

# Minutes

## Faculty Meeting



Tuesday, February 24, 2009  
2:30 p.m., UH 170

101 faculty members were in attendance

Dr. Bloodworth called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m.

### Agenda Items:

I. **Approval of the Minutes** from January 27, 2009, available at:

[http://www.aug.edu/faculty\\_secretary/facmin\\_01\\_27\\_2009\\_draft.pdf](http://www.aug.edu/faculty_secretary/facmin_01_27_2009_draft.pdf)

Moved and seconded. The minutes were unanimously approved as distributed.

II. **Faculty Policies Committee** – Dr. Tom Crute

**Motion From the FPC**– Dr. Tom Crute presented and reviewed the purpose of the changes to the policy for handling honor violations.

Dr. Hubert van Tuyl, chair of History, Anthropology and Philosophy, thanked the Faculty Policies Committee for their work on the policy, and he expressed a concern about the potential workload the changes would cause. Dr. Crute replied that the reports do not have to be extensive.

Dr. Kim Davies, chair of Sociology, Social Work, and Criminal Justice, raised the scenario of honors violations during an exam; should the faculty member still speak first with the chair, or handle the problem during the exam? Dr. Crute replied the intent was for the faculty member to discuss it with the chair first, but that they have leeway if the problem is during an exam. The FPC felt that new faculty members will benefit from discussion with the chair.

Dr. Davies asked if the intent was for teaching chairs to consult their deans if they encounter a problem. Dr. Crute replied that the intent is to reach the best decision; consultation should be done as needed.

Dr. Cliff Gardiner, assistant dean in the Pamplin College of Arts and Sciences, asked if the wording could be changed to prevent misinterpretation by new faculty. If they read the policy and have no experience, they might feel forced to wait until they consult, which might be problematic in proving cheating during exams.

Professor Robert Smalley, Hull College of Business, felt that for new faculty, it might be best to wait and discuss the issue with their chair. Dr. Crute replied that waiting could make the problem more difficult to handle.

Dr. Paula Dohoney, chair of Kinesiology and Health Science, felt that a well-done introduction to the process for new faculty might work better than a wording change.

Dr. Gardiner suggested insertion of the words “when possible.”

Dr. Edgar Johnson, Communications and Professional Writing, moved to amend the proposal:

**Motion –**

to amend the first sentence of the proposal,

replacing:

**Procedures:** Upon encountering a violation of academic honesty by a student:  
For all incidents the faculty member should first discuss the matter with the chair and then must:

with:

**Procedures:** Upon encountering a violation of academic honesty by a student:  
Unless immediate action is appropriate, the faculty member should first address the situation with the chair and then must:

**Vote –** To amend the FPC proposal. The ayes have a majority, by hand vote.

Discussion returned to the proposal, as amended.

**Vote -** majority are ayes with one opposing vote. The amended FPC proposal will be placed in the Catalog.

### III. **President’s Report –** Dr. William Bloodworth

Dr. Boodworth reviewed the current budget situation and actions by the Chancellor to meet the required cuts. He also reviewed progress on the four strategic goals introduced recently.

**Goal 1 –** An increase (by fiscal year 2012) in funds received from grants and contracts for teaching, research, and public service to the average received by non-HBCU state universities in the University System of Georgia.

So far this year, we’ve received \$491,750 from grants and contracts. We are on track to exceed last year.

**Goal 2 –** An increase in the percentage of graduates who major in natural sciences and mathematics and science and mathematics education to at least 15 percent of all baccalaureate graduates.

We have between 49-55 applicants for graduation and have already graduated 21. We now have more than 110 majors in chemistry and 75 physics majors (though some are Georgia Institute of Technology/ ASU engineering majors.)

**Goal 3 –** A gain in student credit hours averaging at least 2.5 percent each fiscal year.

For 2009, unofficially, we have a gain in student credit hours to 165,280, a 2.75 percent increase over last year.

