

**Armstrong State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of September 15, 2014
Student Union, Ballroom A, 3:00 p.m.**

- I. Senate President Desnoyers-Colas called the meeting to order at **3:02** p.m. (see Appendix A).
- II. Senate Action
 - A. Approval of Minutes from [August 18, 2014](#) Faculty Senate Meeting
 1. APPROVED without corrections.
 - B. Remarks from Dr. Linda Bleicken, President
 1. She and Dr. Ward, interim Provost/VPAA, met with Senate Leadership at a pre-Senate luncheon meeting on Friday, September 12.
 2. Thanks to Chris Hendricks for his lecture on September 4 at The Telfair Museum as part of "A Moveable Feast." Continued attendance is encouraged at such events, which provide positive community engagement and public relations media for Armstrong.
 3. The Liberty Center groundbreaking in Hinesville also garnered much media attention. This is the first new building Armstrong has built since the Science Center and is important in part because of Hinesville's population growth.
 4. The in-process project this year is a proposed structure for the College of Health Professions.
 - i. Armstrong is the number one provider/producer of undergraduate health professions majors in Georgia. It has been her job, along with members of the Cabinet, to remind the Legislature and the Regents of the need for a new CHP structure.
 - ii. This year, \$1.6 million has been placed in the Regents' budget for funding the design of a new Health Professions structure. This next goes to the Governor, who must decide if he will put this in his budget; however, if it moves forward, the Legislature also must vote for it.
 - iii. Approval of funding at this stage only includes the design of a structure. Campaigning will then be needed for construction funding.
 - iv. The probable site for the building will be in the area of the current Ashmore Hall.
 - v. Discussion:
 - a. Concern was raised about the removal of trees in the area of Ashmore Hall. Response: The impact a structure would have on this area of campus will be taken into consideration as part of the design.
 - b. A question of clarification was asked regarding to total estimated cost of the structure, which is \$29.1 million, and whether this includes the \$1.6 million for design. Response: No, the \$1.6 million is in addition to the estimated \$29.1 million, which raises the total estimate for the proposed structure to \$30.7 million.

C. Old Business

1. Outcome of Bills/Resolutions

- i. [FSB 2014-05-12-01](#) Institutional Accountability, Transparency and Communication
 - a. Human Resources open/new job postings template
 - i. This item has been completed. The form was sent to all members of the Faculty Senate with requests for questions and suggestions. No additional feedback was provided.
 - ii. Per a request at the last Faculty Senate meeting, Human Resources now includes a listing of the titles of positions in e-mail communications about open employment postings.
 - b. Consultants
 - i. As consultant hires occur as needed, there is no one listing of all consultants that will be used during the year. However, the Senate PBF Committee is supposed to be notified when consultants are planned for tasks that cost more than \$25,000. The webpage related to this is available through the President's website. An e-mail will be sent to faculty notifying faculty that this webpage is live.
 - c. Three-year plan regarding faculty salaries
 - i. The committee for the three-year plan regarding faculty salary adjustment has been staffed.
 - ii. Provost Ward at the last PBF meeting announced the formation of this committee, which will include three faculty members: two from PBF (Wendy Wolfe and Catherine MacGowan) and one from Senate Leadership (Cliff Padgett).
 - iii. The committee reports to the President and will be co-chaired by Dr. Ward and Rebecca Carroll.
 - iv. It will develop the plan by which Armstrong can achieve an average faculty salary of 100% of the CUPA average and lay out a timeline and proposed mechanisms. Implementation is intended to occur as the committee proceeds (not waiting until the end).
 - d. Faculty Senate officers attend meetings of the President's Cabinet as well meet with the President and the Provost once per month. Faculty Senate Leadership will prioritize disseminating this information to the Faculty Senate and all faculty.
- ii. [FSB 2014-03-24-07](#) (Space and) Payment Schedule for Part-Time Faculty (see also [March 24, 2014](#) Faculty Senate Agenda)

