3-21-2016

March 21, 2016 Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes

Armstrong State University

Armstrong State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of March 21, 2016
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 (Appendix A)
    A. She comments that we have some in attendance who will be serving on the senate next year.
III. Senate Action
    A. Approval of Minutes from February 15, 2016 Faculty Senate Meeting
    APPROVED without corrections.
    B. Brief Remarks from Dr. Linda Bleicken, President
    I hope you all had a relaxing spring break. While you were gone, the house and senate was busy passing Campus Carry and is in Governor Deal's hands. No matter what your feelings are about the bill, this bill has ignited emotions. We will be having a forum about this on Thursday at 3:30. It's an opportunity to hear about what this could mean for our campus if the bill is signed. University Attorney Lee Davis will be speaking, as well as Chief Wilcox. The discussion will be moderated by Dr. Beth Howells. I sent a letter to Governor Deal. The USG has cautioned us as administrators, faculty, and staff not to directly engage the legislature. The letter I sent communicated that we support the current law. There has been some potential softening in his position as indicated by his postponement of signing the bill. Eight other institutions have also sent letters. Another issue that has come up at the state level is due process rights of students. There is an invitation for input from faculty on the student conduct code from our Office of Student Integrity. Our student conduct code has to be updated no later than April 22. Our student affairs professionals and Title IX coordinator have been discussing this process. We will be doing a search for the new CIO. It will be an internal search. Provost Smith will chair the search. It will include someone recommended by faculty senate. It is my pleasure to introduce a relatively new hire to the university, Mr. John Brooks, our new director of HR. He has worked in the system as HR director for Clayton University and more recently at Tennessee Tech. As another introduction, Tim Moody is our interim CIO.
    C. Brief Remarks from Dr. Robert Smith, Provost
    I wanted to update you on a couple of things. First, the admissions office has been working very hard. In terms of admits, we are up 14% year over year. I've been working with Deans and Department Heads to follow up on admitted students – welcoming students to campus, inviting them to visit a class or two. Deposits are up about 50%. I am also working with Deans and Department Heads to improve retention. Academic advising has already seen more than 800 students. Department Heads are working with faculty to get students in to meet with their advisors. We are working with ITS and Institutional Research to find out who has and has not been advised. This registration period, we are implementing wait lists for full courses. Registration holds are global holds – when they are on, that student cannot register

for anything until their advising hold is lifted. They are not specific to particular semesters. I am working with the Registrar to switch to a term-specific PIN the student will get during advising. We are interviewing for the position of Director of Applied Cyber Education. We have been designated as a center for excellence in cyber education. One of their charges will be to raise funds through grants to support their salary. One word on eCORE: The agreement for eCORE has changed. The state system has altered the language to read that we have attained faculty endorsement through existing faculty governance channels and that faculty have reviewed the courses offered and found them to be consistent with our curricular standards. We lost about $17,000 in revenue in fall and spring through students taking eCORE courses. The rate of enrollment of our students in eCORE is increasing. We also cannot count these students in our headcount. We are the only institution in USG not affiliated with eCORE.

President Desnoyers-Colas notes that she has sent the new verbiage to our UCC for review.

Question from senator: can you clarify the issue regarding how holds are set up now, versus the PIN system?

Response from Provost: Under the current process, every student has an advisement hold and it's either on or off. PINs would be specific to that student and to a particular semester. Banner can support this.

D. Brief Remarks from Dr. Angeles Eames, Director of Assessment (Appendix B)

I know there have been some questions about SmartEvals. What's been provided is a handout about the background of SmartEvals and the progress we've made to date. There have been questions about what happens to the comments. SmartEvals has multiple choice questions and open-ended questions. All faculty and department heads receive feedback about multiple choice responses. Department heads do not receive open-ended feedback. Right now the reason they don't do that is that the comments are not signed and in the past there have been concerns about unsigned comments going forward. We have a proposed solution. We could add two questions: do you want to identify yourself and allow the department head to view your comments about this class? If so, the student would be prompted to enter their name.

Question: Is there a way to ensure they are entering their name, as opposed to a classmate's name or a made up name? Couldn't it auto-fill from some other area of the survey? Why did we sign on for this if it was different than what we did before?

Answer from Dr. Eames: These are proposed solutions. I will make note of your comment. Let's pretend we can address those concerns (I'm not a computer programmer, I would have to ask the vendor), there would be two views – instructor view and department head view. Instructors would see signed and unsigned comments and department heads would only see signed comments.

