

**Armstrong State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of October 20, 2014
Student Union, Ballroom A, 3:00 p.m.**

- I. Senate President Desnoyers-Colas called the meeting to order at **3:03** p.m. (see Appendix A).
- II. Senate Action
 - A. Approval of Minutes from [September 15, 2014](#) Faculty Senate Meeting
 1. A question was asked about Item II.B.4.v.b in the minutes concerning the \$1.6 million placed in the Regents' budget for the design of a new Health Professions structure and the \$29.1 million total cost of the structure. The President's Office clarified that the \$1.6 million is part of the \$29.1 million (*not* in addition to the \$29.1 million). See "Correction for item [II.B.4.v.b](#)" on the Faculty Senate webpage.
 2. APPROVED with the above correction noted.
 - B. Brief remarks from Dr. Linda Bleicken, President
 1. Dr. Bleicken was unable to attend. Dr. David Ward, Interim Provost/VPAA, spoke in her place.
 2. Dr. Ward has talked with some Faculty, Department Chairs, and Deans about Armstrong's "academic identity" and how to define this (e.g., level and types of student engagement, quality of engagement, undergraduate research opportunities, international opportunities, new pedagogical experiences within and beyond the classroom, etc.). Next steps include forming a taskforce to develop a mini strategic plan on this concept of engagement to flesh out what we already do, how to synthesize and bring it together, and what we want to do in the future. Drs. Becky da Cruz and Jane Wong will serve as co-chairs of this committee.
 3. Current Fall enrollment: 7,094 students (last Fall enrollment: 7,101). Enrollment is down relative to what was anticipated (estimated at 7,254).
 - i. However, Fall-to-Fall retention for 1-year students is 70%, up from 67.4% the year before; 2-year retention is 52.6%, up from 46.6%; 3-year retention is 41.4%, up from 38.5%.
 - ii. The Fall 2015 enrollment target is 7,272 students. Dr. Ward, although cautiously optimistic, thinks this is achievable, particularly because of the above retention numbers.
 - iii. Fall-to-Spring retention last year was 85%, lower than normal, and should not be below 90%. That means Armstrong over-performed Spring-to-Fall in order to have increased from Fall-to-Fall.
 - iv. Students were not allowed to "frontload" their financial aid this year. (They used to be allowed to take a year's worth of financial aid in the Fall, which created the possibility of being short in funds for the Spring, with no more financial aid available). Thus, Armstrong is better positioned this Fall-to-Spring because students have access to financial aid.

- v. There are fewer students in accounts receivable owing the University money than a year ago today, even though their financial aid was not frontloaded. This, too, should position Armstrong well for next Fall.
4. Armstrong is being asked by the USG to address in the University's budget submission what it is doing about "low-producing programs." The University's response is that it will review the factors that drive low numbers and identify three things: whether programs can increase the number of students enrolled in/graduating under the current model; new program designs, perhaps combinations of majors; and recommendations for deactivation.
 - i. The Nursing Department has decided to deactivate its RN-to-BSN program. It has been on the low-enrollment list. The Nursing Department felt that attention is better spent on its BSN program and post-bac program and hopefully in the future a DNP program.
 - ii. Question: Does the analysis consider whether a program will have a lower number than others in terms of national averages? Answer: Yes and no. Internally this will be considered, but the University and programs will need to anticipate issues and think creatively. The USG is not telling us to close any programs, and Dr. Ward's plan is to keep them from doing so by making sufficient progress.
 5. The USG in the budget submission has asked all institutions to bring forward a plan for a 3% reduction in state funding. It is not clear at this time whether we need to take that reduction, but the USG is asking for the plans as to how the University would meet that reduction. A 3% reduction at this point is \$954,000. The University won't be able to come up with this in operating expenses; thus, there would have to be elimination of vacant positions. If this happens, "we will have to take some personnel lines."
 - i. Question: Why the potential? Are revenues down? Answer: Yes. Across the system, there are institutions that have enrollment declines. We are one of them. It is about enrollment declines.
 - ii. Question: Wasn't this also a plan for this last year that wasn't put into action? Answer: Yes. No institution is exempt from putting forward that plan. How it gets implemented is another thing.
 6. eCore: It is coming and here's why. The Board of Regents has directed the USG to make sure that eCore is available to all students in all 31 institutions. Currently, Armstrong students can take eCore, although we are not a member of eCore. To do so, students have to become a transient student somewhere else in order to take them. This transient step is being removed. What will happen is eCore courses will show up in SHIP next to Armstrong courses. It is not clear if these courses will be differentiated. Students will be able to click on and register for eCore courses. eCore tuition is currently less than most, if not, all institutions' online tuition; it is less than ours. We have three basic questions:
 - i. Should we join? If so, we get 20% of the revenue. If a member of our faculty teaches an eCore course, then we (as the host institution) get 40%. If it is one of our students taking the course, we get another

