

9-23-2013

September 23, 2013 AASU Faculty Senate Minutes

Armstrong State University

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

Recommended Citation

Armstrong State University, "September 23, 2013 AASU Faculty Senate Minutes" (2013). *Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes*. 50.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/armstrong-fs-minutes/50>

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 Atlantic State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of September 23, 2013
Student Union, Ballroom A, 3:00 pm**

- I. Senate President Baird called the meeting to order at 3:02 pm (see Appendix A)
- II. Senate Action
 - A. Approval of [Minutes from August 19, 2013 Faculty Senate Meeting](#)
 1. APPROVED Without Corrections
 - B. Point of order: Is the Faculty Senate still in executive session from the August 19, 2013 meeting? Executive session was terminated once quorum was lost in the meeting as noted in the [minutes](#).
 - C. Remarks from Dr. Linda Bleicken, President
 1. Issues with Armstrong staff and faculty salaries have been shared with Chancellor Huckaby at a recent meeting. Dr. Bleicken asked him to continue to engage the state legislature and Governor Deal regarding the need for raises since it negatively impacts Armstrong's capacity to recruit and retain staff and faculty.
 2. Faculty Senate leadership (FSL) has continued to communicate faculty issues during monthly meetings with her. Another town hall meeting will be held in early spring 2014. Additionally, some smaller, informal meetings may be held later in the fall semester.
 3. The faculty salary study committee was charged last Friday. Committee members include: Michael Toma (Chair), Catherine Gilbert, Lynn Roberts, Clifford Padgett, Erik Nordenhaug, Laura Mills, and David Carson. The study will be completed by Thanksgiving since the University System of Georgia (USG) budget hearing is occurring early than previous semesters (December vs. late February). At FSL's request, a "Plan B" will be developed in case the state legislature does not fund the requested salary increases. The plan will depend on the outcome of the salary study.
 4. A gate has been added to the back side of campus to improve campus security during evening hours and holiday breaks. A draft plan is coming soon for entrance awareness stones at the corners of Arts and Science Drive and Abercorn to improve community awareness of the Armstrong campus.
 - D. Remarks from Dr. Carey Adams, Provost/VPAA
 1. Several Faculty Development deadlines are pending. Details are available on the [Faculty Development website](#) and will also be sent out via email.
 2. The advisement and registration dates have been modified:
 - i. Registration schedule is the same (Oct. 30); the schedule will be available online no later than Oct. 21., with a preview schedule available online on Oct. 16.
 - ii. The advisement period will now start on Oct. 21 and conclude on Nov. 8. The period will be renamed the "Priority Advising Period" since advisement actually often happens outside of the regular advisement period anyway. Advisement will be a priority during this period, but it may still occur outside of this period as it has been in the past. An email will be sent out regarding these changes.
 - E. President Baird welcomed the new Vice President of Student Affairs, Dr. Georj Lewis to

Armstrong.

F. Old Business

1. Outcome of Resolutions/Bills (see links for details)

- i. [FSR-2013-08-19-01: Affirmation of Faculty Governance of Academic Issues](#)
 - a. Since the regular admissions standardized test scores were lowered while the GPA was increased, the Student Success Committee was given the charge:
 - i. Determine if the May, 2012 changes to the regular admissions standards in the Armstrong catalog should be considered a net increase or decrease in Armstrong's admissions standards.
- ii. [FSB-2013-08-19-03: Transparency in Armstrong Infrastructure Planning](#)
- iii. [FSB-2013-08-19-04: Promotion of Shared Governance](#)

G. New Business

1. Committee Reports

- i. [University Curriculum Committee meeting minutes](#)
 - a. Discussion: Concern expressed in setting a precedent for the replacement of a literature course with an assessment course. Response: The literature content will be infused in other courses. The course is necessary to address assessment needs in the education field.
 - b. APPROVED without modifications
- ii. [Graduate Affairs Committee meeting minutes](#)

