I. Senate President Desnoyers-Colas called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. (see Appendix A).

II. Senate Action

A. Approval of Minutes from January 26, 2015 Faculty Senate Meeting
   1. APPROVED with a request to add to the minutes that $1.2 million in funding was allocated in the budget for Liberty Center remediation issues.

B. Brief remarks from Dr. Linda Bleicken, President
   1. None (as she was unable to attend due to a scheduling conflict).

C. Old Business
   1. Outcome of Bills/Resolutions
      i. FSB_2014-05-12-01 Institutional Accountability, Transparency and Communication
         a. All items in this bill have been addressed or are in the process of being addressed. Question: Regarding the item requesting a list of consulting services of $25,000 or greater, have there been any that are cause for concern? Answer: These were entered into the record in the PBF Committee’s minutes, and PBF will do this once per year.
      b. Joint Leadership Team summary January 27
      c. Faculty Personnel Requests 1.27.15
      d. Staff Personnel Requests 1.27.15
         a. A request is being made to have the annual report from January 26 posted to the Business and Finance webpage at
            http://www.armstrong.edu/Departments/office_business_finance/business_office_welcome
            i. This is now available on the Business and Finance webpage.
            ii. The direct URL is:
         b. The Faculty Senate also will look to posting as much information as possible on its webpage to try to make pertinent information easily accessible for all Faculty.
   2. Other Old Business
      i. Update on the “Academic Resource Center” (ARC)
         a. The designers/architects visited campus and shared the basic design of the building as well as feedback from USG.
         b. Question: Is there a schematic of the design? Answer from Dr. David Ward, interim Provost: The University does have a
schematic, and we will provide a copy to the Faculty Senate (see Appendix B).

ii. Update on eCore (for the January 29 presentation, see https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Tg5fKB1DGIE)
   a. Following the presentation, a request was made to provide a copy of/link to the presentation. Doug Harrington disseminated this information, which includes numerical data and other details related to eCore.
   b. Currently, there are 16 schools affiliated; a handful of institutions (approximately five), including Armstrong, have not yet affiliated.
   c. A team from Armstrong attended an eCore training, including representatives from IT Services and Financial Aid, the Registrar, and Dr. Delana Gajdosik-Nivens, Associate Provost for Student Engagement and Success.
   d. There is a deadline for schools to make a decision regarding affiliation. Questions regarding affiliation that have been asked include: If Armstrong does affiliate, can the University later opt out? What would be the process to opting out? Does Armstrong have to be affiliated in the first place? What are the benefits of affiliation? The eCore presentation answers some of these questions. The process to opt out of affiliation later seems to be fairly easily: a Senate vote was the example we were given. Regarding benefits, Armstrong would get a certain percentage of the monies.
   e. The current number of eCore courses is 26. According to the presentation materials and other information, it is believed that the students who tend to sign up for an eCore class often are those who are unable to secure a space in the home university’s on-site course. There also may be a belief among some students that online courses are “easier,” and this may be a prompt. It doesn’t appear at present that we lose a lot of students to eCore courses, but if we were affiliated we might gain some students from other schools.
   f. Motion: Vote now regarding affiliation. Seconded.
      i. Discussion:
         1. The deadline to affiliate for the upcoming academic year is the end of February. Faculty Senate leadership planned to suggest that Senators be able to discuss this with their Departments and then have an electronic vote later this month.
         2. Comment: We should not engage in a vote until everyone has had a chance to review the video presentation and statistics.
3. Another comment advocated against eCore in general, likening any permanent or tenure-track Faculty member who supports eCore to bank tellers voting for ATMs. There is not enough information or data to understand the short-term effects, and the long-term effects will be tremendous. This should be given much thought. There is a great deal of weight to this analogy; this is a form of outsourcing. We need more time to consider this in greater depth. Motion: Postpone the vote.

4. A request was made that the e-mail from Doug Harrington be re-sent.

5. Comment: How many people went to the presentation? Not everyone. But not everyone could make it or had time afterward to look at the statistics.

