

Georgia Southern University

Georgia Southern Commons

Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes

Armstrong Faculty Senate

4-12-2010

April 12, 2010 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, "April 12, 2010 AASU Faculty Senate Minutes" (2010). *Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes*. 56.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/armstrong-fs-minutes/56>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Armstrong Faculty Senate at Georgia Southern Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Armstrong Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Georgia Southern Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.



**Armstrong Atlantic State University
Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes of April 12, 2010
University Hall, room 156, 3:00 p.m.**

I. Call to Order 3:04

For a roster of attendees please see Appendix A.

II. Approval of Minutes from March 8th Faculty Senate Meeting – Approved

III. Approval of Minutes from March 22nd Faculty Senate Called Meeting – Approved

IV. Approval of Undergraduate Candidates for Spring 2010 Graduation – Approved

Senator Nivens: add Matthew Dulin, remove Andrew Hammond

Sen. Bevis: add Jillian Coble

Sen. Taggart: delete John Holderfield

V. Approval of Graduate Candidates for Spring 2010 Graduation – Approved

VI. University Curriculum Items (App B)

Motion to take colleges individually – Approved

COE: Approved

Edit, bottom of pg 1 –“Adolescence” needs to be in bold.

COHP: Approved

COST: Approved

Sen. Carpenter: Chemistry withdraws items 4 & 5 from section B

Sen. McGrath: why?

Sen. Carpenter: we’re not actually bailing on the idea, but rather taking it back to the department to bring fwd next year regarding Chem. 1200’s consistency with BOR policy.

Dean Shields: we’re getting conflicting reports from BOR and affiliate universities’ policies.

VII. Graduate Committee Items (App C, the February 9 and February 26 Minutes) – Approved

VIII. Old Business

a. UCC remanded items – App D

i. Senate Charge to “review the Course Repeating Policy...”

A. Repeating Course Policy – Approved, with amendment (see final at appendix)

Discussion:

Sen. McGrath: this is a good start, we need stronger language on limits though on number of attempts.

Sen. Mincer: some majors in graduate programs do have individual policies toward that.

Sen. McGrath: amend Item 1: “repetition” to “attempt” - “counts” singular. Approved

Sen. Scott: clarify how GPA is calculated please, there are differing reports.

Sen. McGrath: each attempt of each course counts in the GPA is my reading.

Sen. Hollinger: many grad schools do not accept re-takes as grades. So, this is a false sense of hope.

Sen. McGrath: hopefully this policy change can remedy that.

B. Course Withdraw Policy – Approved, with amendment (see final at appendix)

20 for, 4 against, 5 abstentions

Discussion:

General: hardship withdraws do not count toward penalties.

Sen. Scott: please try to implement these policies correctly and uniformly through advising – should this get approved...

Sen. Price: I question the ethics of admitting people who are clearly not prepared for college then placing these students at an immediate disadvantage with our “excellence” policies.

Sen. McGrath: agreed. We as a faculty don’t get to control the admissions end.

Sen. Nivens: Academic Selection is not applied to our admissions.

General: we should have higher admission standards.

Sen. Craven: while we try to get things tightened up at the admission-level, perhaps we can tool this to help.

Dean Shields: 27% of our students are 6 year graduates. Our hands are tied – we cannot teach remedial levels to students. This is this the best way to make some sort of difference.

Assoc. V. P. Watjen: from an enrollment perspective, admission standards are a problem. That’s a conversation this community can/should have with implications of change, carefully researched. We do want to enroll students who are likely to succeed. We have studies indicating what high school GPA’s are related to different levels of success. All to say, you can tweak admission to bring in students likely to “succeed” by passing courses.

Senator Scott calls the question for the first amendment to the policy (increasing the number of withdraws).

Friendly Amendment: Denied

10 for, 16 against, 1 abstention

Sen. Price: charge the enrollment office and Deans to monitor this.

Sen. LeFavi proposes second amendment to the policy: Approved.

Sen. Anderson calls the question to vote on the policy: Approved.

ii. Senate Charge to “examine the [Withdrawing from the University] policy... develop an advisory position that defines clearly and succinctly the question of...who is responsible for initiating the withdraw as well as who bears responsibility for assigning the [“W” or “WF”] grade and when.”

A. Revised Attendance Policy – Denied, with amendment (see final at appendix)

3 for, 13 against, 8 abstentions

Discussion:

General: seems intent of the policy to inhibit faculty freedom regarding the application of W / WF.

Chair Oglethorpe: your grades can be whatever your policy is.

Sen. LeFavi: proposed amendment to last sentence: , or a student who withdraws from the same course more than once, will receive... Amendment: approved.

Sen. Price: long story short: we are allowed to implement grade effect due absence BUT faculty cannot give a WF.

b. GAC

1. Graduate faculty status remanded item. Senate Charge: define assistant graduate faculty status –Denied.

Dr. Coberly: Assistant is the new Associate until renewal comes then it’s renewed as Associate.

Sen. Knofczynski: “Grad Fact Status” at the web indicates it corresponds to “bylaws” but the bylaws are not posted. The senate being involved but only a little bit is for the birds.

Dr. Coberly: it’s my understanding that Graduate faculty business for the senate is Information Only.

General: there's a lot of inconsistency here. Do you have to be a full professor to get full grad faculty status? Is the information that's publicly available accurate?

- c. Elections Process Update for senators and officer core
President Elect: Bob LeFavi
Vice President Elect: Suzy Carpenter
Secretary Elect: Pam Sears

IX. New Business

- a. Final Reports 2009 – 2010, Standing Committees of the Senate
Motion to accept all at once: Approved.

All: Approved.

