FACULTY SENATE
Est. 1991

Ed Walker **President**	**V.P. / President Elect**	**Diane Holliman** **Secretary**	**Michael Noll** **Parliamentarian**	**Tracy Woodard-** **Meyers** **Past President**

Faculty Senate
Minutes
April 17, 2014
University Center Magnolia Room

Items in **bold print** are items that require action by the Faculty Senate. Other items are for information only.

1. Call to Order by Ed Walker, followed by a 10 minute session with President McKinney. Called to order at 3:33 p.m.

Q&A with Dr. McKinney:
Board of Regents met at the University of North Georgia in Dahlonega on Tuesday & Wednesday. On Tuesday they approved a 2.5% tuition increase for all but four of the USG institutions. Research universities got somewhat larger tuition increases. Board also approved the majority of all the mandatory fee increases that we requested. Significant for our PPV projects (those are our bond funded projects). Had not seen an increase at VSU on student fees on average in the last 5-7 years.

Took Intercollegiate Athletics Committee out from under Academic Affairs Committee on the Board and created a stand-alone Intercollegiate Athletics Committee of the Board of Regents.

Money was put into all the universities budgets out of the Governor's allocation for merit raises.
Dr. McKinney replied: We actually got a slight increase in our appropriation, but that still wasn't enough to make up for the loss in enrollment decline. On April 25th at the PBC meeting we will present the FY15 budget for VSU. Turns out with a ½% tuition increase with that $20M not being cut out of the USG budget we are in slightly better shape than we thought we were going to be. Traycee Martin and Dr. Danahar are working on those numbers right now.

Faculty member stated it was requested of her by a couple of adjuncts in the next faculty salary adjustment – don't forget the adjuncts.

Question was asked what is the status of the gun bill? Did that pass and how would VSU position itself?
Dr. McKinney responded Universities are not part of the gun bill that awaits the governor's signature at this point. The law that currently exists – it will be the same practice for us.

1

Question was asked when are the evaluations for Department Heads and Deans coming up? Dr. Gravett stated that is faculty senate's job. T. Meyers stated that is usually sent to the Senate President by Institutional Research. E. Walker will check into this.

2. **Approval of the <u>minutes of the March 27, 2014</u> meeting of the Faculty Senate.**
http://ww2.valdosta.edu/facsen/meeting/minutes/index.shtml (See link for minutes from March 27, 2014). Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes. Minutes approved unanimously.

3. Old & Unfinished Business

a. Statutory Committee Reports:

Report from the <u>Academic Committee</u> – Last meeting was April 14, 2014
http://www.valdosta.edu/academics/registrar/academic-committee.php - M. Sanger – No report.

<u>Committee on Committees</u> - Laura Wright – CoCo will be meeting to fill the Standing Committee seats. There were some suggestions for changes to the Faculty Senate bylaws referring to the Standing Committees – will probably bring draft to the Faculty Senate in the Fall.

<u>Faculty Affairs</u> - Katharine Adams   (See Attachment A): After presentation by K. Adams and discussion from the Senate – Motion on the floor from the committee. Does not require a second. Ed called to question. Faculty Senate voted on if they agree or not with the recommendations made by the Faculty Affairs committee. 30 - Ayes; 18 -Opposed; 1 - Abstention. Recommendations approved.   D. Holliman will send recommendations to all the Department Chairs.

<u>Faculty Grievance Committee</u> - John Dunn: No report.

<u>Institutional Planning Committee</u> - Daniel Baracskay: No report.

b. Standing Committee Reports

> **<u>Academic Scheduling & Procedures</u> - Said Fares, Chair (See Attachment B):** After presentation and discussion, Fred called to question. Comes as a motion from the committee does not require a second. Senate voted on passing the academic calendar as presented by the Academic Scheduling & Procedures Committee. Passed unanimously.
>
> <u>Academic Honors & Scholarships</u> - Jimmy Bickerstaff: AHS committee met earlier this month and interviewed the finalist for the Annie Powe Hopper award and determined an award recipient. University and department award names have been reported. Waiting all physical awards to be delivered to Event Services. Honors Dinner is scheduled for May 1st at 6:00 p.m. Invitations are in the process of going out. Thanked Monique Tripp of Event Services for her excellent work in arranging it.
>
> <u>Athletics</u> - Matthew Grant: No report.

Educational Policies - Michael Sanger (See Attachment C): After presentation and discussion – Comes as a motion from the committee. Does not require a second. Educational Policies Committee accepted the idea of striking the wording "unlimited" as recommended by the committee to be used in the place of "A total of 30" wording. Michael called to question. All those in favor of passing the motion as amended to simply strike the wording "A total of 30" where it appears. Motion passed with 3 abstentions and 1 opposed.

Environmental Issues - Jason Allard: No report.

Faculty Scholarship & Research - Todd Royle: Have allocated about $169,000 in Seed Grant funding; In the next couple weeks will be voting on the Fall, 2014 seed grant proposals. In terms of the Faculty Development funding we have allocated about $340,000.

Library Affairs - Colette Drouillard: No report given.

Minority & Diversity Issues - Sean Lennon: No report.

Student Activities & Services - Viviane Foyou: J. Archibald reported the committee had met on Tuesday of that week and informed the committee on the updates from the Committee on Committees. We actually had a resolution come from the student center – a resolution about campus diversity and minority support in regards to student services and activities.

