

**Armstrong State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of November 17, 2014
Student Union, Ballroom A, 3:00 p.m.**

- I. Senate President Desnoyers-Colas called the meeting to order at **3:01** p.m. (see Appendix A).
- II. Senate Action
 - A. Approval of Minutes from [October 20, 2014](#) Faculty Senate Meeting
 1. APPROVED without corrections.
 - B. Brief remarks from Dr. Linda Bleicken, President
 1. Dr. Bleicken was unable to attend the Faculty Senate meeting due to scheduled meetings with Provost/VPAA candidates.
 2. Dr. Donna Brooks spoke briefly in her stead regarding advisement and registration.
 - i. As Dr. Ward mentioned previously, the returning rate of students who have registered for Spring is up for both undergraduate and graduate students.
 - ii. Dr. Brooks called for improving the retention of returning students.
 - iii. She also stated that the University is now moving into recruitment season for the freshman class.
 - C. Old Business
 1. Outcome of Bills/Resolutions
 - i. [FSB 2014-05-12-01](#) Institutional Accountability, Transparency and Communication
 - a. Joint Leadership Team summary October 28
 - i. This is a new item that Dr. Desnoyers-Colas requested be disseminated on an ongoing basis. The Joint Leadership Team (JLT) is a meeting the Armstrong President holds once per month with all vice presidents, deans, the president and vice president of the Faculty Senate and the Staff Council, and the president of the SGA.
 - ii. A request was made for more details to be included in the JLT summary. However, the summary itself will remain a summary, but if at any time there are further questions, these may be submitted to the Senate Leadership to pass to the JLT.
 - iii. Some current questions will be answered via Robert Howard's presentation regarding consulting fees over the \$25,000 limit.
 - b. Question: Regarding Item 2 in the original bill ("by the end of fall 2014, a three-year plan will be developed and implemented with the target of attaining an average faculty salary of 100% of the CUPA average"), how this is coming along? Please provide an update on progress. Answer: Drs. Cliff Padgett and

Wendy Wolfe are serving on that task force, which has met one time. Rebecca Carroll, the co-chair, states that the committee is aware of the Senate bill and is planning to fulfill the request on time. The committee is following up with Phillip Blount and Associates, which was used for the salary study, and she feels “very confident” about the intention to meet the bill’s deadline.

- c. A question was raised regarding the status of Item 5 (“a consulting services plan for the upcoming academic year ... be presented to the PBF Committee in the fall”). Answer: This is included in the PBF minutes for [October 13, 2014](#). This is intended to be presented to the PBF Committee (and included in its minutes) every year.
- d. Faculty Personnel Requests 10.29.14
- e. Staff Personnel Requests 10.29.14

2. Other Old Business

- i. None raised.

D. New Business

1. Committee Reports

i. University Curriculum Committee

a. Meeting Minutes and Curriculum Changes

i. Old Items

- 1. A motion was made and seconded to approve the revised three items that had been sent back to the UCC in the previous Faculty Senate meeting.
- 2. No discussion. APPROVED with one opposed.

ii. New Items

- 1. COE-AAE: no discussion, APPROVED.
- 2. COE-CESE: no discussion, APPROVED.
- 3. CHP-DDTS:
 - i. Question re: page 8 and the “Note: RADS courses are not being deleted from the Bridge and Special Options curricula in the degree.” Later, the UCC minutes calls for deletion of RADS course 3060 but this still exists on page 116 of the University catalog. Answer from Dr. Brooks: They have changed the prefix. They are renaming it.
 - ii. Question: The degree lines need to be changed to RDSC instead of RADS (otherwise it will be subtracted from the other tracks). Answer from Dr.

- Winterhalter: The same number cannot be reused.
- iii. Friendly suggestion: Change the course number in the catalog on page 115.
Answer from Dr. Streater: Remand Item 1.
 - iv. Motion to remand Item 1 and Items 2–50 forward. Seconded, no further discussion. APPROVED.
4. CHP-RS: This item did not pass though UCC. No vote needed by the Faculty Senate.
5. CLA-CJSPS:
- i. Question re: the rationale of Item 1C CRJU 5010U/G Digital Forensics I on page 35: What is the reference to the online program? Answer: The grad certificate program is 100% online, but many military students have to have a percentage of seated courses. There will be enough courses to have the graduate program fully online.
 - ii. APPROVED.
6. CLA-History:
- i. Question re: the minor and certificate: Are all the EURO courses offered online? Is the minor theoretically online? Additionally, concern was raised with the trend of heavily online programs, as there will be less incentive to commit to permanent faculty lines. Answer from Dr. Winterhalter: EURO 2000 is not offered online, but some of the other participating institutions might do so. Each of the institutions also offers seated sections. However, she states that she too shares this concern.
 - ii. Question: We can use different venues to raise this concern, but what can we do about it? Response: We can start to refuse online courses and online programs.
 - iii. Question: How many of our faculty teach some of these online courses? Answer from Dr. Winterhalter: A lot.

