

The Executive Committee will put the issue of an alternate form of faculty governance (possibly a faculty senate) on their agenda for fall. However, if a faculty member wished to bring a motion at any time to vote on establishing a faculty senate, they could do that without waiting for the Executive Committee to bring forward a recommendation.

It is felt that there have already been positive outcomes from the forums. The Finance Committee has been reconstituted, and the manner in which committees function has been scrutinized. There have also been efforts at making our current governance structure more effective by following the bylaws, such as putting out a call for agenda items to all faculty members and calling for committee reports in the meetings."

August 8, 2005 -- From the Executive Committee minutes:

"It was questioned whether the Executive Committee should follow-up on the faculty governance forums held last spring, and what form that follow-up should take. The Faculty Governance Task Force had recommended in their report that a vote on an alternative form of governance be held at the April 2005 faculty meeting. The general feeling expressed at the forums was that it would be better to try to work at making the current governance structure more effective, so the Executive Committee deferred bringing up a vote in April. However, the forums had very small attendance.

It was decided that Joyce Bergin, Greg Anderson, and John Kraft would be asked to distill the ideas from the forums and the task force report and present them to the Executive Committee in September. After review and discussion at the September meeting, it was felt that the committee would be in a better position to decide whether a vote on alternative forms of governance should be held at the September faculty meeting, or whether the discussion of how to proceed from this point should be brought to the faculty."

September 12, 2005 -- From the Executive Committee minutes

"Dr. Bergin did a recap on the topic of faculty governance, beginning with the formation of the Task Force on Faculty Governance in April 2004 and ending with the Faculty Forums in the Spring of 2005. After some discussion, it was decided that the Executive Committee should present a summary to the faculty at the October faculty meeting, reviewing the changes that came out of the forums (i.e., a return to the Bylaws, the calling for committee reports at the faculty meetings, etc.), and then ask the faculty to vote on whether to continue as-is or go to a different form of faculty governance."

Proposal to Discontinue Early Submission of Final Grades for Graduation Candidates and the Issuance of Diplomas at Commencement

1. Faculty will not be required to submit final grades early for graduation candidates. All grades will be submitted by the final grade submission deadline each term.
2. All graduation candidates will be permitted to participate in the commencement ceremony. A diploma cover containing a certificate of degree candidacy will be presented to each candidate at commencement.
3. Academic honors will be awarded based on the previous term's Overall GPA.
4. Upon verification of degree completion, degrees will be posted on academic transcripts and diplomas mailed (approximately 3-6 weeks after commencement).

This proposal has been approved by the academic deans and is now forwarded to the Executive Committee for review.

9-26-05

Problem:

The current academic suspension policy of Armstrong Atlantic State University allows students on suspension to enroll in summer courses. This can put at-risk students in an academic situation that may be beyond their abilities. There are also some inconsistencies in the current policy with regard to the semester system, probably a holdover from the quarter system.

Proposed Solution

1. Undergraduate catalogue, page 53, under "Academic Suspension".

Modify:

Students on academic probation who neither achieve the required overall GPA nor earn at least a 2.0 GPA during the probationary semester will be placed on academic suspension from the university.

Students suspended for the first time must sit out for the duration of one semester. Students who wish to attend classes during the semester immediately following the suspension must submit an appeal to the AASU Academic Appeals Committee. A student on academic suspension for the first time has the option of attending summer school without having to appeal the suspension. However, a student who fails to make satisfactory progress as a result of summer school will be placed on second suspension.

Students suspended for the second time must sit out for the duration of one calendar year. Students who wish to attend classes during the three semesters immediately following their second suspension must submit an appeal to the AASU Academic Appeals Committee, if they have not been absent from the university for a minimum of one year.

To:

Students on academic probation who neither achieve the required overall GPA nor earn at least a 2.0 GPA during the probationary semester will be placed on academic suspension from the university.

Students on suspension may not enroll in summer or Flex Term sessions. Students wishing to enroll during the suspension period must submit an appeal to the AASU Academic Appeals Committee. Students wishing to enroll in a summer session immediately following their suspension must submit an appeal to the AASU Academic Appeals Committee.

Students suspended for the first time must sit out the next full fifteen-week semester.

Students suspended for the second time must sit out the next two full fifteen-week semesters.

Rationale:

Students who are in academic difficulty may not be able to be successful in an accelerated term such as summer or flex term sessions. Also, in order to provide the students with the best chances for success, the first semester after a suspension should not overwhelm them. By requiring an appeal to take summer classes after a suspension, the Academic Appeals Committee can examine each student individually and determine the number of credits and/or specific classes that may be taken.

2. Undergraduate Catalogue, page 53, under “Academic Standing Appeals”.

Modify:

Students appealing to the university for readmission before the required absence must complete and submit an academic appeals form to the assistant dean of enrollment services, registrar. The priority deadline for appeals is 10 days prior to the first day of classes. Appeals received on or after the first day of class will be considered only for a subsequent term. Appeals must include transcripts of all work and the nature of extenuating circumstances relating to the academic deficiency. The AASU Academic Appeals Committee will make a recommendation to the president, and the decision of the president is final.

