

# Agenda

## Faculty Meeting



Tuesday, April 14, 2009  
2:30 p.m., Room 170, University Hall

I. **Approval of the Minutes** from March 24, 2009, available at:  
[http://www.aug.edu/faculty\\_secretary/facmin\\_03\\_24\\_2009\\_draft.pdf](http://www.aug.edu/faculty_secretary/facmin_03_24_2009_draft.pdf)

II. **Report** of the President

III. **Academic Policies Committee** – Dr. Todd Schultz  
Items for information only– **See Attachment A**  
Items requiring a faculty vote – **See Attachment B**

IV. **Faculty Policies Committee** – Dr. Tom Crute  
Course Evaluation Changes– **See Attachment C**  
Lecturer Description– **See Attachment D**

V. **Announcements**

## Attachments

**Attachment A** - from the Academic Policies Committee  
These items are for information only and do not require a vote.

### From the Pamplin College of Arts and Sciences

1. CHANGE: Require a C in prerequisite courses for MATH 4251, 4252, 5110, and 5220. Change description of MATH 6250 course  
MATH\_001\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1045
2. CHANGE: Drop “ring theory” from course description of MATH 6211  
MATH\_004\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1046
3. CHANGE: MS in Psychology – Increase GPA admission requirement from 2.5 to 3.0  
PSYC\_001\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1047
4. CHANGE: MS Psychology counseling/clinical **non-thesis** track: Increase hours from 45 to 53, per CAMPP recommendation  
PSYC\_002\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1048
5. CHANGE: MS Psychology counseling/clinical **thesis** track: Increase hours from 45 to 53, per CAMPP recommendation  
PSYC\_003\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1049
6. CHANGE: MS Psychology applied experimental track: Add PSYC 6921 and PSYC 6922 (1 credit hour each = 2 hrs)  
PSYC\_004\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1050
7. CHANGE: MS Psychology general experimental track: Add PSYC 6921 and PSYC 6922 (1 credit hour each = 2 hrs)  
PSYC\_005\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1051
8. NEW COURSE: PSYC 6921: Research Methods Lab I  
PSYC\_006\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1052
9. NEW COURSE: PSYC 6922: Research Methods Lab II  
PSYC\_007\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1053
10. NEW COURSE: PSYC 6926: Psychological Assessment Practicum I  
PSYC\_008\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1054
11. NEW COURSE: PSYC 6927: Psychological Assessment Practicum II  
PSYC\_009\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1055
12. NEW COURSE: PSYC 6945: Therapeutic Intervention I  
PSYC\_010\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1056

13. NEW COURSE: PSYC 6946: Therapeutic Intervention II  
PSYC\_011\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1057
14. CHANGE: Change title of PSYC 6173 to include “Human Diversity”  
PSYC\_012\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1058
15. CHANGE: Change hours of PSYC 6930 from variable to (3-0-3)  
PSYC\_013\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1059
16. NEW COURSE: PSYC 6931: Research Practicum II  
PSYC\_014\_JAN09 [pdf](#) C1060
17. CHANGE: description COMS3000/COMD3000 to allow extra coverage of voice, diction,  
phonetics, dialect.  
COMS\_001\_FEB09 [pdf](#) C1061
18. CHANGE: Allow use of research course in Chemistry major professional studies track  
CHEMPHYS\_013\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1062
19. NEW COURSE: CHEM 1000 (1-0-1)  
CHEMPHYS\_015\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1064
20. CHANGE: degree names **from** “BA in {specific language X}” **to** “BA in Foreign Languages with  
a track in {X}”  
EFL\_001\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1065
21. CHANGE: GRMN 3100 catalog entry change to better reflect the course content  
EFL\_002\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1066
22. CHANGE: GRMN 3200 catalog entry change to better reflect interests of students and faculty  
EFL\_003\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1067
23. CHANGE: Drop HUMN 2001 prerequisite from ENGL 2250 so students can move into upper  
level courses faster  
EFL\_004\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1068
24. CHANGE: GRMN 3300 catalog entry change to better reflect the course content.  
EFL\_005\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1069
25. CHANGE: GRMN 3510 catalog entry change to better reflect the course content  
EFL\_006\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1070
26. CHANGE: GRMN 3520 make course content flexible to accommodate interests of faculty  
EFL\_007\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1071
27. CHANGE: GRMN 4950 (selected topics) drop description prerequisite that students  
major/minor in German  
EFL\_008\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1072