1. Academic Standards Committee – App E
 2. Educational Technology Committee App F
 3. Faculty Welfare Committee – App G
 4. Faculty Development Committee – App H
 5. Graduate Affairs Committee – App I
 6. Honors Advisory Committee – App J
 7. Interdisciplinary Studies Committee
 8. International Programs and Activities Committee
 9. Library Committee – App K
 10. Planning, Budget and Facilities Committee – App L
 11. Research and Scholarship Committee – App M
 12. Student Success Committee – App N
 13. University Curriculum Committee – App O
 14. Writing Committee – App P
- b. Final Reports 2009 – 2010, Committees of the Senate
 1. Elections Committee
 2. Constitution and Bylaws Committee – App Q
 3. Committee on Committees

The following items were not discussed due to time constraints:

- c. Senate Resolution relating to the AASU Mission Statement – App R
- d. Senate Resolution relating to the Georgia Private School Tax Credit Law – App S
- e. Educational Technology Committee Bylaws – to Const & Bylaw – App T

X. Announcements

XI. Adjournment 5:11 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Jewell Anderson

Appendix A

Senators Present	Senators Absent
<p><u>College of Education</u> Linda Ann McCall Marsha Moore Greg Wimer Mike Mahan Beth Childress</p>	<p><u>College of Education</u> Brenda Logan, Alt. Ken Fields</p>
<p><u>College of Health Professions</u> April Garrity Bob LeFavi Joey Crosby Laurie Bryant Michelle Butina Helen Taggart Pam Mahan Carole Massey Andi Beth Mincer Gloria Strickland Rhonda Bevis</p>	<p><u>College of Liberal Arts</u> Ned Rinalducci, Alt. Becky daCruz</p>
<p><u>College of Liberal Arts</u> Kevin Hampton John Jensen Rick McGrath Daniel Skidmore-Hess Mike Price Barbara Fertig Karen Hollinger Jack Simmons Hans-Georg Erney Kalenda Easton</p>	<p><u>College of Science and Technology</u> Frank Katz, Alt. Azita Baharami Daniel Liang, Alt. Joy Reed</p>
<p><u>Library</u> Jewell Anderson Kate Wells</p>	<p>Guest Glenda Ogletree</p>
<p><u>College of Science and Technology</u> Kathryn Craven Traci Ness Delana Nivens Suzanne Carpenter Priya Goeser Sean Eastman Greg Knofsczynski Vann Scott</p>	<p>Ex-Officio Present Ellen Whitford, VPAA Russell Watjen, Assoc. VPAA Shelley Conroy, Dean COHP Patricia Wachholz, Dean COE Mark Finlay, on behalf of Dean COLA Steve Jodis, on behalf of Dean COST</p>

Appendix B & C

Approved, yet not edited, University Curriculum Committee Items available [here](#)

Graduate Items available [here](#)

Appendix D
Report of the University Curriculum Committee to the Senate
March 24, 2010

I. Charge from the Senate, October 21, 2008: To review the university's Course Repeating Policy. Senators expressed concern on behalf of the faculty that this policy does not serve either the university, or its students, well regarding grade point average inflation.

Please have the UCC study this policy, examine sister institutions within the University System of Georgia for the sake of comparison, and develop a recommendation on best practice that can be brought before the Faculty Senate for consideration.

Current course repeat policy (Undergraduate Catalog 2009-10, Page 69):

Repeating Courses. When a course is repeated, only the last grade earned counts in earned hours requirements, grade point average hours, points and overall grade point average. All course work taken remains on a student's academic records. Students may repeat any course. However, the grade earned in the last attempt will determine the number of quality points assigned for calculation of grade point average.

Two-part proposal to replace current repeat policy:

1. Repeating Courses. Students may repeat any course. However, when a course is repeated, all grades earned for each ~~repetition~~ **attempt** counts in earned hours requirements, grade point average hours, points and overall grade point average. All course work taken remains on a student's academic records.

Rationale: The subcommittee of the UCC given this charge recommends that all grades earned should be used to compute student grade point averages. For current students, the adjusted GPA earned prior to Fall 2010 will be retained. However, all grades earned after the implementation date will be calculated in their GPA.

The subcommittee feels that Armstrong students have the false impression that repeating a course comes without penalty. Students might retake courses in the hopes of replacing a passing grade (such as a C) with an A to inflate their overall GPA. Students seeking to get into graduate or professional programs assume that AASU's current grade replacement policy is universal. When in reality, most institutions (and financial aid) use all attempted hours to calculate GPA. Changing this

policy may help ameliorate the problem of Armstrong students unnecessarily repeating courses.

Effective Date: Fall 2010

Course Withdrawal Policy. ~~Students are limited to a maximum of five course withdrawals (W or WF). Beyond that maximum, any withdrawal will automatically be recorded as a "withdrawal failing" (WF).~~ **Students are allowed to withdraw from a particular course prior to midterm with the possibility of a “withdraw” (“W”) recorded, with the discretion of the professor, one time. On the second and any subsequent attempt, if a student desires to withdraw from that course, a “withdraw failure” (“WF”) is automatically recorded.**

Policy exceptions

- ~~• For students currently enrolled, only withdrawals incurred after the implementation date will count towards the allowed maximum.~~
- Only AASU course withdrawals will be considered. Therefore, W/WF grades transferred from other institutions will not count towards the maximum allowed amount.
- With approved documentation, hardship withdrawals from the university **are possible** due to circumstances of extreme duress or for military obligations ~~will be exempted from the maximum allowed amount.~~ See the sections on “Withdrawing from the University” and “Hardship Withdrawal from the University.”

Rationale: In the UCC January 21, 2009 minutes, the subcommittee of the UCC given this charge provided recommendations as well as a compilation of policies from Georgia, South Carolina, and Florida schools. In the February 18, 2009 minutes, the subcommittee shared data collected by Andy Clark on the elevated numbers of course repeats at Armstrong.

Upon further review of policies at other Georgia schools, the subcommittee found that many universities have recently imposed a limit on the numbers of withdrawal-passing (WP) grades rather than restricting the number of course repeats (See table below). Each school allows for policy exceptions.