2. FSB-2013-09-23-03: New Administrative Positions Freeze Bill (Appendix B)

- i. Bill was developed by and approved unanimously by LLP faculty
- ii. Bill was co-sponsored by senators from many other departments
- iii. Discussion:
 - a. CHP senators discussed the bill. They concluded that bills such as this have created a divide between faculty and administration. Friendly amendment to add "...creation of any new administrative..." to the original bill was APPROVED. Administration asked to review their resource allocation to ensure efficiency and that campus needs are met. Faculty Senate should also seek ways to work with the administration to establish a more meaningful and collegial attitude towards each other. No solution provided to improve faculty loyalty to university, but interested in working together with faculty welfare and administrators on developing ideas to improve university loyalty.
 - b. Response: This bill should not be taken personally; it is simply an expression of faculty sentiment. It is not intended to contribute to the faculty-administrator divide. Faculty Senate is the formal decision making body of the Armstrong faculty, and is responsible for the shared governance of Armstrong.
 - c. Many other faculty expressed their gratitude and support for the bill. Other faculty reiterated concern for the perceived divide between faculty and administrators. The spirit of the bill is to limit the expansion of administrative positions in times of lower

enrollments and a lack of faculty raises.

d. Bill APPROVED

3. FSB-2013-09-23-04: Faculty Salary Analysis Bill (Appendix C)
 - i. Aspects of the [remanded bill](#) were clarified in this new bill.
 - ii. Gratitude expressed to President Bleicken for moving the salary study forward so quickly (See II.C.4 above).
 - iii. Bill APPROVED
4. Committee Restructuring (Appendix D)
 - i. Proposal to consolidate senate committees to improve efficiency and better alignment of the purpose of the Faculty Senate with its committees.
 - ii. Discussion:
 - a. Ideally, if changes approved at November Faculty Senate meeting, then entire faculty can vote on changes before the end of the fall 2013 semester. A timeline for the consolidation process needs to be developed for relevant committees, senate and all faculty to vote on consolidation.
 - b. Concern expressed about Faculty Senate losing “power” by shifting committees out of senate. However, the senate can still write bills and/or resolutions to address issues as necessary. Faculty Senate should be considered a policy advisory body.
 - c. Concern expressed about the Constitution and Bylaws and Elections committees being combined with Steering Committee given their role in establishing the bylaws and rules of the senate.
 - i. The Elections Committee developed an alternate proposal (Appendix E) for the consolidation of the Elections, Const. and Bylaws, and Committee on Committees into a new “Senate Rules Committee”.
 - d. Under restructuring, committees may need to be larger so that ad-hoc/sub-committees can be formed to handle the larger workload.
 - e. An informal vote on some form of committee consolidation was approved.
5. Grade Appeal Changes (Appendix F)
 - i. Needed to develop a unified university process and catalog description for grade appeals
 - ii. Student guests/advocates may attend the hearing, but must remain silent.

H. Senate Information

1. USGFC Meeting Minutes (see [Appendix in Sept. meeting agenda](#))
 - i. The council is advisory. We may consider electing a representative to attend council meetings to improve continuity.
 - ii. Vice Chancellor stated that the most vulnerable schools for consolidation have enrollments less than 5000. Also, academic programs with single digit enrollment could be eliminated, but there will be a distinction made between necessarily vs. unnecessarily low enrollment.
2. Proposed FH change to 107.4.5: Reappointment of lecturers beyond 6 years of service (see [Appendix in Sept. meeting agenda](#))
 - i. Motion to approve the grade appeal changes APPROVED.

3. Send Committee Meetings and Minutes to faculty.senate@armstrong.edu
 - i. Senate committee liaisons reminded to send the faculty senate secretary meeting dates and minutes in a timely manner.

III. Adjournment at 4:39pm

Yours faithfully,

Wayne Johnson
Faculty Senate Secretary

Appendices

- A. Attendance Sheet
- B. Administrative Hiring Freeze Bill
- C. Faculty Salary Analysis Bill
- D. Faculty Senate Committee Restructuring Proposal
- E. Senate Rules Committee Proposal
- F. Grade Appeal Catalogue Changes

Faculty Senators and Alternates Attendance (8/19/13)