Sean Lennon stated that under the Minority & Diversity Committee they realized that many faculty members may not have read that and it should be stated that we suggested to the committee that faculty Members make themselves aware of that document because the students are asking for a brand new presidential level that has not existed for 20 years and I'm not sure that many people read it.

J. Archibald stated that a lot of the information in the resolution pertains to the Minority & Diversity minutes and we were only focusing on that which pertains specifically to student services. It is part of a greater diversity plan which came up in the discussion at our meeting. Students did not feel that the administration was hearing their needs in regards to campus diversity and university minority programming. Referring to Student Affairs administration. They will vote on this on Monday – then it will flow back to our committee and we will vote on that – then we will submit to the general body for next meeting.

Technology - Jose' Velez-Maralunda: No report.

Internationalization and Globalization Committee - Change to Faculty Senate Bylaws (See Attachments D & E): at the March meeting we approved the bylaws of this new committee but we don't officially yet have it because we just had the bylaw change introduced at the last meeting. Floor was opened for discussion – no discussion – question was called. All those in favor of passing the change to the bylaws to create a new Internationalization and Globalization Committee as read. Passed unanimously.

c. Special and Ad Hoc Committees reports

i. Report from Ad Hoc Committee to Update and Improve VSU faculty handbook; Chair – linda jurczak: Gardner and I met on the 9th of April and we made a plan. Our plan is that we need to include other people to help us with the faculty handbook. Will send out an email.

ii. Ad Hoc committee to compose a response to University Strategic Plan - Ed Walker: We will send something out – we need someone else to head this up. A. Fowler has stepped down from the Senate and Ed will be rolling off due to his change in job.

4. New Business

a. Mission Statement - Dr. Michael Black (See Attachment F): Current mission statement was developed in 1999. It was last updated in 2007. This is our institutional mission statement. A component of our strategic planning process Dr. McKinney asked the committee to look into revising and updating our institutional mission statement. A committee with representation from all over the campus has developed a new mission statement to better represent our image and our progress. This is being brought to you as an information item. It has been developed and approved by the President's cabinet and University Council as a whole. It has been submitted to the Board of Regents for their consideration. If approved it will be put out on the faculty list serve for use in catalogs, etc.

b. Explore having a web master to faculty senate: If you know of someone that would be interested or would be good at maintaining a webpage of the Faculty Senate –please be considering this.

c. Book buyers on campus, emails from book buyers - Dawn Lambeth; Diane Holliman

d. Faculty Salaries - Theresa Grove

e. Executive Committee elections for May Senate meeting - Qualifications for senate and executive committee: At the next meeting we have an election for officers of the Senate. L. Wright has been elected as V.P./President elect. She will be President next year so there will be someone stepping into V.P./ President elect position, Parliamentarian and Secretary. Those eligible – if you have a vote on the Dean's Council or higher – you are not eligible for the Senate or to be an officer of the Senate. Officer's come from the Senate itself.

f. Nominations for a faculty senator to PBC and University Council

5. Discussion: Consent has to be given in writing for someone to be a proxy for a senate member.

E. Walker received an email from the University Architect. There will be a master planning committee meeting on the 29th of April – 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. Location to be announced. Open invitation. Ed will send out an announcement.

6. Adjournment: Motion was made and seconded to adjourn at 5:23 p.m. Recognized and adjourned.

Attachment A

Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation of Teaching and Instruction

The Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) was remanded by the Faculty Senate to consider (a) the current uses and practices of the Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI) and (b) the rating scheme used by department heads in evaluating the Faculty Annual Review (FAR). The FAC views SOIs and FAR ratings as but two elements of a more comprehensive faculty evaluation of teaching and instruction. Considering SOIs and/or FAR ratings in isolation provides a limited amount of evaluative information from which it is inappropriate to draw broad generalizations about faculty performance.

A comprehensive faculty evaluation of teaching and instruction includes information generated from students in the form of SOIs, faculty self-reflection and evaluation, peer-evaluation of instruction, as well as administrative evaluation made by department heads (AERA, 2013; Marincovich, 1998). Information generated from varied sources should focus on student learning outcomes in defining teaching quality, assist faculty in identifying professional development needs to improve teaching, and help identify relative strengths and weaknesses in teaching ability (AERA, 2013).

The *Faculty Evaluation Model at Valdosta State University (VSU) (*available at www.valdosta.edu/colleges/education/deans-office/documents/fem-final.pdf) includes an outline of process and product for SOIs, FARs, Merit, and Tenure and Promotion. Three of the four elements of a comprehensive faculty evaluation described above (i.e., SOIs, self-reflection, and administrator ratings) are represented to some degree in the Faculty Evaluation Model. There appears to be an emphasis on summative information gleaned from SOIs administered at the end of each semester and department head evaluation using ratings of Satisfactory and Unsatisfactory. Modest attention is given to faculty self-reflection and evaluation as prompted in the FAR. Peer evaluation is not routinely included in the FAR and is not represented in the VSU Faculty Evaluation Model. The FAC proposes a faculty evaluation model that incorporates varied sources of information generated from students in the form of SOIs, peer-evaluation of instruction, self-reflection and evaluation, as well as administrative evaluation. Utilization of such data should be balanced and consistent with best practices in faculty evaluation.

Student Evaluation

According to the Faculty Evaluation Model, "The main goal of Student Opinion of Instruction is to help faculty improve courses and instruction; moreover, the SOI is used in the annual evaluation of faculty" (p. 2). Faculty and administrators are encouraged to review this document because it suggests guidelines for interpreting SOIs and how they are to be used in evaluating faculty.