<i>University</i>	<i>Number of WP allowed</i>	<i>Effective date</i>

University of Georgia	4	Fall 2008
Georgia Southern University	5	Fall 2009
Kennesaw State University	8	Fall 2004
Macon State College	No limit	
Georgia College and State University	No limit	
Clayton State University	No limit	

The subcommittee feels that by allowing an unlimited number of withdrawals, Armstrong students are careless in selecting courses and determining appropriate workloads. For example, a student might register for 18 hours with the full intent to drop at least one course. If the consequences of dropping courses are understood, students should be more careful to select the appropriate classes and loads. Furthermore, this policy might encourage students with borderline-passing grades to seriously attempt to complete the courses rather than withdrawing. Implementing this policy should help prevent students from unnecessarily dropping courses and eventually repeating them.

Effective Date: Fall 2010

II. Charge from the Senate, March 22, 2010:

There is considerable confusion regarding the assignment of grades of “W” and “WF,” including who is responsible for initiating the withdrawal – student or faculty - as well as who bears responsibility for assigning the grade and when.

Your charge is to examine the policy approved by the Faculty on April 9, 2007, and in consultation with the Registrar, Ms. Judy Ginter, develop an advisory position that defines clearly and succinctly the questions stated in the above paragraph.

1. Policy approved by the Faculty on April 9, 2007:

Withdrawing from the University. Withdrawing from the university means that a student has requested to drop all courses for the current term. A student who finds it necessary to withdraw should begin the withdrawal process in the Division of Student Affairs. The last day to formally withdraw from the university is the published last day of class for the session enrolled. Withdrawals

based on military obligations must include copies of supporting military orders.

Formal withdrawal from the university is required to ensure that the student is eligible to return to Armstrong Atlantic at a future date. Any refund to which a student is entitled will be considered on the basis of the withdrawal date. Grading procedures for withdrawing are the same as those listed under "Dropping Courses."

Hardship Withdrawal from the University. In the case where a student is forced, through circumstances of extreme duress beyond their control, to withdraw from the university past mid term, the student should begin the withdrawal process at the Division of the Division of Student Affairs will direct the student to the appropriate College Dean. The Dean, or the Dean's designee, may, with appropriate evidence provided by the student, withdraw the student from all courses without penalty. Individual faculty members will be notified that the student has been withdrawn from the university and a grade of "W" issued for all courses. The individual instructor retains the right to challenge the issuance of a "W".

Recommendation: The University Curriculum Committee has examined this policy and finds no reason it should be changed. However, an additional policy clarifying the questions in the charge has been developed by Ms. Judy Ginter. This policy, below, has been vetted by the Academic Affairs Council and by the University Curriculum Committee, and is recommended for approval.

2. Attendance Policy:

Current Attendance Policy (Undergraduate Catalog 2009-10, page 61):

Control of student attendance at class meetings and the effect of attendance on course grades are left to the discretion of instructors. Students are responsible for knowing everything that is announced, discussed, or lectured upon in class as well as for mastering all assigned reading. Students are also responsible for submitting all assignments, tests, recitations, and unannounced quizzes on time.

Instructors are responsible for informing all classes at the first meeting what constitutes excessive absence in the course. Students are responsible for knowing and complying with attendance regulations in all their courses. Instructors may drop students from any course with a grade of W or WF if, in their judgment, absences have been excessive.

Students can be dropped for non-attendance from a course at the discretion of the instructor. Once a student has been dropped for non-attendance, it is the responsibility of the student to reregister for the course with written permission from the instructor. If a student does not attend class and is not dropped from their course, it is the responsibility of the student to request that the instructor drop the course for non-attendance from their registration record during that term. Attendance is processed within the first two weeks of the semester start date.

Proposed Attendance Policy:

The effect of attendance on course grades is left to the discretion of instructors. Students are responsible for knowing everything that is announced, discussed, or lectured upon in class as well as for mastering all outside assignments. Students are also responsible for submitting all assignments, tests, recitations, and unannounced quizzes on time.

Instructors are responsible for informing all classes at the first meeting what constitutes excessive absence in the course. Students are responsible for knowing and complying with attendance regulations in all their courses.

Students may be dropped for non-attendance from a course at the discretion of the instructor only during the attendance verification process at the beginning of the semester. If a student does not attend, it is the responsibility of the student to drop the course before the drop/add period concludes or to withdraw from the course by the last day of the term. A student who withdraws from a course after the drop/add period is over and before the mid-term semester dates will receive a W or a WF at the instructor's discretion. A student who withdraws from a course after the mid-term semester dates, **or a student who withdraws from the same course more than once**, will receive a WF in the course.

Rationale: Students must be responsible for their own course schedule. How many hours they take affects how much money they owe, whether or not they are eligible for financial aid, whether or not they are eligible for health insurance, etc. Faculty should not drop classes from a student's schedule (except during attendance verification) and should never add or withdraw students

Effective Term: Fall 2010

Appendix E

Academic Standards Committee Report – 2009–2010

Chair: Richard Bryan

Secretary: Marilyn Hutchinson

Committee Members: David Adams, James Brawner, Beth Childress, Brett Larson, Jamie Mullins, Stephen Primatic, John Mitchell

The Academic Standards Committee formally met on four occasions during the 2009-2010 academic year. The first meeting was held on August 3, 2009. The meeting was devoted to reviewing admission appeals for students denied admission for academics and re-admission appeals for students academically dismissed from the university. The committee reviewed fifteen (15) admission appeals: one (1) student's appeal was granted, nine (9) students were granted limited admissions (e.g., at a reduced course load, in conjunction with academic support courses, under the supervision of Greg Anderson, or to focus solely on a specific requirement with which the student has had repeated trouble), and five (5) appeals were denied. Thirteen (13) re-admission appeals were reviewed: two (2) appeals were approved, five (5) students were granted limited admission, and six (6) appeals were denied.