Department	College	# of seats	Senator(s) and Term Year as of 2013/2014		Alternate(s)	
Adolescent and Adult Education	COE	2	Regina Rahimi (3)	x	Rona Tyger	
	COE		Ed Strausser (3)	x	Lynn Long	
Art, Music, Theatre	CLA	3	Angela Horne (3)	x	Karl Michel	
	CLA		Deborah Jamieson (1)		Emily Grundstad-Hall	x
	CLA		Elizabeth Desnoyers-Colas (1)	x	Megan Baptiste-Field	
Biology	CST	3	Traci Ness (2)	x	Sara Gremillion	
	CST		Brett Larson (1)	x	Jennifer Brofft-Bailey	
	CST		Kathryn Craven (1)	x	Aaron Schrey	
Chemistry, Physics	CST	3	Brent Feske (2)	x	Brandon Quillian	
	CST		William Baird (3)	x	Jeff Secrest	
	CST		Catherine MacGowan (3)	x	Will Lynch	
Childhood & Exceptional Student Education	COE	2	Barbara Hubbard (2)	x	Patricia Norris-Parsons	
	COE		Anne Katz (1)	x	Glenda Ogletree	
Criminal Justice, Social, & Pol Science	CLA	2	Katherine Bennett (2)	x	Daniel Skidmore-Hess	
	CLA		Michael Donohue (3)	x	Dennis Murphy	
Communication Science & Disorders	CHP	1	Maya Clark (3)	x	April Garrity	
Computer Science & Info. Technology	CST	1	Ashraf Saad (2)	x	Frank Katz	
Economics	CLA	1	Nick Mangee (1)	x	Yassi Saadatmand	
Engineering	CST	1	Wayne Johnson (3)	x	Priya Goeser	
Health Sciences	CHP	2	Leigh Rich (2)	x	Joey Crosby	
	CHP		Janet Buelow (1)	x	Rod McAdams	
History	CLA	2	Chris Hendricks (2)	x	Michael Benjamin	
	CLA		Jason Tatlock (3)	x	Allison Belzer	
Library	CLA	1	Melissa Jackson (2)	x	Ann Fuller	
Languages, Literature, Philosophy	CLA	4	Bill Deaver (1)	x	Nancy Remler	
	CLA		Dorothee Mertz-Weigel (3)	x	Chris Baker	
	CLA		Beth Howells (3)	x	Tony Morris	
	CLA		Erik Nordenhaug (2)	x	Richard Bryan	
Mathematics	CST	3	Michael Tiemeyer (2)	x	Greg Knofczynski	
	CST		Paul Hadavas (1)	x	Tim Ellis	
	CST		Joshua Lambert. (1)	x	Jared Schlieper	
Medical Laboratory Science	CHP	1	Denene Lofland (1)	x	Chad Guilliams	
Nursing	CHP	4	Deb Hagerty (2)	x	Carole Massey	
	CHP		Jane Blackwell (2)	x	Luz Quirimit	
	CHP		Jeff Harris (1)	x	Jill Beckworth	
	CHP		Amber Derksen (1)		Cherie McCann	
Physical Therapy	CHP	1	David Bringman (2)	x	Nancy Wofford	
Psychology	CST	1	Wendy Wolfe (3)	x	Mirari Elcoro	
Radiologic Sciences	CHP	1	Shaunell McGee (1)	x	Rochelle Lee	
Respiratory Therapy	CHP	1	Christine Moore (3)	x	Rhonda Bevis	

Faculty Senate Bill 2013-09-23-03

New Administrative Positions Freeze Bill

Whereas the powers and responsibilities of the Faculty Senate are, according to Article III of the Constitution, to “advis[e] the President of the University on matters of university planning, governance, and resource allocations” and “represent faculty on matters pertaining to the appointment of administrative officers” and “budget and planning matters;”

Whereas the ratio of total faculty salaries to total administrative salaries is imbalanced and demoralizing when considering the number of employees represented in each category;

Whereas we are troubled by the documented national trend of administrative bloat*; and

Whereas faculty salary adjustments for cost of living, increased premiums, and compression have not been redressed and merit raises have not been prioritized;

The Faculty Senate advises and requests a freeze on the creation of any new administrative positions until the salary study has been completed and such faculty salary adjustments and increases have occurred.

