



FACULTY SENATE

Est. 1991

Chairperson
Ronald M. Zaccari

Vice Chairperson
Louis Levy

Executive Secretary
Christine James

Parliamentarian
Jim Muncy

Agenda

February 15, 2007

The Faculty Senate will meet Thursday, February 15, 2007 in the **MAGNOLIA ROOM** at 3:30 p.m. Please note that before the February meeting of the Faculty Senate, there will be a Faculty Senate Social in the University Center President's Executive Dining Room beginning at 2:00pm. This event is sponsored by Academic Affairs and is part of the ongoing new faculty and staff orientation events organized by Dr. Sharon Gravett. All are welcome to attend this informal party, refreshments will be included.

The March 22, 2007 meeting of the Faculty Senate will be moved to the Odum Library Auditorium, because of the acoustics work in the Magnolia Room.

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

Special Request: At the request of the University President and Executive Secretary of the Senate, any actions from the Senate sent to the Executive Secretary for approval after the Senate votes should be accompanied by a written document with the rationale and purpose of the decision. The Executive Committee requests that these documents be submitted as email Word .doc attachments.

1. Call to Order by Dr. Ron Zaccari
For the benefit of record keeping, senators and visitors will please identify themselves when speaking to an issue during the meeting. Please use the microphones to assist with accurate recording. All senators must sign the roster in order to be counted present.
2. **Approval of the minutes of the November 16, 2006 meeting of the Faculty Senate.** These may be found at: <http://www.valdosta.edu/vsu/facsen/Minutes/061116min.pdf>
3. New business
 - a. Report from the Academic Committee – Louis Levy
(See Appendix A, page 4)

b. Report from the Committee on Committees – Jay Rickman

On Committee Chair positions and the revisions to the makeup of the University Council: Previously, the University Council included the Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate and one “Minority” Representative of the Faculty Senate, Jin Wang. The Chair of the Environmental Issues Committee was also invited to serve on the University Council in an Advisory non-voting seat.

With the recent revisions to the Statutes and the University Council, the Faculty Senate receives a total of three representatives on the University Council: the Executive Secretary, and two other representatives to be determined by vote of the Faculty Senate. At this meeting, we will vote on the two new full, voting members of the University Council. Based on current issues of the Faculty Senate and requests made during Fall of 2006:

1. the Chair of the Environmental Issues Committee (Richard Carter, current Chair; Brad Bergstrom, Chair Elect.)
2. the Chair of the Institutional Planning Committee (James LaPlant, current Chair; Michael Noll, Chair Elect.)

(See Appendix B, page 7, updates to Standing Committees, Elections, Chair Elect of EIC)

c. Report from the Institutional Planning Committee – James LaPlant

d. Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee – Marty Williams

e. Report from the Faculty Grievance Committee – Stephen Lahr

f. Report from the Senate Executive Secretary – Christine James

(1) Changes to Commencement beginning with the Spring Commencement on May 4-5, 2007; Ann Lacey/Louis Levy
(See Appendix C, page 12)

(1) Report of the Academic Honors and Awards Committee
(See Appendix D, page 15)

(2) Faculty Evaluation Model for review by Faculty Senate, remanded to Faculty Affairs, please feel free to contact them with any comments.
(See Appendix E, page 16)

(3) New Authority to Travel and Travel Expense Statement Forms, the new version of the forms can be found online at the following web addresses:
<http://romulus.valdosta.edu/finadmin/financial/travel.shtml> or
<http://romulus.valdosta.edu/finadmin/financial/forms.shtml>
(See Appendix F, page 50)

(4) Administrative Evaluations have been sent out to all faculty; return to Angela Elder Henderson in Strategic Research and Analysis, aselder@valdosta.edu

(5) Half-Time Annual Report of the Faculty Senate (covers the Fall of 2006, and serves as a handy reminder for committees with remanded items.)
(See Appendix G, page 52)

- (6) The Executive Committee reviews the By Laws of the Faculty Senate each year; please review them and share any comments, changes or concerns: <http://www.valdosta.edu/vsu/facsen/bylaws/bylaws2005.pdf>
One possible change would be including language about online voting, i.e., sections such as Article 1 Section 8 at the bottom of page 4 of 8:

SECTION 8. VOTING PROCEDURE

- a. Voting will be by show of hands unless otherwise ordered by the Senate. Voting for the election of the Executive Secretary and members for the Committee on Committees, however, will be by paper ballot.
- b. Any Senator may request a paper ballot vote on any issue.
- c. Proxies will be allowed for Senators who are unable to attend Faculty Senate meetings and will be given only to another Senator. Proxies must register with the Executive Secretary prior to the meeting. No person may represent more than one (1) other Senator at a meeting.

- (7) Updates to the ORP contribution issue, Denise Bogart and President Zaccari

4. Old Business

5. Discussion

John Wright of the VSU Office of Volunteer Services asks the Faculty Senate if we will motion and vote for him to do a five minute presentation on the Relay for Life.

6. Adjournment

APPENDIX A:

VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC COMMITTEE MINUTES September 11, 2006

The Academic Committee of the Valdosta State University Faculty Senate met in the University Center President's Dining Room on Monday, September 11, 2006. Dr. Sharon Gravett, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, presided.

Members Present: Mr. Eric Nielsen, Dr. Beverly Blake, Dr. Bruce Caster, Dr. Yahya Mat Som, Dr. Selen Lauterbach, Mr. Alan Bernstein, Ms. Catherine Schaeffer, Mr. Mike Savoie, Dr. Frank Flaherty, Dr. Kathe Lowney, Dr. Ray Elson, Dr. Bill Buchanan, Dr. James Ernest, Ms. Iris Ellis, Dr. James Humphrey, Dr. James Humphrey (proxy Dr. Deborah Weaver), Mr. Cliff Landis, and Dr. Diane Holliman.

Members Absent: Dr. Deborah Weaver.

Visitors Present: Dr. Brian Adler, Dr. Ralph Allen, Dr. Robert Gannon, Dr. Mel Schnake, Dr. Mylan Redfern, Dr. Eric Brevik, and Mr. Lee Bradley.

The Minutes of the June 12, 2006, Academic Committee meeting were approved. (pages 1-2)

A. College of Business

1. New course, Finance (FIN) 3650, "Multinational Corporate Finance", (MULTINATIONL CORPORATE FINANCE – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 3-4). Deactivation of ECON 3650.
2. New course, Finance (FIN) 3770, "Fundamentals of Real Estate", (FUNDAMENTALS OF REAL ESTATE – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 5-6). Deactivation of ECON 3770.
3. Revised course description, Finance (FIN) 3350, "Financial Management", (FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 7-8).
4. Revised course description, Finance (FIN) 4520, "Investments", (INVESTMENTS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 9-10).
5. Revised course description, Master Business Administration (MBA) 7900, "Strategic Management", (STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 11-12).