- iv. Question: Why haven't we leveraged getting more people teaching them? Doesn't mean getting a commitment to more full-line faculty? Answer from Dr. Winterhalter: The EU certificate in the last 10 years has had 6 students; therefore, there is no way we will get people to teach this. We attempt to offer students with this specific interest an opportunity. While this observation is valid, this concern does not apply here. Response from Senator: Not now, but eventually. Answer from Dr. Winterhalter: This program has been here for 10 years and these changes are to offer consistency. This doesn't change what it has been in essence
 - v. Dr. Desnoyers-Colas stated she will put together an ad hoc committee to discuss these types of concerns, with people on the committee willing to commit time to this issue and offer viable solutions. She called for nominations for those interested in working on this ad hoc committee.
 - vi. APPROVED with two opposed.
 - 7. CLA-LLP: no discussion, APPROVED.
 - 8. CST-Chem/Phys: no discussion, APPROVED.
 - 9. CST-CSIT: information only; Items 3–9 and Items 11 and 12 are for Senate Faculty consideration: no discussion, APPROVED.
- ii. Governance Committee
 - a. A charge is coming from the Senate Leadership to make corrections in the Faculty Senate Constitution to conform with prior approved Senate and University changes.
 - b. Re: the PBF Committee, the current bylaws state that no students are on this committee. The Governance Committee will ensure sure that this was approved appropriately in a previous bill.
 - c. Other issues will be sent forth as charges to be voted on.
- iii. Academic Standards
 - a. No report.
- iv. Education Technology
 - a. No report.
- v. Faculty Welfare

- a. The FW Committee is gathering documentation on SmartEvals from the eFACE review committee and a SmartEvals representative re: the issue of how “signed comments” are being handled in the new system. The contract provided by SmartEvals did not contain that issue.
 - i. For an overview of the issue and questions raised about “signed” vs. “unsigned” comments in SmartEvals, see FW minutes from [October 14, 2014](#) and [November 10, 2014](#). Currently, there is no anonymous sharing beyond the instructor.
 - ii. Question: Why do we require students to sign their names to have their comments move beyond the level of the instructor? Concern was raised that students will not make comments if they have to sign their names. Other institutions don’t do this. Answer: There has been concern that the types of anonymous comments passed on to chairs and deans are not germane to the teaching of or helping the professor improve the course. Response: We are intelligent enough to determine the student who is on a rant versus someone making real comments. Answer: A student with serious concerns always has the choice to meet with a department chair. Response: Students might not be willing to do that. This fear is valid. A lot of people with regard to administrative evaluations don’t add comments because we are afraid.
 - iii. Comment from Dr. Wolfe: There was a lot of discussion about this issue in the eFACE committee and in the Senate, and all of these issues were raised in both venues and via private e-mails. We’re changing a lot about how we’re doing the evaluations. If this is the sticking point, let’s keep that consistent and come back to it.
- b. Update on charge to determine the percentage of instructors at Armstrong: 3.8% instructors (lecturers), filtering for administrative positions. A less conservative estimate increases this number to 17.6%, although this is still below the 20% cap.
 - i. Question: Are there still instructors who aren’t lecturers? Answer: Yes. All together lecturers + instructors = 17.6% of total full-time faculty.
 - ii. Question: How many individuals is the 17.6%? Answer: The committee does not know this information offhand but will follow-up on it.