*

http://thebaffler.com/past/academy_fight_song

<http://goldwaterinstitute.org/sites/default/files/Administrative%20Bloat.pdf>

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-11-14/bureaucrats-paid-250-000-feed-outcry-over-college-costs.html>

Ginsberg, Benjamin. *The Fall of the Faculty: The Rise of the All-Administrative University and Why It Matters* (Oxford University Press, 2011).

Faculty Senate Bill 2013-09-23-04:

Every Third Year Salary Analysis Bill

Whereas President Bleicken has already initiated a salary analysis during the coming year;

Whereas the faculty senate represents only the faculty of Armstrong, this bill is recommending only a faculty salary analysis every third year, though the faculty senate certainly does not object to including staff salary analyses every third year as well;

Whereas Armstrong faculty already has the accepted 2011 model for conducting the faculty salary analysis, which includes use of the CUPA data and comparative institutions, as well as a salary analysis committee structure including both faculty, staff, and input from department heads and deans; and

Whereas it is acknowledged that completion of a salary study does not guarantee the institutions' ability to move forward on recommendations that may be made;

The Faculty Senate requests that every third year after 2014 a comprehensive salary analysis with recommendations be conducted and submitted to the president for approval.

Suggested changes to Faculty Senate committees

Dear All,

As you may know, we currently have **18** committees associated with our Faculty Senate (see list below). Not only is it burdensome on faculty senators to serve on often multiple committees so that all are staffed appropriately (not to mention all of the other committees on which we serve outside of the Senate), the committees themselves also are tasked with overlapping duties and/or lack effectiveness because of the current structure.

Current Committees

Committees of the Senate

1. Steering Committee
2. Committee on Committees
3. Constitution and Bylaws
4. Elections

Standing Committees

5. Academic Standards
6. Education Technology
7. Faculty Development
8. Faculty Welfare
9. Honors Advisory
10. Interdisciplinary Studies
11. International Programs and Activities
12. Library
13. Planning, Budget, and Facilities
14. Research and Scholarship
15. Student Success
16. Writing
17. Graduate Affairs
18. University Curriculum

After a review (by the Steering Committee and Committee on Committees) of other universities with regard to the make-up of their Faculty Senates, we recommend reducing our committees and reorganizing them as indicated below. Descriptions and duties of each of these new/restructured committees also should be reviewed and revised (e.g., just because one committee “takes over” the scope of duties of an existing committee does not mean that the newly formed committee must become a compilation of old committees).

Proposed Changes

Committees of the Senate

- 1. Steering Committee**
 - This committee will remain in place, with the addition that it also will assume duties currently related to Constitution and Bylaws and Committee on Committees.
- 2. Elections**
 - This committee will remain as is, as it needs to be an independent committee in the Senate.
- 3. Academic Standards**
 - This committee will remain in place, with the addition that it also will assume duties currently related to Student Success and the appropriate (i.e., academic) parts of Education Technology.
- 4. Planning, Budget and Infrastructure**
 - This committee will assume duties currently related to Planning, Budget and Facilities and the appropriate parts of Education Technology (i.e., infrastructure).

5. Faculty Welfare***

- This committee will remain in place, with the addition that it also will assume duties currently related to Research and Scholarship.
- *** Additionally, at least two members of this committee will serve as members of the Faculty Development committee (which will be moved outside of the Senate; see below).

Committees to Be Moved Outside of the Senate

These committees should not be housed under the Faculty Senate, as each area is already managed by selected Directors and Offices on the Armstrong campus. It is proposed here that these Directors convene and chair a standing committee to be housed within their Office and that they recruit any faculty (and other appropriate members) to serve on their committees as they deem fit.

- Faculty Development***
 - See note above: We recommend that two Senators from the Senate Faculty Welfare committee serve on/act as liaisons for this Faculty Development committee.
 - Additionally, the Director of Faculty Development suggests that the VPAA/Provost consider creating, by appointment of the deans, a review board that could review Advanced Academic Leave and internal grant applications. Two representatives from each college could be members of this board: one who has accrued a distinguished record of scholarship and one who has a strong track record of exemplary teaching (these would probably be either full or associate-level professors, who would serve for two or three consecutive years).
- International Education
- Honors
- Writing
- Library
- Interdisciplinary

Summary of the ELECTIONS COMMITTEE proposed changes to the bylaws and the constitution.