B. College of Arts and Sciences

1. Revised course title, and description, Biology (BIOL) 3650, "Plant Systematics", (PLANT

- SYSTEMATICS – 4 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 3 lab hours, and 6 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 13-14).
2. Revised course title, and description, Biology (BIOL) 5650, “Plant Systematics”, (PLANT SYSTEMATICS – 4 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 3 lab hours, and 6 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 15-16).
 3. Revised credit hours, English (ENGL) 0099, “Developmental English”, (DEVELOPMENTAL ENGLISH – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 17-18).
 4. Revised credit hours, Mathematics (MATH) 0097, “Developmental Math”, (DEVELOPMENTAL MATH – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 19-20).
 5. Revised credit hours, Mathematics (MATH) 0099, “Developmental Math”, (DEVELOPMENTAL MATH – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 19-20).
 6. New course, Philosophy (PHIL) 2020H, “Honors World Religions”, (HONORS WORLD RELIGIONS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 21-27).
 7. Revised senior college curriculum for the BA in Philosophy & Religious Studies – Philosophy Track effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 28-29).
 8. Revised course description and new course, Geography/Geology (GEOG/GEOL) 4861, “Senior Thesis II”, (SENIOR THESIS II – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 30-31).
 9. Revised senior college curriculum and new track for the BS in Environmental Geosciences was approved effective Fall Semester 2008. (pages 32-35).
 10. Revised course description and new course, Geography/Geology (GEOG/GEOL) 4860, “Senior Thesis I”, (SENIOR THESIS I – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 36-37).
 11. Revised course title, description and new course, Geography/Geology (GEOG/GEOL) 4800, “Internship in Environmental Geosciences”, (INTERNSHIP IN ENVIRON GEOSCI – 3-6 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 6-12 lab hours, and 6-12 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 38-39).
 12. Revised Core Area F for the BA in Mathematics was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 40-41).

C. Miscellaneous

1. Dr. Gravett appointed a subcommittee to review and suggest changes to the by-laws – Mr. Alan Bernstein, Dr. Diane Holliman, and Dr. James Ernest.

2. Dr. Levy spoke to the committee on Program Review and its importance, and explained the process that an Academic department has to navigate through to complete their program review. He began explaining the role that the Academic Committee will have in program review.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles L. Hudson
Registrar

**APPENDIX B: FACULTY SENATE
VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES
2006-2007 (updated January 2007)**

Academic Scheduling and Procedures

Robert Bauer	(COE)	2005-2008	Scott McDonald (A&S)	2006-2009
Ada Burnett	(COE)	2006-2009	Arlene Haddon (CON)	2004-2007*
Jin Wang	Sen (A&S)	2004-2007	Tim Reisenwitz (COB)	2006-2009**
Ashok Kumar	CE, Sen (A&S)	2006-2009	David O'Drobinak (A&S)	2004-2007*
Ravonne Green	(LIB)	2005-2008	Karin Murray (COA)	2004-2007
Carol Barnett	C, Sen. (COE)	2005-2008	Allison Curington (SW)	2005-2008

Students:

ex officio:

Chuck Hudson, Registrar

Walter Peacock, Director of Admissions & Enrollment Management

Honey Coppage, Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs

Rob Kellner, Director of Auxiliary Services

Bobby Tucker, Athletics, Academic Services & Faculty Athletic Representative

Tom Hardy, Director of Housing and Residence Life

Tim Yorkey, Director of COSA [Council of Staff Affairs]

Academic Honors and Scholarships

Linda Miller	(COE)	2006-2009	Kathryn Hall (A&S)	2004-2007
Michael Davey	(A&S) C, PC Sen.	2004-2007	Teddi Cunningham(COE)	2005-2008
Nanci Scheetz	(COE) CE, Sen.	2005-2008	Elizabeth Goode (COA)	2003-2006
Shiloh Smith	(LIB)	2005-2008*	Bob Hull (COE)	2006-2009**
Ed Walker	(COB)	2006-2009	Linda De La Garza (A&S)	2006-2009
Deborah Robson	(COA)	2005-2008*	Barry Hojjatie (A&S)	2004-2007*
DeLane Flowers	(CON)	2004-2007*		

Students:

ex officio:

Jean Temple, Assistant Dean, College of Nursing

John Gaston, Dean, College of the Arts

Ann Lacey, Director of Special Events

Athletics

Deb Briihl	(COE) PC, Sen.	2004-2007**	Jesse Spencer (A&S)	2004-2007*
Michael Holland	(COB)	2004-2007	Carolyn Cox (COE)	2004-2007
Jim Muncy	(COB) C, Sen.	2005-2008	Sonya Sanderson (COE) CE, Sen.	2006-2009
J.D. Thomerson	(COE)	2006-2009	Shani Gray (A&S)	2006-2009
Larry Wiley	(COE)	2005-2008	Michael Taylor (COA)	2005-2008
Richard Haptonstall	(COA) Sen.	2005-2008*		

Students:

ex officio:

Herb Reinhard, Director of Athletics

Bobby Tucker, Athletics, Academic Services & Faculty Athletic Representative

Educational Policies

Allison Curington	(SW)		2006-2009**	Mel Schnake	(COB)	2004-2007
Peggy Moch	(A&S) C,	Sen.	2005-2008	Cliff Landis	(LIB)	2004-2007*
Michael Schmidt	(COA) PC,	Sen.	2004-2007	Chen Li-Mei	(A&S)	2004-2007*
Theresa Thompson	(A&S)	Sen.	2006-2009	Mary Gorham-Rowan	(COE)	2005-2008*
David Hill	(A&S) Sen.		2006-2009	Deborah Weaver	(CON)	2006-2009**
Charles Johnson	(A&S)		2005-2008	Lynn Corbin	(COA)	2005-2008
Lynn Minor	(COE) Sen, CE		2006-2009			

Students:

ex officio:

Walter Peacock, Director of Admissions & Enrollment Management

Bill Muntz, Director of Public Services

Chuck Hudson, Registrar

James LaPlant, Assistant Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Tracy Meyers, Interim Director of Women's Studies

Subcommittees:

Admissions Appeals Review Committee

Walter Peacock	Chair
Jean Temple	College of Nursing
Verilette Hinkle	College of Education
Fred Ware	College of Business
Larry Scully	College of the Arts
Donna Gosnell	College of Arts and Sciences
Victor Morgan	Student Affairs

Environmental Issues

Richard Carter	(A&S) C, Sen.	2005-2008	Sheryl Dasinger	(COE)	2006-2009**
Green Waggener	(COE)	2004-2007	Michael Sanger	(SW)	2006-2009
Brad Bergstrom	(A&S) CE, Sen.	2004-2007	Jon Barnett	(A&S)	2006-2009
Jim Hornsby	(COA)	2004-2007	Jeffrey Vasseur	(A&S)	2005-2008
Kevin Colwell	(COE)	2005-2008	Donna Cunningham	(COB)	2005-2008*
Melissa Benton	(CON)	2004-2007*	Jack Fisher	(LIB)	2005-2008
Tom Manning	(A&S)	2006-2009	Carl Hand	(A&S)	2004-2007*

Chair-Elect, appointment pending

Students:

Seth Gunning SAVE, SGA representative

Jacqueline Murray SAVE representative

ex officio:

James Black, Vice President for Finance and Administration

Ray Sable, Director of Plant Operations

Bob DeLong, Environmental Officer

Scott Doner, Director of University Police

Jill Ferrell Rountree, Director of Parking and Transportation

Environmental Issues: Subcommittees

Campus Beautification and Stewardship (CBSS)

Green Waggener (Chair)*
Brad Bergstrom*
Dennis Bogyo
Richard Carter*
Kevin Colwell*
Bob DeLong (ex officio)*
Melissa Benton*
Judy Grable
Monty Griffin (ex officio)
David Hedgepeth
Marc Pufong
Ari Santas

Energy Conservation (ECS)

Carl Hand (Chair)*
Donna Cunningham*
Bob DeLong (ex officio)*
Russ Goddard
Greg Gordon (ex officio)
Seth Gunning (student repr. SAVE, SGA)*
Jim Hornsby*
Tom Manning*
Marc Pufong
Ken Rumstay
Ray Sable (ex officio)*
Michael Sanger*
Jacqueline Murray (student repr. SAVE)*

Recycling (RS)

Jeff Vasseur (Co-Chair)*
Bob DeLong (Co-Chair) (ex officio)*
Bob Agee, Sodexo Campus Services (ex officio)
Jon Barnett*
Sheryl Dasinger*
Jack Fisher*
Greg Gordon (ex officio)
Seth Gunning (student repr. SAVE, SGA)*
Carl Hand*
Diane Holliman
Meredith Lancaster (ex officio)
Jacqueline Murray (student repr. SAVE)*
Ray Sable (ex officio)*