6. Comment: My experience with online programming is just the opposite. We have more students and more Faculty because we are more accessible to students. It works both directions. I don’t buy the argument that this will affect Faculty in a negative way. At worst, it will be neutral and may even be positive.

7. Comment: If we’re talking about eCore, a decision not to affiliate will not change the fact that the courses will be available in SHIP and our students will be able to take them. It is a benefit, a financial benefit, if we affiliate. It is not going away. Deciding to affiliate means a decision about whether Faculty can participate and teach some of these courses.

8. Comment: But affiliation changes the relationship of this school to those teachers; it will decrease incentive for Administration here to hire more permanent and tenure-track Faculty. This requires more analysis. There will be a lot of part-time positions generated from this.

9. Comment: A lot of our money comes from tuition. If we don’t affiliate, and someone takes 6 hours, 100% of that money goes away. If we affiliate, we get, I believe, 40%, and if our Faculty member teaches it we get more. We
are taking money away from our University by not affiliating.

10. Question: The last two times we had an opportunity to consider eCore affiliation, it first went through review by the UCC. What role does the UCC have in this approval process? Answer from Dr. David Lake, current Chair of the UCC: At the previous times, we did not have a central body like the Senate and have not been asked by the Senate to review it. We will, if asked. But our governance structure is different. Comment: There was a Faculty Senate in place the last time.

11. Comment: eCore already is in existence; in effect, it already has been decided for us. We only have a small decision to make (i.e., whether to affiliate), but this still is an important vote. The question is: How do you want to take this on, especially regarding the money? There is a pressure pushing down from BOR, e.g., the deadline is the end of this month because the University Administration and Registrar have to complete certain tasks differently if we affiliate. If we don’t vote, they need to be prepared, so that this is not a factor. We should have a choice.

12. Comment: The word “choice” brings to mind student choice; it seems to be taking away choice from the students—though this will be there for the students regardless. I full-heartedly support student choice.

13. Comment: We have been offered a deal we can’t refuse. It’s coming. It is more how do we want to streamline the process for the students and staff.

14. Comment: Not all of us teach core classes and a lot are taught by part-timers and junior Faculty. We need to pay attention to how we generate revenue, however small a flow it may be.

15. Comment from Dr. Gajdosik-Nivens: If we are affiliated, regarding advisement, we are required to have an adviser who will know about eCore and the classes and what is offered and to walk us through registration. If
we are not an affiliate, we are not required to give students any guidance. When you are an affiliate, you are required to have that success piece on your campus. Question: Does this also affect how credits transfer? Answer from Dr. Gajdosik-Nivens: If we are not an affiliate, they are transfer credits.

16. Comment: I am not convinced that there is a real deadline. There will be continual pressure to affiliate. Answer from Dr. Gajdosik-Nivens: The deadline is for on-boarding for Fall 2015. Next year, there will be another opportunity.

ii. Motion to vote now regarding eCore: NOT APPROVED.

16. Comment: I am not convinced that there is a real deadline. There will be continual pressure to affiliate. Answer from Dr. Gajdosik-Nivens: The deadline is for on-boarding for Fall 2015. Next year, there will be another opportunity.

ii. Motion to vote now regarding eCore: NOT APPROVED.

g. Motion: Schedule an electronic vote between now and the next meeting; re-send the e-mail regarding eCore on Tuesday, February 17, call for votes starting Friday, February 20, and close the voting Wednesday, February 25, by 5 p.m. Seconded.

i. Discussion:

1. Comment: It feels like we have just had a cursory discussion, and I worry that we all will vote independently. Answer: We need to discuss this with our Departments.