The ELECTIONS COMMITTEE which is currently responsible for maintaining membership on the committees in accordance with the bylaws has had difficulty in the past finding volunteering candidates for all the member positions because of the complexity of the current senate committee structure and the non-uniform terms of memberships for various types of committees. The Elections Committee proposes the following changes to help simplify the senate committee structure and terms of office.

I. Proposal to change most terms of office and committee terms to a uniform three years:

A. The Committees of the Senate – we propose changing the member terms to three years without regard to the length of time remaining in the Senator's elected term.

Rationale: This will provide greater continuity and experienced committee members who are able to perform the duties of the committee more efficiently in addition to making more uniform and simple the complex senate terms structures. No longer would the exact ratio of one third be required for annual elections to committees in an effort to keep all positions filled since it is already part of the election cycle that no committee ever has all its members being elected new for the first time to form that committee. Maintaining the one third ratio so specifically is not required to affirm the intent of the rule which is to always make sure some experience committee members are always present from year to year in the election cycles. The current election cycle and terms of office make the specification of having a third new members elected each year somewhat redundant.

B. The Standing Committees - Most already have a three year term with the exception of the university curriculum committee. We propose that the UCC members also have a three year term in the interest of uniformity, continuity, and efficiency. We also propose removing the stricter requirement necessitating half of the membership of all standing committees be elected annually.

Rationale: It would be easier if sometimes slightly more than half could be newly elected and sometimes slightly less than half be newly elected. The intent of the rule is still satisfied by keeping a number of experienced committee members always present from year to year while making room for new members to come into service. The current election cycle and terms of office make the specification of having half new members elected each year somewhat redundant.

II. Proposal to combine three senate committees into one new committee called SENATE RULES COMMITTEE.

A. To help simplify senate committee structure and ease demand on the elections committee to continually find volunteer candidates, the Elections Committee proposes the creation of the SENATE RULES COMMITTEE (and the simultaneous dissolution of Constitution and Bylaws Committee, Committee on Committees, and the Elections Committee). This proposed SENATE RULES COMMITTEE will take on the functions of the Constitution and Bylaws Committee, the Committee on Committees, and the Elections Committee. The committee description and membership is as follows:

Senate Rules Committee

Charge: The committee will regularly review the Constitution and Bylaws and the charges of each committee of the Senate to keep them up-to-date and effective as well as developing and maintaining the nominations and election processes.

Duties: The Committee assures that the membership and work of each committee is consistent with the bylaws. The Committee can propose changes to committee and senate bylaws and inform the Senate of any change(s) in committee structure. This committee has the responsibility to propose revise, or eliminate Senate committees and standing committees of the Senate. The Senate must approve any changes in committees' bylaws. This committee is responsible for maintaining the membership of each committee and the senate via the election processes. These election duties include:

1. solicit nominations and accept nominations
2. determine willingness to serve
3. prepare slates of nominees
4. conduct university wide elections for the Standing Committees of the Senate
5. conduct elections for the Senate Committees
6. manage the election process
7. announce the results of elections
8. have the authority to call special elections.

Membership: The Senate Rules Committee shall consist of six Senators elected by the Senate. No member of the Senate Rules Committee can be nominated for Senate office.

Rationale: All three of the existing committees are RELATED and responsible for reviewing and enforcing the RULES of the senate itself so it makes sense that the functions of these three committees occur in a coordinated and unified way which would occur more easily if all of these duties were performed by ONE single committee instead of three separate committees. We propose six members are needed given the combined duties. None of these Senate Rules members can be nominated for senate offices as is currently the case with The Elections Committee.

The Ad-Hoc Committee on Grade Appeals (Delana Gajdosik-Nivens, Chair; Cynthia Bolton, Donna Brooks and Mark Finaly (Assistant Deans of their respective colleges), Sandy Streater (Graduate Faculty) and Wendy Wolfe (Faculty Senate Representative) met to discuss the Grade appeals procedures in each College.