28. CHANGE: Drop HUMN 2002 as prerequisite for ENGL 3001, 3004, 3101, 3102 (see 004)  
EFL\_009\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1073
29. CHANGE: Catalog entry change regarding placement in MATH 1120 and MATH 1220  
MATH\_001\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1074
30. CHANGE: Catalog entry change to clarify prerequisite for MATH 6242, 6243, and 6260  
MATH\_002\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1075
31. CHANGE: Change in prerequisites CSCI 3030, 3170, 3271, 3300, 3370, 3400, 3410, 3500, 4272, 4280, 4712, 4800, 4820, in the interest of preparation, and due to changes in cycle of course scheduling  
MATH\_003\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1076
32. NEW COURSE: AIST 3531: Introduction to Network Security  
MATH\_004\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1077
33. NEW COURSE: AIST 3532: Network Defense and Countermeasures  
MATH\_005\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1078
34. NEW COURSE: AIST 3541: Digital Forensics  
MATH\_006\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1079
35. CHANGE: Change Area F for the International Studies track  
POLS\_014\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1080
36. CHANGE: Add political theory class to International Studies track  
POLS\_015\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1081
37. CHANGE: Clarify degree requirements for legal studies track  
POLS\_016\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1082

**From the Hull College of Business**

38. CHANGE: Adjust MIS major electives  
HCB\_program\_MISElectives [pdf](#) C1083
39. CHANGE: Adjust Marketing major electives  
HCB\_program\_MarketingElectives [pdf](#) C1084

**Attachment B** - from the Academic Policies Committee  
These items requires a vote by the ASU Faculty.

1. NEW MAJOR: BS in Kinesiology  
COE\_BS\_Kinesiology [pdf](#) C1085
2. NEW MAJOR: MS in Kinesiology  
COE\_MS\_Kinesiology [pdf](#) C1086
3. CHANGE: Delete Cullum  
SOCL\_001\_FEB09 [pdf](#) C1087
4. CHANGE: Delete Cullum  
CPW\_002\_FEB09 [pdf](#) C1088
5. CHANGE: Delete Cullum  
CHEMPHYS\_012\_FEB09 [pdf](#) C1089
6. CHANGE: Delete Cullum  
ART\_001\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C10890
7. CHANGE: Delete Cullum  
PSYC\_015\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1091
8. CHANGE: Delete Cullum  
MATH\_007\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1092
9. CHANGE: Delete Cullum  
BIOL\_001\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1093
10. CHANGE: Remove minor requirement from Biochemistry track to allow program flexibility  
CHEMPHYS\_014\_MAR09 [pdf](#) C1063

## Attachment C - from the Faculty Policies Committee

These items require a vote.

### Proposed Course Evaluation Changes

FPC has completed the mandated review of the ASU course evaluation instrument and has several proposed changes. Due to budgetary issues, it is recommended that the faculty adopt the proposed changes but that they be implemented at a later date upon agreement by FPC and the President.

#### Current Practice

At the last review the course evaluation instrument was updated significantly to its current form. Evaluations are administered using a packet of a 4-page bi-fold evaluation booklet, scantron sheet, free response sheet, and instruction sheet. Upon completion the booklets are collected to be reused. Free response sheets are saved for the faculty member. Scantrons are collected and scanned by ITS. Reports are generated by proprietary software detailing some of the statistics. These reports are printed and sent to the departments.

Faculty manual (section 422) specifies evaluation of all classes by students each fall and spring. A common instrument will be used in at least the fall using adequate classroom time. Instructors will not be present during the evaluation. Course evaluations are intended to be one of the multiple methods of summative assessment and formative feedback of teaching.