- iii. Question: Does this include people who have the title of assistant professor but who are actually instructors?
Answer: That was the previous promotion line, and there is doubt that they would be counted now. At this point, they are listed as assistant professors.

vi. Planning, Budget, and Facilities

- a. PBF minutes for [October 13, 2014](#) are posted on the Faculty Senate website.
 - i. Of note is one large consultant fee. Senators should review this and discuss it further in the Senate.
- b. Question re: plans for the new CHP building: Where it would be? Are there any plans for the land in front of Victor Hall?
Answer: One of the original plans for a new CHP building called for placing it there, but this would entail erecting an entirely new building. Thus, the plan was revised to revamp Ashmore Hall with an adjoining building to attach to Ashmore.
- c. Question: Was there an agreement that Plantonics would have a structure in the area in front of Victor Hall? Answer from Rebecca Carroll: We are waiting on the approval of the Governor's budget for the CHP building. A feasibility study was done, and right now Ashmore is the location being proposed. We are still in the very early stages of that. There is no discussion at this point of developing anything on the parcel in front of Victor Hall. A new vice president will be in place in January/February; however, in the interim, she will take this concern back to the President and the Provost.
Question: Has the Plantonics facility been moved? Answer from Rebecca Carroll: She is not aware if anything has been finalized. This was a place being discussed. Answer from Dr. Feske: This is a somewhat temporary structure that can be moved. The collaboration with Plantonics involves funding through an external agency to build a sustainable vegetarianism and aquaponics complex on campus and connect this to student and faculty research. Aquaponics is the growing of plants in water; a closed system where the plants provide the oxygen and the fish waste provide nutrients.
- d. Answer from Dr. Wong: There is a groundbreaking and signing of the MOU this Friday. Question: Was this groundbreaking on the calendar? Answer from Dr. Wong: It is in the works right now. We just finalized it last week.
- e. Question: We are cutting an agreement with this private company. Long-term if they make a bunch of money, is Armstrong a partner? Will we benefit in the long-term?
Answer from Dr. Wong: There are short-term benefits include many student and faculty collaborations and research. Faculty

hopefully will find external grant money to bring to Armstrong. If the founder of Plantonics develops technology, he and his benefactors can market this and they will profit from it.

Question: Is there a clear description between what we work on and what they work on? Long-term is this a case of a company coming in and picking off reduced labor cost? Who owns that research? Answer from Dr. Feske: Faculty and Lee Davis went over this many times and he believes that we would own that research.

- f. Question: Can we more fully inform the faculty on this in lay people's terms, even though it is already done? Answer from Dr. Wong: She will send out an e-mail with an attached description and provide a link to a video provided by the founder that explains his broader vision.

vii. Student Success

- a. The committee is working on a bill re: online offerings.

2. Armstrong IT improvement timeline (Robert Howard)

- i. Robert Howard provided an overview of accomplishments during his three years at Armstrong, including:
 - a. Introduction of Port
 - b. Wired and Wireless Internet
 - c. Move from Novell to Active Directory
 - d. Move from WebCT to Desire2Learn
- ii. Improvements have been made in Banner re: the streamlining and reduction in delays of assessments and admission decisions; automated calculations of admissions materials (e.g., SAT scores) are now being made.
 - a. Automatic decisioning is coming, so that they don't have to review students' files and human time can be spent on the borderline applications.
 - b. Also Banner will automate fees.
- iii. The Financial Aid process has been improved: Now it is electronic and students get funds much quicker.
- iv. "Pain points" that are being addressed:
 - a. ITS black hole
 - i. As of December, he is getting a list of all open tickets and will build follow-up into practice.
 - ii. The HelpDesk will be getting full-time staff members, one person dedicated and one person roving, along with the current students. They also will hold people accountable for quality standards.
 - iii. The HelpDesk also will be instituting a new call system.
 - b. Online directories out of error
 - i. As of today, the online directory process is improved. Now the possibility of being out of error is virtually zero.

They are also training staff members who make departmental updates.

- c. Classroom technology needing upkeep
 - i. In December, UH156 will be redone.
 - ii. Question: UH157 and UH158 get used more but have the same antiquated technology. Answer from Robert Howard: They will look at this. In March there will be a classroom plan and a committee is looking at this. We will be creating a master plan and a schedule. The next major improvements would occur over Spring Break.
- d. Banner advisement reporting
- e. New computer deployment: They were doing some very poor planning, such as purchasing new computers with end-of-year money, thus making new computers coming very late (e.g., employees notified in April but not receiving computers until October).
 - i. They bought about 120–150 computers last year. This year, they will pre-spend end-of-year money in December and try to avoid the massive problem in the fall.
- f. Port update: E.g., when Google made updates, there were problems with Port. ITS is working on decoupling things like D2L and Port.
- g. Expanding more wifi on campus.
 - i. Streamlining wireless access in residence hall, for parents in Navigate and for conferences.
- h. Website on Amazon: They will be putting the main website on Amazon Cloud.
 - i. Amazon Cloud structure also will provide students and Faculty with space. Question: Will this interfere with our Google? Answer: No.
- i. eFaxes (a fax server) will replace fax machines. Question: A lot of students still come to the Library to fax financial aid and other things. Will this go away? Answer: This will be a new feature and functionality and it is being rolled out. The one for the students will be safe and sound and hopefully they will teach the students eFaxing.
- j. Change of major: As of February, students will be able to log in one time and be able to do that.
- k. Posted on their website, as of February, they will have metrics for what they think services will require to get it done. This will include real-time data to show whether they are meeting it. If not, they will implement quality improvements.
- l. Students will be able to check out laptops and software.

