

1-26-2015

January 26, 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, "January 26, 2015 Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes" (2015). *Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes*. 18.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/armstrong-fs-minutes/18>

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.

**Armstrong State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of January 26, 2015
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 [November 17, 2014](#) Faculty Senate Meeting
 1. APPROVED without corrections.
 - B. Brief remarks from Dr. Linda Bleicken, President
 1. Welcomed Chris Corrigan, the new Vice President for Business and Finance, who started at Armstrong on January 5, 2015.
 2. Armstrong's FY2016 budget will not be decided until the Georgia Legislature and Board of Regents (BOR) finish their deliberations, which typically occurs in April/May.
 3. A team of Armstrong representatives will be at the Capitol in Atlanta on Tuesday, January 29, which is Savannah Day, to share with the Legislature what the University's priorities are. Our one budget priority this year is a new structure for the College of Health Professions. This year's focus is to obtain funding for building design. Additionally, the Armstrong team also includes the mannequin "patient" named Chuck, who will be revived by students multiple times. This is a great way, rather than standing around handing out pamphlets, to engage members of the Legislature and for them to see what our students learn.
 4. CAMINO, a Lumina Foundation-funded initiative, is a collaboration among numerous partners, including Savannah Tech, Savannah State University, the Savannah–Chatham County Public School System, and other organizations, to double the number of Latino students among our institutions. Lumina issued another round of community-partnership funding to grow the number of credentialed students by 2025 from what it is currently. This includes industry partners such as Gulfstream and Georgia Power but also the City. The goal is not simply to grow degrees but also to make people's lives as well as the Savannah community measurably better.
 - C. Old Business
 1. Outcome of Bills/Resolutions
 - i. [FSB 2014-05-12-01](#) Institutional Accountability, Transparency and Communication
 - a. Joint Leadership Team summary December 2
 - i. Senate President Desnoyers-Colas attended the recent the JLT meeting and requested that Administrators and Deans and others who wish to speak to the Senate appropriately limit their time to allow for other Senate business and, if items are purely informational, to disseminate these via other venues as possible. She also recognized that the Senate does need and wish to

hear about relevant and pressing matters and stated that the Senate seeks a balance.

- ii. A comment/question was made regarding follow-up information about the three-year plan and the salary-adjustment study. Answer: We have requested that this be sent out to the faculty, which we believe was sent by the President's Office in December. Also, this likely depends on the budget, and we should know more in March.
- b. Faculty Personnel Requests 11.24.14
- c. Staff Personnel Requests 11.24.14
- d. Staff Personnel Requests 12.16.14
- e. Faculty Personnel Requests 1.12.15
- f. Staff Personnel Requests 1.12.15
- ii. [FSB-2014-11-17-02](#) Armstrong State University's Title IX Policy
 - a. Senate President Desnoyers-Colas: This bill came back as DISAPPROVED. As the bill was making its way to the President, I received a series of e-mails from Deidra Dennie regarding the bill itself and some of the issues that the bill raised. (For copies of these e-mails, please contact Senate President Desnoyers-Colas.) In the end, we needed some more information. We might have been misinformed. Contrary to what we were told, there were Faculty members invited to be on that committee. However, there is a concern that the committee didn't come to the Senate to ask us for assistance in appointing Faculty members. We did not get that opportunity, but there were Faculty members on that committee. The Faculty members were sent the website from the White House and other Title IX information and about what Armstrong was planning to do in May, June, and July. A few meetings were held; whether Faculty members were able to attend is not known. The BOR in essence wasn't saying anything about this issue. It appeared that they were going to be looking at the issue in May and perhaps Armstrong jumped the gun. This concern was shared with the President and the Provost. Concern still exists about what roles Faculty should be playing and questions that we feel are not yet answered. The document that we believed was signed in stone is still a living, breathing document, and we still have the right to bring discussion and changes. I also have asked that we have more reporting officials, particularly adding/increasing the number of male reporting officials. Although the topic is not dead, we can't legally do what we are asking in the bill to do. At this stage, we can revisit the bill. We can ask for more discussion,

more involvement with the document, but the bill itself has been vetoed.