**Goal 4** – A gain in the percentage of undergraduate credit hours generated in upper- division courses from 28.3 percent (in 2008) to at least 33 percent (in 2012).

We are slightly below 2008 levels at the moment, at 27.7. Levels of new junior and senior students in the fall of 2008 were the lowest since the fall of 2004, but beginning and transfer freshmen were higher than in 2007. In examining why levels of transfer students at the junior/senior level are lower than some comparable schools, Ms. Jackie Stewart, director of Institutional Research, found that other schools have two-year schools to feed in transfers, which we do not have.

Dr. Bloodworth turned the meeting over to Dr. Ray Whiting, Political Science and the Accreditation Liaison to SACS, to review the status of our reaffirmation on accreditation.

Dr. Whiting reminded faculty that the review is still four years away, but there remains much work to do. More of the writing will be handled by members of the administration this time, which may be seen as an improvement from the faculty perspective.

Substantive change methodology and training are in place and ready for new proposals, and the training will be repeated next year and will include department chairs. The College of Education's proposals for new courses off campus will use this new methodology.

Several committees are now running. A General Education Assessment Committee has been underway a year and is assessing our core curriculum. The Education Programs and Institutional Effectiveness Committee is working, and a Quality Enhancement Steering Committee is about to start.

An accreditation and compliance management server and software system, Xitracs, is being ordered, and it's the system to which authors will post their materials. All documents will be evaluated by people in other departments. Training for the system will begin in about eight weeks.

There will be greater emphasis in this review on faculty credentials and proof that we're teaching in the right field. This is the number one area in which the reviewers find fault across school accreditations. About 80 percent are found to be faulty in this area during the initial review. The percentage is lower by the time of the campus visit, but 18 percent still are in violation.

**Questions –**

Mrs. Camilla Reid, associate director of Reese Library, asked if all documents will be electronic? Dr. Whiting replied that there will be both electronic copies sent and paper copies here for the reviewers.

Dr. Chad Stephens, Chemistry, asked about the Quality Enhancement Project (QEP). Dr. Whiting answered that the Steering Committee will select that project, while a later committee will actually run the QEP selected.

**IV. Announcements –**

\* Mr. Walt Alexanderson announced the BOR is going to a consolidated payroll and benefits system run by Automatic Data Processing, Inc., (ADP). The transition date will be July 1 this year. Paychecks issued

from July 1 forward will be from ADP. We must be ready by May 1 this year, to run the two systems in parallel until July 1 to verify accuracy of the new system.

This fall, open enrollment will all be done electronically. All time reporting, personnel action request forms, and leave reporting will be done electronically; it will be approved by administrators, then passed to ADP on a set schedule.

Training will begin within the next two months.

**Questions –**

- Will the new system also cover student assistants? Mr. Alexanderson replied it would.
- Will automatic deposits continue? He answered that they will transfer.
- Will step-by-step instructions be provided? Mr. Alexanderson replied they would.
- Will digital signatures be used in approving expenses? The reply was that a “submit” button would be used by the administrator, as is used in the Peoplesoft system.

\* Dr. Edgar Johnson, Communications and Professional Writing, noted that the recent thread about student expectations on campus email has been moved to the campus blog, the Oak. Contact him if you wish to be added to the discussion.

\* Dr. James Grayson, Hull College of Business, noted that the Phi Kappa Phi Arsenal Learning Series will continue at noon tomorrow, featuring Dr. Donna Wear, Biology, in the JSAC Coffeehouse. The annual Research and Fine Arts Conference will be held March 11 with a 12:30 p.m. start.

\* Dr. Debra van Tuyl announced that the Iliad will be presented this evening.