The Faculty Evaluation Model indicates that the SOIs are used to:

> …provide information that instructors can use to identify areas of strength and areas needing improvement in their teaching. Furthermore, departments and teaching units can use student ratings in the aggregate to assess the overall performance of multi-course and multi-instructor units, as well as to evaluate individual instructors for personnel reasons, such as decisions regarding retention, promotion, tenure and merit pay (p. 2).

As such, reviewing the guidelines for interpreting and using the SOIs for personnel actions are important. In the Faculty Evaluation Model, the strengths and limitations of SOIs are noted, thereby providing a qualified and contextual lens for interpretation of the SOI data.

Salient guidelines of the VSU Faculty Evaluation Model for the use of SOIs include:

> **1. Student ratings must be used in concert with other data that relate to the quality of a faculty member's teaching, rather than as a sole indicator of teaching quality**. Other sources such as peer reviews

5

of classroom sessions, peer reviews of curricular materials, and faculty self-reflection should be assessed in addition to student evaluations to gain a true sense of the teaching skills and performance of a faculty member. *Consideration of these other sources of evidence is especially important because student ratings alone do not provide sufficient evidence of the extent of student learning in a course.*

7. Course characteristics should be considered when interpreting results. For example, large lecture courses typically receive lower ratings than smaller courses, new courses being taught for the first time receive lower ratings than well-established courses, and introductory courses for non-majors receive lower ratings than higher division courses for majors. *Adjustments for course type should be made in order to have a fairer sense of the faculty member's teaching skills.* One way to adjust for course types is by choosing similar courses for normative comparisons.

8. Faculty members should be given an opportunity to respond to evaluation results. Faculty should have an opportunity to discuss the objectives of the course, how the teaching methods were used to meet those objectives, and how circumstances in the course might have affected evaluations. Furthermore, other evaluation information gained from a given course (see Recommendation 1) can aid with the interpretation of ratings results. (At VSU, faculty members are given the chance to respond in their annual Faculty Activity Report).

9. Administration of course ratings should be scheduled to maximize the number of respondents. Generally, evaluations will have greater validity when higher proportions of the enrolled students complete evaluation forms. Ratings may not be an accurate reflection of the entire class when smaller proportions of students respond. This problem can be particularly acute in small classes. *It is recommended that at least two-thirds of enrolled students must be included in the results to have any confidence in the results.* As proportions decrease, particularly in small classes, there is greater opportunity for the rating of one or a few students to disproportionately affect the results.

The above guidelines are a highlight of the document's content regarding SOIs. The VSU document contains 14 guidelines and several other recommendations regarding interpreting statistical data and written comments gleaned from SOIs. Promoting the document and encouraging both faculty and administrators to review the document to foster "best practices" in its implementation is encouraged.

The Faculty Evaluation Model suggests that SOIs are one part of the process for evaluating instruction. Other salient methods to evaluate faculty are needed such as peer review and reflective teaching narratives. According to the American Education Research Association's AERA Report and Recommendations on Evaluating Education Research, Scholarship, and Teaching in Postsecondary Education, four types of evaluation are useful when examining instruction (see pages 3-4 of the AERA report for an in-depth look at these evaluation techniques): 1) Evaluation of Teaching portfolios and artifacts; 2) Classroom observations; 3) Surveys and interviews with faculty members; 4) Surveys and interviews with students (SOIs). Commensurate with the AERA's suggestions and VSU's Faculty Evaluation Guidelines, this committee recommends that such evaluative strategies be included and considered when evaluating faculty instruction.

Peer Evaluation
SOI data may be used in combination with peer evaluation in evaluating faculty performance in teaching and instruction. Peer evaluation may include observation of classroom sessions or review of curricular materials as part of a portfolio (Chism, 2007; Marincovich, 1998). The peer evaluation process is focused on improving a course's effectiveness for students, not course ratings, although the two may be related (Marincovich, 1998). Peer evaluation is useful as a formative tool, but may also play a role in summative evaluations such as tenure decisions (Savoie, 2010).

The revised VSU Tenure and Promotion Policy and Procedures presented at the March Faculty Senate meeting provided the following guidelines for peer evaluation:

> Each unit will create processes and procedures for peer evaluations of teaching. If a candidate includes evidence of peer evaluations of teaching in the dossier, at least two peer evaluations of teaching across multiple years must be included for a given personnel action such as tenure or promotion. In applications for tenure, a candidate is strongly encouraged to have at least one peer evaluation documented prior to pre-tenure review and at least one additional peer evaluation documented after pre-tenure review (p. 10-11).

A resource guide on best practices, a literature review, and sample instruments for conducting peer evaluations of teaching can be found on the Academic Affairs website at http://www.valdosta.edu/colleges/arts/deans-office/documents/peerevalguide.pdf

Consistent with the literature and guidelines proposed by the VSU Tenure and Promotion Committee, this committee recommends that peer evaluation be considered in combination with SOIs when evaluating faculty instruction and be included and as part of the FAR and Faculty Evaluation Model.

Self-Evaluation

As one of the critical components of the annual review process, the FAR provides faculty with the opportunity to discuss and evaluate their own performance, professional growth, productivity, and service activities. Faculty self-perception helps to influence effort and overall performance (Hardré & Kollmann, 2012). Therefore, it is important for faculty to self-evaluate their performance compared to the departmental and university expectations for rank.