- b. Question: Regarding the reporting of aggregate data as opposed to individual data, is that illegal? If so, we would like to see that law that states that aggregate data cannot be reported. We would like to see the law that states that. Can anybody here speak to that? Answer: No one at present can speak to this question. Answer from Dr. Bleicken: When I spoke with our legal staff at the University System office, there are three groups granted confidentiality: licensed counselors acting within their counseling duties (not as a Faculty member); clergy, also acting within that role; and medical professions acting in their role as medical professionals. That is from the University System office itself. A follow-up conversation with them indicated the likelihood that such notification information will be disseminated on their website. When interpreting a legal document, it is best to go to the legal system. The University System has been asked to address the issue in a better manner.
- c. Question: What is the University System as a whole and Armstrong doing to make sure that students are educated on the protocol that will be followed? We need to make sure we are very, very forward in this policy, because it will have the negative effect of keeping them from telling us. Answer: There needs to be training for everyone, students and Faculty and Staff alike. We want students to feel safe and Faculty to be a part of the system and to make sure that everyone on campus knows. We can't tell the BOR what to do; if this is as important as it is, this should be something that the BOR addresses.
- d. Question: Regarding the three exempted groups, if someone is both a Faculty member and a doctor, how is the reporting duty determined? Answer: If they are in the classroom teaching as a Faculty member, that takes you out of that exempted category as opposed to if someone came to your faith organization or medical office or a counselor in a counseling session with an appointment. Answer from Dr. Winterhalter: At a recent conference, a person from the Department of Education elucidated that the mandatory reporting comes primarily out of the Clery Act, not specifically Title IX. If a student comes to a Faculty member with a complaint or allegation, you are a mandatory reporter. But if you are, for example, an English professor giving students a writing assignment, this comes under the standards of care under the Clery Act as a reflective exercise, like Take Back the Night. It is a very gray area, and the training has to be very

clear. If a person feels endangered, then we are responsible to report.

- e. A request was made to hear from Deidra Dennie regarding this issue.
 - f. Question: At our last meeting, and someone looked this up on an iPad, there were questions regarding whether the BOR had a policy in place and it looked like they don't have a policy yet, and yet Deidra Dennie came to the Senate in August and stated that there is a policy, that these are rules and this is the training. Is there a BOR policy about reporting? Answer from Deidra Dennie: No. The BOR does not have a Title IX policy, because that is federal law. What they do have is a responsible employee clause, with three areas: one is if a student would hold you out as someone in a leadership role who could solve their problem, or you hold a particular role in which anyone would think you have any sway, influence, or direct action if they came to you with a complaint.
 - g. Question: Can you differentiate between the Clery Act and Title IX, as it seems as there are some ways where they cross each other? Answer from Deidra Dennie: The Clery Act has something called mandated reporters and on campuses there are certain people who are mandated to report certain things, like theft, burglary. That is Clery reportable. Every September-October, you get an e-mail from our University Police Department. This includes sexual assault. The Clery report is reported to parents, the community. Title IX is just about sexual misconduct and sexual assault. Clery covers any law-breaking.
 - h. Comment: The bill didn't state that there was no Faculty representation, but that the Faculty was underrepresented. It would have been and would be a good idea that more Faculty are brought into these discussions. Answer from Deidra Dennie: Let me know who those Faculty are as we move forward. We haven't received any feedback regarding our policy that we sent in the summertime. Just know that our policy that we created in the summer hits all the checkpoints on NotAlone.gov. There were several things we had to do, including offering due process to the accused and the victim.
- iii. [FSR-2014-03-24-01](#) Deferred Action Status
- a. Last year the Senate passed a resolution in support of a request from the SGA to support our undocumented students. A few months ago, the current SGA President drafted a letter to the Governor requesting that our students receive in-state tuition. There are about 17 states that do so. The Staff

Council is also writing a resolution. Together, they will send these to the Governor.

