childress	X	Glenda Ogletree	
CESE	Jackie Kim	X	Barbara Hubbard	
CHEM/PHYS	William Baird	X	Brent Feske	
CHEM/PHYS	Suzy Carpenter	X	Richard Wallace	
CHEM/PHYS	Clifford Padgett	X	Todd Hizer	
CJSPS	Ned Rinalducci	X	Dennis Murphy	
CJSPS	Michael Donohue	X	Alison Hatch	
CSDS	Maya Clark	X	April Garrity	
CSIT	Daniel Liang		Frank Katz	X
ECON	Jason Beck	X	Yassaman Saadatmand	
ENGR	Wayne Johnson	X	Priya Goeser	
HIST	June Hopkins	X	Chris Hendricks	
HIST	Jason Tatlock	X	Allison Belzer	
HSCI	Bob LeFavi	X	Rod McAdams	
HSCI	Bryan Riemann	X	Alice Adams	
LIB	Beth Burnett		Ann Fuller	X
LLP	Hans-Georg Erney	X	Monica Rausch	
LLP	Beth Howells	X	Richard Bryan	
LLP	Dorothee Mertz-Weigel	X	Carol Jamison	
LLP	Ana Torres		Edwin Richardson	X
MATH	Sungkon Chang	X	Tim Ellis	
MATH	Lorrie Hoffman	X	Jared Shlieper	X

MEDT	Charlotte Bates	X	Floyd Josephat	
NURS	Carole Massey	X	Amber Derksen	
NURS	Kathy Morris	X	Luzviminda Quirimit	
NURS	Gina Crabb	X		
PHTH	AndiBeth Mincer	X	George Davies	
PSYCH	Wendy Wolfe	X	Jane Wong	
RADS	Laurie Adams	X	Shaunell McGee	
RESP	Christine Moore	X	Rhonda Bevis	
	(Alphabetical Order)			
Ex Officio	Laura Barrett	X		
Ex Officio	Keith Betts	X		
Ex Officio	David Carson	X		
Ex Officio	Shelley Conroy			
Ex Officio	Bob Gregerson	X		
Ex Officio	Scott Joyner			
Ex Officio	John Kraft	X		
Ex Officio	Marcia Nance			
Ex Officio	Anne Thompson			
Ex Officio	Patricia Wachholz			
Guest	Linda Bleicken	X		
Guest	Patrick Thomas	X		
Guest	Joyce Bergin	X		
Guest	Patricia Holt	X		

Appendix B - Faculty Welfare Committee Items

1. Senate Resolution: Improving eFACE Response Rates

Background

The Faculty Welfare Committee reviewed the efficacy of eFACE as part of its charge from the Faculty Senate. The Committee met with representatives from ITS and Institutional Research to explore ways to increase the student response rate to the eFACE survey. In addition, the Committee solicited feedback from external colleagues regarding concerns with the language of the current eFACE questionnaire. In Spring 2011, Faculty Welfare collected data from 136 colleagues who participated in an eFACE survey and co-hosted a Faculty Forum on eFACE with the help of Faculty Development.

The Committee has compiled a list of recommendations in the following Resolution that if adopted, in part or completely, may improve the efficacy and response rate of eFACE. These recommendations are as follows:

1) Improve marketing of eFACE to students:

Rationale –The University should adopt a campus-wide campaign to promote student participation prior to and during the eFACE evaluation period. Consider use of Pop-ups through SHIP/Pirate’s Cove, flyers posted around campus, advertising evaluation period on website homepage, computer “Kiosk” stations at Student Union accompanied by other activities that tend to attract student participation (cookouts, movie nights, concerts, etc.). The administration should also work with faculty and encourage them to officially announce the start and close dates of the evaluation period to each of their classes. Faculty should also remind students that they do not receive the evaluation results until after final grades are submitted.

2) Involve SGA:

Rationale –It is critically important to recruit the Student Government Association to help communicate the importance of student participation in eFACE. Marketing eFACE without coordination through SGA is unacceptable. SGA should also investigate whether students would be more likely to take time to complete eFACE if student access to the eFACE data were made available to them. Georgia Tech provides data from course evaluations, but not the student comments, through their “Course Critique” system.

3) Establish an eFACE raffle:

Rationale –Students who submit their evaluations should be eligible for small prizes such as an ipad/ipod. This relatively small investment, may increase student participation (Originally suggested by the Faculty Evaluation Committee who studied the impending switch from paper to eFACE evaluations in 2006).

