

Minutes

Faculty Meeting



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

102 faculty members present; President Bloodworth called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m.

Agenda Items

I. **Approval of the Minutes** from March 24, 2009, available at:

http://www.aug.edu/faculty_secretary/facmin_03_24_2009_draft.pdf

The minutes were unanimously approved as distributed.

II. **Report of the President - See Attachment E**

III. **Academic Policies Committee** – Dr. Todd Schultz

Items for information only– **See Attachment A**

Dr. Schultz presented the items.

Item 28 includes changes for ENGL 3002 and ENGL 3003, which were not shown in the summary on the agenda page.

Items requiring a faculty vote – **See Attachment B**

Dr. Schultz presented the items.

There was one correction on item one of this section. The first item concerns a BSK in Kinesiology, not a BS in Kinesiology.

There was no discussion on either attachment.

Vote – all ayes. The items will be placed in the ASU Catalog.

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

Course Evaluation Changes– **See Attachment C**

Dr. Crute presented the changes provided by the FPC subcommittee, a review that must be done each five years according to policy. The evaluation process and form were revised with a focus on the person or group who would use each of the questions. The FPC recommends implementation only after funding becomes available. Software for better manipulation and reporting of data is included, which will also allow an implementation of online evaluations, a need for online-only courses. The changes are an effort to improve logistics; a single sheet with questions and responses on Scantron form will help, though the customized sheets will cost more.

Discussion – A faculty member asked if section 2, number 11, isn't really a reflection of content taught by someone else, though it may reflect negatively on the person teaching the course? Dr. Crute replied that the department chair would be interpreting the results and would understand this. The faculty member felt the number might not be interpreted correctly. She also noted a typo in question 25, a misspelling of "assignments." He added that the example form was only to serve as a mock-up to be sure the form could fit in the space desired.

Dr. Ray Whiting, political science, proposed an amendment to remove possible misinterpretation:

Motion to amend – move Section Two, Number 11, to become Section One, Number 9, and renumber the following items appropriately.

Vote – all ayes. The amendment is approved.

Dr. Kim Davies, chair of sociology, social work and criminal justice, expressed a concern that "my background" in the same question could mean two things, one of which would be the background of the student, which would not be known to the faculty member because the survey is anonymous. Dr. Davies proposed an amendment:

Motion to amend – removal of "background and" in what is now question 9.

Vote –majority ayes, one nay. The amendment is approved.

Dr. Pam Hayward, communications and professional writing, asked if offline course students will be able to evaluate online. Dr. Crute noted that the subcommittee had considered this and recommended it be studied to determine whether online and face to face evaluations were equal before opening it up for all students online.

Dr. Donna Hobbs, chemistry, asked if question 34, dealing with the overall effectiveness of the course, was too nebulous a question. Dr. Crute replied that the intent was to focus on methods employed. Dr. Hobbs suggested an amendment:

Motion to amend – revise question 34 to read "How would you rate the effectiveness of the instructional methods" rather than "How would you rate the overall effectiveness of the course?"

Vote –majority is ayes with one nay. The amendment carries.

Mrs. Camilla Reid added that number 29 might also need revision, as it, like the former number 11, included two items for consideration in one question.

Motion to amend – revise question 29 to read “The professor effectively used the classroom time allotted for the course” rather than “The professor effectively and fully used the time allotted for the course.”

Discussion – The revision does not account for online courses.

Vote – the nays carry the vote. The amendment fails.

Motion to amend – Dr. Rob Bledsoe, English and foreign languages, moved to add a question, to become Section One number 10 (with appropriate subsequent revision of the numbers following), as “My academic background prepared me sufficiently for this course.”

Motion to Table – Dr. Hobbs moved to table consideration of Attachment C and return the item to committee for further work, expressing a concern it would not be possible to vote appropriately on an item extensively revised from the floor.

Discussion - Dr. Chad Stephens, chemistry, noted that since a faculty member’s greatest function is to inspire passion in students, and since this could be better reflected in the survey, it would be best to review the proposed document.

Vote – by voice vote, the ayes seemed to carry the vote. By show of hands, 46 faculty members voted aye, fewer voted nay. The motion to table the item carried.