\* Mrs. Mellie Kerins noted two events in the Reese Library. LaMarcus Hall, Resident Life Coordinator from University Village, author of “I Refuse to Let You Give Up; To My Teens Who feel All Hope is Gone,” will speak on his book February 26, at 2:30 p.m. Dr. Hubert van Tuyl, History, Anthropology and Philosophy chair, will present the book he co-authored with Dr. Jurgen Brauer, Economics, titled “Castles, Battles and Bombs: How Economics Explains Military History,” on Tuesday, March 3, at 2:30 p.m. Both events will be held at the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor lobby.

\* Professor Shelley Ford announced an Opera workshop to be held next weekend.

\* Dr. Peggy Ruth Geren noted a concert to be held this evening at 7:30 p.m., a joint effort of the ASU Choir and the ASU Glee club.

\* Dr. Robert Mayes, director of Counseling Services, announced a counseling services 101 workshop on Thursday, from 3-4 p.m. in Boykin Wright.

\* Dr. Andy Hauger, chair of Chemistry and Physics, noted a March 6 student brown bag lunch in the JSAC Ballroom, highlighting work by physics and history department students.

Adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

## Attachments

### Attachment A - from the Faculty Policies Committee

This item requires a vote.

#### Summary of changes and rationale:

- Steps were overall renumbered and organized into fewer total sequences for clarity.
- It is proposed that the faculty member discuss the matter with the chair prior to confronting the student. It is hoped that the chair will provide valuable insight for the best handling of the situation. Such consultation may not always be desired or possible (such as for cheating on a test).
- It is proposed that the faculty member optionally consult with the chair and/or dean after confronting the student when deciding upon the appropriate action. While this is not required, such consultation may be valuable and may help lead to the best action. The existing procedures have a required review with the final decision resting with the instructor. Removing the required review may streamline and speed up the process while still allowing consultations.
- A written account of all incidents is proposed. Previously only the most serious, WF-action incidents included a written account and rationale. Requiring the summary and rationale is intended to help document incidents, encourage consistency of actions, and help reveal patterns of behavior that may not have been evident previously. Students who might have otherwise accumulated several minor infractions without anyone becoming aware of the pattern are now more likely to be identified through the written documentation to the chair of the minor incidents.
- We propose communication between colleges for students whose major resides in one college but who commit an academic honesty infraction in another college. The student's home college will now be informed of the serious (WF) incidents. If an appeal hearing is held concerning an incident, the home college will be included in the notification of results as well. WF-incidents will still automatically be reported to the VPAA. Reporting of minor incidents to the VPAA remains the discretion of the instructor.
- If an appeal is desired, the next stage is still a written grievance that must be prepared by the student. The existing 3 calendar day deadline is proposed to be extended to 5 calendar days to allow adequate preparation time. Such preparation may be rushed depending on the timing of the receipt of the report from the Dean. The delivery method of the report is proposed as certified mail with return receipt (which formalizes the existing practice).

## Existing

Procedures: Upon encountering a violation of academic honesty by a student, a faculty member should:

1. Confront the student and make the charges known.
2. Discuss the matter thoroughly with the student so that each position is clearly delineated.
3. Decide what action is appropriate
4. Remind the student to refer to the Student Academic Appeals and Student Academic Grievances procedures outlined below.

If the action is less severe than a WF for the course:

1. Report the violation and the action taken to the chairperson of the department in which the violation occurred, who will then report the matter to the Dean of that College.
2. Decide whether the incident shall be made part of the academic dishonesty file in the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

If a WF for the course:

3. Notify the Dean of the College through his/her departmental chairperson and initiate a WF withdrawal form. At this point, the matter shall be reviewed by a departmental committee, the chairperson, or the Dean.
4. If those reviewing the matter do not agree with the interpretation of the evidence or with the action taken by the faculty member, they may ask him/her to reconsider. After reconsidering the matter, the faculty member may stand by the original decision and forward the WF withdrawal form to the Dean.
5. If those reviewing agree with the faculty member, the withdrawal form shall be forwarded to the Dean.