The current text in the catalog for grade appeals:

Grade Appeals

In accordance with Armstrong Atlantic State University regulations, appeals for a change of grade may be initiated through the head of the appropriate academic department prior to midterm of the semester after the grade was received. A change of grade, other than incomplete, may not be made later than two calendar semesters following the semester in which the grade was received.

A student who contests a grade will have the following line of appeal:

1. The student will discuss the contested grade with the instructor involved.
2. If the grade dispute remains unresolved, the student will meet with the department head/program director and the instructor. If the grade dispute is with the department head/program director, the student will meet with the dean of the college/school (or designee) and the department head/program director. A “memorandum for the record” will be prepared by the department head (dean or designee) which will include the substance of the conversations during the meeting. The student will receive a copy upon request.
3. If the grade dispute remains unresolved, the student will present his or her appeal in writing to the department head/program director or the dean of the college/school (or designee), as applicable, who will then appoint a review board to hear the appeal. The board will operate according to A-D below. It is expected that the student will initiate this step within 45 days after the grade is posted. If the student plans enrollment in a course for which the course grade being appealed is a prerequisite, see “4” below.
 - a. The review board will consist of the department head/program director or the dean of the college/school (or designee), as applicable, and two members of the department/program, not including the instructor involved. A separate hearing officer shall be appointed by the college/school dean (or designee). When deemed necessary by the college/school dean (or designee), membership may come from outside the department/program.
 - b. The review board shall hear statements from both the student and the instructor involved and will examine documents that are pertinent to the matter under review.
 - c. The review board will hear the grade appeal and present its findings to the dean of the college/school (or designee) within 30 days from the initiation of the appeal.
4. If the student plans enrollment in a course for which the course grade being appealed is a prerequisite, then the following timetable will be met at the first of that semester/term:
 - a. If a grade appeal is not resolved with the instructor concerned, the student will file an appeal in writing with the department head/program director (or the college/school dean or designee if the grade dispute is with the department head/program director). This step will be taken by the first day of classes of the semester/term following the posting of the disputed grade.
 - b. The review board to hear the appeal will be appointed by the third day of the semester. If department/program members are not available to form a review board, the dean of the college/school, in consultation with the department head/program director, will appoint a review board.
 - c. A review board will hear and complete the grade appeal by the fifth day of the semester, and present its findings to the college/school dean through the hearing officer (or the vice president if the dean is a member of the committee).
 - d. If the appeal to the college/school dean is denied, the student will be removed from the official class roster of the course if the student is already enrolled.
5. If the college/school dean denies the appeal, the student may continue the appeal to the vice president and dean of faculty. This appeal must be in writing and must be filed within five days of notification from the college/school dean.
6. Neither the president nor the Board of Regents will accept or consider appeals based on academic grades.

We found that each College follows these guidelines *in general*, with the College and Health Professions and the College of Education having detailed documents, forms and procedures for appealing grades and other matters (program admission, etc). Other Universities in the system such as Valdosta State, Kennesaw State and Georgia Southern publish detailed procedures for appeals on their websites. Three of the four colleges have college grade appeal committees, typically activated/chaired by the Assistant Dean, as an advisory committee to the Dean. Some colleges have chosen to have departmental committees (such as when number of appeals are high, as is the case in COHP) and other colleges have chosen to have College level committees (as in the COE where there are limited departments/faculty or in CST where there are few appeals and a desire to complete the process in a timely fashion). The College of Liberal Arts sees the fewer appeals and thus operates on an ad-hoc basis. To streamline the process and make the process in the undergraduate catalog consistent with current practice and consistent with the graduate catalog we recommend the following changes to the policy on grade appeals in the undergraduate catalog. We also request that the graduate advisory council consider these changes.

Draft showing the track changes from the original:

Grade Appeals

In accordance with Armstrong Atlantic State University regulations, appeals for a change of grade ~~may be~~ initiated ~~throughby~~ the ~~head of the appropriate academic department~~ student prior to midterm of the semester after the grade was received. A change of grade, other than incomplete, may not be made later than two calendar semesters following the semester in which the grade was received.