#### Proposed

- Change the course evaluation packet materials. The proposed forms show the following changes:

##### *On the Evaluation Instrument*

- Deleted Old question 2- (“subject matter was interesting to me”)
- Reworded Old questions 12 and 13 (new #13 and #14)- change “textbook” to “course materials with examples
- Reworded Old question 15 (new #16)- The course has challenged me to think, ~~not just memorize.~~
- Reworded Old question 21 (new #22)- The professor was available for consultation during posted office hours, ~~or by appointment,~~ **or electronically.**
- Reworded Old question 28 (new #29)- The professor ~~was on time for class~~ **effectively and fully used the time allotted for the course.**
- Added question (new #3)- (how often did you seek assistance from instructor outside of class)
- Added question (new #11)- (background and prerequisite courses prepared me sufficiently for this course
- Added question (new #34)- How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the course?
- Added question (new #35)- This course evaluation was administered in accordance with the directions at the top of this form.

##### *On free response sheet*

Instructions to be rewritten to remind the student that the instructor will not see comments until after grades have been turned in. Add a blank for the instructor name.

*On the Report*

Recommendation is to include the grade distribution for the course being evaluated if possible.

- Transfer evaluation instrument to a single sheet with scantron bubbles and questions combined. A draft format is attached to serve as a rough guide for the final design. Booklet reprinting would have a one-time cost until the next revision should recommended changes to the instrument be adopted but the new format not adopted. Custom scantrons purchased in bulk would have a higher ongoing cost than current (16 cents vs. 7 cents)

Rationale- unifying the scantron and the instrument simplifies the logistics of assembling packets and administering evaluations. It was felt that the single sheet was less intimidating for students than a 4 page booklet and separate scantron.

- Purchase multipurpose scanning and reporting software  
Rationale- proposed software can scan non-standard items and feed data into commonly used databases. Existing database management systems (Crystal reports) can access the data to build reports as we wish rather than relying on the inflexible proprietary software currently used. This software would have utility extending beyond course evaluations to support to questionnaires or surveys across campus.

Reporting of results would be managed electronically rather than by hard-copy. Such a system would facilitate distribution as well as recordkeeping. Safeguards would be built in to allow only authorized personnel to have access to the data.

- Continue to have evaluations administered in hardcopy form in face-to-face classes.  
Rationale- Evaluations need to be mandatory in order to capture feedback from the entire class and not just a few self-selected students who might provide skewed results. Adequate time and opportunity must be provided so that students have the ability to provide their desired feedback.
- Make the newly designed form available for online-taught courses  
Rationale- the existing evaluation instrument currently is not used for online courses. Online courses have no standard assessment. Publishing of the proposed instrument would remedy this situation. ITS would need to work out the details but believes any hurdles are manageable. Data captured from online courses would go to the same database system proposed above. Hardcopy scantrons and online forms would represent two alternative methods to capture the same data. Future studies are recommended to validate the two methods as equal. At this point it can not be assumed that the two methods are equal.

The two pages following are a draft evaluation layout  
for the Scantron form.



# COURSE EVALUATION

Instructor Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Dept/Number/Section: \_\_\_\_\_

Term: \_\_\_\_\_

COURSE ID CODE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
TERM	<input type="checkbox"/>	fall	<input type="checkbox"/>	spring	<input type="checkbox"/>	summer	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
YEAR	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					

For proper evaluation administration, the instruction sheet will be read to you, your instructor will not be present during the completion of the evaluation, the proctor will personally deliver the forms to the instructor's department, and the instructor will have no access to the results until course grades have been assigned. Use a pencil to mark answers on this form. Leave questions blank if they do not apply to your course.