- 20%. If Armstrong joins eCore, we get a say in the course content and the running of eCore.
- ii. Should we limit residential students (whatever that means) to some sort of credit hour cap, so that they can't do everything online/through eCore?
 - iii. What does this mean for our own online core courses and programs and how do we want to think of this strategically?
 - iv. Note: Senate Leadership has asked the Provost to bring someone in to discuss eCore and the Faculty Senate should vote again about whether Armstrong should join eCore, however symbolic that vote might be at this time. These changes in eCore are supposed to begin in Fall 2015. No institution can join eCore without a vote.
 - v. Comment: We addressed eCore twice, the first time it was a narrow vote against joining, but we were not on a Faculty Senate structure then. The second vote, under a Faculty Senate structure, eCore lost by a crushing margin. Estimating that any money to be garnered from joining eCore won't be a lot the first year, we might want to wait for the first year to see what happens.
 - vi. A question of clarification was raised about whether we have any say about limiting or capping the number of eCore hours students can take. Do we know how many student we anticipate? Response from Dr. Ward: We are the fourth largest user of transient status, but he doesn't have the exact number and hesitates to give an exact number on this. (A comment was made that this is a misleading statistic, and one faculty member stated that this number is "8.") Dr. Ward also stated: "I think leaving money on the table is silly."
 - vii. Question: For new faculty members (who might have not heard of eCore), what is so bad about eCore? Response from other faculty members: There is no flexibility to change the course curriculum, and transient students must have permission to take courses from another institution and this undermines the authority of Department Heads.
 - viii. A forum will be set up for further discussion of eCore.

C. Old Business

1. Outcome of Bills/Resolutions

- i. [FSB 2014-05-12-01](#) Institutional Accountability, Transparency and Communication
 - a. 2014–2015 Administrative Committees
 - i. This is not in webpage form; it currently is a PDF link on the President's website. This is a working document and this will be updated.
 - ii. Question: Can this be included each time in the Faculty Senate Agenda, as this changes? Answer: This is the Armstrong President's list and the President's webpage. It is up to the President whether this is

updated. When it is updated and she sends it to the Faculty Senate, it will be included in the Agenda.

iii. Regarding consultants being hired over \$25,000: The list of consultants and their fees will be coming. It has just been submitted to PBF. Next month, it will be available in the PBF minutes.

b. Faculty Personnel Requests 9.23.14

i. These are included, including the staff personnel requests, to err on the side of transparency.

c. Staff Personnel Requests 9.23.14

d. Faculty Personnel Requests 9.30.14

e. Staff Personnel Requests 10.1.14

2. USG Faculty Council October 11, 2014

i. Senate President Desnoyers-Colas attended the Faculty Council and these questions (copied in Appendix G) were presented. The Chancellor and three Vice Chancellors were present at this meeting. The Chancellor didn't go question by question. Many of these questions are also those we are asking here at Armstrong.

ii. The Chancellor did address eCore. He believes eCore is a plan that gives greater access to students, and accessibility is the key. He also is concerned about the rising costs of textbooks, with the average cost around \$200. He talked about open sourcing and eCore as ways to make school open and accessible to students.

iii. The Faculty Council expressed concern about always being put in a reactive mode and instead would like to be more proactive. It is requesting that Faculty Council members be put on more decision-making committees, because it feels the faculty voice is not being heard. The Faculty Council has asked that regular polls be conducted on all campuses so that the pulse of faculty can be sent to the Chancellor in order to encourage more dialogue about the issues that concern faculty.

iv. One issue is rapid turnover of representatives from some institutions who attend the Faculty Council meetings. There is a suggestion that representatives attend for two years. We already meet this.

v. Other concerns included security issues and responses to Title IX.

vi. The Faculty Council is looking for a campus to sponsor upcoming Council meetings. Senate President Desnoyers-Colas nominated Armstrong for the Fall 2015 Council meeting. Dr. Bleicken is supportive of this, and if it occurs, everyone would be invited to attend.