The committee next convened August 13, 2009. Leading up to the meeting, members had corresponded regarding confusion about the (newly combined) committee's structure and by-laws, as the Academic Appeals Sub-committee and the Student Conduct Sub-committee had been merged just prior to the 2009-2010 academic year. Members were informed that, in his current capacity as the Chair of the Academic Appeals Sub-Committee, Dr. Stephen Primatic was restricted from serving as the Chair of the combined Academic Standards Committee. Officers would need to be elected for the joint committee. In addition, it was unclear how the Student Conduct Sub-committee would function—that is, whether there would be standing meetings or the committee would meet only as needed to adjudicate a violation of the Honor Code, as well as what role student members would play, whether there were existing student members, and how future student members were to be selected. At the meeting, the committee elected Dr. Beth Childress as committee Secretary. The meeting schedule for the Academic Appeals Sub-committee was discussed, with the understanding that the meeting immediately preceding the Summer 2010 sessions would be scheduled later, as the design of the summer sessions was still in progress. Finally, the committee reviewed eleven (11) admission appeals: two (2) appeals were approved, five (5) students were granted limited admission, and six (6) appeals were denied. The committee reviewed three (3) re-admission appeals: none (0) were approved, two (2) students were granted limited admission, and one (1) appeal was denied.

The meeting of August 26, 2009 was convened to elect a chair and a secretary for the joint Academic Standards Committee, which now consists of the two subcommittees: the Academic Appeals and Student Conduct Sub-Committees. Also, while the committee had elected Dr. Childress to serve as secretary, her other committee duties—including the Committee on Committees—would interfere with her ability to take on the additional position. Dr. Bryan agreed to serve as the Chair, and Dr. Marilyn Hutchinson agreed to

serve as Secretary. Both elections were unanimously approved. Dr. Brawner informed the committee that the by-laws were available on the Faculty Senate website and clarified the general duties of the two subcommittees, which included those mentioned above, as well as approving any changes in the student code of conduct (Student Conduct Subcommittee). Dr. Bryan agreed to consult Bill Kelso regarding the selection of students for the Honor Court. Dr. Kevin Hampton provided the requested information via email (see attached correspondence from September 9, 2009), and the names of the current student members was updated to the Faculty Senate website.

The most recent meeting, that of January 7, 2010, was devoted to the review of appeals. There were fourteen (14) admission appeals: three (3) were approved, four (4) students were granted limited admission, and seven (7) were denied. Of the ten (10) re-admission appeals, one (1) was approved, one (1) appeal proved unnecessary, and nine (9) were denied. The next meeting was scheduled for March 24, 2010; however, as all of the appeals turned out to involve Presidential exceptions, the committee was not needed, and the meeting was cancelled. Finally, the committee has tentatively scheduled their upcoming summer meeting for August 2, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Bryan, Academic Standards Committee Chair
April 12, 2010

Appendix F

April 12, 2010

Educational Technology Committee Final Report 2009-2010

Chair: Wendy Marshall

Secretary: Wayne Johnson

Committee Members: Kate Farley (Senator), Wayne Johnson (Secretary), Nancy Luke, Wendy Marshall (Chair), Jared Schlieper, Lynn Long, Linda Wright, Sandra Holseth (graduate student representative), Eric Brown (undergraduate student representative), Pam Culberson (Computer and Information Services ex-officio member)

The Educational Technology Committee met twice during the 2009-2010 academic year. The first meeting occurred during Fall registration and a second meeting was held on April 10. The primary goals addressed at these meetings included efforts to:

- more clearly define our duties in relation to the other technology-focused committees on campus,
- recommend changes to our bylaws to more clearly define our mission,
- recommend the reinstatement of the former “Teaching with Technology Symposium” on campus,
- assist faculty in their efforts to pilot various student response systems (clickers) available to help in determining which system will be supported campus-wide by CIS,
- work closely with the Technology Fee Committee on campus to make sure that the funds are first used to repair existing technologies in classrooms, then used to expand access to technologies in classroom for academic purposes,
- recommend starting a faculty blog to post links and reviews of software and Web-based educational technology tools.

Suggested Directions for 2010-2011

- 1) Host and promote the “Teaching with Technology Symposium” for faculty.
- 2) Add an additional committee member from Liberal Arts.
- 3) Work on developing a proposal process, in conjunction with the Technology Fee Committee (TCF), to help determine the best allocation of future student technology fee funds.
- 4) Host a Friday Faculty Forum to look at the various student response systems (clickers) available for faculty adoption.

5) Start faculty blog to post links and reviews of software and Web-based educational technology tools.

Appendix G

Faculty Welfare Committee Report 2009-2010

Chair: Clifford Padgett

Secretary: Rochelle Lee

Committee Members: Maya Clark, Alexander Collier, Elizabeth Crawford, Hans-Georg Erney (Senator), Ann Fuller, John Jensen (Senator), Regina Rahimi

The Faculty Welfare Committee (henceforth abbreviated to FWC) met four times in the 2009-2010 academic year. Our primary goals were 1) Look at eFACE concerns, 2) Draft a furlough resolution, 3) Make recommendations for Emeritus faculty benefits, 4) Make recommendations for part-time faculty benefits.

eFACE issues concerning classes with multiple instructors were examined; the committee recommended that they be handled in the same fashion as the FACE paper forms would have been handled. Problems with banner prevent this and the issue was passed on to Andy Clark.

The Planning, Budget and Facilities Committee, the Student Success Committee, and the Faculty Welfare Committee were asked to write a joint furlough resolution. The chairs met several times and each committee worked on different parts of the resolution. Ultimately the committees recommended the formation of an Ad Hoc committee on furloughs, which was charged with completion of the resolution.

The Faculty Welfare Committee also made recommendations concerning the interests of emeritus faculty and part-time faculty. Concerning benefits like email access, parking decals, office space and computer access.

Other FWC activities during 2009-2010 include a continuation of last year's salary study focusing mainly on promotional salary increases. The lack of child care at AASU remained a concern. However, in light of pressing budget issues this issue remained in the background.

Suggested Directions for 2010-2011

- 1) Continue efforts to provide child care for members of the AASU community.
- 2) Continue eFACE review.
- 3) Continue salary study.

Appendix H
Faculty Development Committee
Year-End Report
Academic Year 2009-10

- The committee met three times during the academic year.