According to the Faculty Evaluation Model, the FAR document is used in part for "*faculty to report their activities over the past year as well as evaluate their performance in teaching and instruction" (p. 3).* Teaching and instruction are defined in the FAR as those activities associated with the design and delivery of instructional events to students. Faculty are asked to provide objective data related to their courses (e.g., course number, new preparation, enrollment, SOI Average) and are then encouraged to self-evaluate by responding to the following prompts:

> *1. Evaluate what you have learned about your teaching effectiveness through reading your SOIs.*
>
> *2. Briefly cite any innovative or experimental teaching approaches used and the associated results. Modification in course content, introduction of technology are also appropriate to mention here. Point out any modifications made to courses based on evaluations of your instruction, SOIs, and/or peer reviews, and/or department head evaluation.*

This committee encourages faculty to engage in self-evaluation by realistically assessing areas of strength and weakness (Weimer, 2010) and to provide self-reflective teaching narratives where appropriate to complement the hard data reported on the FAR. *Narratives may be used to highlight excellent/outstanding faculty performance.* Course portfolios may also be used to supplement information provided in the FAR. Course portfolios allow for faculty to explore and document their design, development, implementation, and refinement of a single course. This method encourages engagement with student learning and satisfaction, as judged not by teaching evaluations but also various other measures of student learning (Marincovich, 1998).

Administrative Evaluation of Faculty

As indicated in the VSU Faculty Evaluation Model, after reading the faculty member's FAR, the department head will complete the Annual Faculty Evaluation including three areas (teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service) and provide an overall evaluation of performance.

The department head's assessment should be based on departmentally established standards of performance and rated as either "Satisfactory" or "Unsatisfactory" as defined in the Faculty Evaluation Model (p. 32).

> *"SATISFACTORY: Satisfactory performance is demonstrated by performance levels that are recognized as meeting all reasonable and acceptable standards compared to other professional faculty within the department."*

> *"UNSATISFACTORY: Unsatisfactory performance is demonstrated by performance levels that are recognized as not meeting all reasonable and acceptable standards compared to other professional faculty within the department, or documentation is not provided by faculty when requested or prescribed in the evaluation process."*

In 2013, the FAC recommended making a third rating of "Excellent" available to department heads in evaluating the FAR. Three ratings were considered a more accurate and descriptive assessment of faculty performance as compared to the two rating scheme. The Faculty Senate voted to deny the recommendation and remanded the issue back to the FAC for further consideration. Additionally, members of the Faculty Senate asked for removal of the language *"compared to other professional faculty"* from the definitions used in the VSU Faculty Evaluation Model.

Upon review of online materials and telephone inquiry of the formal rating schemes used by other institutions, it appears that a two rating evaluative scheme is uncommon. Evaluative schemes identified included between three and six rating options.

Additionally, as indicated in the VSU tenure and promotion guidelines and the BoR Minutes, October 2008, "the minimum criteria for all institutions in all professional ranks include: (1) Superior teaching and demonstrating excellence in instruction; (2) Academic achievement, as appropriate to the mission; (3) Outstanding service to the institution, profession, or community, and (4) Professional growth and development" (p. 20). Based on the minimum criteria above, the use of satisfactory/unsatisfactory ratings alone may not provide for the degree of evaluative variability required in documenting performance standards necessary in application for tenure and promotion.

Finally, the Faculty Evaluation Model specifies that criteria for the determination of merit increases include "teaching ability, completion of significant professional development activities, promotion in rank, seniority, research productivity, academic achievements and publications, academic honors and recognitions, relevant professional achievements and recognitions, and non-teaching services to the institution. Faculty should be informed of their success in meeting criteria specified in the method of evaluation chosen by department heads and deans for which merit will be determined throughout the year and as part of their annual evaluation" (p. 5). By definition "merit" implies work that is superior and valued as compared to satisfactory/acceptable performance of job responsibilities. Thus, satisfactory and unsatisfactory ratings in isolation are not consistent with methods of evaluation necessary for the allocation of merit pay. Without an established method of merit evaluation compatible with the Annual Faculty Evaluation, allocation of merit pay may prove challenging for some departments.

With the considerations noted above, the FAC makes the following recommendations for administrative evaluation of faculty. First, *comparisons to other professional faculty should not be included* in the annual faculty evaluation ratings as defined below and reasonable and acceptable standards of performance should be determined by unit or department.

> **SATISFACTORY:** *Satisfactory performance is demonstrated by performance levels that are recognized as meeting reasonable and acceptable standards within the department.*
> **UNSATISFACTORY:** *Unsatisfactory performance is demonstrated by performance levels that are clearly recognized as not meeting reasonable and minimal standards within the department.*

Secondly, it is the recommendation of this committee that "Satisfactory" and "Unsatisfactory" ratings are accompanied by a descriptive narrative which allows for identification and documentation of excellent/outstanding faculty performance. Department heads may use this narrative to distinguish satisfactory

performance from faculty performance levels that exceed reasonable and acceptable standards within the department, thus making the faculty annual evaluation by department heads more consistent with VSU tenure and promotion guidelines and evaluation for the allocation of merit pay.

[Note: Recommendations were solicited from the Department Heads Counsel without formal response.]

In conclusion, a comprehensive faculty evaluation of teaching and instruction includes information generated from a variety of sources including students in the form of SOIs, faculty self-reflection and evaluation, peer-evaluation of instruction, as well as administrative evaluation made by department heads (AERA, 2013; Marincovich, 1998). Information generated from varied sources should focus on student learning outcomes in defining teaching quality, assist faculty in identifying professional development needs to improve teaching, and help identify relative strengths and weaknesses in teaching ability (AERA, 2013). Interpretation of data from only one or two sources provides a limited amount of evaluative information from which it is inappropriate to draw broad generalizations about faculty performance.