Faculty Development and Research

Margaret Owuor (COE)	2006-2009	Stephen Lahr	(COA) 2004-2007
Amy Aronson-Friedman (A&S) PC, Sen.	2004-2007	Quincealea Brunk	(CON) 2004-2007*
Karin Murray (COA) CE, Sen	2006-2009	John Pascarelli	(A&S) 2004-2007*
Richard Amesbury (A&S) C, Sen.	2005-2008	Calandra Lockhart	(COE) 2006-2009
Scott Pool (COA)	2004-2007	Jennifer Lambert-Shute	(A&S) 2005-2008
Anita Ondrusek (LIB)	2005-2008	Darrell Fike	(A&S) 2006-2009**
Zulal Denaux (COB)	2006-2009	Ruth Hannibal	(COE) 2006-2009

Students:
 ex officio:
 Louis Levy, Vice President for Academic Affairs
 Brian Adler, Dean of the Graduate School
 George Gaumont, University Librarian
 Barbara H. Gray, Director, Grants and Contracts
 Scott Sikes, Vice President for University Advancement

Library Affairs

Ray Fulton	(COE) Sen.	2004-2007*	Nora Swenson	(COE)	2005-2008
Chunlei Liu	(A&S)	2006-2009	Marcy Hess	(A&S)	2004-2007
Apryl Price	(LIB) C Sen.	2005-2008	Todd Royle	(COB)	2006-2009
Harry Ally	(COA)	2004-2007	Emily Rogers	(LIB)	2006-2009
DeLane Flowers	(CON)	2006-2009	William Newell	(COE)	2006-2009
Zhiguang Xu	(A&S)	2005-2008	Lars Leader	CE, Sen (COE)	2006-2009

Students:
 ex officio:
 George Gaumont, University Librarian

Minority and Diversity Issues

LeVonne Lindsay	(COA)	2006-2009	James Ernest	(COE)	2004-2007
Clemente Hudson	(COE) C, Sen.	2005-2008	Luis Bejarano	(A&S)	2005-2008*
Nancy Redfern-Vance	(CON)	2006-2009	Rajesh Iyer	(COB)	2005-2008
Suzannah Patterson	(COA)	2005-2008	Janet Foster	(COE)	2006-2009
Rich Vodde	(SW)	2004-2007	Fred Knowles	(A&S)	2005-2008
Julie Bowland	(COA) PC, Sen.	2004-2007	Marta Kvande	(A&S)	2004-2007
Babacar Mboup	(A&S) CE, Sen.	2006-2009			

Students:
 ex officio:
 Maggie Viverette, Director for Equal Opportunity Programs/Multicultural Affairs
 Sheila Wakeley, Student Affairs Counselor
 Denise Bogart, Director of Human Resources

Student Activities

Carol Smith	(SW)	2005-2008*	Carol Glen	(A&S)	2004-2007
Daniel Barackskay	(A&S)	2006-2009	Deborah Weaver	(CON)	2004-2007
Heather Brasell	(COE) Sen.	2005-2008*	Patricia Miller	(A&S)	2004-2007**
Patrick McGuire	(COA) CE Sen	2006-2009	Paula Wolftech	(COE)	2006-2009
Kenny Ott	(COE) C Sen.	2004-2007	Michael Stoltzfus	(A&S)	2006-2009
Leisa Marshall	(COB)	2006-2009	Stacey Walters	(COE)	2005-2008
Guy Frost	(LIB)	2006-2009	Karen Rowland	(COE)	2004-2007

Students:
 ex officio:
 Kurt J. Keppler, Vice President for Student Affairs
 Richard Lee, Assistant to the Dean of Students for Judicial Affairs
 Patricia Miller, Spectator advisor
 Maggie Viverette, Director for Equal Opportunity Programs/Multicultural Affairs

Student Activities: Subcommittees -- TBA

Student Services

Duke Guthrie	(COA)	2003-2006	Gerald Merwin	(A&S)	2005-2008
Cheri Tillman	(A&S) PC, Sen.	2004-2007	Lori Howard	(COE)	2004-2007*
Chere Peguesse	(A&S) C, Sen.	2005-2008	Rebecca Galeano	(A&S)	2004-2007
Yolanda Hood	(LIB)	2005-2008	Ken Smith	(LIB)	2004-2007
Steven Kohn	(COE)	2005-2008	Jean Temple	(CON)	2006-2009
James Nienow	(A&S)	2005-2008	Dixie Haggard	(A&S)	2006-2009
Delane Flowers	(CON)	2005-2008	Blaine Browne	(COE) CE Sen	2006-2009
Jane Kinney	(A&S)	2006-2009			

Students:

ex officio:

Rob Kellner, Director of Auxiliary Services

Mark Williams, Coordinator of Alcohol & Other Drug Education

Douglas Tanner, Director of Financial Aid

TBA, Loan Collection Officer

Scott Doner, Director of University Police

Tom Hardy, Director of Housing and Residence Life

Kimberly Tanner (née Godden), Acting Director of Access Office for Students with Disabilities

Student Financial Aid Subcommittee

ex officio:

Russ Mast

Technology

Don Leech (COE)PC, Sen.	2004-2007	Jaehoon Seol	(A&S)	2004-2007
Lawrence Etling (COA)	2004-2007	Maria Whyte	(CON)	2005-2008
Fatih Oguz (LIB)	2006-2009	Cindy Tandy	(SW)	2005-2008**
Kelly Heckaman (COE)	2006-2009	Marcella Prater	(COE)	2004-2007
Chere Peguesse (A&S)	2004-2007	Diane Judd	(COE)	2004-2007
John Samaras (A&S) C, Sen.	2005-2008**	Sarah McCalister	(COA)	2006-2009
Bob Williams (COB) CE, Sen.	2006-2009			

Students:

ex officio:

Andy Fore, Webmaster

Joe Newton, Director of Information Technology

Bill Moore, Chief Information Security Officer

Lisa Baldwin, Assistant Director of Information Technology for Enterprise

* finish unexpired term

** elected to second term

PC = Past Chair, C = Chair, CE = Chair Elect

APPENDIX C: Changes to Commencement Ceremonies

- Commencement will be held in six ceremonies instead of two (see below).
- The Dean or Director of the Program will hand out diplomas and shake the hand of the students graduating in their College or Program. (staff, faculty members will not be making presentations)
- In an effort to keep the ceremonies to one hour, ceremony procedures will change to include limiting the number of speakers.
- Each College or Program will be responsible for securing an announcer or reader of the names of their graduates.
- The Student Government Association, Faculty Senate representative, and Alumni representative will not do presentations.

2007 Spring Commencement Ceremonies

Friday, May 4th

College of Nursing

2:00 PM Whitehead Auditorium, Fine Arts Building

Masters of Library Information Science

4:00 PM Library Auditorium, Odum Library

Division of Social Work

7:00 PM Whitehead Auditorium, Fine Arts Building

Saturday, May 5th

Dewar College of Education and U.S. Air Force ROTC

10:00 AM PE Complex

College of the Arts & Harley Langdale, Jr. College of Business Administration

1:00 PM PE Complex

College of Arts and Sciences

4:00 PM PE Complex

Commencement Ceremonies by Degree:

Friday, May 4

Friday Afternoon- Whitehead Auditorium 2 p.m.

**BSN - Bachelor of Science in Nursing
MSN- Master of Science in Nursing**

Friday Afternoon- Odum Library 4 p.m.

MLIS- Master of Library and Information Science

Friday Evening- Whitehead Auditorium 7 p.m.