2. Comment: It just seems very abrupt and haphazard. Answer: This has not been cursory. We have been talking about it since August, we requested that the Administration bring in someone to discuss the issue, which it did, and to send out a copy of the presentation and the very detailed e-mail from Doug Harrington. We have talked about it in here and had a heated discussion; the interim Provost also has discussed it. We have purposefully made sure that this information has gone out.

ii. Motion: APPROVED.

iii. Old Business (from the floor)

a. Question: Regarding Appendix B (from the January agenda and today’s agenda) and the Education Advisory Board (EAB), there is a committee in CST examining RPG and requested data from Institutional Research. Appendix B states that there will be a pilot this semester and a collaborative initiative in the Fall. EAB, in collaboration with other institutions, is looking at a very narrow focus, e.g., students in financial distress and how this affects grades. The studies are very narrow in nature. What are we looking for? Also, EAB and The
Advisory Board Company (its parent) just bought GradesFirst, so student grades will be a part of it. Answer from Dr. Ward: These reports are just white papers; they are not in fact data from the schools. These reports show how Georgia State used its data, and here’s how another used it. They are not showing the comprehensive data related to the institution itself. I think it is a good thing that EAB acquired GradesFirst, with regard to how well they integrate and feed each other. Now that the parent company owns both, I feel better. We have not committed the full $95,000 per year amount; what we have is a proof of concept contract. They will develop the system, they will train us, and then we have 60 days to decide whether we like it. If we don’t, we still have the data and the comprehensive report that we have paid for and can retain, but we don’t have to pay the membership. We have only committed to the analytics as to our students and their success pattern and how they navigate our measures.

b. Question: What data are we making available to them?
Answer from Dr. Ward: Banner grades and student data for the last seven years. They will have the ability to extract and talk to our Banner system.

c. Question: Will the 60-day period fall over the Summer?
Answer from Dr. Ward: The extraction is starting now; it will start immediately. It will be ready to test in the Fall. When I first discussed our decision to carry out a pilot in late Spring, that was the beginning of December, but we delayed. They would have started extracting then. The primary decision-makers in terms of users is really oriented initially for first- and second-year advisers and Department heads. That’s where the real value lies. It is less valuable to Faculty members with students/advisees at the junior and senior levels and already in their majors.

d. Question: Why are we taking on this on our own, when there is Complete College Georgia? UGA is huge, we are just 7,000 students. Answer from Dr. Ward: The whole point of student success—yes there are thematic things you can apply, basic approaches, but what you can’t do without knowing your own data is determine how particular students in our programs fare.

D. New Business

1. Committee Reports
   i. University Curriculum Committee
      a. Meeting Minutes and Curriculum Changes
         i. COE-SAPE:
             1. Items 1–7: no discussion, APPROVED.
             2. Items 13–16
i. Friendly amendment to the modification of the programs of study for the BSED (see Appendix C):
   a. These modified programs of study are presented as four separate tracks and were reviewed by the UCC; a single course example was inserted into the minutes. The impetus for the curricular changes is coming from the State of Georgia and ensuring that our secondary teachers will be much better qualified. Originally, there were specific courses spelled out, but we discovered that there were other prerequisites involved. Therefore, in an effort to make this more concise and to get this to the BOR, this is a friendly amendment to remove the specific course titles and make it general, and then in the Summer and working with the appropriate Departments we can identify specific courses.

   b. Question: You are duplicating a program of study from Math? Answer: We have met with the Chair of Math and with Dr. Jane Wong, interim Dean of CST. It is not a duplication. In Math it is a BS; this one is a BS in Education. Question: It is a non-science track? But aren’t the outcomes the same? Answer: This one you can start earlier at the MATH 1111 level. Question: How are you not still taking the same courses, just with different degree names? Answer: The Education course as opposed to the Math course would have lower-level math courses to begin with. Question: But it
doesn’t matter where you start. Answer: But they only have to take eight courses in the content area. We have worked with Dr. Jim Brawner, Chair of Math, and Dr. Wong. Right now we have a Middle Grades Math program with 15 hours in Math, that’s it. What the BOR and the USG have advised us to do is to change the Middle Grades Math to be an umbrella program with the other three tracks. Question: So they are aware of the duplication? Answer: Yes.

