

Georgia Southern University

Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes

Armstrong Faculty Senate

3-23-2015

March 23, 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, "March 23, 2015 Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes" (2015). *Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes*. 19.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/armstrong-fs-minutes/19>

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 March 23, 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 **3:28** p.m. (see Appendix A).
- III. Senate Action
 - A. Approval of Minutes from [February 16, 2015](#) Faculty Senate Meeting
 1. APPROVED without corrections.
 - B. Brief remarks from Dr. Linda Bleicken, President
 1. Since January, we have actually done our census data for enrollment for Spring. It was not a decline, but a very, very modest increase of 0.06% (though the system rounds this up to 1%). We were fortunate to have had increased numbers of new undergraduate and graduate students. From a retention standpoint at the undergraduate level we are not doing as well as we need to — and this is the chunk of our enrollment that moves up to the new year.
 2. For Fall, applications are up and in specific areas that we have been targeting. For the past few years, we have had a decline in counties in our own backyard. We have had an uptick from the Atlanta area.
 3. We are down 4% for Summer, so we really need to work on Summer. We will keep working at it from the admission side but Faculty can “talk up” Summer registration, as the students who sign up for Summer largely are those already in the pipeline right now.
 4. Regarding legislative action:
 - i. The Health Professions students who attended Savannah–Chatham Day at the capitol did a great job of representing the University, including resuscitating “Chuck” about 25 times. A lot of legislators got involved and, since this was Savannah–Chatham Day, this included some of our own representatives.
 - ii. At this stage, we are moving in a very good direction regarding funding for the design of a new Health Professions building. We have received in the House budget about \$900,000. Last week, the same was matched on the Senate side. We are at our \$1.8 million. But what happens now is that the Governor has to sign off on it, so we will continue to work those channels.
 - iii. If that is funded, next year we go looking for construction money.
 - iv. The total cost of the building is \$29.1 million — \$1.8 million for the design; \$4 million is Armstrong’s responsibility; the remaining \$23.3 million is what we will campaign for from the Legislature.
 5. The official kick-off of the Lumina Foundation-funded initiative took place on February 25, with the goal to grow the number of credentialed students from 35% to 48% by 2025. Why is this important? Having credentials makes a difference between leading an impoverished and a non-impoverished life; it

grows the world for a population currently without a bright future. But it also elevates the entire city, creating an environment that is more enticing for employers because there are more qualified workers. This collaborative initiative is very promising.

6. We are continuing to do outreach for fundraising and “friend-raising.” We are not only at the Legislature; we are out in the community connecting with private donors. To say thank you to our donors and the city, the Paint the Town Maroon will take place on Friday.
7. Additionally, this weekend the Asian Festival will bring 3,000–5,000 people to participate in something that has traditionally been held downtown.
8. Question: Regarding changes in in-state tuition, does that mean that folks from Alabama can get in-state tuition from us? Answer: As of last week, and this has just been passed by the Board of Regents, in-state tuition will apply to South Carolina and Florida as well as Alabama residents. This also will apply to currently enrolled students from those border states. The details are still being worked out.
 - i. Question: Are the agreements reciprocal? Answer: No, not that we know of, but that may come.
 - ii. Question: When will this start, in Summer? Answer: No, in Fall 2015.

C. Old Business

1. Outcome of Bills/Resolutions

- i. [FSB 2014-05-12-01](#) Institutional Accountability, Transparency and Communication
 - a. Question: Someone mentioned from the last meeting that we have to continue to make sure that the stipulations in this bill are being adhered to. For example, there was a question about consultant fees. Is the PBF being advised of the fees? Answer: PBF was advised at the beginning of the academic year, and this information can be found in the PBF October minutes. There is a new \$60,000 consultant fee that we have been informed about. The committee assumes that it will be informed about such information once per year; so next October.
 - b. Answer from Senate President Dr. Desnoyers-Colas: There will be times that we have to bring in consultants, so there will be some that aren't mentioned first on that list, but the Senate will be informed when that happens. Also, on the Provost's webpage there is a list of all of the University committees. We will put in a request to ensure that this will be continually updated as well.
 - c. Question: Regarding the Faculty Salary Adjustment schedule. Where are we with that?
 - i. Answer: The University is waiting for the final budget right now; it is aiming for a 3% performance-based increase.