MSW- Master of Social Work

Saturday, May 5

10:00 AM- PE Complex- Dewar College of Education

**AASBC- Associate of Applied Science in Business
AASDHC- Associate of Applied Science in Dental Hygiene
AASHC- Associate of Applied Science in Health
AASSC- Associate of Applied Science in Services
AASTC- Associate of Applied Science in Technology
BA-PSY- Bachelor of Science with a major in Psychology
BS-ADS- Bachelor of Science with a major in Administrative Services
BS-SMA- Bachelor of Science with a major in Sports Medicine & Athletic Training
BS-PSY- Bachelor of Science with a major in Psychology
BAS- Bachelor of Applied Science
BSED- Bachelor of Science in Education
BSEP- Bachelor of Science with a major in Exercise Physiology
EDS- Education Specialist
EDD- Doctor of Education
MED- Master of Education
MS-PSY- Master of Science with a major in Psychology**

**1:00 PM- PE Complex - College of the Arts and Harley Langdale, Jr. College
of Business Administration**

**BA-ART- Bachelor of Art with a major in Art
BA-MUS- Bachelor of Art with a major in Music
BBA- Bachelor of Business Administration
BFA- Bachelor of Fine Arts**

BM- Bachelor of Music
MMED- Master of Music Education
MBA- Master of Business Administration

4:00 PM- PE Complex- College of Arts & Sciences

AAA- Associate of Arts
BA- CRM- Bachelor of Arts with a major in Criminal Justice
BA- ENG- Bachelor of Arts with a major in English
BA- FR- Bachelor of Arts with a major in French
BA-HIS- Bachelor of Arts with a major in History
BA-LA- Bachelor of Arts with a major in Latin
BA-MAT- Bachelor of Arts with a major in Math
BA-PHRS- Bachelor of Arts with a major in Philosophy and Religious Studies
BA-POS - Bachelor of Arts with a major Political Science
BA-SOC- Bachelor of Arts with a major in Sociology
BA-SPA- Bachelor of Arts with a major in Spanish
BGS-GSP- Bachelor of General Studies
BS-BIO- Bachelor of Science with a major in Biology
BS-CHM- Bachelor of Science with a major in Chemistry
BS-CS- Bachelor of Science with a major in Computer Science
BS-CIS- Bachelor of Science with a major in Computer Information Systems
BS-MAA- Bachelor of Science with a major in Applied Mathematics
BS-PHY- Bachelor of Science with a major in Physics
BS-EVS- Bachelor of Science with a major in Environmental Geosciences
MA- ENG- Master of Arts with a major in English
MA-HIS- Master of Arts with a major in History
MPA-PA- Master of Public Administration
MS-BIO- Master of Science with a major in Biology
MS-CRM - Master of Science with a major in Criminal Justice
MS-MFT- Master of Science with a major in Marriage and Family Therapy
MS-SOC- Master of Science with a major in Sociology

Thanks so much for all you do...

Regards,

Ann Lacey aelacey@valdosta.edu

**APPENDIX D: Report of the Academic Honors and Awards Committee
Dr. Michael Davey, Chair**

The Academic Honors and Awards Committee met on November 15, 2006. The principal item on the agenda concerned VSU Honors Day.

For the last several years, an awards day has been held in the spring to honor VSU's outstanding students from across university. Typically, award recipients are those who have earned the top award from each department. There are also a few university-level awards handed out, including the Annie Power Hopper award, which is the most prestigious academic honor VSU bestows on a graduating senior.

There have been problems, however. Honors Day is often poorly attended by non-recipient students and by parents. Poor attendance by parents is most likely due to the fact that the event is held in the middle of the work week, in the middle of the day. Also, each college has its own award ceremony, which often creates confusion among students and faculty about which awards should be presented where and when the ceremonies will be held. The committee has also received input from faculty across the university concerning the fact that classes are cancelled to celebrate academic achievement, which many see as problematic.

In Fall 2005, the committee discussed the future of Honors Day, how to increase attendance, how to reorganize Honors Day so that it functioned better in relation to other awards ceremonies on campus, and whether to hold an Honors Day at all. Following a meeting between the chair, Dr. Levy and Ann Lacey, director of Special Events, it was decided to go forward with Honors Day that year and to pursue any major changes gradually, possibly implementing them for the 2006-2007 academic year. The consensus on the committee last year was that Honors Day should be eliminated entirely or moved to coincide with graduation so that more parents would be able to attend.

At the meeting November 15, 2006, the committee voted unanimously to forward the following suggested changes to the faculty senate for ratification.

1. Honors Day will be changed to an awards dinner only for the nine university-level awards and the five college award winners.
2. All other awards normally presented at Honors Day will now be presented at the award ceremonies for each college.
3. The award dinner will be held the week of graduation.
4. Recognition of the names of all recipients will be observed at each graduation ceremony.
5. Physical distribution of the awards will take place at the graduation for each recipient's respective college.
6. In addition to the award recipients and their families, attendees at the dinner will be determined based on available funding and on insuring proper and decorous observance of the significance of the achievement of the award recipients.
7. The award dinner will include a speaker.
8. The AHAC in conjunction with the office of special events will continue to organize and monitor the success of this event.

APPENDIX E: Date: Thu, 11 Jan 2007 12:31:01 -0500

From: "Dr. Sharon Gravett" <sgravett@valdosta.edu>

Subject: item for Faculty Senate Executive Committee

To: 'Christine James' <chjames@valdosta.edu>

Cc: Louis Levy <llevy@valdosta.edu>

Hi, Christine,

Happy New Year! I hope your new semester is starting out well. Louis has asked me to forward Faculty Evaluation Model prepared by the Faculty Evaluation Taskforce for consideration by the Faculty Senate.

The Faculty Evaluation Taskforce--composed of faculty members from all colleges and divisions as well as representatives from the Deans' Council, Department Heads Council, the Faculty Senate, and AAUP--met regularly since September 2005 to meet the following charge:

(1) To examine faculty evaluation procedures and policies across the university to assure that they are user friendly for faculty and for evaluators. The following types of evaluations will be investigated:

- (a) annual faculty evaluation
- (b) pre-tenure review
- (c) tenure
- (d) promotion
- (e) post-tenure review
- (f) student evaluation of courses and instructors

(2) To recommend changes to these procedures in order to assure the following:

- (a) the most helpful process for faculty members to ensure that they will have clear guidance about their performance goals and accomplishments in areas of teaching, service, advising, scholarship, and creative activities. This guidance should help faculty work in productive ways to achieve positive evaluations.
- (b) the most helpful product for faculty members, department heads, and deans as they make decisions about promotion, tenure, and merit pay increases.
- (c) the most efficient process for faculty members, department heads, and deans so they will not need to do unnecessary and repetitive work.
- (d) the most uniform process/product possible within the context of the many different disciplines within the university so that all faculty members, department heads, directors, and deans may be assured of equitable evaluation.

The taskforce completed a draft document in August 2006. Since that time, the document has been shared with the Deans' Council and with the Department Heads Council. Attached is a copy for consideration by the Faculty Senate. This Faculty Evaluation Model (FEM) document combines all the evaluative processes used for faculty at Valdosta State University into one comprehensive model.

Much of the material in the FEM is already available in the current faculty handbook (last revised 1997). The most significant changes are in the section on the Faculty Activity Report (FAR) and Annual Evaluation and in the additional material on how to interpret Student Opinion of Instruction in Appendix A.

The taskforce has also produced two new documents for further discussion:

- (1) a draft of a proposed University-wide SOI document in Appendix B
- (2) drafts of a revised FAR and Annual Evaluation in Appendix C.

