

4-20-2015

# April 20, 2015 Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes

Armstrong State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/armstrong-fs-minutes>

---

## Recommended Citation

Armstrong State University, "April 20, 2015 Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes" (2015). *Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes*. 16.  
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/armstrong-fs-minutes/16>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Armstrong Faculty Senate at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu).

**Armstrong State University**  
**Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**Minutes of April 20, 2015**  
**Student Union, Ballroom A, 3:00 p.m.**

- I. Pre-Senate Working Session (3:00–3:30 p.m.)
- II. Senate President Desnoyers-Colas called the meeting to order at **3:30** p.m. (see Appendix A).
- III. Senate Action
  - A. Approval of Minutes from [March 23, 2015](#) Faculty Senate Meeting
    1. APPROVED without corrections.
  - B. Brief remarks from Dr. Linda Bleicken, President
    1. Unable to attend due to a conflict in schedule.
  - C. Old Business
    1. Outcome of Bills/Resolutions
      - i. [FSB 2014-05-12-01](#) Institutional Accountability, Transparency and Communication
        - a. Joint Leadership Team summary 3.31.15
          - i. The last meeting will be held April 28, and the University President has asked members of the team to report on the progress and achievements they believe they have made throughout the year as well as what they plan to work on next year. If there is anything Faculty would like Dr. Desnoyers-Colas to bring to the attention of the President and the JLT, please send these to her as soon as possible.
          - ii. Question: Regarding the 2015 legislative priorities, there was a 0.5% increase for merit raises, but in Appendix E it seems that Chancellor Huckaby refers to 0.75% for merit raises. Has there been any discussion for this discrepancy in the JLT?
            1. Answer from Vice President for Business and Finance Chris Corrigan: I can't speak to what was said at the meeting referred to in Appendix E. I can speak to the actual distribution, which was discussed at a meeting last Tuesday, of 0.55% as an average between all institutions. It is in the ballpark of about half a percent. I am not sure why there was a discrepancy.
            2. Question: Can the Senate President confirm that Chancellor Huckaby stated 0.75%?  
Answer from Dr. Desnoyers-Colas: I was unable to attend that meeting, and there is no secretary.
            3. Comment: This also can be determined by the dates of those meetings, so Chancellor

Huckaby might have been going by estimates before the Legislature approved the budget.

iii. Question: When we get a document like Appendix E, can we have an attribution and know whose notes these are? There is no indication as to who took these notes or who provided these notes.

1. Answer from Dr. Desnoyers-Colas: I forwarded these to you just as information. When the USG Faculty Council has these meetings, there is a lot of information that doesn't always get filtered down to the Senate. I will be clearer as to where the notes come from. I was not able to attend the meeting due to a prior commitment, but I did ask them to send the notes so that they could be forwarded to the Senate. We will be more specific in the future.

2. Question: Do they have a website presence or minutes? Answer: The Faculty Council does not have a webpage. They have a listserv. They don't have a web presence yet.

iv. Question: On page 9 in appendix B, did these notes come from Dr. Desnoyers-Colas? Answer: No. The notes that are in Appendix B are summaries of the JLT meeting from Amy Heaston, who takes notes. The JLT minutes come from Amy Heaston. It was decided that in JLT meetings we could get more candid discussion if there is a general overall summary; it elicits more conversation in the meeting. The notes from the USG Faculty Council in Appendix E were forwarded to the Senate from Dr. Desnoyers-Colas.

v. Question: In Appendix B, the presenter for the Mark Finlay Memorial Lecture is listed by name but not the presenters for Science on Tap, which was Frank Katz, and A Moveable Feast, which was Deborah Jamison. Answer: The Faculty Senate is not responsible for the JLT summary notes. You can contact Amy Heaston to request that specific information be given in the JLT summary notes. The Faculty Senate is not responsible for the veracity of the content included. The Faculty Senate has merely included a copy of these notes as an appendix in the Faculty Senate Agenda for informational purposes.