Professor Don Howard, Hull college of business, implored the FPC to consider timeliness as a vital factor in revising the evaluation process. Evaluations currently may not reach faculty until after the beginning of the next semester, when it is too late for inclusion in evaluation of the faculty member by the chair, and when it’s too late to make changes for the new term.

Ms. Cathy Barner, information technology services, agreed that timeliness is important. Her unit is aware of this challenge and will seek improvements. Dr. Sullivan noted that he will include this on his agenda to discuss with the deans.

Lecturer Description– **See Attachment D**

Dr. Crute presented the document. Our campus has had Lecturers since 2004, and we currently have about 13. Their appointments are year-to-year appointments but more permanent than part-time or temporary.

Discussion – Dr. Cynthia Craig, chair of learning support, noted that the original text copied in attachment D did not include the category of “instructor,” and it’s not in the newer version. Dr. Crute confirmed this.

A faculty member asked if our current number of faculty who are Lecturers (13) is more than or less than the 10 percent level we seek to maintain. Dr. Sullivan replied that less than 10 percent of our faculty is in this category.

Dr. Edgar Johnson, communications and professional writing, asked under what criteria Lecturers would be evaluated. Dr. Sullivan replied that the proposed policy doesn't include that level of specifics; it could include them or it could be left to the department chair to interpret. Dr. Bob Jarman, associate dean of the Pamplin college of arts and sciences, felt the document should be approved as is to bring the university in line with BOR policy; the specifics should be considered later if needed. Dr. Kim Davies said that her Lecturer is evaluated using the same criteria as other categories of faculty. Dr. Sullivan noted that service as a Lecturer need not necessarily be counted for probationary credit. Dr. Bill Reese, sociology, asked if the intent was to rank Lecturers below other faculty categories. Dr. Crute replied that as it relates to the tenure track, it was. Dr. Bill Dodd, associate vice president for academic affairs, clarified that instructors can be promoted, lecturers can not be.

Vote – all ayes. The document is adopted.

V. Announcements

* Mr. Eddie Howard, director of student activities, announced three events. On April 24th, 7 p.m., San Jose Taiko will perform at the D. Douglas Barnard Amphitheatre, the final event in the Lyceum Series for this year. On April 25th, 1-5 p.m., the final event of the Family Fun Series will provide carnival food and photo opportunities. On April 29th, a midnight breakfast will be served to students starting at 10 p.m. in the JSAC Ballroom; there is a need for faculty help in providing the breakfast.

* Ms. Willene Holmes, director of financial aid, noted a seminar on personal budgeting to be held from 2-3 p.m. in the JSAC Coffeehouse, sponsored by the National Student Loan Program and the ASU Financial Aid Office.

* Mrs. Mellie Kerins, Reese Library, announced a library event featuring the poetry of Dean Robert Parham, Pamplin college of arts and sciences, Thursday, April 30 at 2:30 p.m. in the second floor lobby.

* Dr. Holly Carter, assistant vice president for international affairs, noted that 15 Mid-Sweden University faculty will be here to do lectures, panels, and discussions. A wine and cheese social will be held at 4:30 p.m., April 21, at the Maxwell Alumni House.

* Dr. Cathy Tugmon, biology, said the next Academy for Learning event will feature Drs. Jackie Cohen and Pam Hayward at 2:30 p.m., Thursday, April 16, 2009, in room N241 Allgood Hall, in a session moderated by Dr. Deborah Richardson, titled "Uncommonly Good Ideas from the SoTL* Commons Conference."

* Mrs. Katherine Sweeney, registrar and director of admissions, reminded faculty that grades are due within 24 hours of the final test.

* Mr. Dan Whitfield, vice president for business operations, announced an April 27 - May 1 employee appreciation week.

* Dr. Andy Hauger, chair of chemistry and physics, noted the final brown bag lunch highlighting the research efforts of students at ASU for the semester, to be held Friday April 24 at 1 p.m. in the JSAC Ballroom. Chemistry, history, and communications students will present.

* Mrs. Camilla Reid, associate director of Reese Library, wished faculty a happy National Library Week and asked they look for further announcements on Pipeline and the ASU website.

* Dr. Sullivan thanked all those who participated in the search for a new dean for the College of Education.

Adjourned at 3:32 p.m.

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: BSK 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.

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.