- a. This is an unfinished item from last year. The bill received a conditional response and was sent back by the President to be modified. Additionally, last year each College assured the Faculty Senate that there is sufficient office space for part-time faculty. The Faculty Senate did not determine how and if the need has been met. The Faculty Welfare Committee has been charged with following up on all items.
 - b. Due to an unexpected vacancy, a Faculty Senator is needed to serve as the Part-Time Liaison.
 - c. Question: Is there someone within the Administration who is also a part of this discussion in order to determine whether and how to complete the process? Someone from Human Resources should be participating. Response: This will be added to the charge to Faculty Welfare, with the suggestion of including Rebecca Carroll in the discussions.
- 2. Senate Committee lists
 - i. A scheduling conflict will prevent one PBF member from attending these meeting; thus, PBF needs one more member from CLA. The Governance Committee will work with PBF to fill this vacancy.
 - ii. Faculty Welfare has not yet elected a Chair for this committee. Faculty Welfare will update the Senate as soon as a Chair is named.
 - iii. The Governance Committee is waiting on the Graduate Student Coordinating Council (GSCC) to assist with nominations and appointments of graduate student representatives to Senate committees.
- 3. Review of Committee charges
 - i. Student representation on Faculty Senate committees
 - a. Determine whether student representatives on committees should have voting privileges or be ex officio (e.g., re: quorum)
 - i. An ongoing challenge has been students' availability to attend Senate committee meetings. (The scheduling of meetings might be one reason why students don't tend to attend, and more effort might need to be made to find appropriate times.) One concern is whether quorum can be achieved if students are voting members; however, most committees do not necessarily "vote" on items but rather engage in discussions and reach conclusions from these discussions. Thus, whether students are voting or ex officio members might not be a problem.
 - ii. Bylaws will need to be changed if student representative positions are added or removed from committees or made ex officio.

- iii. On March 22, 2013, PBF voted to move students to ex officio status. This change needs to be moved at an upcoming Senate meeting, voted on by the Senate and, if approved, sent to the fully faculty for a vote.
 - iv. Cassian Nunez stated that he will be happy to help appoint an undergraduate student for the PBF.
 - v. On Ed Tech, the Student Voice Subcommittee is a bit unwieldy and may need to be changed to include student representatives as ex officio members.
 - vi. To promote transparency and shared governance, it was emphasized that students should have a voice in Senate committees, although if invited to serve, students should make an effort to attend. Ex officio status still provides this opportunity.
 - b. If no student representation currently exists, determine whether student representatives should be added
 - i. There are only three committees that currently have student representatives.
- ii. Academic Standards
 - a. Current standards, timing, and protocol for academic probation and suspension
 - i. No discussion.
- iii. Education Technology
 - a. Faculty technology needs/wish list in classrooms (Robert Howard also will be holding forums regarding this)
 - i. Robert Howard would like the Ed Tech Committee to assist with a list of what faculty see as ideal technology resources in classrooms. The past few years have been about fixing technological infrastructure. Looking forward, he would like to start adding new technology to classrooms. Forums will be held.
 - ii. A question was raised about updating staff and faculty desktop computers, particularly for faculty and staff in the Library, whose computers are outdated.
Response: Faculty computers are supposed to be replaced every three years.
 - b. ETA on Helpdesk tickets
 - i. Issues exist with the current tracking software the Helpdesk uses. This software was purchased because it was the least expensive at the time. CIS is looking for new software and drafting policies that would identify an ETA deadline for responses and, if that deadline cannot be met, provide a response explaining why.

- iv. Faculty Welfare
 - a. Full- and part-time faculty needs
 - i. See II.C.1.ii above.
 - b. Resolution for the “Space” aspect of the Payment Schedule for Part-Time Faculty bill (as originally submitted and discussed in the Senate; see March 24, 2014 [Agenda](#) and [Minutes](#))
 - i. See II.C.1.ii above.
 - c. Recommendations for evaluations of “jointly appointed” faculty
 - i. A suggestion was made to examine what constitutes “jointly appointed” positions and then put definitions and procedures for evaluation into writing. The rationale for this relates to accountability and includes identifying who such faculty report to, who evaluates them, and what assessment criteria are used.
- v. Planning, Budget, and Facilities
 - a. Armstrong’s campus master plan (incl. maintenance issues)
 - i. A question was raised regarding clarification of this charge, which was explained as: Looking beyond just the construction aspect, where is Armstrong going in the next 5 to 10 years in terms of facilities? The future projects that are on file now (see the PBF minutes) already do touch upon the facilities master plan.
 - b. Current contract with Sodexo and beyond
 - i. This was initially handled by PBF last year. This year’s charge was clarified to include examining why a 10-year contract was signed and what will happen once the current contract is up.
 - ii. Discussion was raised about faculty dissatisfaction with parts of the contract, the current pricing of food-related items, the scheduling of cleaning staff, and the quality of care of the buildings.
- vi. Student Success
 - a. Alignment of academic renewal policy with USG and Regents
 - i. No discussion.
 - b. Effects of Armstrong’s withdrawal policy
 - i. A search is underway for a replacement for a Director of Admissions. The schedule has been set but the committee has not met yet.