- ii. Question: When will we know? Answer: Unsure at this time. Answer: The main caveats against making those planned adjustments include not reaching enrollment projections as well as unplanned catastrophic expenditures.
 - iii. Comment: PBF will look at this at its next meeting.
 - iv. Question: But adjustment and merit raises are different, correct? A merit raise would be different, an addition? Answer from Vice President for Business and Finance Chris Corrigan: The budget process is just beginning for next year. The Legislature is still in session. Once the budget is approved at the state level, it has to be approved by the Board of Regents in the first week of May. We have plans to move forward on two tracks: (1) market-based adjustments and (2) the possibility of merit raises. This is something that the President's Cabinet will be considering as soon as it has the budget. We will provide PBF with an update at the next meeting. It does depend on our revenue. We only have two sources of revenue: state funding, which has been flat, and tuition-based, so we either have to grow our enrollment and/or have the Legislature approve a tuition increase.
 - d. Joint Leadership Team summary February 24
 - e. Staff Personnel Requests 3.10.15
 - ii. [FSB-2015-01-26-03](#) Shared Planning of Future Budget Cuts
 - a. This bill was remanded by the University President with some suggested revisions.
 - b. MOTION: Remand to PBF. SECONDED.
 - i. Comments: There are things that should be clarified in the bill, and it is best to do that in committee before bringing it to the floor.
 - c. APPROVED.
2. Other Old Business
 - i. FSB-2015-03-23-02 Academic Hazing
 - a. This is currently in draft form and is being reviewed. Dr. Desnoyers-Colas is obtaining further input from others on campus and will submit this to the Senate next month.
 - b. The wording of this type of policy change is important. Examining similar policies from other institutions, this is an important issue, and we need to ensure that we include all elements related to academic hazing. We don't want to write something so generalized that it doesn't have impact.

D. New Business

1. Committee Reports

- i. University Curriculum Committee
 - a. Meeting Minutes and Curriculum Changes
 - i. COE: No items.
 - ii. CHP-HS: no discussion, APPROVED.
 - iii. CLA-CJSPS:
 - 1. Question/Clarification re: SOCI 4800: How does this course differ from an internship or does it involve an internship? Answer: The course is mostly classroom-based where students examine concepts of community action and connect with community outreach locations. It is about community action, and then students put this learning into practice. It is both.
 - 2. Question: Is the community interaction a small portion of the classroom time? Answer: Yes. We have seen a sample syllabus, and there are three instances.
 - 3. APPROVED.
 - iv. CST-PSYC: no discussion, APPROVED.
- ii. Governance Committee
 - a. FSB-03-23-03 Changes in Terms and Titles for President and Vice-President
 - i. The proposed changes are in response to a list of charges assigned by the Senate Leadership. The Governance Committee has met twice and has not yet completed all of the charges, but we are making progress. The first bill is the biggest change. It is a bill to amend the Constitution of the Faculty Senate to change both the terms and the titles of the President and Vice President. This goes back to a former Steering Committee suggestion. What the bill would do is change the term of the President to one year (from the current two), but that President would have been elected the year before as President-Elect — so that there would be a built-in training or mentoring period, enabling the President-Elect to “learn the ropes” and already be involved with Senate Leadership before becoming Senate President. There currently is a steep learning curve. The President-Elect would still be serving essentially as the Vice President. The bill would not change the Secretary’s position.
 - ii. This involves three hours of reassigned time, both for the President-Elect and the President. So the person elected President-Elect would still serve a two-year term, but it would be one year as President-Elect and

one as President. The idea is that the President-Elect and the President work together closely as a team. This also would reduce the number of elections we have by one, once it is started. It has a couple of practical advantages. But this does mean a reduction of term as the President.