## Section I: The Student's Role

- What is your reason for taking this course?  
 Core requirement    Elective    Major/minor requirement    Prerequisite    Learning Support requirement
- On average, approximately how many hours per week did you devote to this course outside class and lab?  
 12 or more hours    9 - 11 hours    6 - 8 hours    3 - 5 hours    0 - 2 hours
- How often did you seek assistance from the instructor outside of class during the term?  
 daily    weekly    monthly    seldom    never
- How difficult has this course been for you?      Extremely easy ←      → Extremely hard
- How frequently did you complete *reading* assignments on time?      Always ←      → Never
- How frequently did you complete *written* assignments on time?      Always ←      → Never
- How frequently did you *attend class*?      Always ←      → Never
- How often did you feel that you prepared well for graded assignments, such as test, papers, presentations, projects, etc.?      Always ←      → Never

## Section II: Course Overview

- The course objectives were clearly stated in the syllabus or in class.      Strongly Agree ←      → Strongly Disagree
- The course objectives were achievable with appropriate effort and preparation.      Strongly Agree ←      → Strongly Disagree
- My background and prerequisite courses prepared me sufficiently for this course.      Strongly Agree ←      → Strongly Disagree
- Doing the course assignments contributed to my learning the subject matter.      Strongly Agree ←      → Strongly Disagree
- Overall the course materials were helpful, such as textbooks, handouts, online supplements, etc.      Strongly Agree ←      → Strongly Disagree
- Tests were representative of the content of the course materials, lectures, discussions, and other assignments.      Strongly Agree ←      → Strongly Disagree

15. I was usually able to complete tests within the time allowed.

Strongly Agree ←     → Strongly Disagree

16. This course has challenged me to think.

Strongly Agree ←     → Strongly Disagree

17. As a result of taking this course, I feel more knowledgeable in this field.

Strongly Agree ←     → Strongly Disagree

18. After taking this course, I see how this course relates to other academic areas and/or practical situations.

Strongly Agree ←     → Strongly Disagree

**Section III: The Role of the Professor**

19. The professor stated clearly in the syllabus what grading standards were to be used in the course.

Strongly Agree ←     → Strongly Disagree

20. The professor showed enthusiasm in the teaching of this course.

Strongly Agree ←     → Strongly Disagree

21. The professor provided opportunities to ask questions and to participate in class.

Strongly Agree ←     → Strongly Disagree

22. The professor was available for consultation during posted office hours, by appointment, or electronically.

Strongly Agree ←     → Strongly Disagree

23. The professor's classes were well organized.

Strongly Agree ←     → Strongly Disagree

24. The professor explained ideas and concepts clearly.

Strongly Agree ←     → Strongly Disagree

25. The professor gave clear instructions for course assignments.

Strongly Agree ←     → Strongly Disagree

26. The professor graded in a fair manner.

Always ←     → Never

27. The professor gave feedback (oral or written or both) on tests, papers, and other assignments.

Always ←     → Never

28. The professor returned graded assignments, except for long-term projects or papers, within one week.

Always ←     → Never

29. The professor effectively and fully used the time allotted for the course.

Always ←     → Never

30. The professor was well prepared for class.

Always ←     → Never

31. During class, the professor kept the focus on material relevant to the course.

Always ←     → Never

**Section IV: Overall Evaluation**

32. How would you rate the *professor's overall performance* in this course?

Excellent ←     → Poor

33. How would you rate your overall *performance as a student* in this course?

Excellent ←     → Poor

34. How would you rate the overall *effectiveness of the course*?

Excellent ←     → Poor

35. This course evaluation was administered in accordance with the directions at the top of this form.

Yes  No

Attachment D - from the Faculty Policies Committee  
This item requires a vote.

## Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Ranks

Proposed changes to faculty manual to:

- Add Lecturer and Senior Lecturer ranks to the corps of instruction, give qualifications for initial hiring, insert promotion criteria for senior lecturers, and specify ineligibility of these ranks for tenure.
- Renumber section 400 accordingly based on insertions of new rank categories.
- Make editorial changes throughout catalog replacing “instructor” used in the generic context (but not as a rank) with either “faculty member,” “teacher,” or other synonym that is not used to describe a particular faculty rank.

**Proposed additions in underlined bold**, ~~deletions in strikethrough italics~~

### 105.1.1 Faculty Organization

#### 105.1.1.1 Membership

The faculty shall consist of the Corps of Instruction, the President of the University, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Business Operations, the Vice President for Student Services, the Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations, the Associate Vice Presidents, **Assistant Vice Presidents**, the Deans, the Associate Deans, the Assistant Deans, the Director of the Library, the Associate Director of the Library, the Librarians, the Registrar, the Directors, the Associate Directors, the Assistant Directors, the Counselors, and such other administrative officers as are reported to the Board of Regents by the President as having faculty status.