D. New Business

1. Committee Reports

- i. University Curriculum Committee
 - a. Curriculum Changes
 - i. APPROVED without modification.
 - b. Meeting Minutes

- i. Corrections are needed in relation to outdated references in Senate committees, due to restructuring that took place within the Senate as well as University Administration. These changes are akin to grammatical “house cleaning.”
 - ii. No objections were raised to allow the Senate Leadership and Governance Committee to clean up these areas.
- 3. Proposed changes to parking permits (Cassian Nunez, SGA President)
 - i. An SGA proposal has been put forward to expand the student universal parking decal (which allows, for an added fee, commuter students to park in residential spaces and vice versa) to include Faculty/Staff spaces, especially when spots are empty during portions of the day or if a student wants to run in and out of a building quickly. The SGA is seeking Senate co-sponsorship for this SGA bill. It also will be presented to the Staff Council.
 - ii. Currently, 36 students have purchased the “universal” decal option for an added \$25.
 - iii. Discussion:
 - a. Concern was raised about faculty and staff who have off-campus obligations during the day and/or those who arrive later in the day because they work on campus beyond the 8 a.m.–5 p.m. weekday.
 - b. Concern also was raised about the message this could send, particularly at an educational institution — that those with more discretionary income can purchase extra convenience.
 - c. A question was raised regarding how such additional funds would be used. Response: SGA has not determined this, but the funds likely would be used for something that value to the campus.
 - d. A suggestion was made for a feasibility study, although there are currently approximately 4,000 student parking spaces on campus and the need has not exceeded capacity.
- 4. Faculty and course evaluations (Angeles Eames, Director of Assessment)
 - i. The pilot phase for the new course evaluation system is on track. A set of questions has been identified (see Appendix B) and these and the new system will be used following the first flex-term, starting September 22.
 - ii. After this pilot phase, another faculty group will be convened to review this experience and offer suggestions.
 - iii. Discussion:
 - a. Students will complete evaluations online.
 - b. A representative from the software company Armstrong now uses (SmartEvals) will be on campus on October 1 and 2 to explicitly address questions. There will be sessions for faculty.

These sessions also will demonstrate how first flex-term faculty can retrieve and use results.

- c. A question was raised about whether Armstrong purchased the software package that tracks each student's ratings and GPAs. Response: This question could not be answered.
- d. A question was raised about plans for increasing student response rates. Response: This was looked at extensively by the committee during the Spring term. The committee conducted a literature review on the topic and also examined what other schools are doing. Dr. Eames stated: "It is what faculty do to encourage responses" and suggested that faculty repeatedly remind and encourage students in class to complete evaluations. This tactic (encouraged during the Spring term) did increase response rates, but a request was made for more information about exact numbers. There also will be a reminder on Port.
- e. SmartEvals states that its response rate is about 85% (though no further information was provided regarding this number). Some of its tactics to increase response rates include sending e-mail reminders and a mobile app that students potentially could access in class. During the open period, faculty also will know how many students in a class have completed the evaluation.
- f. The feedback from a student focus group of approximately 100 students indicated that students don't complete evaluations because they don't think their responses will be taken seriously.

5. Updates on searches:

- i. Provost/VPAA (Maya Clark)
 - a. A committee was put together in late Spring and received a charge from the President in late May. The position announcement went out in July. There is a page on the Armstrong website for candidates that provides information about Armstrong and explains the position, lists the search committee members, and indicates the timeline for the search.
 - b. Currently, more than 100 people have applied (109).
 - c. The committee is narrowing the pool down to semi-finalists, with the plan to interview them in early October and bring finalists to campus in late October/early November.
 - d. Discussion:
 - i. Question: How many semi-finalists will there be?
Response: The committee is looking for 8–10 for semi-finalists. As of last Friday, there were 10 candidates of interest. The committee is currently calling references.