- iii. Question: Are you ready for this Dr. Padgett. Answer from Dr. Cliff Padgett: This year, I would have to be elected as President-Elect. There is a clause at the end of the bill for the first year of implementation. Question: If elected to President-Elect, you would have two years left. Answer from Dr. Padgett: Without these changes, I could be re-elected anyway.
- iv. This is a constitutional revision. It has to be approved by the Faculty. This requires four weeks of notice to the Faculty, and, if approved, it then moves to the University President to sign. So there are two steps left.
- v. APPROVED. (This bill moves back to the Governance Committee to be posted for a full Faculty vote, with four weeks of notice.)
- b. FSB-03-23-04 Bill to Amend the Bylaws of the Armstrong Faculty Senate, Article VI, Section B: Duties of the Vice President of the Senate
 - i. This bill increases the duties of the Vice President, who if the prior bill is approved will become the President-Elect. Four new duties are added.
 - ii. Question: All of the references to Vice President will then need to be changed to President-Elect. Answer: This is mentioned in this bill and would be changed once approved by the Faculty.
 - iii. APPROVED.
- c. FSB-03-23-05 Bill to Amend the Bylaws of the Armstrong Faculty Senate, Article VIII, Section B: Executive Session
 - i. The bill relates to how the Faculty Senate moves into Executive Session. In *Robert's Rules of Order*, there are several different descriptions for how this can be done.
 - ii. As originally listed in our Bylaws, it starts out backward. This reorders it and specifies more clearly how to go into Executive Session. If a Senator were concerned enough about an issue, it could be moved and seconded and then we would go into Executive Session.

- iii. Question: And this is apart from our pre-Senate working session? Answer: Yes.
- iv. Question: So we still have the provision that someone can make a motion for Executive Session? Answer: It is still a question of privilege. There is more than one way for a question of privilege in *Robert's Rules of Order*; it basically comes down to the wording: If someone says I want to go into Executive Session, then we can, or if someone says I make a motion. Answer: What we are changing is the need for a majority vote to a motion and a second. We are just clarifying our existing practice. In the past, we have said that if one person has raised the request, we've gone into Executive Session. Now we are clarifying our practice. The Bylaws state that we resort to *Robert's Rules of Order*, but there are two cases.
 - v. APPROVED (with 4 opposed).
- d. FSB-03-23-06 Bill to Amend the Bylaws of the Armstrong Faculty Senate, Article V, Section A.1: Senators and Alternates
 - i. Instead of having a one-to-one correspondence between a Senator and his or her alternate, this bill states that Departments can establish a pool of alternates. If a Department has one or two Senators, then it elects one alternate. If it has three to four Senators, then a pool of two alternates. Also, currently alternates serve only one year. This bill would amend that to a term of one to three years, depending on the Department. It would be up to the Department.
 - ii. Difficulties have arisen in the past with the restriction that if you could not make a meeting it had to be your specific alternate. It is more important that we have enough Senators for quorum than a one-to-one correspondence.
 - iii. Friendly Amendment: In the second sentence, it states that if there are two Senators then we only have one alternate. But what if neither Senator can make a meeting? Change this to an equal number of alternates. Instead of "Shall elect one alternate," "Shall elect an equal number of alternates."
 - iv. Question: Is there a limit on a number of years an alternate can serve? Is there the new limit? Answer: Yes, although they can be reassigned. We are keeping it as one to three years and leaving it up to the Department.

