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I. Call to Order

II. Senate Action

A. Approval of Minutes from March 19, 2012, Faculty Senate Meeting (minutes available at: http://www.armstrong.edu/Departments/faculty_senate/senate_minutes)
B. University Curriculum Committee Items from April 3, 2012
C. Absence Policy Report from Academic Standards Committee (Appendix A)
D. i-Fac Bills from Education Technology Committee (Appendix B)
E. Resolution from Planning, Budget, and Facilities Committee (Appendix C)
F. University Committees Directory Bill from Faculty Welfare Committee (Appendix D)
G. Other Action Items

III. Senate Information

A. Referral of Graduate Curriculum Committee Minutes to President Bleicken (for the full GAC report from April 3, 2012, see: http://www.armstrong.edu/Departments/faculty_senate/senate_minutes)
B. Annual Reports and Posting of Summary of Charges
C. Faculty Salary Study and Adjustments
D. Graduation List Process
E. Turnitin.com Use
F. Constitution and Bylaws Vote on Cove
G. Complete College Georgia
H. Elections Committee
I. Other Information Items

IV. Announcements

V. Adjournment
Appendix A - Report of the Academic Standards Committee on Attendance Policy

The committee was asked to review the current attendance policy as given in the Regulations section of the Faculty Handbook, and advise the Senate on whether Armstrong’s present policy is adequate. This statement is as follows:

Regulations, Article VIII, SECTION F. Policy on Student Attendance
Each faculty member may establish a policy for student attendance in class. Students who miss class while officially representing the university will be excused from class. These students are responsible for arranging with individual instructors to make up any work that might have been missed. Monthly reports on the attendance of veterans are requested from faculty by the Veterans’ Affairs Office.

At issue are the second and third sentences of this statement: "Students who miss class while officially representing the university will be excused from class. These students are responsible for arranging with individual instructors to make up any work that might have been missed.” Although this statement addresses all students representing the University, the majority of instances seem to involve student athletes (perhaps due to the large number).

After consulting Ms. Lisa Sweany, Athletic Director, and Dr. Will Lynch, Faculty Athletic Representative, the Committee offers the following:

1. The phrase “will be excused” seems to leave room for argument; the crux of this issue is in the interpretation of this phrase. The committee interprets it this way: If attendance constitutes a portion of the student’s grade in the class, and the student misses class while representing the university in any official capacity, then the absence cannot have a negative impact on the student’s grade. Thus, this regulation negates the attendance requirement.

    The remaining issue is that of making up work missed during an excused absence. As written, the policy could be interpreted as affording a chance to make up work for any student missing class due to representing the university. However, within the scope of academic freedom, this decision must be left to the individual faculty member. Many professors will work with a student to complete missed tests or assignments, but many have a “no make-up” policy. In some cases (e.g. laboratories, clinicals), it is not possible to re-create the experience; no make-up is possible. While this regulation could be expanded upon to require make-up tests, etc, the committee feels that doing so would infringe on academic freedom.

    In conclusion, the committee finds this regulation, as stated, to warrant clarification. It would behoove the University to make known:
- to the faculty: the protection afforded to the student by this regulation.
- to the student: the limitation of that protection.
The Athletic Department may want to consider adding a statement in the Student Athlete Handbook. A nice model would be a statement used by the University of South Carolina – Aiken:

“If you miss a test or other assignment, it is your responsibility to try to make arrangements with your professor prior to the class period when the test or assignment is due. Professors are not required to make special arrangements for you to take tests or complete assignments; however, most professors are willing to work with you if you give them prior notice. You should work with your advisor to create a class schedule that will minimize the number of practices and classes you will miss.”

As part of the informational process, the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics may want to include a similar statement in the student-athlete handbook.
Appendix B – Improving Faculty Access to Computing from Education Technology Committee (i-FAC) 1-3

16 APRIL 2012
Sponsor: Wayne M. Johnson
Co-Sponsors: William Baird

Background

Armstrong’s Strategic Plan:
Our Mission
Armstrong is teaching-centered and student-focused, providing diverse learning experiences and professional programs grounded in the liberal arts.

Our Vision
Armstrong strives to be an academically selective institution of first choice, recognized nationally for undergraduate, graduate, and professional education.

Strategic Goal 3
Armstrong will enhance existing campus technologies, expanding both its technological capabilities and reach, to meet current and emerging needs.

Armstrong is keenly aware of the rapid changes in technological innovation that impact higher education. The university must or will assess the needs of faculty, staff, students, and other constituents in order to systematically develop plans to secure, deploy, and maintain appropriate technologies campus-wide.
Faculty Senate Bill: i-FAC 1.

We, the duly elected faculty senate of Armstrong Atlantic State University, kindly request that President Bleicken work with the Vice President of Business, Finance and the Chief Information Officer, and the Planning Budget and Facilities Committee to develop an ITS budget line item for full-time faculty computer procurement (new faculty) and replacement (current faculty) starting with FY2012-13 and each FY thereafter.