c. Question: Why are the upper-level courses only 3000 and 4000? Why not 5000? Answer: It is an undergraduate degree. Comment: These students can take 5000U courses. Answer: This is what the USG requires. I think they are amenable to 5000-level courses. We are amenable to working with Departments to determine what courses they think will be suitable. The BOR is mandating this; several schools are doing this and they want to look at it at the same time. We will be working with Departments and Department heads. This is just to get the framework in place.

d. Friendly Amendment: Can this be changed to 3000-level and above?

e. Answer from Dr. Charles Ruch, interim Dean of COE: There are three regulatory bodies that advise us. One is the DOE, which hires teachers. Second is the BOR, which grants degrees for teachers. Third is the licensing board. Would that they
would all speak together. We got this request to change this curriculum the day before. We were asked to have a plan back to the BOR by the end of this month. Their reasoning for that comes from the DOE stating that we have to do something about how we certify and train in the middle grades. The current situation and what we’re trying to phase out is a requirement that to teach in those middle schools you have to have two disciplines: Biology and Math, English and whatever. You take only a modest amount of courses in each discipline. You have to pass two tests. The Superintendents are saying that they’re not getting what they want in terms of teachers being able to deliver the content. The BOR said, “Here is a way to do it quickly: restructure the curriculum so that there is one track, one major.” There is a push against hiring people staying with the old format.

f. Question: You cannot say that about Math. Answer from Dr. Ruch: With all due respect, that’s what they told me, the Superintendents’ advice. We think that determining the courses that are taken in the discipline is not our decision; it’s yours. We’ll worry about the teacher education part. Either we sign off on this in February, they will package it and put it on the agenda for the BOR, or, if we miss that, then they will ask us to do it program by program next Fall. Teacher requirements in
Georgia changed January 1, and we are trying desperately to get caught up. We understand the Math issue, and we will work with the Department. That is what is driving this agenda.

g. Question: Later, these courses will be identified specifically? Answer from Dr. Ruch: Yes and identified by the Departments. Question: And come through the UCC process? Answer from Dr. Ruch: Yes. We could just pass it with the electives, but we would much rather work with the Departments and have your input into what courses the students have to take.

h. Summary: Being put forth in this friendly amendment are the four tracks as originally proposed to the UCC; we’re willing to change the 3000- and 4000-level requirement to 3000-level and above, and specific course selections will be done with the various Departments in late Spring and Summer. Then the full programs will go to the UCC in the Fall.

i. Comment: We need to state and reiterate for the record that this will go through the full process later.

j. Motion: Accept these four tracks that the UCC passed with the modification that the specific courses be removed and that “upper level courses (3000-4000)” be changed to “upper level courses (3000-level and above)” for all four tracks. Seconded. APPROVED.
1. Question: Why is this course only open to majors? Answer from Dr. Sandy Streater, interim Assistant Dean of CHP: They used the REHAB course as a mock-up, but it needs to be track-specific so that this course presents exactly what the track is about. I don’t foresee a student taking this if the student is not considering changing his or her major to this track.

2. APPROVED.

ii. Governance Committee
   a. Charge re: preparing for upcoming Senate elections
      i. The committee will meet next week to attend to the long list of charges.

iii. Academic Standards
   a. No report.

iv. Education Technology
   a. The committee will meet sometime this week.

v. Faculty Welfare
   a. The committee has submitted reports.
   b. An educational session will be held this semester on domestic partner benefits, purely informational at this time. The committee will update the Faculty Senate on the date(s) of these sessions.
   c. Status update on joint appointments
      i. The committee is working on this.
   d. Charge re: post-tenure review process
      i. The Faculty Senate would like to add a bit of a financial incentive and is asking the Faculty Welfare Committee to find out what other USG institutions are doing to see if we can offer this to our Faculty members.

vi. Planning, Budget, and Facilities
   a. No report. The committee will meet again in March.

vii. Student Success
   a. No report. The committee will meet in late February.