D. New Business

1. Committee Charges (for the Faculty Welfare Committee)

i. Audit needed regarding lecturer cap

- a. The lecturer cap is supposed to be 20%, but we do not know where we are. We need to request an audit to make sure we don't go over the cap.
- b. Question: Last year, a bill was passed to start a part-time faculty taskforce to look at these very issues, [FSB-2014-03-24-03](#), Part-Time Faculty Compensation Taskforce. Answer: We still need to deal with that. The Faculty Senate also still needs a liaison for part-time faculty; a person may need to be appointed if no one volunteers.
- ii. Reexamination of the functionality of new course evaluation system
 - a. We will ask the Provost for further discussion about this. Some people attended the meetings with the SmartEvals company. There remains a problem with how the new evaluation system deals with comments and where they go, how they can get to Chairs and Deans.
 - b. Dr. Ward stated that the SmartEvals pilot seemed to go well. The overall response rate was over 50%, with some sections over 60%. He called this a "marked improvement." There is an issue, however, that the vendor may have suggested that we could differentiate between signed and unsigned comments, and we in fact cannot. What went to faculty was full access—numeric and full comments. Chairs and Deans only received numbers. The system doesn't enable signed responses. The Faculty Senate will have to look at how we address the current policy and philosophy on comments re: course evaluations.
 - c. Question: Is there anywhere in writing that they told us it would be the same? Buying something that our old system did? Response from Dr. Ward: "I have no idea if there's anything in writing," but in comparison to our old system, he emphasized that it got us a "40%" response increase. Response from Dr. Teresa Winterhalter: We e-mailed them and it may be in writing; we did have a lot of discussion with them when they were here and are anticipating getting answers. This is something the eFACE committee was very concerned about.
 - d. Question: With eFACE, even signed comments were being seen by higher-ups? Response from Dr. Ward: In his experience, he didn't see any signed comments.
 - e. A request was made that a copy of the eFACE report be provided to the Faculty Senate.

2. Committee Reports

- i. University Curriculum Committee
 - a. Curriculum Changes
 - i. COHP-HS: no discussion, APPROVED.
 - ii. COLA-AMT: no discussion, APPROVED.

- iii. COLA-CJSPS: no discussion, APPROVED.
- iv. COLA-ECON: no discussion, APPROVED.
- v. COLA-GWST:
 - 1. Some courses in the Program of Study (III.D.7.A and III.D.7.B) do not reflect current course titles and should be changed accordingly:
 - i. ~~GWST~~GNST 2101 ~~Gender and Ethics~~
Ethics, Values, and Gender
 - ii. ~~GWST~~GNST 5700U **Perspectives in**
Feminist Theory
 - iii. ~~GWST~~GNST 5000U Topics in Gender **and**
Women's Studies
 - 2. All other items APPROVED.
 - 3. Question: Regarding page 23 and the “Ethics, Values, and Gender” course, the phrase in the descriptor concerns particular aspects of philosophy—are these being taught in the course? Answer: Yes. Question: These are being taught by a non-philosopher? Answer: This course is in response to traditional philosophical ethics. This is the feminist critique of traditional ethics, and the traditional theories are being taught there. That course description is not being changed and was previously approved.
- vi. COLA-LLP:
 - 1. Discussion: Many of these changes are related to an e-major. This seems to be part of an increased trend of outsourcing and should be opposed on the same grounds as eCore—outsourcing to other instructors who are not Armstrong faculty and a slow loss of control over Armstrong curriculum.
 - 2. Questions: Regarding Items 29 and 30 and the note at the top of the page following the description of Item 30: Is there a certificate of teaching ESL in a non-Education department? Concern was raised that an education certificate would be awarded to students without it coming out of an Education department. Will Armstrong be producing the degrees or come out of Valdosta and Clayton? I heard it to say that Armstrong faculty would be on a rotating basis for teaching it? Answer: We

only have one full-time French faculty. E-major started in Spring 2013 and was proposed to us at a CLAC meeting. We do not have a French major at Armstrong and the possibility is pretty nonexistent. The entire curriculum was decided by French professors. The changes offered here reflect that the courses had to be aligned at all of the participating institutions; students will need to be able to take courses at any of these. Armstrong majors will be counted as our graduates. All courses will undergo a Quality Matters review and be Quality Matters approved. Valdosta already offers the ESL certificate. Armstrong's catalogue currently doesn't offer this. There is an elective sequence on page 40.