A student who contests a grade ~~will have~~ must follow the following ~~line of appeal~~ procedure:

1. The student will discuss the contested grade with the instructor involved.
2. If the grade dispute remains unresolved, the student will meet with the department head/program director and the instructor. If the grade dispute is with the department head/program director, the student will meet with the dean of the college/school (or designee) and the department head/program director. A "memorandum for the record" will be prepared by the department head (dean or designee) which will include the substance of the conversations and pertinent documentation presented during the meeting. The student will receive a copy upon request.
3. If the grade dispute remains unresolved, the student will ~~present his~~ request a formal hearing, in writing by mid-term of the semester following the posting of the disputed grade, according to the procedures outlined by the College.
 - a.) College procedures are available in the Dean's Offices
 - b.) Colleges may choose to have one or ~~her~~ two levels of review: departmental appeal ~~in writing to committee and/or college appeal committee.~~
 - c.) Committees deliberate in closed door sessions after both the student and the instructor have presented their case and documentation. All discussions are confidential.
- 4.) In the event of a departmental review, the department head/~~program director or the dean of the college/school (or designee), as applicable, who will then~~ appoint ~~a review board~~ the departmental appeal committee to hear the appeal. The ~~board~~ committee will operate according to A-D below. ~~It is expected that the student will initiate this step within 45 days after the grade is posted.~~ If the student plans enrollment in a course for which the course grade being appealed is a prerequisite, see "46" below.
 - a. The ~~review board~~ departmental appeal committee will consist of ~~department head/program director or the dean of the college/school (or designee), as applicable, and two at least three faculty members of the department/program,~~ not including the instructor involved. ~~A separate hearing officer shall be appointed by the college/school dean (or designee). When~~ Membership on the departmental appeal committee may include faculty from other departments in the college when deemed necessary by the ~~college/school dean (or designee), membership may come from outside department head. One of the faculty members will be designated by the department head as the department/program hearing officer.~~
 - b. ~~The review board~~ b. The departmental appeal committee shall hear statements from both the student and the instructor involved and will examine documents that are pertinent to the matter under review.
 - c. The departmental appeal committee will hear the grade appeal and present its findings to the assistant dean of the college within 30 business days from the initiation of the appeal.
 - d. Students may appeal the departmental appeal committee decision to the Assistant Dean for a College Committee hearing within 10 business days of the departmental appeal committee decision.
- 5.) In the event of a college level review, the dean of the college (or designee) will appoint a college appeal committee to hear the appeal. The college appeal committee will operate according to A-D below. If the student plans enrollment in a course for which the course grade being appealed is a prerequisite, see "6" below.
 - a. The college appeal committee will consist of one faculty member from each department, not including the instructor involved. The Assistant Dean of the college will chair the College Committee and serve as an ex-officio member of the committee.
 - b. The college appeal committee shall hear statements from both the student and the instructor involved and will examine documents that are pertinent to the matter under review.
 - c. The ~~review board~~ college appeal committee will hear the grade appeal and present its findings to the dean of the college/~~school (or designee)~~ within 30 days from prior to the initiation last day of the ~~appeal~~ semester.
- 4
6. If the student plans enrollment in a course for which the course grade being appealed is a prerequisite, then the following timetable will be met at the first of that semester/term:
 - a. If a grade appeal is not resolved with the instructor concerned, the student will file an appeal in writing with the department head/program director (or the college/school dean or designee if the grade dispute is with the department head/program director). This step will be taken by the first day of classes of the semester/term following the posting of the disputed grade.
 - b. The ~~review board to hear the college~~ appeal committee will be appointed by the third day of the semester. ~~If department/program members are not available to form a review board, the dean of the college/school, in consultation with the department head/program director, and will appoint a review board.~~
 - e. ~~A review board will hear and complete~~ the grade appeal by the ~~fifth~~ third day of the semester, ~~and~~.
 - c. The college appeal committee will present its findings to the college/~~school~~ dean ~~throughby~~ the ~~hearing officer (or the vice president if the dean is a member~~ fifth day of the ~~committee~~ semester.
 - d. If the appeal to the college/~~school~~ dean is denied, the student will be removed from the official class roster of the course if the student is already enrolled.
5. ~~If~~ 7. In all cases, if the college/~~school~~ dean denies the appeal, the student may ~~continue the~~ appeal to the ~~vice president and dean of faculty provost's office.~~ This appeal must be in writing and must be filed within five days of notification from the college/~~school~~ dean.
6. ~~Neither the president nor the Board of Regents will accept or consider appeals based on academic grades.~~

Students should consult their program and college for further information and their policies that may apply.