Question: I wonder if putting "department head" would be too limited. Wouldn't we want to add "dean" as well since comments can go up to that level?

Answer from Dr. Eames: We can word it however we want.

Question: Currently, SmartEvals are designed for face-to-face courses. Are you going to develop a survey for online courses?
Answer from Dr. Eames: That's a great question, I think we should be addressing online courses. I want to remind this group that the folks who designed this survey were faculty and approved by faculty, so there may be a need to revisit this.
Comment from Senate President Desnoyers-Colas: This survey has only been used for a year. We can have a charge for a committee to review how this is going.
Comment from Senate Secretary Wolfe: I want to clarify that faculty were on the committee but did not design the survey questions. SmartEvals has a core list of questions. We wanted that – questions that had been carefully designed, evaluated and vetted. Questions could be modified, but we did not want to design the questions from scratch. It was our understanding on the committee that the modification to distinguish signed and unsigned comments would occur from the beginning. We asked vendors about it. Had we known that no comments would be forwarded, we may have revisited the issue and perhaps recommended that all comments be forwarded, but didn't discuss that possibility because we assumed something like this modification was happening at the outset. We were told by SmartEvals that they could make this modification to continue what we had done in the past. If there is a committee that should revisit whether all comments should be forwarded, then perhaps they could make recommendations for next year.

E. Old Business
    1. Recurrent Updates
        i. Joint Leadership Team Summary
        ii. Faculty and Staff Vacancy Reports 2.18.16 & 3.4.16

    2. Other Old Business
        i. Updates on University Committee Representation: Senate President Desnoyers-Colas notes we are re-doing the search for Dean of CST. Any updates? Chair: we have identified 9 candidates and are Skyping them now. First and second week of April is the timeline for bringing them to campus – looking to bring in 5.
            a. Director of Admissions and Recruitment: 30 applications. Skyping next week. First, second week of April is timeline for campus visits.

            b. Faculty Senate Representation and IT Governance Model: Senate President Desnoyers-Colas – I had the chance to meet with Tim Moody to discuss the IT governance plan. Tim Moody notes: the last two pieces of governance model required metrics. We built a balance score card working with Business and Finance to evaluate each project – cost vs. benefit. I will have a presentation on this. There will be an advisory committee and the input, recommendations will be funneled up to a strategic plan committee. I spoke at the Ed Tech

committee and we will make sure we have representation from that committee. Question: a question came up in a meeting with the Provost and LLP faculty. We asked about any new administrative positions and were told there would not be any. There is now a new position in admissions. Senate President Desnoyers-Colas: It's not a new position. It has been vacant for over a year. President Bleicken clarifies: It has been six years. The position has remained unfilled until we could build stability in that office.

ii. eCORE: previously discussed by Provost – no additional discussion.

iii. Campus Carry Legislation
Senate President Desnoyers-Colas: Town hall meeting is this Thursday. I sent out the powerpoint from the University of Houston. I thought it was practical and could be applicable in terms of what we could do here at Armstrong. As uncomfortable as this is, I thought it was good for us to start thinking about these things. Campus carry legislation – the USG has been trying to keep up with other campuses, if they are sending forth resolutions and bills, what they are doing. There are campuses writing their representatives.

iv. Enrollment Management Council Update
Dr. David Bringman: We are still debating holistic review. This is where admissions can look at a student who doesn't meet all of their requirements for admission (e.g., a student who doesn't meet the math score requirement, but wants to be an English major). A question was raised about the admissions area of campus. We have had some turnover, but not due to change in the office. They are not advising more students than the consultant recommended per advisor. We'll still have to work on our indicators to how we transition to departmental advising. Would love recommendations for how we can still be mentors to students in their first 45 hours. Question: What is the number of students per advisor? Answer: 160-200 is the target. Question: Are any advisors advising more than 200? Answer: no. Question: Eventually, the director will have some advisees? Answer: Yes, I believe so. Provost Smith: if the concern is whether the new advisors have too many students, you should know they are running ahead of what we expected.

v. Salary Committee Update
Senate President-Elect Padgett: Committee met Friday before spring break. Dr. Mike Toma is working with the data and the committee will meet in two weeks to review the spreadsheets. There is a rumor that the state legislature may limit funds universities can use for faculty raises to the 3% merit raise. Our top budget request was for salary

adjustments. There is no tuition increase. The expectation is that we won't have additional funds. We don't know that yet, however. Question: Was there a 3% additional request beyond what the state is allocating for merit raises. The 3% is a merit pay increase. The salary increase is different? Answer from Provost: We don't know what the committee will recommend. The concern that Cliff mentioned, in a conversation with CVO's, is that we may have a prohibition against adding additional funds.