b. Faculty and Staff Vacancy Report 4.2.15

c. Faculty and Staff Vacancy Report 4.13.15

- i. Question: What about Appendix D? Who is responsible for this? Answer: This report is generated by HR.
    - ii. Question: In Appendix D, the line item for Engineering Studies is incorrect. Answer: Again, this is included for informational purposes. Questions and corrections can be directed to HR and Vice President Corrigan.
  - d. Question: Will there be a new salary study? Is it going to take place?
    - i. Answer: This was discussed at the April 15 Faculty meeting.
    - ii. Answer: Dr. Corrigan also addressed this in the PBF Committee meeting, and it is noted in the minutes.
    - iii. Answer from Vice President Corrigan: We have calculated how much it would cost to implement the next step in the Faculty and Staff adjustments: \$325,000. Although this is a “reasonable, doable” number, working with the budget now, it will be tight. We did get a reduction in our amounts, because the formula is still being driven off of enrollment numbers from two years old. We have to finalize the budget by May 1, and this will be put in the budget.
  - e. Question: Does this slight decline call into play the triggers outlined in the plan?
    - i. Answer from Vice President Corrigan: No. What was put there was really pro forma, what are some of the possibilities to consider. We are not there yet. Putting the budget together takes time. I am confident we will be able to get to a balanced budget; the reduction is less than 3%, about 1.75%. This is something that we will consider along with a lot of items that are being added to the budget. No, we’re not considering any of those items that were in the budget as options to balance the budget for FY16.
    - ii. Question of clarification: What the strategic salary adjustment plan committee put together was an agreement that those amounts would occur unless there were specific triggers, and you are saying that those triggers are not applicable. Thus, those adjustments should take place. Answer from Vice President Corrigan: The only trigger was mentioned was whether revenues were available. Answer from Interim Provost David Ward: There were triggers such as an unanticipated one-time building collapse, a reduction in state funding, and enrollment decline, and

that would trigger pulling the group together to reassess or to do something; that's what the verbiage says.

- iii. Question: If none of that occurs, then the agreed-upon amount would take place? Answer from Dr. Ward: That is correct. But what you just heard was that there *was* a reduction in state funds. And what Chris is saying is that ideally he along with the President's Cabinet will work to make the adjustments happen in spite of that reduction. This is not a guarantee that they can, but that is on the table to discuss, in preparation of the now-reduced state funding.

## 2. USG Faculty Council

- i. Notes from March 21, 2015 meeting
  - a. As stated above, the Faculty Senate will be more specific moving forward about where this information comes from.
- ii. Resolutions/Recommendations and Armstrong vote
  - a. The USG Faculty Council was asked to vote on three resolutions and one recommendation (annotated in Appendix F in the Agenda). The Faculty Council cannot send a bill to the Chancellor, only a resolution. Dr. Desnoyers-Colas voted in the affirmative for all and according to the way she thought Armstrong would want her to vote.

## 3. Other Old Business

- i. FSB-2015-01-26-03 Budget Planning Bill (revised)
  - a. This bill came back to PBF, and the committee discussed it with Dr. Corrigan and made some minor changes. In essence, the revised bill is satisfying the spirit of the original bill, with PBF having a larger input in the budget process. It also lays out a timeline (see Appendix G in the Agenda). Before end of fall, the Vice President will review the budget priorities with PBF. During the spring semester, item B doesn't really involve PBF but, rather, the Provost and Deans on behalf of Faculty. Item C can be a little tricky, since it involves a kind of report back after the budget is formed. This could be tricky because the budget might be finalized in May, after the semester has completed. This might trigger an open meeting in May, or at least it is an opportunity to receive confirmation of items such as merit raises, etc. Item A is most important for PBF. Item B is important for the Provost and the Deans, but the revised bill lays out for all of us the overall timeline. The January budget report to the Senate will still continue. Members of the PBF Committee approved this unanimously.
  - b. No discussion.
  - c. APPROVED.