Accomplishments:

- Reviewed guidelines for the AASU Internal Teaching and Learning and Gignilliat grants.
- Reviewed the rubric to evaluate Teaching and Learning grants.
- Committee members participated in the Workshop on Grant Writing, held on October 2, 2009.
- Reviewed Teaching and Learning and Gignilliat grant proposals and made recommendations regarding funding.
- Began discussions about providing more detailed feedback on the T&L grants that are not funded to encourage revisions for resubmission when appropriate, required progress reports, and possible creation of a review board for internal grants. Discussion on these issues will continue next year.

Appendix I

Graduate Affairs Committee Report–2009-10

With the dissolution of the School of Graduate Studies in 2009, the academic year was very much a year of transition and saw the GAC functioning much more as an administrative body overseeing the day-to-day operations of graduate programs than it has in the past. Establishing the new decentralized system instituted by the administration has called for a great deal of troubleshooting to find the best location of graduate administrative functions and solving problems as they became apparent. We have made it through this first year under the new system surprisingly well; however, the transitional oversight will need to continue next year as policy and procedural reviews continue. Hopefully, upon completion of those tasks, the GAC can spend less time on administrative issues and more on planning for the future development of graduate programs and the welfare of our students.

The end of the School of Graduate Studies necessitated altering the GAC's bylaws passed by the senate last year. Drafts of those revisions have moved forward, but a quandary over terminology has delayed final submission to the senate for approval. Hopefully, those issues can be resolved before the end of the year.

The committee devoted time to reviewing the requirements and procedures for obtaining different levels of graduate faculty status. That work also should be completed by the end of the year. Graduate faculty records are now housed and maintained in Academic Affairs.

Work continued this year reviewing student financial support. The committee is awaiting direction from President Linda Bleicken on her ideas for the use of out-of-state tuition waivers before moving forward on the initiative begun last year. However, the committee has gone ahead and moved forward with changes to the graduate assistantship program. The committee is trying a new system of having programs submit proposals for graduate assistantship positions for the next academic year, utilizing forms and criteria developed by Director of Operations, Enrollment Management, Melanie Mirande. A committee made up of representatives from each of the colleges will review the requests and distribute the positions.

Much of the GAC work next year necessarily will focus on preparation for SACS accreditation triggered by the request to raise AASU's status to a doctoral-granting institution. In these tough days, the creation of AASU's first Ph.D. program is a highpoint, one of which the entire university community should be proud.

Minutes of the GAC meetings can be found on the committee's web page at <http://gs.armstrong.edu/graduateaffairscommittee.html>.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher E. Hendricks

March 26, 2010

Committee Members:

Communicative Disorders–Maya Clark

Computer Science–Ray Hashemi

Criminal Justice–Becky da Cruz, Vice Chair

Adult Education–Patricia Coberly

Early Education–Elizabeth Crawford

Curriculum and Instruction/Middle Grades Education–Regina Rahimi

Curriculum and Instruction–Marilyn Hutchinson (Fall)

Health Services Administration–Joey Crosby

History–Christopher Hendricks, Chair

Liberal and Professional Studies–John Kraft

Nursing–Anita Nivens

Physical Therapy–Anne Thompson

Public Health–Michael Mink

Special Education–Robert Lloyd

Sports Medicine–Bob Lefavi

Members-At-Large:

Carol Andrews

Jose da Cruz

Nonvoting, *Ex Officio* Members:

Shelley Conroy

Laura Barrett

Bill Kelso

George Shields

Patricia Wachholz

Appendix J

Honors Advisory Committee Report – 2009–2010

The Honors Advisory Committee formally met as a committee twice during the fall semester of 2009. The first meeting was held on August 14, 2009. At the meeting, new members were introduced to the committee and committee secretary and chair were selected. Then, a timeline for selecting Presidential Honors Scholarships and Ambassador Scholarships was agreed upon. Also, there was a discussion on how to ensure that Honors-eligible freshman students are enrolled in Honors courses. The committee decided that Dr. Jonathan Roberts should look into the possibility of having a Navigate AASU cohort devoted to Honors-eligible freshman. The second meeting on September 4, 2009 was devoted to interviewing the selected candidate for Presidential Honors Scholarship and to reviewing eight applications for Honors Ambassador Scholarships. The selected candidate was awarded the Presidential Honors Scholarship, and five of the eight Honors Ambassador Scholarship applications were accepted.

During February 2010, the Honors Advisory Committee corresponded through e-mail to decide whether or not to award Honors in Service and Leadership to the only applicant for the honor this academic year. Ultimately, the committee decided that the application did not fully meet the criteria for the honor. Consequently, the application was not accepted for the honor. Further, the review process of this application inspired in the committee a desire to clarify certain criteria in the description for the honor in an effort to improve future applications.

Later this month, the Honors Advisory Committee plans to have one last formal meeting. In this meeting, reworking the criteria for Honors in Service and Leadership will be discussed. Also, applications for Presidential Honors Scholarships and Honors Study Abroad Scholarships will be evaluated and awardees will be selected.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristin Stout, Honors Advisory Committee Chair
April 9, 2010

**Appendix K
Library Committee
Annual Report (2009-2010)**

The Library Committee met five times this academic year. In those meetings, the members accomplished the following tasks:

- I.** At the initial meeting in August, members discussed projected plans for the academic year.

- II.** In December and February, members attended several meetings with architects from Jova Daniels Busby firm to hear designs for the library expansion project.

- III.** In January, the committee established timelines for the call for nominations and application deadlines for the 2009-2010 Brockmeier Faculty Award.

- IV.** In March, the committee reviewed application packages for the Brockmeier Faculty Award and collectively decided on the winner. Last year's winner, Pamela Sears, will present the winner at the Leadership Award ceremony.