3. A concern was raised that Quality Matters is strictly designed-based. Answer: There is always a content master on the review team.
4. Motion: Remove Items 29 and 30 and send them back to the UCC. Discussion: All of these items are tied together. No second.
5. Motion: Pull Item 29 and send it back to the UCC. Seconded. Motion APPROVED.
6. Motion: Remove ESL statements from Item 30 and allow the remainder of it to continue with the rest of the items; send the ESL language back to the UCC. Seconded. Motion APPROVED.
 - i. Discussion: We are undermining our UCC, which has a representative from every College.
 - ii. Discussion: Just because something passes in a different committee doesn't mean the Senate can't raise issues.
 - iii. Question: The ESL statement doesn't attend to concern about the outsourcing of Armstrong courses. Response from Dr. Beth Howells: We have a French faculty member who is operating as a department of one right now. She has combined with other French faculty members who are also departments of one. They are working together to ensure that curricula are appropriate to

the discipline and cutting edge in terms of pedagogy. This is a way to be creative and grow a French program. This is our only shot.

- iv. Question: The same kind of logic being used to defend this will be used to defend eCore. Response from Dr. Ward: “This provides our students with an opportunity they do not have” and is different from eCore.

vii. CST-BIOL: no discussion, APPROVED.

b. Meeting Minutes

ii. Graduate Affairs Committee

iii. Academic Standards

- a. No report at this time.

iv. Education Technology

- a. This committee has not met since the last report.
- b. There is a request from CIO Robert Howard to address the Faculty Senate in November.

v. Faculty Welfare

- a. No report at this time.

vi. Planning, Budget, and Facilities

- a. The minutes have been updated.
- b. PBF is still short a member from COLA.
 - i. A co-chair of the PBF Committee has talked to three Department Chairs from COLA, but no Faculty member has stepped up to serve. Senate President Desnoyers-Colas will send out another request within AMT.

vii. Student Success

a. [Academic Renewal](#) (draft)

- i. Greg Anderson participated on the Board of Regents rewriting of the policy. The USG allowed four different places to make recommendations: (1) How long a student has to be away: We have proposed a 5-year stint away. We believed it needs to be at the maximum amount. (2) Determining honors—whether students that come here can hold or should be able to hold that status. (3) Admissions: Any student below a 2.0 be denied admission. We are asking that Academic Standards look into being open to hearing these requests. Students would have to submit documentation of academic renewal on certain courses of their GPA. (4) Programs that use secondary admissions. Those areas should deal with the GPA

based on a case or program basis, whether to use a clean slate GPA or one that includes all prior work.

b. [USG Withdrawal Repeat Policies](#)

c. [W and WF Grades](#)

- i. Laura Mills pulled data for Student Success. We've had a slight decrease in both since the policy came about. Armstrong is in the middle, if not on the lenient side, on the W and WF policy. Recommend no changes.

3. Campus Climate Survey (Deidra Dennie)

- i. The Diversity Council met and developed survey questions. Currently there are 102 questions, but it does not plan to stay at 102; 13 focus groups met today and 150 people were invited. Feedback from the consultants has been very good. The Diversity Council is working on developing questions to put into the survey. It will meet again in November and December. The survey will be launched in January and will be open for two weeks. The Diversity Council wants a 30% return rate for students and 100% for faculty and staff. The survey will be online. IP addresses will be stripped out and will be collected on the consultant's servers. Paper and pencil surveys will be available, and the Diversity Council will accommodate needs related to disability and language.
- ii. Question: How was this consultant firm chosen and who chose it?
Answer: An RFP was sent out. The selected company has completed surveys on 131 campuses across the nation. All the other consultants who responded were not higher-ed specific. This one was the only one.
- iii. Question: It is disturbing that all of the data will be destroyed after the report is submitted. There is no data record; this is a dubious methodology. Answer: The Diversity Council discussed this and was split on the issue. There is distrust. The decision by the Council was not to have data available for us to see after the report is written. This decision can still be changed, but a decision will need to be made soon.
- iv. Question: Did the Council consider keeping the data for a while?
Answer: The consultant will agree to keep the data for a while (which would go to Deidra Dennie only). This could be problematic; for example, one of the questions is about sexual assault and safety and there would have to be an N of 5 or more for it to be reported to her. Response from Dr. Ward: The consultant wants us to keep the data and wants to send the data here. The consultant will only keep the data for a certain amount of time. There was concern that, if given the data, the institution would be able to identify respondents through the data. The response rate might plummet if people thought the data