- ii. FSB-2015-03-23-02 Academic Bullying and Hazing
  - a. Motion made. Seconded.
  - b. Discussion:
    - i. Comment: I am concerned because the definition of bullying is not clear to me. The “feeling of exclusion” — I feel that all the time. The language makes it hard for me to objectively support this bill. Answer: What this is doing is setting up the process to review the issue and set up a policy. We are not making a policy. Hopefully, this committee would take this and define these things more clearly.
    - ii. Question: Can we add to the bill that they look at the definitions? Answer from Dr. Desnoyers-Colas: I tried not to put the definitions in the bill, because I didn’t want to limit the hands of the committee. If a definition is included, something may be missed. I was trying to make this both specific as well as broad.
    - iii. Comment: There is a danger with that kind of abstraction, like our politicians do with “terrorism,” that anything can be put in there. Answer from Dr. Desnoyers-Colas: If this other committee makes this policy, I assume that the policy would then be placed in the Faculty Handbook. Answer from Dr. John Kraft: The policy itself stands alone from the Faculty Handbook, but there is a specific grievance policy, and it would be included in there.
    - iv. Question: Would the Faculty see this policy, since this is a non-Senate committee? Answer from Dr. Kraft: I would think that the committee would want to bring it to the Senate for review. This would be a big deal, a big change.
    - v. Question: If I have any grievance whatsoever, can I bring it to the Grievance Committee? What advantage is there to identifying this sub-type of grievance? Answer from Dr. Kraft: It is a University committee, so it includes both Staff and Faculty, but the USG outlines what grievances can be brought. Bullying is not well addressed.
    - vi. Question: This is very serious wording. There has to be a really high bar. If we go back to the Faculty Handbook, I believe it excludes performance-based issues, so that it doesn’t mix issues. What would be the bar for the strong wording? Answer from Dr. Desnoyers-Colas: The people who write the policy would set the bar. The research indicates that this is a

prevailing problem, primarily for women and academicians of color.

- vii. Comment: You said that do not have data but you can guarantee that it happens. Answer from Dr. Desnoyers-Colas: I don't have any Armstrong data.
- viii. Question: But this might give the committee almost complete latitude. How do you possibly measure these things? Answer: Like you measure those things in other policies. If we can get some data from the climate survey, this could help. I don't have any Armstrong data at this time. Answer from Director of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Deidra Dennie: The climate survey will hit the streets on September 1 and will include information about exclusion behavior that can be broken down by gender, race/ethnicity, etc. I just need to know what data you want. The question asked if you have experienced any exclusionary behavior, what kind was it, and who did it and where. Comment: And keep in mind, everyone might not have answered this question.
- ix. Question: I got the impression that we were going to ask that this committee review the whole issue to see if we have a need for this. The wording about "asking for a policy" is an issue. Are we asking for a review or a policy? Are we asking for them to add a policy? Answer: That is the intention of the bill, asking for a policy.
- x. Question: Is exclusionary behavior included in the meaning of the word discrimination? Answer: Academic bullying and hazing are not. Answer from Dr. Kraft: There will be language about discrimination regarding protected classes. The current policy describes something related to bullying. Bullying sounds like harassment but it is not necessarily.
- xi. Comment: Seeing that we will have some data, if one person answered that question, then I think that policy needs to be made. All we're asking is that one group add a policy and they can define it. This only enables them to make another policy within their committee. We are asking for a policy for which there might be data in a few weeks. Answer from Dr. Desnoyers-Colas: The background for making this request is a personal one, but I will share it. I made a complaint in regards to these issues, but because there isn't anything in our current policy, there was nothing to

base the complaint on. I could not go to that particular committee; there was no mechanism on campus at that time able to deal with it. Since it has happened to me, I know it has happened to others who have made comments to me. I campaigned on that issue. This is a grievance, but it is a grievance that we don't currently address. If the University felt it needed to put it on the climate survey, then it may be a problem. Others have brought it to my attention. This bill is not for me; this is for others going forward.