- v. Question: Should we change this to “up to three years” instead of “one to three”? Answer: Currently there is no limit in the number of terms you can serve as an alternate. Answer: This is more a convenience to the Department.
- vi. Question: What about phrasing it “May serve for one to three years at a time”? Answer: We don’t want to limit it too much, because some Departments don’t have enough people.
- vii. Question: Senators have a term of three years, but can they serve two terms in a row? Answer: Yes.
- viii. Question: But terms for alternates are currently open-ended? Answer: Yes.
- ix. Question: Will there be a change in the “repeat ability” of alternates? Answer: No.
- x. APPROVED.
- e. FSB-03-23-07 Education Technology Committee Representation Bill
 - i. This is a request from the Senate. We cannot determine who serves on committees. However, the Senate has discussed this with Robert Howard, and he is happy to have someone on this committee. We are in charge of technology fees, and we are currently not doing that. In our corresponding Senate committee, we are looking at long-range issues, and that committee is looking at proposals. This is a way to ensure we have some communication between the two committees. The duties of the two committees are very similar. Comment from Dr. David Ward: The Provost is also okay with this.
 - ii. APPROVED.
- f. FSB-03-23-08 Bill to Amend the Bylaws of the Armstrong Faculty Senate Article XI, Section F: Duties of the Education Technology Committee
 - i. This bill removes the duty currently listed under the Ed Tech Committee of allocating tech fee funds (as it has not been doing it anyway).
 - ii. APPROVED.
- iii. Academic Standards
 - a. Proposal for Academic Standards Change
 - i. There is a bill buried on the second page that needs to be examined and discussed.
 - ii. Explanation from Dr. Delana Gajdosik-Nivens: We examined at the request of the Senate the academic standards at all of the USG institutions and what they

did. Armstrong was in the middle. This bill would raise our standards and raise them earlier and then provide an additional level of support for students under 30 hours. Currently, students can have a 1.5 GPA and still be in good academic standing. As we are trying to get them to a 2.0 to graduate or 2.5 for secondary education, this is difficult. The proposed changes are modeled after programs that have higher standards than we do. We did add another step in the process for students under 30 hours and that is an academic intervention stage, similar to Georgia Southern and Georgia State. Students would be required to enroll in AASU 1101 and that would be included in their limited hours of 14 in order to refocus that student and improve time-management and study skills and thus GPA.

- iii. Question: What is AASU 1101? Answer: It is a two-credit course and there is a grade. It involves study strategies, strategies for success, time management, and study skills. Academic advisers can teach in that course and provide whatever support the student might need to be successful.
- iv. Question: Wasn't this course replaced by the new First Year Experience (FYE) courses? Answer: It was not. AASU 1101 is completely different.
- v. Question: How many students still take it? Answer from Dr. Teresa Winterhalter: One or two sections per semester. Many are students who were readmitted after having failed out. Some also are adults students who need to re-acclimate.
- vi. Question: Do we need to change that prefix? Answer from Dr. Gajdosik-Nivens: Yes, we probably should and will.
- vii. Question: If someone transfers in at 29 hours and has a 3.0, if they fail out two semesters in a row, they still won't meet that mark? Answer: You have to reach below a 2.0 to trigger this. If you have a 1.9 and are on academic warning and consistently get a 2.0, you stay on academic warning.
- viii. Question: Was there discussion to set this at 2.0? Answer from Dr. Gajdosik-Nivens: We didn't feel the campus was ready for that yet. There are a lot of students under the 2.0 mark. Over time, we might want to go toward the 2.0. Most of those currently doing this are the smaller schools and this might be

because the students need to be able to transfer somewhere else.

ix. Question: Can someone take AASU 1101 and the FYE course? Answer: Yes.

x. Comment: Clarification is needed in the bulleted points on the third page.

xi. APPROVED.

iv. Education Technology

a. The committee met with Robert Howard to discuss some of the ways to improve the service response time to Faculty and students. They have made pretty good progress and now are supposed to provide an estimate for a ticket request and/or an update if a service request is delayed. Going forward, you should have more information regarding the status of a Helpdesk ticket. There are checks in place in the software.

b. Regarding technology in the classrooms, the goal is equipment within five years or newer.

c. They are also surveying select focus groups and will host a few Faculty forums to discuss what type of technology we want to see in the classrooms. The first forum might be next month and/or in the Fall.

v. Faculty Welfare

a. No report.