vi. USGFC
    a. Response to Resolution
       Senate President Desnoyers-Colas: I think the response is pretty self-explanatory. I have heard from others that they didn't feel he had answered all of our concerns, but all I can say is that is his response to our resolution.
    b. USGFC Representation Bill
       Senate President-Elect Padgett: We currently don't have a process for doing this as required by the USGFC constitution. I have drafted recommendations for identifying this individual, term of service, etc. It's under review by the Governance Committee.

vii. Post-Tenure Review Bill (Appendices C and D)
     Bill and resolution came from Faculty Welfare committee. Committee Representative: one of our charges was to compare what we do for post-tenure review with what they do at other universities. We did that, including with nearby, comparable universities. We are proposing there to be a raise with satisfactory post-tenure review. Other schools also have a designation for very satisfactory performance at post-tenure review, so we have drafted a resolution to change the categorization we use to include very satisfactory and an associated increase in salary. Question: Where would this money come from? Response: We don't have that answer. You have to start somewhere and see who can find the money. Question: I shared this with faculty in my department and they were offended by the word "incentive". Perhaps "recognition" could be used instead. Further discussion: could the language be changed to "recognizing and rewarding". Further discussion: Do we want to change this to clarify how this would affect those who might go up for promotion and review separately in order to get two bumps up in salary? It could be limited to just full professors. Comment: What about lecturers? Suggestion: It could be made specific to fully promoted faculty. Additional suggested change: Change wording of last statement of resolution: …their base salary, in addition to any merit and CUPA based salary adjustments, for fully promoted faculty. Resolution APPROVED (28-4)

Regarding the Bill: Dr. Padgett asks, I assume you want the same wording changes there? Comment: What would really make faculty in my department feel recognized is a one year sabbatical. Comment: Can PBF ask how much this will cost? Answer from PBF representative: Yes. Question: Don't we need to add the wording about "very satisfactory"? Answer: No, because that is from a resolution. We hope it is implemented based on this recommendation, but this is not a bill and does not have to be implemented. Bill APPROVED (25-3)

3. Old Business from the Floor

F. New Business
   1. Committee Reports and Charges
      i. University Curriculum Committee
         a. Meeting Minutes and Curriculum Changes
         b. College of Health Professions (Two items, APPROVED 26-2)
         c. College of Health Professions, Dept. of Health Sciences (Two items, APPROVED 26-3)
         d. College of Liberal Arts, Dept. of Economics (15 items, APPROVED 25-2)
         e. College of Science and Technology, Dept. of Computer Science and Information Technology (1 item, APPROVED 24-2)
         f. College of Science and Technology, Dept. of Mathematics (4 items, APPROVED 27-2)

      ii. Governance Committee: (Appendix E)
      Bylaws change proposed by Education Technology was reviewed and approved by Governance Committee. Discussion: to say "help create" versus "insure" weakens what Education Technology should be about. We should be insuring the access and functioning of technology. Also, this word should be spelled with an "e". Comment: I move to change "help create" with "ensure". Vote for friendly amendment: APPROVE 29-0. Vote for the bill with the change: APPROVE 27-2.

      iii. Academic Standards: We had submitted committee bylaw changes in October and they have not been reviewed yet by governance. Are they going to be reviewed in time for voting in April's senate meeting? Answer from Committee Rep: yes

      iv. Education Technology: No report.

v. Faculty Welfare: We met on March 2nd and that was to draft the post-tenure review bill. We are also working on a charge related to the campus climate survey.

vi. Planning, Budget, and Facilities: This past month's PBF meeting addressed the following issues – the low completion rate for the MyCampus Survey, making the website more user-friendly for students who are registering (e.g., changing the advising hold process and making it easier for students to find the list of course offerings), an update on the GCA Janitorial contract (they hired a new site manager and performance has improved – the are off probation), funding for the Cyber Director position, and we continue to discuss the status of summer profit sharing.

vii. Student Success
    a. Bylaws Change (Appendix F): We have lost quorum, so will have to defer voting until April.