xii. Comment: This is asking for policy first, data after. It seems to be backwards. We should get the data first and base the policy on that and not on anecdote. That is not a sound foundation for policy.

xiii. MOTION to call the question. Seconded. APPROVED.

xiv. Vote on the bill: NOT APPROVED (as abstentions count as a vote of "no").

iii. Candidates for Faculty Senate Leadership

a. There is one candidate for Senate Vice President (Dr. Cliff Padgett) and no candidates for Senate Secretary. We need a candidate for Secretary. There is a course release for the Secretary, and the process has been streamlined so that the duties are not as onerous as they used to be.

i. Comments from Dr. Padgett: I hope most of you know me by now. Technically, this is my second term as a Senator, but under Dr. Baird's term I was Parliamentarian. When I started my second term, I became Vice President under Dr. Desnoyers-Colas. I am very familiar with the workings of the Senate.

ii. Question: If the current Constitution and Bylaws amendments are approved, are you willing to move on to be President from President-Elect? Answer from Dr. Padgett: I would be willing to do that, but I still feel that because this vote is coming before the votes for the amendments, we should enact the clause that addresses the transition.

iii. APPROVED.

b. We should attempt to get a Secretary before we leave today. Are there nominations from the floor?

i. No nominations.

ii. Comment: Some of us are rolling off of Senate, and the incoming Senators are not in the room. Answer: There will be 9 new Senators.

iii. Question: Can the Governance Committee contact them and see if anyone from that group is interested?



Answer: Yes. Although, if we don't have anyone nominate him- or herself, we will need to ask again.

- iv. Comment: This could be an area related to bullying, because Department Chairs might not be okay with giving a course release. Answer: Senators should ask their Chairs and tentatively nominate themselves pending Chair approval.
- v. TABLED.

#### D. New Business

##### 1. Committee Reports

###### i. University Curriculum Committee

###### a. Meeting Minutes and Curriculum Changes

- i. COE: No items.
- ii. CHP: No items.
- iii. CLP-Liberal Studies: No discussion, APPROVED.
- iv. CST-CHEM/PHYS: No discussion, APPROVED.
- v. CST-CSIT: No discussion, APPROVED.
- vi. One last note: Under those items from CHEM/PHYS, there are additional ones that received a provisional administrative approval from the UCC.

1. Motion made to approve these other course modifications. Seconded. No discussion.

2. APPROVED.

###### ii. Governance Committee

- a. Please vote on the Constitution and Bylaws amendments by the end of day Monday, April 27. Please also tell others in your Departments to vote.
- b. Please note, however, that the amendment related to how the Senate goes into executive session is moot.
- c. The Governance Committee and the Faculty Senate would like to issue a special thank you to Yingxia Gao in ITS who did a wonderful job setting up the voting, including adding buttons with rationales. She really did a fine job and we thank her.
- d. There also is the issue of populating the new committees. This may be taken care of in May. There will be a survey coming out in May (to all Faculty) to consider what committees you would like to serve on. For UCC, we have very specific instructions from Dr. Rick McGrath that we will be following.

###### iii. Academic Standards

- a. No report.

###### iv. Education Technology

- a. The committee hasn't met since the last Senate meeting.

###### v. Faculty Welfare

- a. No report.

###### vi. Planning, Budget, and Facilities

- a. The committee met last week, and the minutes will be available on the Senate website soon.
- b. The committee discussed with Dr. Corrigan some follow-up questions. That information is in the minutes. For example, this included cost overruns on the Liberty Center and the salary adjustment plan. He did clarify that any salary adjustment would be separate from a merit raise. The next reference point is 93%, and data was pulled at the end of March; thus, determinations will be made using very recent data.
- c. Dr. Lewis also discussed the rationale for hiring an American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) consultant. This is a consultant fee that came in after the regular collection of information about consultant fees for the year. Dr. Lewis provided a rationale and a timeline.

vii. Student Success

- a. The committee met earlier today. Minutes will follow soon.
- b. A resolution will be coming forward regarding limiting online hours for new students so that the Senate can vote on this.
- c. The committee is also reviewing admission data and when students actually apply and are admitted and how this relates to their success. We are trying to come up with better deadlines for applications. We will still have open admissions, but data show that students who apply later don't do as well.