vi. Planning, Budget, and Facilities

a. In the March meeting, information was presented by Doug Harrington who worked with Laura Mills to compile potential financial data regarding the impact eCore could have on Armstrong. They modeled several scenarios, such as what would be the impact if we start losing on-site classes to eCore or by not being a part of eCore. This information will be made available in the next PBF minutes.

vii. Student Success

a. Policy: Enrollment in Fully Online Courses

i. Student Success has been looking at ways to try to protect some students to make sure that they are successful. This draft policy is one means.

ii. Question: Is there is a concern from students about this policy? Answer: Yes, this was discussed. As this policy indicates, there is a way for students to still take these classes, but they would have to take an extra step. But getting them engaged in campus life is part of what makes them successful.

iii. Comment: We already put limits on the number of hours or what types of classes students can take (e.g., prerequisites); thus, there are limits already.

- iv. Friendly Amendment suggestion from Dr. Gajdosik-Nivens: The policy was not supposed to apply to any student enrolled in a fully online program. That was left off. The bottom also should have “academic intervention” added.
- v. MOTION to endorse the policy.
- vi. Comment: This was presented to us not as anything to do with students but to circumvent eCore on campus. I have a problem looking at it from a non-student viewpoint. There is no research that supports that student success is better in a face-to-face setting. This is about student engagement. Regarding engagement on campus, there are things the dorms and other areas on campus can do that don't have to do with what happens in classes. We have to focus on our students. Many of them are coming from high school with online courses. The State of Georgia is coming out with a rule that to graduate from high school you have to take an online course. Answer: eCore started the discussion, but that made us look at how we want our freshmen to be fully engaged. But there are students who can stay at home and never come onto campus and can't be engaged in campus life. Our other idea here is that we are not limiting anybody. They can easily go to a Department head. With the research, in many of the areas freshmen fail twice as much using our data. That's why we had Laura Mills dig through that data.
- vii. Comment: But our Ns are small, and this data is from before Quality Matters was in place. If we want to attract other students, we have to make ourselves a part of the 21st century.
- viii. Question: Was any thought given to nontraditional students? Would you make the same exclusion? Answer: With this, I would want the conversation to occur and ensure that there is more advisement.
- ix. Question: How much work is this going to put on Chairs? And how many incoming freshmen will know about this? Answer from Dr. Gajdosik-Nivens: Remember, it's just the first 15 hours. It is a recommendation from a Senate committee. It also says “or their designee.” Thus, it could be a professional adviser, which all of our colleges have. The point is to draw their attention to this type of choice. Because we are not affiliated with eCore, we

can have a student come to campus and take no courses from us, other than FYE. This is just to drive the conversation for the first-year freshmen. And there is a second part to it, not connected, and could be passed separately for students who are obviously struggling.

- x. Answer from Dr. Ward: This goes back to early Fall and is not related to eCore but to online learning. I started an online course in 1990. The biggest predictor of online success is selection bias: Is the student ready to learn in that environment? Or do they take the online course for the wrong reasons (e.g., the on-site course is too early)? It really is about protecting the pedagogy and experience for the student, and the traditional student, and they don't always make the best choices.
- xi. Comment: Having a student here for the first semester or the first year online potentially runs completely counter to the whole FYE and first-year initiative. Ultimately it will really help with retention. This is very consistent with that program.
- xii. Question: Was Doug Harrington brought into the discussion? Answer: Doug is on it.
- xiii. Question: What about focusing on the word "residential"? Answer: The committee is still worried about the student who lives in Chatham County and only drives here for the FYE. This is not a nontraditional student. It still allows "designee" to be a college adviser.
- xiv. MOTION to remand this back to the committee.
Seconded.
- xv. APPROVED.

- b. Academic Standing and Online Courses
- c. Online vs. Face-to-Face Grade Distributions by Classification
09-19-2014

2. Other New Business

- i. None.

E. Senate Information and Announcements

1. Elections for Faculty Senate are nearing

- i. Please send nominations for Vice President and Secretary to the Governance Committee by April 1, 2015
 - a. Election for the Vice President could be rolled over to President-Elect, depending on how Faculty vote on the Governance Committee bill regarding these changes.