With consideration of the information provided in this report, the FAC respectfully recommends the following:

1. Become familiar with the strengths and limitations of SOI data as detailed in the Faculty Evaluation Model. Interpret SOI data with consideration of the documented limitations and supplement data with other sources of information.

2. Consider SOI data in combination with peer evaluation and/or other evidence of student learning when evaluating faculty teaching and instruction. Include peer evaluation and/or other evidence of student learning as part of the FAR and Faculty Evaluation Model.

3. Engage in self-evaluation by realistically assessing areas of strength and weakness and provide self-reflective teaching narratives (or course portfolios when appropriate) to complement other data reported on the FAR. Narratives may also be used to highlight exceptional activities or outstanding performance.

4. Use ratings of "Satisfactory" and "Unsatisfactory" (excluding comparisons to other faculty) for annual faculty evaluation. Reasonable and acceptable standards of performance may be determined by unit or department. Department heads may accompany "Satisfactory" ratings with a descriptive narrative evaluation to distinguish excellent/outstanding faculty performance.

References

American Educational Research Association (AERA, 2013). *Rethinking faculty evaluation.* Retrieved from http://www.aera.net/Portals/38/docs/Education_Research_and_Research_Policy/RethinkingFacultyEval_R4.pdf

Chism, N. V. N. (2007). *Peer Review of Teaching: A Sourcebook*. 2nd Ed. Bolton, Mass: Anker.

Faculty Evaluation Model at Valdosta State University (VSU). Retrieved from http://www.valdosta.edu/colleges/education/deans-office/documents/fem-final.pdf

Hardré, P. L. and Kollmann, S. L. (2012). Motivational implications of faculty performance standards. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 40,* 724-751.

Marincovich, M. (1998). *Ending the disconnect between the student evaluation of teaching and the improvement of teaching: A faculty developer's plea.* National Center for Postsecondary Improvement.

Savoie, M. (2010). *A guidebook for peer evaluation*. Valdosta State University College of the

Arts. Retrieved from http://www.valdosta.edu/colleges/arts/deans-office/documents/peerevalguide.pdf

Weimer, M. (2010). *Inspired college teaching: A career-long resource for professional growth.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, John, & Sons.

Attachment B

2015 – 2016 Approved ASPC Academic Calendar
Valdosta State University

2015 Fall

Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun
17-Aug	18-Aug	19-Aug	20-Aug	21-Aug	22-Aug	23-Aug
24-Aug	25-Aug	26-Aug	27-Aug	28-Aug	29-Aug	30-Aug
31-Aug	1-Sep	2-Sep	3-Sep	4-Sep	5-Sep	6-Sep
7-Sep	8-Sep	9-Sep	10-Sep	11-Sep	12-Sep	13-Sep
14-Sep	15-Sep	16-Sep	17-Sep	18-Sep	19-Sep	20-Sep
21-Sep	22-Sep	23-Sep	24-Sep	25-Sep	26-Sep	27-Sep
28-Sep	29-Sep	30-Sep	1-Oct	2-Oct	3-Oct	4-Oct
5-Oct	6-Oct	7-Oct	8-Oct	9-Oct	10-Oct	11-Oct
12-Oct	13-Oct	14-Oct	15-Oct	16-Oct	17-Oct	18-Oct
19-Oct	20-Oct	21-Oct	22-Oct	23-Oct	24-Oct	25-Oct
26-Oct	27-Oct	28-Oct	29-Oct	30-Oct	31-Oct	1-Nov
2-Nov	3-Nov	4-Nov	5-Nov	6-Nov	7-Nov	8-Nov
9-Nov	10-Nov	11-Nov	12-Nov	13-Nov	14-Nov	15-Nov
16-Nov	17-Nov	18-Nov	19-Nov	20-Nov	21-Nov	22-Nov
23-Nov	24-Nov	25-Nov	26-Nov	27-Nov	28-Nov	29-Nov
30-Nov	1-Dec	2-Dec	3-Dec	4-Dec	5-Dec	6-Dec
7-Dec	8-Dec	9-Dec	10-Dec	11-Dec	12-Dec	13-Dec

2016 Spring

Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun
11-Jan	12-Jan	13-Jan	14-Jan	15-Jan	16-Jan	17-Jan
18-Jan	19-Jan	20-Jan	21-Jan	22-Jan	23-Jan	24-Jan
25-Jan	26-Jan	27-Jan	28-Jan	29-Jan	30-Jan	31-Jan
1-Feb	2-Feb	3-Feb	4-Feb	5-Feb	6-Feb	7-Feb
8-Feb	9-Feb	10-Feb	11-Feb	12-Feb	13-Feb	14-Feb
15-Feb	16-Feb	17-Feb	18-Feb	19-Feb	20-Feb	21-Feb
22-Feb	23-Feb	24-Feb	25-Feb	26-Feb	27-Feb	28-Feb
29-Feb	1-Mar	2-Mar	3-Mar	4-Mar	5-Mar	6-Mar
7-Mar	8-Mar	9-Mar	10-Mar	11-Mar	12-Mar	13-Mar
14-Mar	15-Mar	16-Mar	17-Mar	18-Mar	19-Mar	20-Mar
21-Mar	22-Mar	23-Mar	24-Mar	25-Mar	26-Mar	27-Mar
28-Mar	29-Mar	30-Mar	31-Mar	1-Apr	2-Apr	3-Apr
4-Apr	5-Apr	6-Apr	7-Apr	8-Apr	9-Apr	10-Apr
11-Apr	12-Apr	13-Apr	14-Apr	15-Apr	16-Apr	17-Apr
18-Apr	19-Apr	20-Apr	21-Apr	22-Apr	23-Apr	24-Apr
25-Apr	26-Apr	27-Apr	28-Apr	29-Apr	30-Apr	1-May
2-May	3-May	4-May	5-May	6-May	7-May	8-May