2. Other New Business
   i. Academic bullying/hazing suggestion for the Grievance Committee
      a. Faculty Senate President Desnoyers-Colas is writing a bill for next month that covers a campaign promise with junior Faculty in mind to try to append Grievance Committee policy to include jurisdiction of cases or charges or complaints of academic bullying or hazing. Some people might think this is a rite of passage. Although we are known as being pretty collegial, there are instances that have stretched the boundaries and are not covered under other policies. This can be very
demoralizing and we can lose great scholars because of it. This has been discussed initially with the President and the Provost.

ii. Senate decorum
   a. Comments from Faculty Senate President Desnoyers-Colas:
      After last month’s meeting, I would like to be candid and address this topic. I enjoy serving, including serving on the Senate and representing the Faculty and the process that we have, especially compared with the previous format. We didn’t vote on a lot of substantive things. I believe that my job, in part, is to finish what prior Senate Leadership have started. We have gotten through these bills. But there is a lack of respectability of this assembly. I initially wanted to have students and the SGA shadow us as examples of leadership. But after watching sleeping, grading papers, loud conversations, standing in the gallery when not a part of the Senate process, all of the egregious things we tell our students not to do, we do in this assembly. One way of having effective communication is to try to do our business as efficiently as possible. We are here from 3–5 p.m., unless you have a class. We have to hold the Administration’s feet to the fire; we want to get involved in the budget; there is a master plan that has not been updated since 2009. But it is difficult to do that if we don’t give each other the respect we deserve as colleagues. We need to use our time efficiently. There is also a belief that this Senate Leadership is too Administration-friendly. I show respect for an office. That doesn’t mean I am afraid of an office or won’t confront an office. I wasn’t elected to be rude to the Administration or colleagues. If you don’t respect the Administration or the Senate Leadership or even your colleagues, you should show respect for yourself. At the end of the day, you represent you and your Department. Let your alternate come, if you don’t want to be here. But we need to be efficient and we need to be respectful of each other. When you have a comment or question, please try to wait to be recognized, and if a point of order is needed, I will do that when we get out of control. The people in the gallery, you are guests. Not to be rude, but this [indicating the Senate seating] is where the business happens. We will ask you for clarification.
   b. Motion: Continue this discussion in Executive Session.
      i. [Complete Executive Session minutes are redacted here. However, a motion that emerged during the Executive Session is reported below.]
ii. Motion: Regularly schedule an Executive Session at the beginning of Senate meetings. Seconded.

iii. Friendly Amendment: Limit the Executive Session to 30 minutes, from 3–3:30 p.m., but not begin other agenda items until 3:30 p.m.

iv. Friendly Amendment: Have Senate Leadership take a pulse of the President’s Cabinet about how they might feel about this.

v. Motion to call the question: APPROVED.

vi. Motion to regularly schedule Executive Sessions for up the first 30 minutes of Senate meetings: APPROVED.

iii. New Business (from the floor)
   a. Please send the Senate Leadership questions for the President for the upcoming Town Hall Meeting, and these will be forwarded.

E. Senate Information and Announcements
   1. Update on Dean’s search for the College of Education (Ela Kaye Eley)
      i. The announcement has been posted, and the committee has met for the first time. The committee will be reviewing applications the first week of March and screening will begin; dates have already been set for Skype interviews.
      ii. Currently, there is up to 20 applicants.

   2. A request was made to examine the upcoming Summer schedule, as there appears to be inconsistencies in the lengths of sessions.

   3. New Armstrong master plan
   4. Emergency Planning Committee update (Debra Hagerty)
   5. Classroom safety inventory
   6. Announcements (from the floor)
   7. Contact the Governance Committee at governance.senate@armstrong.edu.
   8. Send Committee meeting dates/minutes to faculty.senate@armstrong.edu.