Submitted by,

Jennifer Zettler, Secretary
Joan Schwartz, Chair
March 25, 2010

Appendix L Planning, Budget, and Facilities Committee

Annual Report, 2009-10

Membership: Doug Frazier (Chair, Library), Christine Bild (Graduate Student), Suzanne Edenfield (Health Professions), Sean Eastman (Secretary, Science & Technology, Senate Representative), Kam Lau (Science & Technology), Robert Lloyd (Education), Michael Mahan (Education), Michael Mink (Health Professions), Stephen Primatic (Liberal Arts), Zerik Samples (Student), David Wheeler (Liberal Arts), . Ex Officio Members: David Carson (VP Business & Finance), Shelley Conroy (Dean, College of Health Professions), Michael Donohue (VP External Affairs, Fall 2009 only), Vickie McNeil (VP Student Affairs), Ellen Whitford (VP Academic Affairs), Jane Wong (Department Head, Psychology).

Meetings: The Committee met seven times during the academic year: Aug. 14, Aug. 28, Oct. 9, Nov. 20, Feb. 12, Mar. 11, and Apr. 2. The bylaws call for eight meetings, but it was difficult to schedule meetings at a time when all members could be present.

Process for naming student members: Although the bylaws call for student representation on the Committee, there were no student members in 2008-2009 because of questions about the selection process. This year it was determined that the SGA would name the undergraduate member, and the Graduate Student Council would name the graduate member.

Committee role: The Committee invited AASU President Dr. Bleicken and Faculty Senate President Dr. Hampton to the first formal meeting of the year to discuss what the Committee's role should be in the University's budgeting process. Dr. Hampton indicated that the Senate would look to the Committee for leadership in budgetary matters. Dr. Bleicken asked Committee members if they would like to review suggestions she had received for saving money on campus and make recommendations to her. The Committee voted to accept her offer. Ultimately, the Committee sent a list of 14 suggestions to the President for her consideration.

Furlough resolution: The Faculty Senate charged the Committee to work with the Faculty Welfare and Student Success Committees to prepare a resolution for the Faculty Senate on furloughs. Specifically, the committees were asked to address "the disparity of financial burden between" 10 and 12 month employees, the appropriate reduction of teaching faculty workload, and the anticipated duration of furloughs beyond the current academic year. The combined membership of the three committees being 43 people, the three committee chairs met to determine a plan of action. We agreed that the Faculty Welfare Committee would draft a resolution, which would be circulated to the other committees for approval. Consideration of the draft by our committee was lively but ultimately inconclusive. The committee could not reach agreement on the level of disparity, if any, between 10 and 12 month faculty, especially when Summer School is

taken into account. In the end, the Committee sent the draft back to the Faculty Senate with the suggestion that the Senate establish its own ad-hoc committee to draft a resolution.

Participation in the Budget Process: The Committee had no direct involvement in the budgeting process this year. The normal budgeting process has been disrupted by repeated cuts in state report and by problems with ADP. Availability of budgets online has also been delayed. Mr. Carson provided regular updates to the Committee on budgetary matters and answered questions, keeping everyone well-informed.

Major budget reduction: President Bleicken requested a meeting with the Committee shortly after the University had to submit a plan for absorbing an additional \$5 million reduction in FY2011. She provided detailed information about the plan to close outreach programs, cut temporary faculty positions, and eliminate 3 programs, should the additional budget cut be enacted by the General Assembly. She also emphasized the need for AASU to focus on core programs and to find new sources of revenue. Mr. Carson supplied figures on the budget reductions and the apportioning of the budget to salaries & wages (76%), operating expenses (22%), and equipment and travel (1% each).

Planning: The Committee did not participate directly in planning for the University, perhaps because the process to create a new strategic got started late in the academic year. Dr. Whitford presented a synopsis of the preliminary results from the Crane Marketing Study of the University. AASU's strengths are the faculty and quality of education provided. Perceived weaknesses are the service areas, particularly financial aid. Results from the full study will be used in the strategic planning process.

Respectfully submitted,

Doug Frazier
Chair, Planning, Budget, & Facilities Committee, 2009-2010

Appendix M

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Thomas Cooksey (committee chair)
WHEN: 5 April 2010
SUBJECT: Annual Report for the Research and Scholarship Committee: 2009-2010

The Committee as a whole met twice, the organization meeting during Fall registration, then a formal meeting 7 September 2009. At that time the committee divided into two subcommittees: Faculty Research and Scholarship Subcommittee (Cooksey (chair), Bennett, Coberly, Lake, Masini, Sammons, Sturz; Student Research and Scholarship Subcommittee: Saad (chair), Davis, Garrity, Mateer, Moore, Nivens, Sears.

I. *The Faculty Research and Scholarship Subcommittee* (chaired by Cooksey) evaluated 24 faculty research and scholarship grants and teaching and learning grant proposals. The subcommittee met 20 November 2009 to make its final assessments and rate the grant proposals, recommending the funding of 16 proposals:

<i>Applicant:</i>	<i>Amount Approved:</i>
Jennifer Baily	1,821.00
Mark Budden	2,000.00
Brent Feske	2,000.00
Austin Francis	1,957.00
Sara Gremillion	979.00
Karen Hollinger	2,000.00
Wayne Johnson	1,000.00
John Kraft	1,700.00
Josh Lambert	2,000.00
Scott Mateer	1,200.00
Traci Ness	1,940.00
Cliff Padgett	1,800.00
Leigh Rich	1,972.00
Jared Schlieper	2,000.00
Eric Werner	900.00
Wendy Wolfe	1,750.0
<hr/> TOTAL	27,019.00

II. *The Student Research and Scholarship Subcommittee* (chaired Saad) organized and coordinated presentations for the Student Research Symposium, soliciting abstracts from students, enlisting judges, and organizing poster sessions and oral presentations of student research. The Student Research Symposium is scheduled for 14 April 2010. 10-12 students submitted proposals for poster presentations and 7-9 submitted proposals for oral presentations.

III. The committee was not consulted with regard to the Gignilliat Summer Research Fellowship, the Alumni Award for Distinguished Faculty Service to the Discipline, or Advanced Academic Leave.

Appendix N
STUDENT SUCCESS COMMITTEE

ANNUAL REPORT

AY 2009-2010

Please refer to meeting minutes submitted to the Faculty Senate for details.