- ii. Question: Will faculty be notified of this information and the timeline? Response: An e-mail should be sent by the end of the week, but faculty should just go to the website.
 - iii. Question: Is the committee ensuring a level of diversity among the narrowed-down candidates? Response: The committee has been very pleased with the initial diversity of the applications and Deidra Dennie is one of the search committee members. The committee is seeking someone with proven experience and strong leadership and stated that “we are inheriting other people’s biases.”
 - ii. Vice President for Business and Finance (Bryan Riemann)
 - a. See the report in the agenda.
 - b. No questions were raised.
- 6. USG Tobacco and Smoke-Free Campus policy (Sara Plaspohl and/or Rebecca Carroll, Interim Vice President for Business and Finance)
 - i. The Board of Regents adopted a campus-free policy effective October 1.
 - ii. The rationale for this includes: promoting a healthy community, supporting the rights of all, and promoting respect for each other and the environment. The USG has established a website regarding this policy, with resources for free ways to quit,
 - iii. Armstrong is one of 12 institutions in the state that already is tobacco-free.
 - iv. A meeting regarding the Regents policy was held in Macon in July, and Sara Plaspohl, Rebecca Carroll, and Katie Twining attended.
 - v. Another meeting will take place this Friday in Athens, with Sara Plaspohl and Cassian Nunez attending. This meeting is being hosted by the Georgia Department of Public Health, which supports the initiative and provides training materials.
 - vi. Discussion:
 - vii. Question: How are schools implementing and enforcing the policy? Response: There was a lot of discussion in Macon and likely more discussion will be held at the meeting this Friday. Overall schools right now that have policies in place do not plan to have punitive measures, at least at first, and there is no mandate that each institution implement and enforce the policy in the same way. This is left to the President of each institution.
 - viii. Question: The policy currently lists a fine of \$50, which is not being enforced. What does Armstrong plan to do? Also,

certain places such as International Garden, the Fern Garden, and the loading dock for the Library seem to be areas where smoking is occurring. Response: The Armstrong community in general is expected to become the enforcer, including changing the culture so that Armstrong members remind people of the policy and why it is in place. However, there are challenges: We have a lot of audiences, and each one can be addressed in different ways. For example, there is a reporting line via the smoke-free webpage to report anonymously, but students may need another format. There also is a need to get the word out about the USG website. Sara Plaspohl is meeting with Allison Hersh in Marketing to tie Armstrong's website to the USG's website.

7. New Business from the floor?

- i. None.

E. Senate Information

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

F. Announcements

- 1. The USG Faculty Council will be meeting at Gwinnett College on October 11. The Chancellor and a few Regents will be in attendance. Send any concerns and/or questions you think should be raised to Elizabeth Desnoyers-Colas at elizabeth.desnoyers-colas@armstrong.edu.

III. Adjournment

- A. Adjournment at **4:38** p.m.

Minutes completed by:

Leigh E. Rich

Faculty Senate Secretary, 2014–2015

Appendices

- A. Attendance Sheet
- B. Armstrong Pilot Question Set

Faculty Senators and Alternates for 2014–2015 (for Senate Meeting 09/15/2014)

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)	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)	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)		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)		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 Knofczynski 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)	x	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	

Armstrong SmartEvals Question Set

Section 1: About Yourself

1. Are you either a major or minor in the department in which this course is offered?
 No Yes

2. What percent of the time were you prepared for class, i.e. having completed all reading and assignments?
 Always (91-100%) Frequently (70-90%) About Half (30-69%) Rarely (10-29%) Never (0-9%)

Section 2: The Course

3. Overall, how much do you feel you have learned in this course?

__An exceptional amount __More than usual __About as much as usual __Less than Usual __Almost nothing

All of the following items below used the response set: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, or Not Applicable

4. The course assignments adequately reflected the goals of the course.

5. The expectations of this class were clearly communicated in the course syllabus

All of the following items below used the response set: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree

6. Test questions accurately reflected course content.

Open-Ended Questions:

7. What aspects of this course contributed most to your learning? Please be as specific as possible.

8. What aspects of this course detracted from you learning?

Section 3: The Instructor

All of the following items below used the response set: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree

9. The instructor gives assignments that contribute to my understanding of the subject.

10. What is the overall rating of this instructor's teaching effectiveness compared with other college instructors you have had?

__One of the most effective __More effective than average __About average __Worse than average
 __One of the least effective

All of the following items below used the response set: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree

11. The instructor met class regularly and on time.

12. The instructor was accessible outside of class.
13. The instructor's teaching style stimulates active learning and interest in the subject matter.
14. The instructor seemed genuinely interested in teaching the class.
15. The teaching strategies (e.g. lecture, demonstration, group work, peer review, technology) enhanced my learning in the course.
16. The instructor has a strong ability to communicate the subject matter to the class.
17. The Instructor is skillful in guiding me to be more self-directed in my learning.
18. The instructor facilitated class participation.
19. The instructor respected student opinions and ideas.