Draft showing how the document would read:

Grade Appeals

In accordance with Armstrong Atlantic State University regulations, appeals for a change of grade are initiated by the student prior to midterm of the semester after the grade was received. A change of grade, other than incomplete, may not be made later than two calendar semesters following the semester in which the grade was received.

A student who contests a grade must follow the following procedure:

1. The student will discuss the contested grade with the instructor involved.
2. If the grade dispute remains unresolved, the student will meet with the department head/program director and the instructor. If the grade dispute is with the department head/program director, the student will meet with the dean of the college/school (or designee) and the department head/program director. A "memorandum for the record" will be prepared by the department head (dean or designee) which will include the substance of the conversations and pertinent documentation presented during the meeting. The student will receive a copy upon request.
3. If the grade dispute remains unresolved, the student will request a formal hearing, in writing by mid-term of the semester following the posting of the disputed grade, according to the procedures outlined by the College.
 - a.) College procedures are available in the Dean's Offices
 - b.) Colleges may choose to have one or two levels of review: departmental appeal committee and/or college appeal committee.
 - c.) Committees deliberate in closed door sessions after both the student and the instructor have presented their case and documentation. All discussions are confidential.
- 4.) In the event of a departmental review, the department head will appoint the departmental appeal committee to hear the appeal. The committee will operate according to A-D below. If the student plans enrollment in a course for which the course grade being appealed is a prerequisite, see "6" below.
 - a. The departmental appeal committee will consist of at least three faculty members, not including the instructor involved. Membership on the departmental appeal committee may include faculty from other departments in the college when deemed necessary by the department head. One of the faculty members will be designated by the department head as the hearing officer.
 - b. The departmental appeal committee shall hear statements from both the student and the instructor involved and will examine documents that are pertinent to the matter under review.
 - c. The departmental appeal committee will hear the grade appeal and present its findings to the assistant dean of the college within 30 business days from the initiation of the appeal.
 - d. Students may appeal the departmental appeal committee decision to the Assistant Dean for a College Committee hearing within 10 business days of the departmental appeal committee decision.
- 5.) In the event of a college level review, the dean of the college (or designee) will appoint a college appeal committee to hear the appeal. The college appeal committee will operate according to A-D below. If the student plans enrollment in a course for which the course grade being appealed is a prerequisite, see "6" below.
 - a. The college appeal committee will consist of one faculty member from each department, not including the instructor involved. The Assistant Dean of the college will chair the College Committee and serve as an ex-officio member of the committee.
 - b. The college appeal committee shall hear statements from both the student and the instructor involved and will examine documents that are pertinent to the matter under review.
 - c. The college appeal committee will hear the grade appeal and present its findings to the dean of the college prior to the last day of the semester.
6. If the student plans enrollment in a course for which the course grade being appealed is a prerequisite, then the following timetable will be met at the first of that semester/term:
 - a. If a grade appeal is not resolved with the instructor concerned, the student will file an appeal in writing with the department head/program director (or the college/school dean or designee if the grade dispute is with the department head/program director). This step will be taken by the first day of classes of the semester/term following the posting of the disputed grade.
 - b. The college appeal committee will be appointed by the third day of the semester and will hear the grade appeal by the third day of the semester.
 - c. The college appeal committee will present its findings to the college dean by the fifth day of the semester
 - d. If the appeal to the college dean is denied, the student will be removed from the official class roster of the course if the student is already enrolled.
7. In all cases, if the college dean denies the appeal, the student may appeal to the provost's office. This appeal must be in writing and must be filed within five days of notification from the college dean.
8. Neither the president nor the Board of Regents will accept or consider appeals based on academic grades.

Students should consult their program and college for further information and their policies that may apply.