The work to produce this model has been challenging, and taskforce members have endeavored to produce documents that will be flexible yet standard enough to meet the needs of our diverse campus community.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thanks,
Sheri

Dr. Sharon L. Gravett
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
Valdosta State University
Valdosta, GA 31698
(229)333-5950

DRAFT 08/25/06

FACULTY EVALUATION MODEL AT VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

Valdosta State University wants its faculty members to succeed and to be productive members of the VSU community; therefore, the university and its colleges, departments, and divisions continuously use a series of evaluation processes that are intended to be both summative and formative. They should not only provide an accurate picture of the faculty member's performance in teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service, but they should also assist faculty members in defining and meeting their own professional goals in these areas.

Faculty members at Valdosta State University are evaluated both by themselves and others numerous times over the course of their careers:

- (1) Every semester, students are given the opportunity to express their opinions about classroom instruction through the **Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI)**.
- (2) Each year, faculty members evaluate themselves through an **Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan** to which their department/unit head adds an **Annual Evaluation**.
- (3) Each year, faculty members are evaluated according to individual departmental standards for the award of **merit pay**.

- (4) During their third year of full-time service at VSU, tenure-track faculty members are also evaluated by departmental committees as well as their department/unit heads when they participate in a **Pre-Tenure Review**.
- (5) Beginning in their fourth year of full-time university service (if hired as an Assistant Professor or the fifth year if hired as an Associate Professor), tenure-track faculty members are eligible to apply for **Promotion**, and they are eligible to apply for **Tenure** in their fifth year. In both these processes, faculty must show the results of their earlier evaluation processes to departmental colleagues, department/unit head, the appropriate dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- (6) Every five years after the award of tenure (unless interrupted by another personnel action such as promotion), faculty members participate in a **Post-Tenure Review**. During this review, they are evaluated by their departmental colleagues and their department/unit heads.

The Faculty Evaluation Model at Valdosta State University seeks to provide the following:

- (a) the most helpful process for faculty members to ensure that they will have clear guidance about their performance goals and accomplishments in the areas of teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service. This guidance should help faculty work in productive ways to achieve positive evaluations.
- (b) the most helpful product for faculty members, department/unit heads, and deans as they make decisions about the allocation of resources as well as for promotion, tenure, and merit pay increases.
- (c) the most efficient process for faculty members, department/unit heads, and deans so they will not need to do unnecessary and repetitive work.
- (d) the most uniform process/product possible within the context of the many different disciplines within the university so that all faculty members, department/unit heads, and deans may be assured of equitable evaluation.

(1) STUDENT OPINION OF INSTRUCTION (SOI)

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. Therefore, faculty will administer student evaluations for each course* they teach during the fall and spring semesters, and the summer sessions. All SOIs must include both quantitative and qualitative sections and be completed by the last teaching day of the semester or summer session. Results from these evaluations will be returned to the faculty member in a timely manner. Fall semester student evaluations will be returned by midterm of the following spring semester. Spring semester evaluations will be returned by midterm of the following summer session II. Summer session evaluations will be returned by midterm of

the following fall semester. All academic units are expected to follow this policy and exceptions should be reported to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

*Possible exceptions must be approved by the department head and might include student teaching, practicum courses, thesis courses, directed studies, internships, or other courses with low enrollments (<5) where the anonymity could be compromised.

See

Appendix A **Guidelines for Interpreting Student Opinion of Instruction SOI)**

Appendix B **Student Opinion of Instruction Form (Revised Draft of University-wide Questions)**

(2) THE ANNUAL FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT, ACTION PLAN AND ANNUAL EVALUATION

The Board of Regents' Policy regarding Annual Faculty Evaluations is quoted below.

Each institution shall establish definite and stated criteria, consistent with the Regents' Policies and the statutes of the institution against which the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated. The evaluation shall occur at least annually and shall follow stated procedures as prescribed by each institution (Board of Regents' Policy Manual, section 803.07).

The guidelines pertaining to the above were developed by the Chancellor's Office. They read in part:

The purpose of the new faculty evaluation policy is twofold. The primary purpose is to aid the faculty member in improving and developing his or her performance as a member of the academic community and to ensure the faculty member's understanding of the relationship between his or her performance and the expectations of the institutions. Secondly, the faculty evaluation should assist the institution in its review of the faculty member for continued employment, promotion, tenure and merit salary increases. The institution may wish to develop different procedures for each category of review. However, the faculty member must clearly understand the criteria and procedures to be used in the evaluation process for continued employment, promotion, tenure, and merit salary increases.

The faculty has a right to comment in writing on any aspect of the annual evaluation.

The faculty shall sign and receive a final copy of their annual evaluation (Memoranda from the Chancellor to Presidents, June 22, 1981 and December 15, 1986).

At Valdosta State University, the Annual Faculty Activity Report, Action Plan, and Annual Evaluation document plays a number of important roles:

- for faculty members, it helps them report their activities over the past year as well as evaluate their performance in teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service;
- for department/unit heads, it allows them to assess the progress of faculty members for their next personnel action or merit determination and to provide

- guidance and assistance to help faculty members reach departmental expectations and goals;
- for deans, directors, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs, it not only provides documentation for personnel processes but also for strategic planning and development.

This document is also a critical component of the promotion and tenure process for faculty, it is the primary source of information for the university annual report, and it serves as a means to evaluate individual units' progress toward meeting strategic goals. Individual programs and departments should develop policies that address specific components of the report such as allocation of loads for service or special assignments. It is important that professional growth and productivity activities be discussed in departments, divisions, and colleges so that listings of activities are clearly and consistently reported across the unit.

Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan (FAR)

Faculty members are responsible for accurately reporting all activities—in teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service in which they have been involved over the preceding calendar year. They should then view these activities in light of whatever personnel action they will next undergo—pre-tenure review, application for promotion and/or tenure, or post-tenure review—and set goals for the upcoming year in all three areas. This planning process will aid not only faculty members in meeting their own professional goals, but it will also help them realize these goals in conjunction with university, college, and departmental goals. Department/unit heads will be able to see what resources will be needed to help faculty members realize those goals.

Annual Evaluation

After the faculty member has completed the Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan, the faculty member's department/unit head will complete an Annual Evaluation. This document should evaluate the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service. It should also include recommendations if activity in any given area is determined to need improvement. Attention should be given in cases where a faculty member has any form of load adjustment related to their duties within the department. The department/unit head should address the faculty member's planning and goals for the following year and determine if they are aligned with departmental, college, and university goals, and if they are prioritized in a manner that facilitates appropriate levels of activity that may lead to tenure and promotion.

Faculty Activity Reports and supporting documentation will be housed in the department/unit of the faculty member. Copies of the Annual Evaluation document will be forwarded to the appropriate dean and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Schedule for Annual Faculty Activity Report, Action Plan, and Annual Evaluation

- First semester of employment: *New faculty members meet with department/unit heads to discuss the Faculty Evaluation Model and departmental expectations.
- End of fall semester: *All faculty members complete and submit faculty activity report and action plan.
- February: *Department/unit heads meet with all faculty members to go over annual evaluations and action plans.

See Appendix C draft Faculty Activity Report, Action Plan, and Annual Evaluation

(3) MERIT PAY

The Board of Regents each year receives an appropriation from the General Assembly for all phases of its operations. Expenditures for operation of the University System, including salaries, are therefore necessarily contingent upon legislative appropriations. While compensation could be reduced as a consequence of actions of the governor or General Assembly, it is the stated intent of the Board "to maintain current salary commitments in so far as possible to every employee and the Board will exert its composite influence and best efforts to that end." (Board of Regents' Policy Manual, Section 803.1401).