To:

Students who feel that extenuating circumstances have negatively affected their academic performance may file an appeal for earlier readmission through the assistant dean of enrollment services, registrar. Appeals will be considered on a case –by-case basis. The priority deadline for appeals is 10 days prior to the first day of classes. Appeals received on or after the first day of class will be considered only for a subsequent term. Appeals must include transcripts of all work and the nature of extenuating circumstances relating to the academic deficiency. The AASU Academic Appeals Committee will make a recommendation to the president, and the decision of the president is final.

Rationale:

The original wording “before the required absence” is confusing. This wording provides more information about the appropriate circumstances for filing an appeal, and how individual appeals are handled.

**Summary of Comments from the AASU Faculty Evaluation Committee
Regarding Voluntary Midterm Online Faculty Evaluations**

1. There was some concern about the nature of the questions, and how helpful these questions would be in restructuring problematic areas during the second half of the semester. Whatever questions are used on the survey should provide meaningful data to the instructor that can be used for course improvement during the second half of the semester.
2. The committee agreed 100% that this evaluation should be strictly voluntary for faculty to offer to their students.
3. Only faculty who were interested in the feedback should seek it.
4. The results should be for the eyes of the individual faculty member only.
5. The results should not impact promotion or tenure decisions. It should not be reflected in any manner on a performance appraisal.
6. Student participation should be totally voluntary. No extra credit or bonus points should be awarded for students to participate.
7. Students should be assured that their responses will be anonymous.
8. There was some discussion about when students completed surveys. Some felt that completing them during classtime was best, as the instructor would know that their students were the ones who were responding.
9. Concern was expressed over how time and labor intensive implementing the evaluation would be for CIS.
10. The following question was brought up: Will the extensive faculty concerns that existed a year ago over the online FACE evaluations exist for implementation of this tool?
11. Will students worry about being penalized for their responses during the second half of the semester?
12. Being able to head off any troubling issues while the semester is in progress may result in more positive evaluations at the end of the semester.
13. If a student is doing well, we will be credited for good teaching, and conversely, if a student is performing poorly, it is the instructor's fault. This statement supports the midterm evaluation, as at midterm, students may be more frank on an evaluation, whereas as the end of a semester, they may have a more fixed attitude, either positive or negative.
14. Student participation will be a major factor for success.
15. Computer access may be an issue. If the opportunity to complete the survey is not offered during classtime, many students may not take the time to complete the survey, as their schedules are quite full.
16. The instrument was straightforward, and asked questions regarding instruction. There is an opportunity for students to confess their academic behaviors.
17. If this instrument were utilized in a non-threatening manner, many faculty would engage in this evaluation opportunity. If it were utilized as a method for administrative monitoring, faculty will be less likely to embrace the opportunity.

18. The feedback may not be a true picture of what the majority of the class actually thinks.

Overall, the Faculty Evaluation does support implementing a voluntary, online midterm evaluation system, providing this data is not used for punitive or evaluative measures by administration.

This evaluation system can be previewed at:

<http://eee/help/student/evalmidtermfor.php>

<http://eee.uci.edu/help/eval>

Honors Advisory Committee Report
November 14, 2005

The Honors Program Advisory Committee has not met since our last faculty meeting. However, faculty should be aware of the following Honors Program matters:

1) A number of students on our attached list of graduating seniors are honors students. Some of them have fulfilled their requirements to graduate from the honors program, and others have not. As we have followed up with these students we have learned students and advisors confuse graduating from the honors program and graduating with honors. The differences are as follows:

Graduating with Honors: Students who graduate with a grade point average of 3.2 are those we traditionally term “graduating with honors”: cum laude, magna cum laude or summa cum laude. Students do not have to be in the honors program to graduate with these honors. When they graduate with honors they receive a gold rope from the registrar’s office to wear with their caps and gowns.

Graduating from the Honors Program: Honors students who graduate from the honors program must have the minimum grade point average (3.2), must have earned at least a B in four honors courses and complete an honors project to the satisfaction of their major program of study. Students who fulfill these requirements will also graduate with honors but will also be given a gold stole from the Honors Program and have a gold Honors Program seal on their diplomas.

We have spoken to Honors Students and/or their advisors if they have not met all these requirements. If you’re advising graduating seniors and you have any questions, please contact Nancy Remler or Jonathan Roberts.

2) This semester we implemented three options for upper level Honors Students for fulfillment of the Honors Project requirement. One of those options is Honors in the Major. Each major program of study decides the requirements for Honors in the Major. Not all major programs outline their Honors in the Major requirements in the university catalog. Many of the requirements we have on file are outdated. In August Jonathan asked department heads to provide us with current guidelines for Honors in the Major. We have not heard from all departments. To date we have guidelines from **applied physics, art, biology, chemistry, computer science, early childhood education, economics, English, health science, history, math, medical technology, middle/secondary education, music, nursing, special education, psychology**. Some of these guidelines are ten years old, then they still reflect a quarter system and not a semester system. Other department heads have told us they’re in the process of updating policies. We would like to have those policies on file so that we can help you guide next semester’s graduating seniors appropriately. Please provide us with your current Honors in the Major policies or contact Nancy or Jonathan if you have questions.