2. Elections
    i. New Senators and Alternates: Welcome new senators who have attended today.

    ii. Nominations of Officers (email carol.andrews@armstrong.edu): we have a couple of people who have volunteered to be nominated for senate office. Cliff is serving as president. I'd like to nominate Dr. David Bringman for president-elect. Question: today is not the only day to nominate. Is there a deadline? Answer: By next month when we vote. New senators can also be nominated. We also have someone who has been willing to be nominated for Secretary, Dr. Wendy Wolfe has volunteered to continue to serve.
3. Other New Business: None

4. New Business from the Floor

G. Senate Information and Announcements

1. Other Search Committee Updates
2. Send Committee Meeting Dates and Minutes to faculty.senate@armstrong.edu
3. Send Changes in Committee Chairs and Senate Liaisons to governance.senate@armstrong.edu
4. Announcements (from the floor)

IV. Adjournment at **4:55pm**

V. Minutes completed by:

Wendy Wolfe
Faculty Senate Secretary 2015-2016
Appendices

- A. Attendance Sheet
- B. SmartEvals Handout
- C. Faculty Welfare Resolution
- D. Faculty Welfare Bill
- E. Education Technology Bill (Bylaws Change)
- F. Student Success Bill (Bylaws Change)

Faculty Senators and Alternates for 2015-2016 (Senate Meeting 3/21/2016)

Department	College	# of Seats	Senator(s) and Term Year as of 2015/2016		Alternate(s)	
Adolescent and Adult Education	COE	2	Kathleen Fabrikant (3)	x	Anthony Parish	
			ElaKaye Eley (3)		Brenda Logan	x
Art, Music and Theatre	CLA	3	Rachel Green (2)	x	Emily Grundstad-Hall	
			Deborah Jamieson (3)	x		
			Elizabeth Desnoyers-Colas (3)	x		
Biology	CST	4	Jennifer Broft Bailey (1)		Sara Gremillion	
			Brett Larson (3)		Jennifer Brofft-Bailey	
			Aaron Schrey (2)		Michael Cotrone	x
			Jennifer Zettler (2	x	Scott Mateer	
Chemistry and Physics	CST	3	Brandon Quillian (1)	x	Catherine MacGowan	
			Donna Mullenax (2)	x	Lea Padgett	
			Clifford Padgett (2)	x	Will Lynch	
Childhood and Exceptional Student Education	COE	2	Kelly Brooksher (1)	x	Bob Lloyd	
			Anne Katz (3)	x	John Hobe	
Computer Science & Information Tech	CST	1	Hongjun Su (1)	x	Frank Katz	
Criminal Justice, Social and Political Science	CLA	2	Dennis Murphy (1)		Michael Donahue	
			Becky da Cruz (2)			
Diagnostic and Therapeutic Sciences	CHP	2	Shaunell McGee (3)		Rhonda Bevis	
			Pam Cartright (2)		Christy Moore	x
Economics	CLA	1	Nick Mangee (3	x	Yassi Saadatmand	
Engineering	CST	1	Wayne Johnson (2)	x	Priya Goeser	
Health Sciences	CHP	2	Lesley Clack (1)	x	Joey Crosby	
			Janet Buelow (3)	x	Rod McAdams	
History	CLA	2	James Todesca (1)	x		
			Michael Benjamin (2)	x	Allison Belzer	
Languages, Literature and Philosophy	CLA	5	Bill Deaver (3)	x	Nancy Tille-Victorica	
			Carol Andrews (2)	x	Nancy Remler	
			Jane Rago (2)	x	Annie Mendenhall	
			Christy Mroczek (1)	x	Rob Terry	
			James Smith (2)	x	Deborah Reese	
Library	CLA	1	Aimee Reist (1)	x	Ann Fuller	
Mathematics	CST	3	Selwyn Hollis (1)	x	Sungkon Chang	
			Paul Hadavas (3)	x	Sean Eastman	
			Joshua Lambert (3)	x	Tricia Brown	
Nursing	CHP	3	Sherry Warnock (1)	x	Carole Massey	
			Gina Crabb (1)		Luz Quirimit	
			Jeff Harris (3)		Jill Beckworth	
Psychology	CST	1	Wendy Wolfe (2)	x	Nancy McCarley	
Rehabilitation Sciences	CHP	2	David Bringman (1)	x	AndiBeth Mincer	
			Maya Clark (2)		April Garrity	

Smart Evals

Faculty Senate Presentation
March 21, 2016
Angeles L. Eames, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Assessment

Background

- SmartEvals application and survey were developed by Task Force and an ad hoc faculty committee in response to Faculty Senate's requests made to the Provost
- Launched in Fall 2014
- Initial results—students found it easy to use, faculty pleased that they could get results much faster than older system
- Additional features allow faculty to track and chart their results over time and compare these with those of faculty teaching in the program

Progress to Date

- Response rates have remained high.
  - Fall 2014: 1616 classes and 14,121/30,826 students complete surveys, for a response rate of 46%.
  - Fall 2015: 1630 classes and 13,972/31,062 students complete surveys for a response rate of 45%
  - 5 programs in Fall 2015 had a response rate of 75% or more.