Salary increases for full-time teaching faculty are awarded on the basis of merit. Merit ratings should be based on departmental evaluation procedures established in accordance with university policies and represent a consensus arrived at by the department/unit head, dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Criteria for the determination of merit increases will include teaching ability, completion of significant professional development activities (including the attainment of additional academic degrees,) 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

Department/unit heads and deans of the colleges are responsible to convey in writing at the beginning of each academic year the method of evaluation of the criteria for merit that are specified in the preceding paragraph which will be utilized in determining merit pay increases. Faculty should be apprised of their success in meeting these evaluative requirements throughout the year and as part of the annual evaluation for which merit will be determined. If upon merit evaluation, the faculty member is not satisfied with the evaluation, the faculty member may appeal the decision through the normal appeal process for faculty.

(4) PRE-TENURE REVIEW

Preamble

Two of the significant milestones of any professor's career involve the awarding of tenure and promotion in rank. Tenure resides with each institution and is not guaranteed; one normally must be employed in a tenure track position for at least five years of consecutive service before a tenure decision is considered. In order to be tenurable, faculty must meet the criteria set forth in the university's statutes and the Board of Regents' policies. The decision to grant tenure to a member of the faculty involves an extensive commitment of the institution's resources. Both the institution and the affected faculty member should maintain close contact with the individual's progress towards tenure. Each college or unit will hold an annual meeting to review the goals and needs of the institution in relation to tenure.

Process

Upon accepting a faculty appointment, new faculty should be provided with the guidelines for tenure followed by their college and department/unit. While insuring one's tenurability is primarily the responsibility of the individual, all tenured members of a department/unit have a professional obligation to help guide untenured faculty through their probationary period. The pre-tenure review process is one of the formal mechanisms through which untenured faculty gain positive and corrective feedback about their performance and how it relates to their tenure progress. This pre-tenure review process will employ the college and department/unit's established criteria for tenure, emphasizing excellence in teaching.

Annually, faculty are evaluated by their department/unit heads. One component of such evaluations should address the head's perception of the untenured individual's progress towards tenure. It is important to note that satisfactory progress towards tenure is never a guarantee of tenure because the needs of the institution do change, and even positive recommendations may not be supported at higher levels. Evaluations by the department/unit's head, while extremely important in all personnel decisions, are only one source of information that is considered in the tenure process. Accordingly, untenured faculty should also receive timely feedback from the tenured members of the department/unit to judge more accurately progress towards tenure. While the tenured members of department/units could also provide untenured faculty with written comments about their progress on an annual basis, all probationary faculty will have a pre-tenure review in the third year of the probationary period or, in cases with prior years services, at the mid-point of the remaining probationary period. By September 15 of each year, candidates for pre-tenure review are notified of their review and are asked to prepare materials for submission no later than November 1.

To accomplish this, the tenured members of the department/unit, or a committee representing the tenured faculty in the department/unit that consists of at least three faculty who are elected by the department/unit's tenured faculty must meet and discuss

each candidate's progress towards tenure and promotion. In the case where a department/unit does not have at least three tenured faculty, the pre-tenure materials will be reviewed by a committee of at least three tenured faculty who are acceptable to both the individual faculty member and the appropriate dean/director or Vice President for Academic Affairs. The candidate should submit to the committee a draft copy of the current promotion and tenure document for that college/division with the appropriate supporting materials.

Using the college/division and department/unit's criteria, the committee will provide the candidate with a written report identifying areas of strength and areas where additional attention is warranted. Within two weeks of the delivery of the written report to the untenured faculty member, the committee or candidate can request a meeting to discuss and clarify the report.

The committee's report and the optional follow-up meeting should be completed before the end of April of the academic year in which the pre-tenure review is mandated. The committee's report will be submitted to the faculty member and the head of the department/unit. A copy of the report should be included in the faculty member's personnel file.

If the faculty member feels that the report of the committee is unfair, the faculty member can follow the University's established appeals process.

(5) PROMOTION AND TENURE

Promotion

Promotions in rank are based on merit and are not automatic. The Board of Regents has fixed certain minimum criteria for promotion from one rank to another; these criteria include superior teaching, outstanding service to the institution, academic achievement, and professional growth and development. In at least two of these four areas, the faculty member's accomplishment should be noteworthy, with the greatest emphasis on teaching. Regents policies also state that there should be appropriate involvement of faculty in making recommendations for promotion. Each department/unit should have written procedures for making recommendations for promotion, and these procedures should be available to all faculty members.

At Valdosta State University, the terminal degree or its equivalent is normally required for promotion to associate or full professor. Strong justification should be provided in support of any recommendation for promotion to the ranks of associate or full professor without the terminal degree. In addition, length of service is considered for promotion: three years as instructor, four years as assistant professor, and five years as associate professor. Consideration is also taken of the number of promotions available to the university and the number of faculty members in each rank. Promotions are considered once each year at the April meeting of the Board of Regents.

Applications for promotion are initiated at the department level, with the applicant providing the relevant documentation. Appeal is through the deans to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President, and the Board of Regents.

Criteria for Promotion are delineated in the Board of Regents' Policy Manual, Section 803.08.

Tenure

Tenure resides at the institutional level and is not guaranteed. Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors are eligible for tenure. Faculty members with adjunct appointments will not acquire tenure, nor does tenure apply to honorific appointments.

Tenure may be awarded, upon recommendation by the President and approval by the Board of Regents, after completion of a probationary period of at least five years of full-time service, defined as a one-hundred percent workload basis for two out of every three consecutive academic terms, at the rank of assistant professor or higher. The five-year period must be continuous, with the exception of a maximum of two years' interruption because of a leave of absence or approved part-time service. However, no probationary credit may be given for such interrupted service. A maximum of three years' credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed for service in tenure-track positions at other institutions or for full-time service at the rank of instructor or lecturer at the same institution. Such credit for prior service is to be defined in writing by the President and approved by the Board of Regents at the time of the initial appointment at the rank of assistant professor or higher.

Credit toward the award of tenure and/or promotion may be earned while in a temporary status at this institution. However, only full-time permanent faculty members are eligible for the award of tenure. Credit should be negotiated before the first tenure-track faculty status contract.

The maximum time that may be served at the rank of assistant professor or above without the award of tenure is seven years. The maximum time that may be served in any combination of full-time instructional appointments without the award of tenure is ten years. The maximum period of time that may be served at the rank of full-time instructor is seven years. Tenure or probationary credit towards tenure is lost upon resignation from an institution. However, in the event the individual is again employed as a candidate for tenure, probationary credit for the prior service may be awarded in the same manner as the service at another institution.

Tenure is discussed in the Board of Regents' Policy Manual, Sections 803.09 and 803.0901.

Availability of Promotion and Tenure Evaluation Forms

Each college within the university provides its own promotion and tenure evaluation forms. Copies are available in the respective dean's offices.

(6) POST-TENURE REVIEW

Preamble

Tenure protects academic freedom; it is granted only after a rigorous review of an individual's teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service. The tenured faculty member becomes a leader of the university community by providing direction, expertise, and stability to the university's academic programs. Tenured faculty members must maintain a level of professional competence that serves as a model for all faculty members and for members of the professional community. According to Board of Regents' policy, this competence must be evaluated periodically throughout each faculty member's career.

Goals

Routine evaluation of tenured faculty is a system of recognition, reward, and enhancement of faculty performance. In every aspect of post-tenure review, the principles of academic freedom and due process must be protected.

Goal 1: Expand and strengthen established evaluation procedures

Valdosta State University (VSU) already evaluates the performance of all faculty members through an established annual review process. This process is designed to guide faculty in maintaining a high level of professional competence and to recognize and reward faculty for outstanding achievement. The annual evaluations will serve as the guide for the post-tenure review, and each annual evaluation should end with a statement that clearly specifies if the previous year's performance was satisfactory, needs improvement, or unsatisfactory.