- b. Question: Who wrote the resolution and has it been voted on?
Answer: Yes, it was passed last March (last calendar year and last school year). In the current items being sent to the Governor, it also might behoove us to include the Lumina funding to show that there is interest in the community to help students attain their degrees.

iv. [FSB-2013-03-18-06](#) Annual Financial Report (Chris Corrigan)

- a. (A request has been made for the Annual Financial Report to be available via the webpage for the Office of Business and Finance. Detailed information about the items listed below can be located there.)

b. FY2015 Budget Status

- i. We are a little behind, about 1.3%, in our budget. This is in part due to how we handle summer revenues and other factors. This is not of major concern, but we are keeping an eye on it.
- ii. We are running a little ahead than prior years for personnel and travel.
- iii. We do have some spending issues. One way to balance the budget is through salary lapse funds. A lot of these funds are spoken for. Given the revenue shortfall we are expecting, this is something to keep an eye on.
- iv. Regarding Liberty Center funding, bids came in ahead of budget but we also had some remediation issues. Funds had to be allocated for this.
- v. Health plan increases, merit/salary increases, and a few other items also added up and impacted our funds.

c. FY2016 Budget and Process Overview

- i. University and University System funding requests are sent to the Legislature and the Governor. The BOR will take what the Legislature provides and then allocate that out. Thus, specific questions about the 2016 budget won't be able to be answered until all of our budget information comes together. Tuition is really the main revenue source that we here at Armstrong control and will be the main source of growth. He believes that the 2016 budget will be a slight increase over 2015.
- ii. How funding works: The Legislature will make decisions, and once the BOR gets the funds it will allocate them based on a formula that, up until this year, involves enrollment, square footage, FTEs. It's

been that way for many years, but it is going to change. Starting this year, there is a transition to performance funding. We will get our funding according to the old formula, but any add-ons will have to be based on metrics. Next year's budget is going to be based on metrics. We have not received the model yet, so we don't know how that will work.

- iii. However, we will need to focus on RPG (retention, progression, graduation). It is not just about enrollment growth, not just getting the students here, but how well the students do when they are here. These likely will be key metrics.
- iv. Last year we got a 3.6% increase, for health insurance, merit pay increases, a campus fiber project, and some other items that we requested. The BOR requested this year for a 2.4% increase. We are anticipating 2.4-3%, but it is unclear how performance metrics will affect this.
- v. If we want to grow our priorities, we need to do this through the tuition piece. Again, this is complicated. It is not just about our head count but how we retain students and the mix between undergraduate and graduate students. Our head count has declined. It was even in 2014, and as Georj Lewis has reminded us, we all have a part in that. It is important that we turn this line from being flat back to an upward direction.
- vi. Retention numbers are another big piece. After he has been here longer, he says he will know what a 1% increase in retention means for the budget, but there is a positive trend.
- vii. Regarding in-state tuition rates, we have requested a 3% increase, the BOR asked for 2.5%, so it is likely the Legislature will approve something in this range.
- viii. We need to bend that curve upward by hitting the enrollment targets and improving retention.
- ix. Mandatory fees have been pretty flat. We made a fairly significant change in our athletic fees. This needed to happen, as we were one of the lowest in the state.
- x. We pretty much were average on most of these fees, but there is room in a couple of them for us to get up to average. Thus, there is an opportunity for us to request higher fees.