Results

- Overall, Armstrong's aggregate scores indicate that students are pleased with the quality of instruction they are receiving
  - Overall, means on a 5 point scale range from 4.1 to 4.7.
  - Lower means, though still positive, 4.1 - 4.2 are found in the items:
    - Learned in this course, and
    - Instructor effectiveness
  - Higher scores, 4.5 - 4.7 are found in the items:
    - Instructor met class regularly
    - Instructor respected student opinions
    - Instructor is genuinely interested in teaching

Survey Format

- Survey allows for both multiple choice and open-ended responses.
- All faculty and department heads receive students' responses to multiple choice questions.
- Currently, only faculty receive responses to the open-ended questions since at the moment these are not "signed" comments that can be forwarded to the department head

Proposed Solution

- The survey format would be modified to add 2 questions:
  - "Do you want to identify yourself and allow the department head for this class to view your comments?" (yes, no)
  - "Please enter your name"

New Reporting Format

Instructor View

- Would get all multiple choice responses as before
- Open-ended responses would be divided into 2 groups:
  - Summary of anonymous responses, and
  - Summary of signed responses

Department Head View

- Would get all multiple choice responses as before
- Summary of signed responses only (not the anonymous ones)
- Student names of those who agreed to allow department heads to view their comments

Contact

- Dr. Angeles Eames, Director of Assessment
  - Victor Hall 213
  - 344-3328
  - angeles.eames@armstrong.edu

Appendix C

Faculty Senate Resolution: Addition of Very Satisfactory to Post-Tenure Review

We believe that in the post-tenure review process there should be additional incentive and reward for faculty who exceed expectations. We propose that in the future there be a “very satisfactory” category, defined below. We would then propose to add to our above policy: Faculty who are found to be “very satisfactory” at post-tenure review are to be awarded a $1500 raise to their base salary.

Very Satisfactory: The faculty member is performing effectively as a teacher and is making greater than satisfactory contributions, exceeding those typically appropriate to a senior faculty member, in either scholarship or service. Individual departments/programs may have specific service or scholarship expectations for individual faculty members because of the particular position held by the faculty member. This point should be addressed in the review. If a faculty member is found to be "very satisfactory," the department head may wish to further commend the faculty member.

Faculty Senate Resolution (with proposed and approved changes): Addition of Very Satisfactory to Post-Tenure Review

We believe that in the post-tenure review process there should be additional recognition and reward for faculty who exceed expectations. We propose that in the future there be a “very satisfactory” category, defined below. We would then propose to add to our above policy: Fully promoted faculty who are found to be “very satisfactory” at post-tenure review are to be awarded a $1500 raise to their base salary, in addition to any merit and/or CUPA-based salary adjustments.

Very Satisfactory: The faculty member is performing effectively as a teacher and is making greater than satisfactory contributions, exceeding those typically appropriate to a senior faculty member, in either scholarship or service. Individual departments/programs may have specific service or scholarship expectations for individual faculty members because of the particular position held by the faculty member. This point should be addressed in the review. If a faculty member is found to be "very satisfactory," the department head may wish to further commend the faculty member.

Appendix D

Faculty Senate Bill: Post-tenure Review Raises

Rationale:

Our current policy does not financially incentivize faculty who are tenured to continue meeting and/or exceeding expectations. Due to this lack of incentive, there has been concern about keeping talent at Armstrong. In addition, this system of raises would help alleviate salary compression and would help raise senior faculty to or above CUPA levels. Many other USG institutions, especially those in our area geographically (Georgia Southern University) and those that are similar to us (University of North Georgia), have such flat fee raises in their post-tenure review process. In addition, many other sister institutions have discretionary raises included in their post-tenure review process.