III. Adjournment at 4:58 p.m.

Minutes completed by:

Leigh E. Rich
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2014–2015

Appendices
   A. Attendance Sheet
   B. Academic Resource Center (ARC) Schematic
   C. BSED Programs of Study Modifications (not including the additional friendly amendment)
## Faculty Senators and Alternates for 2014–2015 (Senate Meeting 02/16/2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th># Seats</th>
<th>Senator(s)/Term Year 2014/2015</th>
<th>Alternate(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adolescent and Adult Education</td>
<td>COE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kathleen Fabrikant (2)</td>
<td>Anthony Parish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ela Kaye Eley (2)</td>
<td>Brenda Logan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, Music and Theatre</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Carol Benton (1)</td>
<td>Emily Grundstad-Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deborah Jamieson (2)</td>
<td>Rachel Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Desnoyers-Colas (2)</td>
<td>Megan Baptiste-Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Traci Ness (3)</td>
<td>Sara Gremillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brett Larson (2)</td>
<td>Jennifer Broff-Bailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aaron Schrey (1)</td>
<td>Michael Cotronne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jennifer Zettler (1)</td>
<td>Scott Mateer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry and Physics</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Brandon Quillian (3)</td>
<td>Catherine MacGowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Donna Mullenax (1)</td>
<td>Lea Padgett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clifford Padgett (1)</td>
<td>Will Lynch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood and Exceptional Student Education</td>
<td>COE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Barbara Hubbard (3)</td>
<td>Beth Childress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anne Katz (2)</td>
<td>John Hobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science and Information Technology</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ashraf Saad (3)</td>
<td>Frank Katz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice, Social and Political Science</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Katherine Bennett (3)</td>
<td>Michael Donahue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Becky da Cruz (1)</td>
<td>Dennis Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic and Therapeutic Sciences</td>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shaunell McGee (2)</td>
<td>Pam Cartright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elwin Tilson (1)</td>
<td>Rhonda Bevis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nick Mangee (2)</td>
<td>Yassi Saadatmand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wayne Johnson (1)</td>
<td>Priya Goeser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leigh Rich (3)</td>
<td>Joey Crosby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Janet Buelow (2)</td>
<td>Rod McAdams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Hendricks (3)</td>
<td>Jim Todesca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Benjamin (1)</td>
<td>Allison Belzer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages, Literature and Philosophy</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bill Deaver (2)</td>
<td>Gracia Roldan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carol Andrews (1)</td>
<td>Nancy Remler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Rago (1)</td>
<td>Christy Mroczek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Erik Nordenhaug (3)</td>
<td>Jack Simmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Smith (1)</td>
<td>Dorothée Mertz-Weigel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>CLA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Melissa Jackson (3)</td>
<td>Ann Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aimee Reist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Michael Tiemeyer (3)</td>
<td>Greg Knofczynski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Hadavas (2)</td>
<td>Tim Ellis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Joshua Lambert (2)</td>
<td>Jared Schlieper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Deb Hagerty (3)</td>
<td>Carole Massey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Blackwell (3)</td>
<td>Luz Quirimit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jeff Harris (2)</td>
<td>Jill Beckworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>CST</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wendy Wolfe (1)</td>
<td>Mirari Elcoro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Sciences</td>
<td>CHP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>David Bringman (3)</td>
<td>Nancy Wofford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maya Clark (1)</td>
<td>April Garrity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACADEMIC RESOURCE CENTER
FOR
ARMSTRONG STATE UNIVERSITY
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

CONCEPTUAL DESIGN
Create program of study for BSED in Secondary Education: English/Language Arts Teacher Education

AREA F ................................................................. 18 Hours

EDUC 2110 Critical and Contemporary Issues in Education 3
EDUC 2120 Exploring Socio-Cultural Perspectives of Diversity in Education 3
EDUC 2130 Exploring Learning and Teaching 3
See advisor for 9 hours of courses (1000-2000) level that support area of English concentration