- xi. Auxiliary operations are run mostly as profit-center operations, so we can keep the reserves to fund those activities. Most of them are doing well.
- d. Expenses/Expenditure trend
 - i. This has been relatively flat, except for personnel, expanding salaries.
 - ii. Personnel services broken down by category:
 - 1. Kind of flat for Faculty across three years. Administrators went up a bit earlier but then have been flat.
 - iii. Increases have gone to instruction and academic support — where he emphasizes we ought to be spending our money. He hopes we will continue that.
- e. FY2016 Budget Plan
 - i. We will get a base budget moving forward. Part of the increases of 2015 involved salaries, health insurance, and other initiatives. We may get some state-appropriated funds for certain items. Anything new that we want probably will come from growth and enrollment.
 - ii. We asked for salary dollars to bring Faculty and Staff up to market levels as well as a couple of other special initiatives related to retention.
 - iii. We asked for some specific facility money, such as renovating MCC and UH, creating redundant fiber access to the campus, and the key item of a new CHP building.
- v. Questions
 - a. Regarding auxiliary totals, we were told that we were going to be using a new housing company; will that affect the auxiliary totals? Answer: It is. It also affects the cost. Instead of being able to generate our own revenue, we are getting rent and reimbursables. They are paying us to run the facility. And then we get a base rent. This is supposed to reimburse us for the profits. It might not, but it does take the risk out. This is a fixed fee. This is good news and bad news.
 - b. How is the money figured for the former aquatic center? Answer from Dr. Ward: The former pool, what we have been calling the academic success center, is not fee-based; it is not in the auxiliary. There was a capital allocation in this year's budget to fund this. Academic coaches will work there. Question: Where will the money come for those people? Answer from Dr. Ward: We don't know if we have those monies yet.

- c. Is there an architect yet for the CHP building? Answer: No. That's something that we will collaborate on with the BOR. We'll bid that out. We get a vote with the BOR. We have to get the dollars first.
- d. Regarding the CHP building, will there be certain sustainability requirements? Answer: He will ask Katie Twining. The BOR wants very tight control over capital projects. He will follow up on this question and get back to the Senate.
- e. In the past, cost overruns on construction projects ended up in reductions of scope. Regarding the Liberty Center, has this been looked into, changing the scope of the project? Answer: We are past that point. This funding happens way in advance, a few years at a time; when we bid, we ask for deductible alternatives. We made a strategic decision not to accept any of those deductible alternatives. Answer from Dr. Bleicken: This building likely will need to grow even beyond what was planned. We asked for and received permission to put in our own dollars.

2. Other Old Business

i. Academic Renewal for Returning Students

- a. When something like this comes forward, we often like to go on record and make a motion to support or not support it.
- b. Motion made to support the draft. Seconded.
- c. Discussion:
 - i. Question: At the end, there is reference to this possibly becoming USG-wide policy. Answer: There already is a USG mandate saying that we have to have a new policy within these guidelines. We also have to accept another USG's school renewal.
 - ii. Within the mandated set of parameters, are there variations from institution to institution? Answer: Yes.
- d. APPROVED.

ii. Presentations to the Faculty Senate

- a. Concern over Informational vs. Informative presentations given by non-Senators at Faculty Senate meetings
 - i. See above.

D. New Business

1. Committee Reports

i. University Curriculum Committee

a. Meeting Minutes and Curriculum Changes

i. New Items from December 3, 2014

- 1. CHP-DDTS: no discussion, APPROVED.
- 2. CHP-REHAB: no discussion, APPROVED.
- 3. CLA-CJSPS: no discussion, APPROVED.
- 4. CLA-ECON: no discussion, APPROVED.