Business conducted through the academic year 2009-2010

Ongoing numerous scholarships approved through External Affairs
Scholarship sub-committee reviews and recommends scholarship recipients for all incoming freshmen (in March), returning freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, graduate students and non-traditional students (in May)
Reviewed the list of undergrad graduation candidates for both December 2009 and May 2010 graduation
Responded to charges brought to this committee by the Senate
 Joint charge: resolution regarding furloughs
 Charge: concerning financial aid distribution (and “pre-professional” major declarations)
 Charge: concerning prerequisites and transcript analysis
AASU/EAP (Enhanced Advisement Process) Advising Scorecard underway

Business to be carried forward in the 2010-2011 academic year

Ongoing approval of scholarship recommendations through the Office of External Affairs
Review list of undergrad graduation candidates provided by the Registrar in the Fall and Spring semesters
Follow-up on the progress of the AASU/EAP (Enhanced Advisement Process) Advising Scorecard and the written Advisory Plan and Communication Plan

Appendix O

University Curriculum Committee Annual Report for 2009-2010

The University Curriculum Committee will have met eight times during the 2009-2010 academic year on the third Wednesday of the month unless there was an official holiday for faculty. Agendas and minutes for UCC meetings are posted on the Faculty Senate website.

The regular monthly business of the committee included acting upon curricular items from the colleges of the university. Below is a table of the number of items from each college. Eleven items were 5000 level.

	Items		Items
College of Education		College of Liberal Arts	2
Early Childhood Education	7	Art, Music and Theater	0
Health and Physical Education	15	Criminal Justice, Social and Political Science	12
Middle and Secondary	5	Economics	1
Special and Adult Education	8	Gender and Women's Studies	0
College of Health Professions		History	3
Communication, Science and Disorders	12	Languages, Literature, and Philosophy	13
Dental Hygiene	3	Interdisciplinary Programs	0
Health Science	14	Military Science/ROTC	0
Medical Technology	0	College of Science and Technology	
Nursing	10	Biology	10

Physical Therapy	5		Chemistry and Physics	10
Radiologic Sciences	7		Information, Computing, and Engineering	18
Respiratory Therapy	5		Mathematics	5
			Psychology	2

The subcommittee that was formed in 2008-2009 provided recommendations for the course repeat policy, hardship withdrawal policy, grade point policy, and the attendance policy. The University Curriculum Committee sent the approved recommendations to the Senate for their consideration for Fall 2010.

No action was taking during the 2009-2010 academic year on the effect of 5000 level courses on undergraduate education. This will be on the agenda for 2010-2011.

Glenda L. Ogletree, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Early Childhood Education
Chair, University Curriculum Committee

Appendix P

Annual Report; 2009-2010
AASU Committee on Writing

Members: Wendy Wolfe, Chair; Karen Hollinger, Senate Representative; Carole Massey, Recorder; Julia (Judy) Dubus; William Baird; Deborah Reese, Director of the Writing Center and *ex officio* member; Kemi Elufiede, SGA student representative; Joe Morgan, Writing Center student representative.

The committee met three times – once during the Fall semester and twice during the Spring semester. At least one more meeting is anticipated before the Spring semester ends. In addition, committee business and discussions were conducted via email.

Accomplishments:

Due to poor attendance at last year's faculty forum on writing, the committee decided to focus on the student writing recognition event (Writing Showcase) this year. Efforts were made to contact faculty much earlier in the academic year (twice during the Fall semester and several times in the Spring semester) with requests for student papers. An emphasis in these communications was a call for diverse examples of excellent student writing, with a goal of one student paper submission per academic department and interdisciplinary program. In addition to email communications to faculty about the event, flyers were sent by campus mail and personal appeals to department heads were made to increase submissions. Thus far, one day before the deadline for entries, six undergraduate and five graduate papers are scheduled to be recognized for excellence in writing, with submissions from eight departments or interdisciplinary programs. This represents a slight increase in participation from last year. The award reception is scheduled for April 23rd and will be combined with the unveiling of the Common Read book for Fall, 2010.

In addition to our efforts to increase participation in this year's student writing recognition event, we changed the format of the event to more fully "showcase" students' writing. Whereas in recent years only the names and paper titles of the honorees have been publicized, our plan is to have the nominating faculty member introduce the student at the event and speak briefly about the paper. The committee felt this would add a personal touch to the proceeding, make the event more memorable for students and their guests, and would enhance the experience for audience members who wish to learn more about what makes for excellence in student writing across various academic disciplines. We also plan to "showcase" the Writing Committee's new website (another accomplishment for this year) at the event, where visitors can read the award winning papers. Finally, we have adapted a consent form to allow winning papers to be archived at Lane Library.

Problems for consideration by new committee

Despite the committee's efforts to increase participation in the Writing Showcase, submissions at this date are only marginally higher than last year's event. Next year's committee will be faced with deciding whether to stick to the existing format for the Showcase in hopes that consistency will yield increased involvement over time as faculty and students become more familiar with the event and the nominating process, or to change the format, or to abandon the Showcase all together and focus efforts instead on another means of supporting student writing. It is difficult at this point in time to assess the success of the Showcase itself (and some of the changes to the Showcase format), since it has not yet been held.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Wolfe
Chair, 2009-2010

Appendix Q

Constitution and Bylaws Committee

Annual Report for 2009-10

Constitution and Bylaws Committee

Annual Report for 2009-10

The Constitution and Bylaws Committee met 7 times during the 2009-2010 academic year. Agendas and minutes of our meetings are posted on the Faculty Senate website.

During this academic year this committee reapportioned the senate seats due to a reduction in the number of departments on campus, and created a proposed plan to modify term lengths of AASU Faculty Senators. It examined proposed changes to bylaws of some of the standing committees. Some resulted in approval, while others did not. This committee dealt with the issue of ex-officio status of administrators at faculty senate meetings and wrote an extensive report from the finding of a survey which took place in the spring of 2009. This committee established and used a viable method of bringing proposed amendments to the full faculty for a vote. Three amendments addressing term lengths of alternates and student representation on standing committees of the faculty were passed. This committee proposed a solution to the likely possibility that a tie may occur during reapportionment, however this proposal is not yet approved (see number 3 below).