- m. In April, the first annual client services satisfaction survey will be sent to faculty, staff, and students.
 - n. D2L/Banner integration: This is a big deal; they would have liked to have this done by spring but that won't happen. This will be fixed by the summer semester.
 - o. It currently can take about one month for newly hired faculty and staff to get credentials and access to the system. IT is working with HR so that as soon as someone is hired this will be part of the welcome package (along with some training).
 - p. Question: What are the costs of this, and do some of these include consultants over \$25,000? Answer: ITS has three specific requests for consultants [though the PBF Committee minutes note that there are technically five ITS-related consultant requests here; and see below]: A database administrator left and ITS is currently using a temporary consultant. When they hire someone that will go away. Another involves helping to move Banner from Solaris to Red Hat. The Solaris platform is no longer supported. This is a one-time thing, until they decide that Red Hat is not supported. Another is to get Banner/D2L to talk to one another; this is a one-time issue as well. Finally, there is a large one; this is really a marketing project that has ITS involvement—the website redesign agreement for \$167,000. Elements include: Our students are craving more for mobile devices and our current website doesn't work well here (e.g., phones, tablets). The redesign includes a more responsive design so that the website renders appropriately. Marketing also is looking at SEO, so that we show up when people are looking for colleges. This was done through an RFP; the company selected was the second least expensive. Also needed in marketing, there is no good data on return for website and marketing to enrollment. Once the new systems are in place, ITS will be trained to be able to support it. Another \$25,000 is for Shannon James who is acting as a project consultant.
 - q. Question: There is only one person in ITS who does a specific job. Are there ways to cross-train ITS staff? Answer: We do not have a lot of bench depth in ITS. We're not unique. We have had some cross-training activities but have come up against institutional inertia. The database position was a failed search, with only one qualified candidate. We're having to think creatively. In looking where the University budget is, Banner is more business-oriented and related to workflow.
3. A motion was made to postpone the remainder of the agenda and move to executive session. This was seconded and approved.

- i. [Complete Executive Session minutes are redacted here. However, the bill that emerged from the executive session is considered public, as it must be sent to the President at this point.]
 - ii. FSB-2014-11-17-02: Armstrong State University's Title IX Policy (Appendix B)
 - a. The bill, based on national recommendations, requests that faculty be able to report aggregate data on sexual assaults while preserving a student's confidentiality should the student request it. This bill was created in response to the presentation at the August Faculty Senate meeting of the University's developing Title IX policy.
 - b. APPROVED, with one opposed.
 - 4. Emergency Planning Committee (Debra Hagerty)
 - 5. Other New Business
 - E. Senate Information
 - 1. Contact the Governance Committee at governance.senate@armstrong.edu.
 - 2. Send Committee meeting dates/minutes to faculty.senate@armstrong.edu.
 - F. Announcements
- III. Adjournment at **4:48 p.m.**

Minutes completed by:
Leigh E. Rich
Faculty Senate Secretary, 2014–2015

Appendices

- A. Attendance Sheet
- B. FSB-2014-11-17-02: Armstrong State University's Title IX Policy

Faculty Senators and Alternates for 2014–2015 (for Senate Meeting 11/17/2014)

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

Faculty Senate Bill: Armstrong State University's Title IX Policy

Whereas the Faculty Senate recognizes the importance of an Armstrong State University Title IX Policy;

Whereas the Faculty Senate agrees to encourage formal reporting via appropriate channels; and

Whereas we have concerns about whether the currently proposed policy fits with state and federal law, particularly when the BOR and the USG have no set public policy;

The Faculty Senate, based on national recommendations, requests the right to report aggregate data on sexual assault and retain student's confidentiality should student request it.