5. CST-BIOL: no discussion, APPROVED.
 6. CST-CHEM/PHYS: no discussion, APPROVED.
 7. CST-CSIT: no discussion, APPROVED.
 8. CST-ENGR: no discussion, APPROVED.
 9. CST-MATH: no discussion, APPROVED.
 10. CST-PSYC: no discussion, APPROVED.
- ii. New Items from January 14, 2015
1. COE-CESE: no discussion, APPROVED.
 2. CHP-HS: no discussion, APPROVED.
 3. CST-BIOL: no discussion, APPROVED.
 4. CST-CHEM/PHYS: no discussion, APPROVED.
 5. CST-MATH:
 - i. A request for clarification was made regarding corequisites for students in, e.g., MATH 0997 with MATH 1001 or MATH 0999 with MATH 1111. Must students indeed take these courses in the same term? Answer: Yes.
 - ii. Why? Answer: Because the DWF rate is so high, the USG has put forward this motion to better the pass rate.
 - iii. Comment: This then means that students are taking five (5) hours of Math in one semester; it would be five of their overall semester hours.
 - iv. Question: Have we defined how we deal with a student who passes MATH 1111 but does not pass MATH 0999? Answer from Dr. Delana Gajdosik-Nivens: The USG does not mandate that they have to pass the 0999 class; they have to pass the 1111 class to move on. This is the same thing for English (though here it would be a total of 4 credit hours, whereas in Math it is 5).
 - v. Comment: In such a scenario, though, we have now dropped someone's GPA. Answer: By definition, if they blow off a class, they have made that choice. Answer from Dr. Gajdosik-Nivens: Their success is based on passing the gateway course, but the USG has mandated that they cannot get a D.
 - vi. APPROVED.

ii. Governance Committee

- a. The Chair of this committee is on a Faculty search and thus is not able to attend today. Charges, as listed in the agenda, have been sent to the Governance Committee. This has included: cleaning up the Bylaws and the Constitution; consideration of a course release for the Senate Vice President, since duties of the VP have been increased; changing the procedure for committee assignments so Faculty members do not have to stay on the same committee for three years, with an option for replacing people; and establishing pooled, instead of specific, Senator alternates within Departments.
- iii. Academic Standards
 - a. No report.
- iv. Education Technology
 - a. Not met since the last Senate meeting.
- v. Faculty Welfare
 - a. Not met since the last Senate meeting.
- vi. Planning, Budget, and Facilities
 - a. FSB 2015-01-26-02 Teaching Priority
 - i. Rationale: This bill was proposed because of suggestions in the budget narrative that vacant lines could be considered one way to deal with a possible 3% reduction in state funding. Based on Vice President Corrigan's presentation at the current Senate meeting, however, this reduction seems to be a low probability at this time.
 - ii. Question: Are we putting forward a bill that we know will not be supported? This ties the wrist of Administration. I don't see how it could be supported if there isn't another way to do it? Is there enough wiggle room in other places in our budget in order to make that shortfall? Answer from Dr. Bleicken: I want to remind everyone that when the budget narrative was put forward, it was late October; we had at that time two interim people, the Vice President for Business and Finance and the Provost. Chris Corrigan is very open to being open in the budget-building process. I would suggest that we think about that going forward. Rather than saying that we want X, we more likely can think about a broader and more inclusive process going forward. I am in pretty continuous conversations with new Provost, who will be at Armstrong in March. This bill is a bit premature, given that we don't know yet what our budget-building process will be.

- iii. Comment: It does seem that things are more collaborative, but it seems a good idea to concretize that. The second bill speaks to that. The context behind this first bill happened at the time when we were told of the possibility of closing vacant Faculty lines while we are trying to move Faculty salaries.
- iv. Comment: If we support this and don't get rid of Faculty lines, but we have to cut the budget, the money from Faculty lines disappears to maintain vacant lines. This seems like we are chasing two things. Answer: We should discuss the second bill, as this addresses that we be a part of the discussion.
- v. Question: Why did we have vacant lines? They are not equal and should not be treated equally. Answer: Some come from retirement; this is one reason. Also, if a Department is shrinking, do we necessarily need to keep a line, if it is truly gone and we don't need it?
- vi. Question: Can you give an example? Answer: No examples come to mind at the moment. Answer from Dr. Ward: There are examples where lines are cut because enrollment can't fill it.
- vii. Comment: In a previous presentation, wasn't it suggested that if there isn't enough money in the budget, we look at Faculty lines? The absolutism of this is bothersome. What about a suggestion that Faculty lines are the last thing to look at but not something so absolute? There is an issue with the wording.
- viii. Comment: There is concern being raised about tying the hands of the Administration, but is anyone asking Administrators to look at their budgets? These two places for cuts, faculty lines and salaries, seem to be presented as the only two possibilities. This bill addresses this. Answer from Dr. Ward: Clarification is needed about what was stated and what was written to the BOR. It was stated was that we would not be able to achieve a 3% reduction without hitting the personnel budget. This includes Administrators. Everyone who works at the institution. What was written says that vacant Faculty and Staff lines would be looked at. This was never referred to low-hanging fruit. To get to 3% reduction, there aren't a lot of low-hanging fruit. I did not state this.
- ix. NOT APPROVED.