2016 Maymester

Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun
			12-May	13-May	14-May	15-May
16-May	17-May	18-May	19-May	20-May	21-May	22-May
23-May	24-May	25-May	26-May	27-May	28-May	29-May
30-May	31-May	1-Jun	2-Jun	3-Jun	4-Jun	5-Jun

2016 Summer II

Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun
13-Jun	14-Jun	15-Jun	16-Jun	17-Jun	18-Jun	19-Jun
20-Jun	21-Jun	22-Jun	23-Jun	24-Jun	25-Jun	26-Jun
27-Jun	28-Jun	29-Jun	30-Jun	1-Jul	2-Jul	3-Jul
4-Jul	5-Jul	6-Jul	7-Jul	8-Jul	9-Jul	10-Jul
11-Jul	12-Jul	13-Jul	14-Jul	15-Jul	16-Jul	17-Jul
18-Jul	19-Jul	20-Jul	21-Jul	22-Jul	23-Jul	24-Jul
25-Jul	26-Jul	27-Jul	28-Jul	29-Jul	30-Jul	31-Jul

2016 Summer III

Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun
			9-Jun	10-Jun	11-Jun	12-Jun
13-Jun	14-Jun	15-Jun	16-Jun	17-Jun	18-Jun	19-Jun
20-Jun	21-Jun	22-Jun	23-Jun	24-Jun	25-Jun	26-Jun
27-Jun	28-Jun	29-Jun	30-Jun	1-Jul	2-Jul	3-Jul

2016 Summer IV

Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun
		6-Jul	7-Jul	8-Jul	9-Jul	10-Jul
11-Jul	12-Jul	13-Jul	14-Jul	15-Jul	16-Jul	17-Jul
18-Jul	19-Jul	20-Jul	21-Jul	22-Jul	23-Jul	24-Jul
25-Jul	26-Jul	27-Jul	28-Jul	29-Jul	30-Jul	31-Jul

Legends

- Columbus Day Fall Break
- Finals
- Graduation
- Midterm
- National Holiday
- Spring Break
- Thanksgiving

2015 - 2016 Academic Calendar

2015 Fall			Break	2016 Spring			Break	Summer I			Break	Summer II			Break	
Mon 17-Aug	Fri 11-Dec	Sat 12-Dec	29 Days	Mon 11-Jan	Fri 6-May	Sat 7-May	5 Days	Thu 12-May	Fri 3-Jun	9 Days		Mon 13-Jun	Thu 28-Jul			Mon 15-Aug
1st day of classes	last day of finals	Graduation	Christmas Break	1st day of classes	last day of finals	Graduation	Spring-Summer Break	1st day of classes	last day of finals			Summer III		Break	Summer IV	17 Days	2016 Fall
												Thu 9-Jun	Thu 30-Jun	6 Days	Wed 6-Jul Thu 28-Jul		
Note: Chart is Not to scale																

11

Attachment C –Educational Policies Committee

Credit by Examination

A total of 30 semester hours can be earned through any combination of CLEP, credit by departmental examination, correspondence courses, extension work, and advanced placement (70).

PRIOR LEARNING ASSESSMENT (PLA)

Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) is a process through which students identify areas of relevant learning from their past experiences, demonstrate that learning through appropriate documentation, and submit their materials so that they can be assessed and possibly awarded academic credit at Valdosta State University. The University will work with students from diverse backgrounds to evaluate their prior learning and determine if it meets the standards and requirements of college-level learning. **A total of 30** semester hours can be earned through any combination of CLEP, credit by departmental examination, correspondence courses, extension work, PLA, International Baccalaureate, and advanced placement.

Removing "A total of 30" in the preceding, and replacing it by "Unlimited" seems the simplest way to remove the credit hour cap.

Attachment D

BYLAWS
INTERNATIONALIZATION AND GLOBALIZATION COMMITTEE

Article I (Name)

The Internationalization and Globalization Committee is a Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate (Senate Bylaws, Art. II, Sec. 3 (i)[1]) with the responsibility of initiating, developing and/or reviewing policies and procedures to <mark>strengthen</mark> the institution's internationalization and globalization efforts, interacting with other statutory and standing committees when such issues overlap their charge.

Article II (Membership)

Section 1: Selection

Members of the Internationalization and Globalization Committee (IGC) are appointed by the Committee on Committees. Wherever possible, membership is assigned so that each College of the University, Division and the Odum Library is properly represented. (Senate Bylaws, Art. II, Sec. 3 (a))

Section 2: Composition

a) Two of the members must be Senators, one of whom is chair. (Senate Bylaws, Art. II, Sec. 3 (c))

 b) One member is a student recommended by the President of the SGA. (Senate Bylaws, Art. II, Sec. 3 (b))

c) Ex Officio members may be appointed by the Committee on Committees. All ex officio members on the IGC will be voting members. Ex officio members will include the Director and Associate Director of the Center for International Programs and the Provost. The Committee may nominate additional ex officio members to the Committee by sending a request in writing to the Committee on Committees.

d) Subcommittee members do not need to be faculty or Senators and are chosen solely by the IGC. All Committee members will serve on created subcommittees.