The Dean shall:

1. Review each faculty member's recommendation for a WF for the course, check the academic honesty status of the student via the academic dishonesty file, and either let the WF stand or make some other recommendation. The final decision shall be made by the faculty member.
2. If the WF is to stand, send the withdrawal form to the Registrar and request the Vice President for Academic Affairs to enter the violation in the academic dishonesty file.
3. Notify the student in writing of the action taken, remind the student of his/her right to appeal as outlined below, and inform the student that if he/she plans to appeal, the appeal must be filed within three calendar days.
4. Notify the involved faculty member in writing of the action taken.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall:

1. Upon a student's second offense requiring a WF for a course, expel the student from Augusta State University and direct the Registrar to enter the phrase "Ineligible to Register" on the student's permanent record.
2. Maintain the academic dishonesty file so that all appropriate administrators have access to the record of violations but also so that the student's rights to limited access shall be safe-guarded.

Should the student desire to appeal the decision that a violation of academic honesty occurred, he or she may appeal that finding via the academic grievance process. A student who wishes to appeal shall submit a written grievance (as defined in stage two of the Student Academic Grievance policy) to the appropriate dean. The dean will provide copies of the written grievance to the instructor, the department chair, and the Academic Policies Committee and will ask the Academic Policies Committee to arrange a hearing in the manner set forth in this catalog under stage three of Student Academic Grievances. The grievance will proceed beginning at stage three, section A of the grievance process.

## Proposed- page 42 of 2008-09 ASU catalog

**Procedures:** Upon encountering a violation of academic honesty by a student:

For all incidents the faculty member should first discuss the matter with the chair and then must:

1. Confront the student and make the charges known.
2. Discuss the matter thoroughly with the student so that each position is clearly delineated.
3. Decide upon the action that is appropriate to the incident. The instructor may request informal consultation with the chair and/or dean when making this decision.
4. Remind the student to refer to the *Student Academic Appeals* and *Student Academic Grievances* procedures outlined below.
5. Summarize the incident in writing with a brief rationale for the action taken. Materials relevant to the incident such as copies of papers or exams must be included.
6. Submit this report to the Chair of the department in which the incident occurred, who will then report the matter to the Dean of that college.

If the action is less severe than a WF for the course, the faculty member must decide whether the incident shall be made part of the academic dishonesty file in the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

If the action is WF for the course the following procedure applies:

1. The faculty member initiates a WF withdrawal form to accompany the report of the incident.
2. The Dean shall send the withdrawal form to the Registrar and request that the Vice President for Academic Affairs enter the violation in the academic dishonesty file.
3. The Dean shall (a) notify the student in writing by certified mail with return receipt of the action taken, (b) remind the student of his/her right to appeal as outlined below, and (c) inform the student that if he/she plans to appeal, the appeal must be filed within five calendar days of receipt.
4. The Dean shall provide the faculty member and the dean of the college that houses the student's major a written report of the action taken. The student's dean may choose to put the report into the student's file in that college.
5. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall, upon a student's second offense requiring a WF for a course, expel the student from Augusta State University and direct the Registrar to enter the phrase "Ineligible to Register" on the student's permanent record.
6. The Vice President for Academic Affairs shall maintain the academic dishonesty file so that all appropriate administrators have access to the record of violations but also so that the student's rights to limited access shall be safe-guarded.

Should the student desire to appeal the decision that a violation of academic honesty occurred, he or she may appeal that finding via the academic grievance process. A student who wishes to appeal shall submit a written grievance (as defined in stage two of the Student Academic Grievance policy) to the appropriate dean. The dean will provide copies of the written grievance to the instructor, the department chair, and the Academic Policies Committee and will ask the Academic Policies Committee to arrange a hearing in the manner set forth in this catalog under stage three of Student Academic Grievances. The grievance will proceed beginning at stage three, section A of the grievance process. In the event of a hearing, the dean shall notify all parties of the outcome.