b. FSB 2015-01-26-03 Shared Planning of Future Budget Cuts

- i. Comment: A suggestion was made to stipulate that PBF be involved rather than just having something submitted to PBF.
- ii. Amendment suggested by Dr. Anne Thompson: Along these lines of having more active participation, strike “be submitted to” and replace it with “include.” Answer: That is consistent with the spirit of this bill.
- iii. Motion to accept the amendment: APPROVED.
- iv. APPROVED with the amendment.

vii. Student Success

- a. No report.

2. Other New Business

E. Senate Information

1. College of Education update on Dean search

- i. COE was informed about low enrollment and Armstrong’s concern about that. Prior to winter break, discussions occurred about whether to have a Dean’s search, to fold the COE into another College, or to farm out programs to individual Departments at the University. This came as a big shock. Members of the COE were under the impression that a Dean’s search would take place once the Provost had been hired. The COE has since been told that there will be a Dean’s search. Answer from Dr. Ward: A committee has been formed and is moving forward.
- ii. However, the COE has been told that if the search is not successful, there will not be another one. The current Interim Dean, who is chairing the search, is confident that a search can be successful, and he has been very transparent. Members of the COE are concerned about the fate of the College and its Departments. Academic requirements for teachers have increased as have exams and hours in the classroom; becoming a teacher is very rigorous. We are graduating competent teachers. There is concern about folding the programs into another College or Departments, as these requirements don’t really match those of others.
- iii. Question: Is there anything the COE would like from the Senate? Answer: The COE’s frustration has been shared with the Senate Steering Committee, including that several other Universities in the USG system also are looking for COE Deans. Although there is a belief that the search can be successful, the Senate will continue to ask that it receive as much information as possible and it expresses concern about the lateness of the search.
- iv. Comment: If the Dean’s search fails, if the COE is absorbed by the CHP, by merging two colleges so diverse the only money that seems to be saved would be the Dean’s salary. Answer: Columbus State was held as a model, but we do not know how well this has worked/is working. Answer from Dr. Ward: The CHP was put forward as an

example; I said that reorganization would be considered at that time, and this is one option. Another option would be to distribute the programs to other units on campus. I also said that what the President wants is continued Education programs.

2. eCore forum January 29 and related SGA resolution
 - i. This will be held from 1 p.m. – 3 p.m. in the Student Union ballrooms. eCore is possibly going to roll out in the summer, rather than waiting for the fall. The people who are coming supposedly will be able to address those issues.
3. The Climate survey will go live on January 28. Encourage all Faculty as well as students to participate. There will be labs as well as paper copies available or you can use the computer of your office. Go to the Diversity Inclusion website for more information.
4. Contact the Governance Committee at governance.senate@armstrong.edu.
5. Send Committee meeting dates/minutes to faculty.senate@armstrong.edu.

F. Announcements

III. Adjournment at **4:58** 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 01/26/2015)

| 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) | 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 | x |
| | | | 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 | |
| | | | 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) | 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) | | Nancy Remler | x |
| | | | 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) | 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 | |