- b. Send nominations; we will vote in the next meeting. Time will be allotted for candidates to speak to the Senate at the start of the next meeting.
 - c. Question: Can candidates nominate themselves? Answer: Yes.
- ii. governance.senate@armstrong.edu
- 2. Update on Dean's search for the College of Education (Ela Kaye Eley)
 - i. The committee is meeting at this very moment. They are looking at phone interviews within the week and on-campus within three weeks. They are narrowing the on-campus visits to five. At last count, there were about 40+ applicants.
- 3. Emergency Planning Committee update (Debra Hagerty)
 - i. Yvette Upton is chair of the committee. There has not been a meeting yet or a notification for a meeting.
- 4. Announcements (from the floor)
 - i. The Faculty Senate Leadership received an anonymous letter regarding first-year students and Navigate. Concern was expressed that first year students at Navigate have their schedules dictated to them, and the University thus decides what classes they should take. The author alleges that this limits students' free choice with regard to the curriculum and takes choices away from students to make their own schedules and plan their lives. The author states that s/he understands that success is vital for retention and the student but feels that students should not be coerced into certain course schedules. The author also questions whether this is a part of trying to reach the 7,272 goal. Dr. Desnoyers-Colas brought this letter to the attention of the Provost and the Steering Committee.
 - a. Comment: At the last Navigate of the Summer, Greg Anderson had placed a majority of those students in their schedule. Dr. Ward got us numbers pretty quick that we retained those students at a higher rate and their GPAs were similar. Students said they were thankful. There may be some misinformation. Students can go home and delete all of their classes and sign up for new ones. Advisers state that these are the classes they should take; also, with regard to the MATH and SCIENCE sequences as well as FYE, it is hard to get students on the correct path. Other universities do this completely. Parents seem excited. Students who are not excited are advised that they can change their schedule, other than FYE, and they can select times and sections. There may not be much grounding for the letter.
 - b. Answer from Dr. Desnoyers-Colas: I raise this here because rumor control is essential. Since I can't get the information directly back to the author, we raise it here.

- c. Answer from Dr. Gajdosik-Nivens: Pre-filled schedules are very, very common and a strategy for Complete College America. Also, we have new learning support requirements. College advisers are going to be involved in this going forward, and these professional advisers have the knowledge and the skills based on SAT scores and other scores. Their professional judgment is important.
- ii. For Summer, please remind members of your Departments that there is a fee reduction. If you take four (4) or fewer hours, there is a reduction in fees. The students aren't full-time, so there is no financial aid.
 - a. Comment from Dr. Ward: This reduction amounts to about \$300.
 - b. Comment: It definitely removes the conundrum of paying more in fees than for credits.

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

IV. 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 03/23/2015)

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)	X	Brenda Logan	
Art, Music and Theatre	CLA	3	Carol Benton (1)	X	Emily Grundstad-Hall	
			Deborah Jamieson (2)		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)		Beth Childress	
			Anne Katz (2)		John Hobe Glenda Ogletree	X
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	
			Nick Mangee (2)	X	Yassi Saadatmand	
Economics	CLA	1	Wayne Johnson (1)	X	Priya Goesser	
Engineering	CST	1	Leigh Rich (3)	X	Joey Crosby	
Health Sciences	CHP	2	Janet Buelow (2)	X	Rod McAdams	
			Chris Hendricks (3)	X	Jim Todesca	
History	CLA	2	Michael Benjamin (1)	X	Allison Belzer	
			Bill Deaver (2)	X	Gracia Roldan	
Languages, Literature and Philosophy	CLA	5	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	
			Melissa Jackson (3)		Ann Fuller	
Library	CLA	1	Michael Tiemeyer (3)	X	Greg Knofczynski	
Mathematics	CST	3	Paul Hadavas (2)	X	Tim Ellis	
			Joshua Lambert (2)	X	Jared Schlieper	
			Deb Hagerty (3)	X	Carole Massey	
Nursing	CHP	3	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	