Following is a list of items which need to be addressed by this committee in the upcoming academic year.

1) The issue of the Graduate Affairs Subcommittees using the term “subcommittees” in their name. Since the members of the subcommittees are not on the Graduate Affairs Committee, they should not use the term subcommittee. The term subcommittee implies that all members on the subcommittee are members of the “parent” committee. See article X, Section D of the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate. This issue was scheduled to be discussed by VPAA, the chair of the GAC, the chair of this committee, and the president of the senate, but the meeting was canceled due to budgetary issues that needed to be addressed by the VPAA. Additionally, the GAC edited their bylaws and the changes were approved by this committee. However, these changes have not gone forward for senate approval as the GAC was waiting for a new name for their subcommittees before going forward. The changes to their bylaws (which are ready for senate approval) and a proposed solution to the subcommittee issue are available in the minutes from the November 2nd 2009 Constitution and Bylaws committee meeting.

2) The University Curriculum Committee would like to change their bylaws to reflect the correct path for 5000 level curricular items. This edit to the UCC bylaws is awaiting

approval from the Constitution and Bylaws Committee before it can be voted on by the full senate.

3) A resolution to the issue of how to handle a tie when reapportioning the senate seats is currently awaiting approval by the faculty senate and the full faculty. It would be best if this vote could take place prior to the senate being reapportioned in the fall of 2010.

Respectively submitted,

April 12th, 2010

Greg Knofczynski, Constitution and Bylaws Committee Chair

Appendix R

Whereas any proposed mission for AASU affects the goals of all university faculty,

Be it resolved that changes to the AASU mission must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the faculty senate.

Appendix S

Senate Motion:

The AASU Faculty Senate recommends the elimination of the Georgia Private School Tax Credit Law, which allows private citizens and corporations to receive tax credits for donations to Georgia Student Scholarship Organizations.

Rational:

The Tax Credit sends money that until 2008 was allocated to the state budget to private K-12 schools in Georgia. In a time of financial exigency, the state should not be subsidizing the Georgia Student Scholarship Organizations and private schools, but instead use revenue streams to save existing public enterprises.

Description of the Georgia Private School Tax Credit:

The Georgia Private School Tax Credit law allows eligible private citizens and corporations to receive tax credits for donations to Georgia Student Scholarship Organizations (SSOs). SSOs will provide student scholarships to parents that will help cover the cost of a private school education for their children in the state of Georgia.

Eligible Student Scholarship Organizations (SSOs) are charitable organizations located in Georgia.

- SSOs must submit their annual notice of participation to the Georgia Department of Education in accordance with department guidelines regarding their participation as an SSO. The annual notification form can be found in the “FOR SSOs” box.
- SSOs are exempt from federal income taxation under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code;
- SSOs must allocate at least 90 percent of their annual revenue for scholarships or tuition grants to allow students to attend any qualified private school of their parents’ choice.
- SSOs must provide educational scholarships or tuition grants to eligible students without limiting the availability of those scholarships or grants to the students of any one school.
- SSOs must be legally registered and in good standing with the Georgia Secretary of State as required by Georgia law.
- SSOs must obligate 90 percent of their annual revenue for scholarships or tuition grants (Up to 25 percent of this amount may be carried forward for the next fiscal year).

Qualified schools are private schools (grades K-12) that meet the following criteria:

- Accredited or in the process of becoming accredited by one or more accreditation agencies:
 - Southern Association of Colleges and Schools; or

- Georgia Accrediting Commission; or
- Georgia Association of Christian Schools; or
- Association of Christian Schools International; or
- Georgia Private School Accreditation Council; or
- Accrediting Commission for Independent Study; or
- Southern Association of Independent Schools.
- Physically located in Georgia;
- Adheres to the provisions of the federal Civil Rights Act of 1964; and
- Satisfies the private school requirements prescribed in Georgia state law.

From:

http://www.doe.k12.ga.us/pea_policy.aspx?PageReq=PEAHB1133

Appendix T

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 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, and scholarship.

Duties

The committee will provide coordination and communication among the various University committees and other committees of the Senate that are involved with technology use at AASU for the purpose of ensuring faculty awareness of technology applications related to teaching, learning, and professional development, as well as providing a faculty voice in the evolving policies related to such use.

Specifically, this committee will **make recommendations regarding:**

- * ~~Monitor~~ campus access to educational technology for students and faculty;
- * ~~monitor~~ university policies governing the use of technology and technology infrastructure of the University, in collaboration with the Committee on Information Technology;
- * ~~monitor ongoing student and faculty development in~~ the use of technological tools in teaching and learning in collaboration with other appropriate committees.
- * ~~Communicate with the University Advisory Committee for Distance and Online Learning (ACDOL) regarding activities and policies related to distance learning.~~

The committee will also communicate with the University Advisory Committee for Distance and Online Learning (ACDOL) and the Committee on Information Technology regarding activities and policies.

Student issues will be addressed by the Student Voice Subcommittee. This subcommittee will consist of the chair of the ETC, at least two other ETC committee members, and one graduate and one undergraduate student representative nominated by the SGA and the Graduate Student Council.

Membership

The committee shall be composed of ten members, including seven faculty members with at least one member from each of the Colleges, and a representative from Computer and Information Services who shall serve as an ex-officio, non-voting member. One undergraduate and one graduate student, nominated by the Student Government Association and Graduate Student Council respectively, will serve as voting members of the Student Voice subcommittee.

Meetings

The Committee will meet at least twice each academic semester. The committee will determine meeting dates and time to be posted on the Senate Web site.

Reports

The committee will, upon approval, provide minutes of each of its meetings to the Secretary of the Senate for posting. At the end of each semester, the chair of the committee will submit to the Senate a summary report of committee activities.