2. Other New Business

- i. End of year committee reports also are due. Please send these to the Faculty Senate Secretary, if possible, before May 1 due to the University's planned changes for the Armstrong website.
- ii. Question: Can PBF look into the loss of GA positions, which, I believe, was about 10? I have heard that this was a budgeting mishap, some budgeting problems in the summer, and that shortfall has reduced the number of GA positions. I don't know who else might want to look at the overall process for posting positions and applying for GAs. Who else can we ask to investigate that? It seems the funding of some of these positions is a last-minute thing, and perhaps there could be a more explicit timeline of the GA process.
  - a. Question: Aren't they included in the HR process? Don't they have to go through the same process?
  - b. Question: Before students apply, would it be possible for them to look through the available positions so that they could tailor their applications for specific ones?
  - c. Answer from Associate Provost Donna Brooks: As the person over the GAs, the process used this year is not different from prior years. We were funding positions rather than looking at our budget. Because we have \$130,000, I believe, for GAs,

we had previously funded 26 GAs across the campus out of the Provost's Office, including one for every academic graduate program and GA positions that belong to the Provost's Office. When we had to go back and look at our actual budget; we did not realize that we had funded GAs for the summer as well. So when you pay GAs for July, this impacts the upcoming year's budget. We lost 1.5 positions. That is all we lost. Every year we send out a request for at-large positions. The decision was made prior to me coming into the office that some of those at-large positions would be funded for a two-year cycle. That committed slots and left only 1.5 at-large positions. Three positions were committed for two years, and there 1.5 positions we lost due to summer funding. It was not 10.

- d. Question: Is there a process that sets clear deadlines and notifications? Answer from Dr. Brooks: The applications were due the 15<sup>th</sup> and then we had to wait until we had worked through the budget to see what we had. Before sharing the information with individual applicants, I wanted to talk with the Graduate Affairs Council, then I notified students.

#### E. Senate Information and Announcements

1. Faculty-wide vote for Senate Constitution and Bylaws changes
  - i. Please vote between April 20 and April 27, 2015.
  - ii. Questions: contact [governance.senate@armstrong.edu](mailto:governance.senate@armstrong.edu)
2. Update on Dean's search for the College of Education
  - i. Four candidates visited campus. Evaluations of strengths and weakness are due tonight. The committee is meeting tomorrow and also will meet with the new Provost. The plan is to make an announcement by graduation.
3. Announcements (from the floor)
  - i. Comment from Dr. Desnoyers-Colas: As President of the Senate, this has been a very productive year, building on last year. There were a couple of curve balls in there. It has been great working with all of you. It is a challenge, but I can't do it by myself. I know some of you are going off of the Senate. I want to thank all of you for your support and your service, both the Senators whose terms are ending and those Senators who will return next year.
4. Send Committee meeting dates/minutes to [faculty.senate@armstrong.edu](mailto:faculty.senate@armstrong.edu)

IV. Adjournment at **4:42** p.m.

Minutes completed by:

Leigh E. Rich

Faculty Senate Secretary, 2014–2015

Appendices

A. Attendance Sheet

### Faculty Senators and Alternates for 2014–2015 (Senate Meeting 04/20/2015)

Department	College	# Seats	Senator(s)/Term Year 2014/2015		Alternate(s)	
Adolescent and Adult Education	COE	2	Kathleen Fabrikant (2)	X	Anthony Parish	
			ElaKaye Eley (2)		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)	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)		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)		Priya Goeser	X
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)	X	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)	X	Greg Knofczynski	
			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	