Section 3: Terms

a) All committee members serve three-year terms. Terms are staggered by the Committee on Committees. (Senate Bylaws, Art. II, Sec. 5 (a,b,c)) Terms of Committee members and the chair begin on August 1 and end on July 31.

 b) Terms of membership on subcommittees are determined by the Committee.

Section 4: Resignations

Resigning members must submit to the Chair of the Committee a written resignation. A copy of all resignations must be submitted in writing to the Committee on Committees within a week of the resignation by the Committee Chair. The Committee on Committees appoints replacements. (Senate Bylaws, Art. II, Sec. S (h))

---

[1] Senate Bylaws will need to be amended to add this new standing committee to the list.

Article III (Officers)

The officers of the IGC, along with their respective duties, are

a) Chair: The Chair of the Committee must be a Senator, is appointed by the Committee on Committees, and serves a one-year, renewable term. (Senate Bylaws, Art. II, Sec. 3 (g))

b) Secretary: The Chair-elect shall act as Secretary, and shall keep and distribute written minutes of the Committee meetings, pursuant to the provisions of Article V(e) below.

c) Subcommittee chair: The chair of each subcommittee will be determined by the IGC.

Article IV (Subcommittees)

a) The IGC may create subcommittees, which may include non-committee personnel
(Senate Bylaws, Art. II, Sec. 3 (h)) The IGC Committee may also discontinue and/or merge subcommittees as warranted by prevailing circumstances.

b) The Chair of the IGC will inform the Committee on Committees of the
membership of each subcommittee in time to include them in the Fall listing of the Faculty Handbook.

c) The IGC will approve the chair of each of its subcommittees. The chair of each
subcommittee will be a faculty member of the IGC.

d) Reports from the subcommittees will be presented to the chair of the IGC one
week prior to each scheduled meetings of the Committee.

Article V (Procedures)

a) On or before September 1, the Committee will discharge the following responsibilities: (Senate bylaws, Art. II, Sec. 6 (a 1-3))

1. Set the schedule for regular meetings and so inform the Committee on Committees. The Committee on Committees will publish the schedule to be included in the Faculty
Handbook.

2. Submit to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate a report containing an assessment of the Committee's charge and its annual goals.

3. Submit written rules governing its procedures to the Executive Secretary of the Faculty
Senate and place a copy of these rules on reserve in the Odum Library.

b) All proposals, recommendations, reports, and any other material to be presented for consideration to the IGC must be submitted to the Committee Chair.

c) All committee meetings are open.

d) <mark>Guests of the Committee are freely allowed to participate in the Committee's discussions</mark>.

e) Substantive minutes and/or records of deliberations of the Committee will be kept. Copies of the minutes, reports, proposals, recommendations, and all other documents will be placed on reserve in the Odum Library no later than two weeks after a committee meeting. At the end of the year these Committee records will be collected and placed in the University archives in the Odum Library. (Senate Bylaws, Art. II, Sec. 6(e)).

f) An annual report will be prepared and submitted to the Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate by April 30.

g) A quorum to carry on the business of the Committee will be one-half of the voting membership.

h) Proxies will be allowed for Committee members who are unable to attend Committee meetings, but can only be given to other Committee members. The Chair of the Committee must be notified of proxies prior to the meeting. No person may hold more than one proxy at any meeting.

i) Voting will be by a show of hands, unless otherwise ordered by the Committee. A simple majority of votes will carry an issue. Any Committee member may request a written ballot on any issue.

Article VI (Amendments)

The Bylaws of the IGC may be amended by a majority vote of the Committee. Proposed amendments to the Bylaws must be submitted by Committee members to the Chair in a timely manner for review, discussion, and possible action.

ATTACHMENT E

ARTICLE II. COMMITTEES

SECTION 1.   All committees, with the exception of the Grievance Committee, will meet at least twice a semester during the academic year and at least once during the summer, if necessary.

SECTION 2.   The Committee on Committees will review all Standing Committees annually to determine whether overlap or duplication exists among the committees and will report to the Faculty Senate at its last meeting of the spring semester.

SECTION 3.   **MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

a. The Committee on Committees will arrange the membership of each committee so that, wherever possible, each school of the University and the Odum Library is properly represented.

b. No fewer than one (1) student recommended by the President of the SGA will sit on each committee.

c. No fewer than two (2) Senators selected by the Committee on Committees will sit on each committee.

d. No fewer than one (1) Council of Staff Affairs (COSA) member recommended by the President of COSA will sit on each committee.

e. Terms of committee members will be staggered.

f. Membership of Standing Committees may include persons appointed by the Committee on Committees in *ex officio* capacity, maintaining an appropriate balance to meet the overall goals of Faculty Senate.

g. As soon as all committee vacancies are filled, the Committee on Committees will prepare a membership list of Statutory and Standing Committees for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook for the coming year.

h. Committee chairpersons and chairpersons-elect must be Elected Senators and are to be selected by the Committee on Committees for a term of one (1) year, except as provided in VSU Statues or elsewhere in these Bylaws. The terms of the chairpersons may be renewed.

i. Standing Committees may create sub-committees, which may include non-committee personnel. The Committee on Committees will be informed by each committee chairperson of the membership of sub-committees.

j. Specific Standing Committees and Their Responsibilities.

1. Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to the University calendar, class scheduling, final examination scheduling, University catalogs and bulletins, Honors Day, and commencement.

2. Athletic Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to the University programs of intercollegiate and intramural athletics.

3. Educational Policies Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to advising, undergraduate admissions and retention, public services, and registration; and to hear undergraduate petitions for exceptions to academic policy, including graduation.

4. Faculty Scholarship Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to both graduate and undergraduate faculty development, research, and the use of animal and human research subjects; to receive and review research and development proposals; and to allocate research and development funds.

5. Library Affairs Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to the Odum Library and its use, and to review and make recommendations related to library allocations.

6. Minority and Special Student Needs Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to ethnic, religious, and gender minorities; and to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to quality support programs for students with special needs including, but not limited to, those with physical impairments, behavior disorders, and learning disabilities.

7. Student Services and Activities Committee is to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to such student services as financial aid, housing, health services, counseling services, mail services, and food services; as well as student communications and affairs, in general.

8. Environmental Issues Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to environmental issues, as they relate to recycling, facilities use, campus beautification, and traffic planning.

9. Academic Honors and Scholarship Committee: to review and recommend college-wide scholarships and honors for students and to arrange for appropriate presentations, including Honors' Day.

10. Technology Committee: to develop and review policies and procedures relating to technology issues and to interface with other statutory and standing committees when such issues overlap their charge.

11. Internationalization and Globalization Committee: to initiate, develop and review policies and procedures to strengthen the institution's internationalization and globalization efforts, interacting with other statutory and standing committees when such issues overlap their charge.

Mission Statement

As a comprehensive institution of the University System of Georgia, Valdosta State University (VSU) is a welcoming, aware, and vibrant community founded on and dedicated to serving our communities' rich and diverse heritages. Through excellence in teaching, basic and applied research, and service, VSU provides rigorous programs and opportunities that enrich our students, our university, and our region. As such, the VSU mission consists of three interrelated parts:

Student Mission: To provide a diverse student population with an inspired education, a safe learning environment, a nurturing community, and a wealth of experience that assists students in molding their futures in a creative, conscious, and caring fashion while preparing them to be lifelong learners who will meet the needs of a changing global society.

University Mission: To operate the university with a focus toward human, environmental, and financial sustainability while increasing value to our local, regional, national, and international stakeholders. To expand opportunities for our students, employees, and varied community members by promoting social justice and service learning.

Regional Mission: To provide our region and our home with the resources and support necessary to develop and sustain a higher quality of living, greater economic and community development, and inspired innovation that nurtures and respects our diverse population and beautiful environment while promoting academic outreach, public and private entrepreneurship, and collaboration with all regional entities.

Valdosta State University fulfills its mission by focusing on inclusion in all aspects of the educational experience.

Developed by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, August 2013.
Approved by the President's Cabinet, September 16, 2013.
Approved by University Council, March 24, 2014.

Members and Visitors Present

*Indicates proxy

<u>**Executive Committee:**</u>
Ed Walker, President
Laura Wright, Vice President/President Elect
Diane Holliman, Secretary
Michael Noll, Parliamentarian
Tracy Meyers, Past President (ex-officio)

<u>**College of Arts:**</u>
J. Bickerstaff
L. Corbin*
T. Crane
C. Hawkins
l. jurczak
K. Murray
K. Paoletti
K. Winska*

<u>**College of Arts & Sciences:**</u>
T. Aiello*
J. Allard
D. Baracskay
S. Chakraborty
J. Dunn
S. Fares
D. Fike
V. Foyou
R. Gladwin*
T. Grove
D. Hall
J. Harper
M. Clegg-Hyer
J. Jewusiak*
S. Kregar
A. Lazari
B. Mboup - absent
N. McIntyre
T. Meyers
K. Morris - absent
O. Nikolova*
M. Noll
M. Pufong
V. Russell*
J. Velez-Marulanda
G. Walczak

College of Business Administration:
G. Futrell - absent
D. Kuhlmeier
A. Ostapski
T. Royle
E. Walker

College of Education:
K. Adams
L. Adams
J. Archibald
J. Baxter Graves
D. Briihl*
M. Carter
M. Grant
R. Green
D. Holliman
D. Lambeth
S. Lennon
M. Sanger
R. Tsemunhu*
D. Wright*

College of Nursing:
D. Atkinson*
B. Cohen
S. Walters

Odum Library:
C. Drouillard - absent
E. Rogers
L. Wright

COSA Representative (non-voting):
R. Lee

Student Senators (non-voting):
W. Jimerson

Proxies:
Said Fares for Randy Gladwin
Grazyna Walczak for Victoria Russell
Dan Baracskay for Diane Wright
Darrell Fike for Jacob Jewusiak
Katharine Adams for Deb Briihl
Diane Holliman for Olfelia Nikolova
Ronnie Green for Rudo Tsemunhu
Craig Hawkins for Kalina Winska

Karl Paoletti for Lynn Corbin
Bonni Cohen for Denise Atkinson
John Dunn for Tom Aiello

<u>Visitors:</u>

Angela Uyeno	Internal Audit
Michael Black	Academic Affairs
Richard Hammond	Campus Recreation
Jeffrey Gallant	Odum Library
Barry Hojjatie	Physics, Astronomy & Geosciences
Walter Peacock	Admissions