Major Courses .......................................................... 36 hours
EDUC 3100 Technology Applications for Teachers 2
EDUC 3200 Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment 3
EDUC 3300 Educating Students with Disabilities in the Gen Ed Classroom 3
EDUC 3250 Educational Policy and Professional Standards for Teachers 2
SCED 3081 Student and Classroom Assessment 2
SCED 3400 Classroom Management Strategies 3
SCED 4200 Reading and Writing In the Content Areas 3
SCEDU 5300U Content Methods in Secondary English and Language Arts 3

SCED 3750 Internship I 3
SCED 4750 Internship II 12

Teaching Area Content Courses ..................................... 24 hours
See advisor for 24 hours of upper level courses (3000-4000) that support area of English concentration

First Year Seminar 1
Physical Education 3

124 hours
ii. Create program of study for BSED in Secondary Education: History Teacher Education

**AREA F**

EDUC 2110 Critical and Contemporary Issues in Education 3
EDUC 2120 Exploring Socio-Cultural Perspectives of Diversity in Education 3
EDUC 2130 Exploring Learning and Teaching 3
See advisor for 9 hours of courses (1000-2000) level that support area of History/Social Studies concentration

**Major Courses**

EDUC 3100 Technology Applications for Teachers 2
EDUC 3200 Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment 3
EDUC 3300 Educating Students with Disabilities in the Gen Ed Classroom 3
**EDUC 3250 Educational Policy and Professional Standards for Teachers** 2
SCED 3081 Student and Classroom Assessment 2
SCED 3400 Classroom Management Strategies 3
**SCED 4200 Instructional Approaches to Reading and Writing in the Content Areas** 3
SCED5400U Content Methods in Secondary History and Social Studies 3

SCED 3750 Internship I 3
SCED 4750 Internship II 12

**Teaching Area Content Courses**

See advisor for 24 hours of upper level courses (3000-4000) that support area of History/Social Studies concentration

**First Year Seminar** 1
Physical Education 3

124 hours
iii. Create program of study for BSED in Secondary Education: Science Teacher Education/ General Science Teacher Education

**AREA F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 2110 Critical and Contemporary Issues in Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 2120 Exploring Socio-Cultural Perspectives of Diversity in Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 2130 Exploring Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See advisor for 9 hours of courses (1000-2000) level that support area of Broad-field Science concentration*

**Major Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 3100 Technology Applications for Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 3200 Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 3300 Educating Students with Disabilities in the Gen Ed Classroom</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 3250 Educational Policy and Professional Standards for Teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCED 3081 Student and Classroom Assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCED 3400 Classroom Management Strategies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCED 4200 Reading and Writing in the Content Areas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCED5500U Content Methods in Secondary Science</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCED 3750 Internship I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCED 4750 Internship II</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching Area Content Courses**

*See advisor for 24 hours of upper level courses (3000-4000) that support area of Broad-field Science concentration*

**First Year Seminar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Hours:** 124
iv. Create program of study for BSED in Secondary Education: Mathematics Teacher Education

AREA F

EDUC 2110 Critical and Contemporary Issues in Education 3
EDUC 2120 Exploring Socio-Cultural Perspectives of Diversity in Education 3
EDUC 2130 Exploring Learning and Teaching 3

See advisor for 9 hours of courses (1000-2000) level that support area of Mathematics

Major Courses 36 hours

EDUC 3100 Technology Applications for Teachers 2
EDUC 3200 Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment 3
EDUC 3300 Educating Students with Disabilities in the Gen Ed Classroom 3
EDUC 3250 Educational Policy and Professional Standards for Teachers 2
SCED 3081 Student and Classroom Assessment 2
SCED 3400 Classroom Management Strategies 3
SCED 4200 Reading and Writing Across the Curriculum 3
SCED 5600U Content Methods in Secondary Mathematics 3

SCED 3750 Internship I 3
SCED 4750 Internship II 12

Teaching Area Content Courses 24 hours

See advisor for 24 hours of upper level courses (3000-4000) that support area of Mathematics concentration

First Year Seminar 1
Physical Education 3

124 hours