4) Purchase Class Climate software license:

Rationale – eFACE software does not provide real-time feedback regarding student response rate during the two-week evaluation period.

Class Climate is a cost-effective* evaluation system that supports online and paper evaluations and provides real-time feedback to faculty regarding anonymous student participation for each course.

*Purchase of Class Climate software was recommended by the former Interim VP of Enrollment and Management (cost estimate of approximately \$30,000 + maintenance fees)

5) Improve the eFACE questionnaire:

Rationale –There are legitimate concerns regarding the current eFACE questionnaire. Several of the questions ask for multiple responses and are poorly worded. The Vice president of Academic Affairs should assemble an Ad-hoc committee to revamp the current eFACE questionnaire. Faculty Welfare would recommend that changes to the questionnaire be modeled after external evaluation instruments such as the IDEA Center or SALG that focus primarily on the assessment of student learning gains.

The Ad-hoc committee could also better consider whether the University should switch entirely from eFACE and instead rely on an external evaluation service.

6) Provide survey access through SHIP/Banner or Vista instead of Pirates' Cove:

Rationale – Most students do not use Pirates' Cove. Many are not even aware of how to log in to their Cove accounts. Instead, they forward their Cove email to their personal email accounts, eliminating the need to go to Cove. Additionally, students have issues when they attempt to log in to Cove, if they have a personal Gmail account. Students' lack of familiarity with Cove seems to act as yet another deterrent to eFACE survey access. ITS should implement a survey mechanism that is accessible through SHIP/Banner (or Vista) rather than providing access through Pirates' Cove.

For example, Valdosta State & Georgia College and State University operate a survey that is overlaid on the Banner/Oracle system. Gainesville State uses SurveyDIG, also a Banner add-on application. These schools when last surveyed all had average response rates greater than 50% for their electronic course evaluations.)

7) Eliminate restrictions that limit student comments:

Rationale -The current Cove-based survey limits the length of comments and will not allow students to use contractions or other special characters or to tab. Faculty report that the constructive comments are valuable to them in making adjustments to their courses. A severe limit on comment length is not in line with maximizing the value of this feedback. ITS should implement a more robust survey system that will permit students to comment more fully and easily than is possible through the current Cove survey.

8) Develop an eFACE mobile application:

Rationale -Students always have their cell phones accessible, but do not always have time or think to complete eFACE while they are at a PC. ITS should explore the development of a mobile application to allow students to complete the eFACE survey on their smart phones.

9) Ensure all courses are accessible for eFACE:

Rationale -Many faculty report that students tell them their course was not listed as available for eFACE in Cove. The Deans and Department Head offices should implement a quality control mechanism to ensure that

all courses that should have been selected for evaluation are accessible online prior to the start of the evaluation period.

For these reasons, the Faculty Welfare Committee asks the Senate to approve the following Resolution to be forwarded to the president.

Resolution

Be it resolved that the Administration consider the adoption of any/all of the following recommendations to improve student participation in eFACE:

- 1) Adopt and implement a campus-wide marketing campaign
- 2) Coordinate marketing efforts through SGA to maximize results
- 3) Provide raffle prizes each semester for lucky participants
- 4) Purchase Class Climate Software license
- 5) Form an Ad-Hoc Committee to revamp the eFACE questionnaire
- 6) Request ITS to implement a survey mechanism that is accessible through SHIP/Banner (or Vista) rather than providing survey access through Pirates Cove.
- 7) Request ITS to implement a more robust survey system that will permit students to comment more fully and easily than is possible through the current, Cove survey.
- 8) Request ITS to develop a mobile application that would allow students to complete the eFACE survey on their smart phones.
- 9) Ask the Deans and Department Head offices to implement a quality control mechanism to ensure that all courses that should have been selected for evaluation were indeed selected for evaluation.

2. Faculty Senate Bill: Improving eFACE Response Rates

Whereas the faculty evaluation response rates have fallen precipitously since the transition from paper to electronic evaluations occurred in 2009, and only 16% of students completed eFACE in Fall 2010¹.

Whereas a survey conducted by the Faculty Welfare Committee in Spring 2010 revealed broad dissatisfaction with the current eFACE response rate. The majority of respondents felt too few students were completing the eFACE forms to provide useful information². The survey also revealed broad support for the adoption of a policy that would require students to either complete their eFACE evaluations or electronically “opt-out” before they would be allowed to view course grades and/or register for future classes through SHIP³.