The Corps of Instruction shall include full-time Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Instructors, **Senior Lecturers, Lecturers**, and teaching personnel with such other titles as may be approved by the Board of Regents. Full-time research and extension personnel and duly certified librarians will be included in the Corps of Instruction on the basis of comparable training

### 400 FACULTY RANK AND QUALIFICATIONS

The faculty ranks at Augusta State University are **Lecturer, Senior Lecturer**, Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor. The minimum criteria listed below for each rank are normally used for determining faculty rank when initially employed by Augusta State University and should not be confused with the criteria for promotion in Section 430 of the Augusta State University Faculty Manual.

#### 400.1 RANKS

##### **400.1.1 Lecturer**

**Lecturers are full-time faculty who are appointed on a year-to-year basis in departments outside of Learning Support. They hold at least a Masters degree or appropriate experience that can be recognized as valid in an academic situation. Excellent teaching abilities are essential. Generally lecturers are either not eligible for**

**instructor or professorial ranks or do not desire the level of service and professional development required of the other ranks. Reappointment of a Lecturer who has completed six consecutive years of service to an institution will be permitted only if the Lecturer has demonstrated exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers shall not comprise more than 10% of the institution's FTE corps of primarily undergraduate instruction.**

#### **400.1.2 Senior Lecturer**

**Generally faculty are not initially hired at the rank of Senior Lecturer, but are rather promoted from the Lecturer rank during the sixth year of service. Substantial achievement in service or professional development will be required as one component of promotion to this rank. Reappointment of a Senior Lecturer who has completed six consecutive years of service to an institution will be permitted only if the Senior Lecturer has demonstrated exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the institution. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers shall not comprise more than 10% of the institution's FTE corps of primarily undergraduate instruction.**

#### 431 Criteria

*Three* **Four** ranks may be considered as promotion categories at Augusta State University. These are **senior lecturer**, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor. Applications, recommendations and supporting evidence from individual faculty, promotion/tenure committees, chairs, and deans should address all relevant areas listed below. Sections 431.1, 431.2, and 431.3 set out the levels of performance requisite in areas one (Teaching), two (Service), and three (Professional Development and Achievement). Noteworthy achievement in area one is expected of all applicants for promotion. **For promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer, applicants must demonstrate exceptional teaching ability, extraordinary value to the institution, and substantial achievement in either of areas two or three.** For promotion to the rank of Associate Professor, substantial achievement is expected in areas two and three, with noteworthy achievement in one of these two areas.\* For promotion to the rank of Professor, significant achievement beyond that for Associate Professor should be demonstrated in areas two and three, with noteworthy achievement beyond the level for Associate Professor expected in one of these two areas. Appropriate Academic Achievement, area Four, and Length of Service, area five, should be demonstrated as well. The Chancellor's office has established guidelines that require special justification in certain situations or that clarify their interpretation of Board of Regents policy. Those guidelines are contained in the Information Section of this manual. Assessment of faculty achievement levels will be based on the Augusta State University Faculty Evaluation and Development System (Section 420), incorporated herein by reference, and the agreements between faculty members and supervisors required by the abovementioned Role Model (Section 421). Faculty members and supervisors should carefully consider the criteria set forth in this manual for promotion to the various ranks.

#### 440.6.3

Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors who are normally employed full-time (as defined by Regents' policies) by an institution are eligible for tenure. Faculty members with adjunct appointments, **lecturers, and senior lecturers** shall not acquire tenure.

#### 440.6.6

The maximum time that may be served at the rank of assistant professor or above without the award of tenure shall be seven years; provided, however, that a terminal contract for an eighth year may be proffered if an institutional recommendation for tenure is not approved by the Board of Regents. The maximum time that may be served in any combination of full-time instructional appointments (~~lecturer,~~ **as an** instructor, or **at a** professorial ranks) without the award of tenure shall be ten years; provided, however, that a terminal contract for an eleventh year may be proffered if an institutional recommendation for tenure is not approved by the Board of Regents.