Rationale:
1.1 Given Armstrong’s Strategic Goal 3 to “… enhance existing campus technologies...” and the vital importance of faculty access to modern and reliable computing resources, Armstrong must make clear its commitment to providing its faculty with the tools needed in order for faculty to maximize their role in achieving Armstrong’s mission and vision.
Faculty Senate Bill: i-FAC 2.

We, the duly elected faculty senate of Armstrong Atlantic State University, kindly request that President Bleicken work with the Vice President of Business and Finance and the Chief Information Officer to modify the current ITS-100 policy (See References below) to reflect a 4 year (maximum) computer replacement policy for full-time faculty. This bill would not preclude faculty that perform computationally intensive work in their teaching and/or research duties from receiving a replacement computer prior to 4 years. This need must be verified by the faculty member’s department head.

Rationale:

2.1 Given Armstrong’s Strategic Goal 3 to “... enhance existing campus technologies...” and the vital importance of faculty access to modern and reliable computing resources, Armstrong must make clear its commitment to providing its faculty with the tools needed in order for faculty to maximize their role in achieving Armstrong’s mission and vision.

2.2 As shown in the Table 1 below, the majority of post-secondary institutions (57.6%) replace faculty computers every four years. The survey included a total of 496 institutions from across the nation.

Table 1. 2011 Campus Computing Survey results for computer replacement cycles in higher education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPUS COMPUTING 2011</th>
<th>All Institutions</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th>4-Year Colleges</th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student labs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative offices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 Campus Computing Survey campuscomputing.net
Faculty Senate Bill: i-FAC 3.

We, the duly elected faculty senate of Armstrong Atlantic State University, kindly request that President Bleicken work with the Vice President of Business and Finance and the Chief Information Officer, and the Planning Budget and Facilities Committee to place the highest priority on replacing any remaining full-time faculty computers that are from 2009 or older using FY2011-12 “end of year budget money”.

Rationale:
3.1 Given Armstrong’s Strategic Goal 3 to “... enhance existing campus technologies...” and the vital importance of faculty access to modern and reliable computing resources, Armstrong must make clear its commitment to providing its faculty with the tools needed in order for faculty to maximize their role in achieving Armstrong’s mission and vision.

3.2 ITS will begin transitioning to the Windows 7 operating system (OS) no later than Spring 2013. Faculty PCs from 2009 or older will not have sufficient hardware to run this OS.

Reference:
Armstrong’s current ITS Computer Replacement Policy (ITS-100):
http://www.armstrong.edu/Departments/cis/cis_computer_replacement_policy
Desktop and laptop computers have an expected life cycle of three to five years. A "Technology Request Form" for a replacement desktop or laptop computer may be processed after the third calendar year.

An application must be completed prior to completing the purchase of a computer, and approved by a Director, Department Head, Dean, or Vice President. An application that is placed prior to the third calendar year in the lifecycle of a computer must also be approved by the Vice President. To complete the application, a Technology Request Form must be submitted to ITS.

All replacement computers must be purchased using the purchase request/purchase order process. Replacement computers must not be purchased with p-cards, personal credit cards, or check requests.

ITS provides standard options for desktop and for laptop computers, as well as various standard options for peripherals. These options are updated annually. If the requested replacement computer is not standard, the application must be approved by the requestor's Vice President, as well as either the Chief Information Officer.

The computer that is to be replaced shall either be disposed of using the Equipment Disposal Process (see Equipment Disposal Policy) or used at another location on campus.

If an employee needs to request an additional computer in addition to his/her existing computer(s), these requests must be approved by the requestor's Vice President.
Appendix C – Recommendation and Resolution from the Planning, Budget & Facilities Committee

Recommendation:
At the beginning of each Spring term (early January), the Chief Financial Officer and the Provost/Vice President of Academic Affairs will present to the Planning, Budget & Facilities Committee:
1. a report of the University’s net income earned from the previous Summer term, and
2. discuss with the committee upcoming fiscal year budget and financial matters.

The PB&F committee will report its findings from January meeting at the February Senate meeting.

Resolution:
The PB & F committee is aware that it is unrealistic to involve faculty in the day-by-day aspects of planning and designing in future building projects. However, after becoming aware of the over-enthusiastic enrollment predictions that were used to secure government funding (bonds) for construction of the Student Union & Recreation Center, the PB & F committee request a mechanism be implemented so that faculty can be made aware of future financial obligations that affect student fees & the university debt obligations.
Appendix D – Bill on University Committees Directory from Faculty Welfare Committee

Whereas the faculty and administration are trying to improve communication between various groups on campus, and minimize redundant efforts.

Be it resolved that a document containing a comprehensive list of the membership and charges of all committees (University, Presidential, and Administrative), interdivisional working groups and taskforces be published and available online so that any interested group on campus would have access to this information.

Rationale: Their have been several times in the last few years when two independent committees on campus were working on the same issue with no knowledge of the other’s charge. This lack of communication and potential redundancy makes it difficult for committees to complete their duties as charged. Most recently, this confusion has lead to the passage of legislation by the Senate that has later been remanded by the President.