The post-tenure review process should not place an onerous burden on faculty to document their continuing competence, which is why the primary documentation submitted by faculty are the five most recent annual evaluations and a current curriculum vitae. Generally, faculty with three or more satisfactory annual evaluations with at least two of these within the three years prior to the review will be considered as candidates for reward and recognition by the department/unit's Promotion and Tenure Committee. Faculty who have two or more unsatisfactory annual evaluations with at least one of these within the three years prior to the review will be considered as candidates for remediation. Faculty whose annual evaluations are between these extremes will be provided with information concerning their areas of strength as well as those areas which they should consider for continued development.

The post-tenure review will be conducted by each department/unit's Promotion and Tenure Committee. The deadline for submission of material will be consistent with those established for VSU promotion and tenure. This review should begin five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action (tenure) and continue at five year intervals unless interrupted by a promotion, impending candidacy for promotion within a year, or approved leave of absence. A statement will be added to each annual contract stating the anticipated year for post-tenure review. Tenured faculty who hold administrative positions above department head will be reviewed five years after

returning to a full-time teaching appointment. The review process for department heads will be the same as for faculty except the report from the review committee will be submitted the dean of that college.

The post-tenure review should address accomplishments in teaching, in advising and serving students, in research/scholarly/creative activity, and in service. While a candidate should not be expected to prepare additional materials solely for the purpose of the post-tenure review, faculty should provide performance documentation as follows:

- (1) a current curriculum vitae and copies of annual evaluations for the years under consideration;
- (2) measures of teaching effectiveness including, but not limited to, written student ratings and/or peer evaluations;
- (3) a self-assessment; and
- (4) other documentation faculty may choose to present.

Goal 2: Recognize and reward outstanding professional accomplishments

Post-tenure review should help tenured faculty members improve their performance. One important means of achieving this objective is formally to recognize and adequately reward outstanding faculty accomplishments. The University will develop a reward structure that recognizes faculty excellence, supports distinguished faculty work, attracts and retains outstanding faculty, and enhances the academic reputation of VSU. Such a reward program should include, among other measures, the following:

- (1) increased visibility for faculty achievements in teaching, scholarship, and service;
- (2) substantial merit-pay increases that are in addition to those awarded through the annual evaluation process; and
- (3) continuation, expansion, and support of course reassignment policy and an enhancement of the leave of absence program for the development of faculty scholarship, other creative professional activities, and teaching.

Goal 3: Detect and remediate sub-standard professional performance

If, as a result of the review process, the need for faculty development is recommended, the Promotion and Tenure Committee will provide a written summary of its findings and any recommendations to the department/unit head. Department/unit heads should add their own comments, confer with the faculty member, and present the findings. Both the department/unit head and the faculty member must sign the report indicating the results had been presented and discussed. If a development plan is proposed, recommendations from the Promotion and Tenure Committee will be forwarded to the department/unit head for additional suggestions.

This development plan must accomplish the following:

- (a) define specific goals or outcomes;
 - (b) outline activities to be undertaken to achieve these goals or outcomes;
 - (c) contain a schedule; and
 - (d) define the criteria by which the faculty member's progress will be monitored.
- The department/unit head will be responsible for forwarding the faculty member's development plan resulting from post-tenure review to the appropriate administrator at

least one level above the faculty member's unit and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The department/unit head and administrative officer are responsible for arranging appropriate support for the approved plan, if required. This process will be integrated into the timetable for personnel decisions and merit pay decisions established by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

The development plan will be signed by the members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, the department/unit head, and the faculty member. A copy of this signed plan will be provided to the faculty member, committee members, the department/unit head, and the appropriate dean. As part of the annual evaluation, the department/unit head will meet with the faculty member engaged in enhancement work to review progress according to the plan. The outcome of this review will be included in the annual evaluation. If, in a period of time not to exceed three years, the department/unit head and Promotion and Tenure Committee agree the faculty member has been successful, they will report this to the department/unit head, dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. A faculty member who successfully completes the development plan will be reviewed 5 years from the date of the original review.

For a faculty member who fails to achieve the improvements identified in the development plan within the agreed-upon timetable as evidenced by the department/unit head's evaluation, both the faculty member and head will be asked to submit a written explanation to the Promotion and Tenure Committee. The faculty member's account should explain why the faculty member has been unable to meet the terms of the development plan. The Promotion and Tenure committee may respond to these written explanations in one of three ways. The Promotion and Tenure Committee:

- (1) may agree with the faculty member's evaluation that performance has improved;
- (2) may agree with the faculty member's explanation for why the performance goal(s) have not been met; in this case, the committee will work with the faculty member to revise the development plan; or
- (3) disagree with the faculty member's explanation; in this case it will prepare a report of the entire post-tenure review process specific to the case, and forward it to the faculty member, the department/unit head, and the dean with the recommendation that appropriate sanctions be implemented.

Regardless of the committee's recommendation, the faculty member can follow the appeals process established by the Board of Regents. If the administration decides to initiate sanctions or dismissal procedures because of an unsatisfactory performance on the part of the faculty member, it will adhere to the University and Board of Regents guidelines for dismissal for cause.

Establishing Standards of Performance

Each department/unit will periodically review and maintain its statement of expectations for satisfactory performance applicable to all faculty members (tenured and non-tenured). Departmental/unit statements will address expectations for the areas of teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service. These must be as specific as possible, without arbitrarily precluding the diverse

contributions that individual faculty members might make to the university community. Individual differences in teaching, scholarship, and service are valued. After approval by the members of the department/unit, the statement will be submitted to the dean for review.

The dean of each unit will certify in writing that department/unit expectations are in keeping with the established mission of the college, that they meet minimum standards, and that expectations are equitable throughout the college. These expectations will be provided to all new faculty. Questions concerning these policies and procedures will be answered at annual meetings open to all faculty of the college.

Conclusion

This post-tenure review provides an opportunity to assess faculty development goals and achievements and provides assistance to faculty in ensuring continuous intellectual and professional growth. The post-tenure review is distinguished from the annual review in that it requires faculty and administrators to assess achievements and goals over a longer term. It also merges the faculty and administration into a unit dedicated to expanding and strengthening the overall quality of education at VSU by encouraging highly motivated and professionally active tenured faculty.

APPENDIX A

Guidelines for Interpreting Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI)

Note: The following recommendations are taken from the University of North Dakota website, with only slight modifications.

http://www.und.edu/dept/oid/evaluation_literature.htm

Student course ratings have many uses, particularly if viewed over time and across courses. Student ratings 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.

The recommendations listed below can provide helpful guidelines for the use of student course ratings in personnel decisions.

- 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 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.
- 2. Evaluations from more than a single section should be used in making any decision about teaching quality.** Research has shown that ratings from at least five courses are necessary to assure adequate reliability. The validity of the ratings for measuring teaching quality is increased as a greater variety of course formats is represented in the data upon which decisions are based. Trends in ratings across years may also be important in assessing teaching.
- 3. Overall ratings of teaching effectiveness are most appropriate to use in personnel decisions.** Overall ratings of the teacher and the course tend to correlate more closely with student achievement scores than do other items. More specific items should be used by the faculty member for review of specific skills and areas for improvement.
- 4. Small differences in individual evaluations should not be used as a basis for differential decisions.** Because student ratings yield numerical averages, there is a temptation to overestimate the precision of the averages that are presented. Small differences in ratings may not be meaningful. It is better to deal with much broader classifications, such as

Excellent/Good/Acceptable/Unacceptable or Significantly Exceeds Expectations/Meets Expectations/Falls Short of Expectations/Falls Significantly Short of Expectations.

5. Interpretations of student ratings averages should be guided by awareness that students tend to rate faculty at or near the high end of the scale. It is therefore not appropriate to use the median (or 50th percentile) as a presumed dividing line between strong and weak teachers. More appropriate would be to assume that the majority of teachers are strong. It is also appropriate, when evaluating average ratings of individual instructors, to consider relevant comparisons (see Recommendation 6) and specific characteristics of courses taught (see Recommendation 7).