Statement:

We, the Faculty Welfare Committee of Armstrong State University, wish to address the problem of lack of post-tenure raises. We petition the administration of the university to attend to the lack of post-tenure raises based on the guidelines for post-tenure review in the Faculty Handbook pages 67-68 and departmental guidelines with the addition of the following policy: Faculty who are found to be "satisfactory" at post-tenure review are to be awarded a $1000 raise to their base salary.

Faculty Senate Bill (with proposed and accepted changes): Post-tenure Review Raises

Rationale:

Our current policy does not financially recognize and reward faculty who are tenured to continue meeting and/or exceeding expectations. Due to this lack of incentive, there has been concern about keeping talent at Armstrong. In addition, this system of raises would help alleviate salary compression and would help raise senior faculty to or above CUPA levels. Many other USG institutions, especially those in our area geographically (Georgia Southern University) and those that are similar to us (University of North Georgia), have such flat fee raises in their post-tenure review process. In addition, many other sister institutions have discretionary raises included in their post-tenure review process.

Statement:

We, the Faculty Welfare Committee of Armstrong State University, wish to address the problem of lack of post-tenure raises. We petition the administration of the university to attend to the lack of post-tenure raises based on the guidelines for post-tenure review in the Faculty Handbook pages 67-68 and departmental guidelines with the addition of the following policy: Fully promoted faculty who are found to be "satisfactory" at post-tenure review are to be awarded a $1000 raise to their base salary, in addition to any merit and/or CUPA-based salary adjustments.

Appendix E

AMENDMENT TO THE BYLAWS OF THE EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

Mission

The Education Technology Committee will review policies and practices in technological infrastructure and University policies governing the use of technology in collaboration with other University and senate committees to ~~insure~~ help create an optimal environment for the educational use of technology, to promote the use of technology in education, and to assist faculty in using technology for teaching, service, scholarship, and professional development.

Rationale: We are recommending a change from "insure" to "help create" since the ETC does not actually have the power to insure anything about the IT infrastructure. We are recommending the addition of "professional development" to teaching, service, and scholarship in keeping with the current campus-wide expansion of professional responsibilities.

AMENDMENT TO THE BYLAWS OF THE EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE (with proposed and accepted changes)

Mission

The Education Technology Committee will review policies and practices in technological infrastructure and University policies governing the use of technology in collaboration with other University and senate committees to ~~insure~~ ensure an optimal environment for the educational use of technology, to promote the use of technology in education, and to assist faculty in using technology for teaching, service, scholarship, and professional development.

Rationale: We are recommending the addition of "professional development" to teaching, service, and scholarship in keeping with the current campus-wide expansion of professional responsibilities.

Appendix F

Student Success Committee Bylaws

Mission

The Student Success Committee shall recommend policies on recruitment, admissions, advisement, retention, and academic progression. ~~It will also select award recipients for scholarships.~~

Duties

~~The committee will define and evaluate advisement goals, objectives and procedures as well as evaluate the relationship between academic advisement and retention. The committee will review both current and proposed policies concerning advisement and recommend changes to the Senate. The committee will additionally identify resource needs for advisement and retention and develop, assess, and help implement an annual advisement and retention plan. Committee work will also include the review of scholarship applications compiled by the Office of Financial Aid, and selection of award recipients. The committee will present the list of candidates for graduation.~~
The duties of the student success committee include evaluation of recruitment, admission, and retention goals; review of current and proposed policies related to recruitment, admission, and retention; and identification of resource needs in those areas.

Membership

The committee shall be composed of ten faculty representatives with at least two from each college, one undergraduate student, one graduate student, and ~~seven~~ nine ex officio non-voting members. The ex officio, non-voting members are the ~~Director of Academic Orientation and Advisement, the Director of Multicultural Affairs, the Registrar, the Director of the Honors Program, the Director of Financial Aid, the Director of First Year Experience, and Associate Provost for Student Engagement and Success. Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, and the Assistant Vice President of Graduate Studies.~~
the Associate Provost for Student Engagement and Success, the Dean of Students, the Director of Academic Advising and Support, the Director of Financial Aid, the Director of First Year Experience, the Director of the Honors Program, the Director of Multicultural Affairs, the Registrar, and the Trio Director.

Meetings

This committee shall meet ~~at least~~ once per month or as needed during the Fall and Spring semesters. The committee will determine meeting dates and times to be posted on the Senate website.

Reports

The minutes of each meeting will be provided to the Secretary of the Senate for posting. A separate report will be submitted to the faculty senate when a recommendation for action is made by this committee. At the end of each semester, the chair of the committee will submit to the Senate a summary of committee activities.