- was coming back to campus. The decision was weighing a higher response rate versus keeping the data.
- v. Question: How can we identify respondents? Answer: The concern is about small departments. If you slice and dice the data into small cells, people might be identifiable.
 - vi. Question: Can't the consultant send the data back in two files: the stuff about who you are and the more sensitive stuff. Response from Dr. Ward: The real value in the data is to determine where there are pockets of concern.
 - vii. Question: Where would the data be housed? Answer: Deidra Dennie would be the only one who would have it and have access to it.
 - viii. Note: This requires further discussion but needs to be settled by the November Senate meeting. Faculty Senators should discuss this within their Departments and report back to Senate.
4. Revised parking proposal, Learning Commons hours, Tobacco policy (Cassian Nunez, SGA President)
- i. No discussion on revised parking.
 - ii. The SGA passed the Breathe Strong Resolution. The SGA requested a vote of affirmation from the Faculty Senate. The first event is Nov. 4, a guest speaker from Voice Masters. Two other events will be held in the Spring. The SGA is funding this. There will be more campaign information and marketing materials starting in January.
 - iii. Question: How does the SGA define enforcement? Answer: Not punitive, but positive; not tickets. An information campaign and word-of-mouth. Question: Is that enforcement then? Answer: If a student is belligerent, then the SGA would favor the imposition of the fine. "Belligerent" is defined in physical terms.
 - iv. Question: Would this be a student conduct issue, even if not physical? Answer: Yes. Question: What about an HR issue for faculty and staff? Answer: The SGA is trying to set an expectation across campus; for example, having Navigators inform incoming students of the policy. Then later it would consider enforcement in different ways as need be.
 - v. The SGA requested a vote of affirmation from the Faculty Senate on its Learning Commons Resolution. The Learning Commons is currently open about 90 hours per week. Dr. Ward is studying the issue and with data will reset the schedule. The University had shifted the schedule to earlier hours (per students' requests); 200 students wanted hours shifted back. Now, the SGA just wants to increase hours. Response from Dr. Ward: Many universities have designated 24–7 spaces. Our physical Library doesn't lend itself for that, but we are looking at potentially other options for 24–7 student access, whether it is the Learning Commons.
 - vi. Motion: To affirm the SGA's Breathe Strong Resolution and the Learning Commons Resolution. Seconded. Motion APPROVED.

5. Leadership Development Program (Jane Wong)

- i. An e-mail was sent out last Tuesday announcing a second leadership cohort. All seven participants from the first cohort in the Spring graduated.
- ii. The vision behind this program is to enable the development of leadership, administration, and managerial skills so that more people at Armstrong would be ready to assume such positions and also to give faculty opportunity to explore if this might be something of interest to them now or down the road.
- iii. The second cohort will occur this Spring. See the e-mail for eligibility and the process for self-nominations and recommendations from Department Chairs and Deans. If you self-nominate, please discuss this with your Department Chair first.

6. Other New Business

- i. None raised at this time.

E. Senate Information

1. Send Committee meeting dates/minutes to faculty.senate@armstrong.edu.

F. Announcements

III. Adjournment at **4:38** p.m.

Minutes completed by:

Leigh E. Rich

Faculty Senate Secretary, 2014–2015

Appendices

A. Attendance Sheet

Faculty Senators and Alternates for 2014–2015 (for Senate Meeting 10/20/2014)

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)		Rachel Green	x
			Elizabeth Desnoyers-Colas (2)	x	Megan Baptiste-Field	
Biology	CST	4	Traci Ness (3)	x	Sara Gremillion	
			Brett Larson (2)	x	Jennifer Brofft-Bailey	
			Aaron Schrey (1)	x	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)		Frank Katz	x
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)	x	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)		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 Knefczynski Tricia Brown	x
			Paul Hadavas (2)	x	Tim Ellis	
			Joshua Lambert (2)		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)		April Garrity	