Whereas the data collected from eFACE is used in evaluating faculty performance, which is tied to raise, promotion and tenure.

Be it resolved that the University adopt and implement a required popup in SHIP, in which the students must either complete eFACE or opt-out of eFACE before entering SHIP after the eFACE window has opened.

- 1) Office of Institutional Research University Response Rates: Summer 09 (20.53%); Fall 2009 (28.13%); Spring 2010 (22.26%); Summer 2010 (22.75%); Fall 2010 (16.31%)
- 2) Survey Question: Too few students are completing the FACE forms to provide useful information to my department head (88.9% Agree/Strongly Agree)
- 3) Survey Question: All students should be required to complete the eFACE evaluation or electronically "opt-out" before they are allowed to view course grades and/or register for future classes (70.1% A./S.A.)

eFACE Survey Respondents (n = 136)

3. Report from Faculty Welfare Committee

In response to a charge from the Faculty Senate to further analyze the efficacy of the present summer schedule, the Faculty Welfare Committee met with the Calendar Committee on October 12 and provides the following in the way of a report to the Senate.

The following information garnered at the Calendar Committee meeting is summarized below:

1. The current 5-5-10 schedule is set for summer 2012 and summer 2013. Although additional sessions could be added, it is very difficult to change because this information has been forwarded to USG and the federal government in order to meet financial aid needs of students;
2. The Office of Financial Aid needs approximately 18 months notice to implement any calendar change for students to obtain financial aid;
3. A 12-week summer schedule, or some combination thereof, will not work because the registrar's office cannot process grades in time for financial aid in the fall and registration for fall classes. Additionally, the 12-week schedule could mean that students would be taking finals from one summer session while already starting another summer session. Finally, if students drop classes, this creates a significant burden on the registrar's office because this task must be done manually;
4. Another issue related to summer scheduling pertains to students who receive Stafford Loans; they must enroll in a minimum of 6 credit hours;
5. The current 5-5-10 summer schedule allows for more student enrollment, which means more revenue;

6. The summer FY 2011 schedule (5-5-10) produced the first profitable summer in years;
7. The summer profits help to make up for the financial shortfalls of the fall semester.

The committee also notes that efforts will be underway by the Calendar Committee to gather more data relative to student success in the summer. Also, data will be collected from sister institutions to assess their summer schedules and student success.

Respectfully submitted this seventeenth day of November 2011.

Appendix C – Bill on Summer Teaching Assignments

We, duly elected senators of the faculty at Armstrong Atlantic State University, request the president put in place a policy whereby department heads, deans, and others similarly charged with assigning Summer Term courses offer those courses first to qualified full-time faculty prior to offering them to part-time faculty.

Appendix D – Resolution on Faculty Activity/Planning Period

Since the removal of the planning period, it has become increasingly difficult to schedule departmental and committee meetings that everyone can attend. In addition, the recent changes instituted by the registrar limiting the choices that department heads have in course scheduling has exacerbated the situation. (This situation may be made worse with the temporary closing of Gamble Hall.) While it is a good idea to maximize room usage, it is imperative that we maintain common planning/activity periods in order to carry out the required service activities of a properly functioning university. Therefore, we ask that the university create a 12-1pm planning period on MWF for the Fall and Spring terms to begin in the 2012 Fall semester. We understand that the VPAA has asked for voluntary compliance for Fall 2012 by all of the university's Deans and Department Heads. However, we would encourage the VPAA/Provost to make this mandatory when Gamble comes back online.

Appendix E – Bill on Philosophy B.A. Program

Regarding the rejection of the Philosophy B.A. Program proposed and approved by the faculty in the FACULTY SENATE BILL 052.11/12: UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE and NOT APPROVED by the President in the “presidential action” form.

Given that the president indicated that this is “not the optimal time” to be sending the Philosophy B.A. degree program to the Board of Regents based on a memo from the Board and given that no other explanations or rationales for rejecting the Philosophy Major Program were given, **we move that the President reconsider and approve the Philosophy B.A. Program proposal and hold it for forwarding to the Board of Regents later when the time is favorable.**

Rationale

No academic explanation was given for the rejection of the Philosophy proposal, only a memo from the V.P. and the Board of Regents was attached. The B.A. Philosophy Program clearly supports Armstrong’s currently stated mission. This suggests that the Philosophy B.A. Program Proposal which has been approved by the Faculty Senate and rejected by the president should be approved by the President and held on the President’s desk until the political climate for forwarding it up to the Board of Regents becomes less obstructive.