6. Comparative data should be used with caution. Department-wide comparison data might be reported on the summary report. However, for comparisons to be useful, the normative group should be based on more than a narrow population of instructors. Smaller departments may not want to rely on departmental norms but use norms calculated for a number of similar departments.

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, 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.

For References, see http://www.und.edu/dept/oid/evaluation_literature.htm

Thinking about Teaching Evaluations <http://www.oberlin.edu/cot/pdweval.htm>

Patty deWinstanley, Associate Professor of Psychology (Oberlin), prepared the following based on her reading of the extensive literature on teaching evaluations. She focused predominantly on three literature reviews: [1] Cashin, W. E. (1995). Student Ratings of Teaching: The Research Revisited. Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, Idea Paper no.32; [2] Aleamoni, L.M. (1999). Student rating myths versus research facts from 1924 to 1988. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 13(2), 153-166. (Provided to COT in Spring, 2000); and [3] Pratt, D. D. (1997). Reconceptualizing the evaluation of teaching in higher education. Higher Education, 34, 23-44.

1. Students can make reliable and valid judgments about an instructor and certain aspects of instruction.

A. Reliability

Just as you would throw away a bathroom scale that gave you a different measure of your weight every time that you stepped on it, an evaluation form with low reliability also should be thrown away. Fortunately, under best case scenarios, student evaluation forms have been shown to be reliable.

Reliability refers to the consistency, stability, and replicability of a measurement.

The consistency of student evaluations refers to the extent that students within the same class give similar ratings on a given question. Good consistency is achievable with class sizes greater than 30. Class sizes of 10 or fewer students will probably not produce adequate consistency.

The stability of student evaluations refers to the agreement among raters over time. Student evaluations tend to be fairly stable. Thus, one can expect to see good agreement between ratings at the end of the semester and ratings given by those same students years after graduation. Some institutions spend a lot of time and effort surveying graduates about teaching effectiveness for tenure decisions. The literature suggests that little if any new information is obtained because of the high stability levels of student evaluations.

The replicability of student evaluations refers to the extent that the same instructor is rated the same for the same course over a number of semesters and for all his or her courses. Replicability is high for both the same course over a number of semesters and for different courses taught by the same instructor.

Cashin (1995) provides the following guidelines for assuring that acceptable levels of reliability are achieved for student evaluations when making personnel decisions.

1. Reliability will be achieved only to the extent that the surveys are well designed, thus forms should be developed in consultation with someone knowledgeable about educational measurement.
2. Reliability will be achieved when using "ratings from a variety of courses, for two or more courses from every term for at least two years, totaling at least five courses." If there are less than 15-20 students in any class, data from additional classes are recommended.

Aleamoni (1999) echoes Cashin's suggestions and further emphasizes the importance of consultation in the construction of the evaluation forms: "It should be noted, however, that wherever student rating forms are not carefully constructed with the aid of professionals, as in the case of most student- and faculty- generated forms, the reliabilities may be so low as to negate completely the evaluation effect and its results".

B. Validity

Although you might not throw away a scale that always reported your weight at ten pounds lighter than every other scale that you have stepped on, you would know that the scale isn't a valid measure of your weight. A scale can be highly reliable (always giving you the same weight) but not valid (the weight is really ten pounds under your actual weight). Student evaluations can also be reliable (in the ways mentioned), but not valid. That is, student evaluations might not measure "effective teaching."

Validity refers to the extent that student evaluations measure what we want them to measure, that is, good teaching. There are several studies reported in the literature indicating that student evaluations can be valid measures of some aspects of teaching effectiveness. To illustrate, student ratings have been found to correlate with final exam performance, instructor's self-ratings, ratings of colleagues, and ratings of administrators. In addition, numerical ratings tend to correlate well with student comments on open-end questions.

2. Some variables that are unrelated to teaching effectiveness do correlate with student evaluations. In addition, some variables that have been purported to correlate with student ratings do not.

When considering student evaluations as part of a personnel evaluation, the variables that are unrelated to teaching effectiveness but do correlate with student evaluations should be taken into consideration. The variables listed below as correlating with student evaluations are the ones for which a consistent pattern based on many studies has been obtained.

- A. Elective courses are rated higher than required courses.

- B. More advanced students give higher ratings than less advanced students.
- C. Grades are weakly correlated with student ratings: Higher grades are associated with somewhat higher ratings.
- D. Humanities courses receive higher ratings than social science courses, and social science courses receive higher ratings than science courses.

The variables listed below are the ones that many people believe are correlated with student ratings, but for which inconsistent results have been found.

- A. Size of the class (although, keep in mind the issue of reliability when class size falls below 15).
- B. Gender of the student
- C. Gender of the instructor
- D. An interaction between gender of the student and gender of the instructor
- E. Time of day that the course is offered.
- F. Whether students are majors or non-majors.
- G. Rank of instructor

Information regarding the type of variables that have an impact on student evaluations must be kept in mind when comparing evaluations from different courses. At the very least, department heads and deans should be aware of the impact of variables on student evaluations that we do not think are important to teaching effectiveness. Furthermore, the information provided to the persons making personnel decisions must be periodically updated. The research on student evaluations is very active. More researchers are beginning to investigate the interactions of several variables on student evaluations. To insure appropriate interpretations of the evaluations, up-to-date information must be provided.

3. Student evaluations are multidimensional. Contrary to some people's perceptions, student evaluations are not simply measuring popularity. Most researchers show that at least six dimensions, or factors, are commonly found in student rating forms. Below is a list of the factors. Any student evaluation form must have a few questions dedicated to assessing each of the six factors.

- A. Course Organization
- B. Clarity, communication skills

- C. Teacher/student interaction, or rapport
- D. Course difficulty, workload
- E. Grading and examinations
- F. Student self-rated learning

All authors of the review articles cautioned that a single overall (or general) measure of teaching effectiveness is inadequate because single items are not reliable or valid. Furthermore, single items, such as in general how would you rate this teacher's effectiveness, tend to correlate with many more of the factors that are unrelated to teaching effectiveness (i.e., gender, class size, etc.)

4. All authors of the review articles state that student evaluations must be used in conjunction with other methods of evaluating teaching. Pratt (1997) lists six principles for evaluating teachers in a broader approach that includes student evaluations as only one aspect of teaching evaluations.

The six principles are as follows:

- A. Evaluation should acknowledge and respect diversity in actions, intentions, and beliefs.
- B. Evaluation should involve multiple and credible sources of data.
- C. Evaluation should assess substantive, as well as technical, aspects of teaching.
- D. Evaluations should consider planning, implementation, and results of teaching.
- E. Evaluation should contribute to the improvement of teaching.
- F. Evaluation should be done in consultation with key individuals responsible for taking data and recommendations forward within an institution.

Understanding Quantitative Data in the Student Opinion of Instruction

Common Statistical Terms—What they mean and how to use them

<http://cstl.syr.edu/cstl2/Home/Teaching%20Support/Teaching%20at%20SU/Student%20Ratings/12A400.htm>

N—The letter “N” represents the sample size (number of students who responded to the course evaluation overall or to a particular item).

Mean—The mean score represents the numerical average for a set of responses. The following points assume a scale in which a low score is assigned to negative responses (i.e., poor) and a high score to positive responses (i.e., excellent).

Generally, the higher the mean score, the better the evaluation.

On a 5-point scale, items with mean scores above 4.0 generally reflect teaching aspects that are particularly effective.

Standard Deviation—The standard deviation represents the distribution of the responses around the mean. It indicates the degree of consistency among student responses. The standard deviation is often abbreviated in data tables as *s*, *sd*, *SD*, *std*, or *StD*.

The standard deviation in conjunction with the mean provides a better understanding of your data. Begin by adding the standard deviation to the mean. Next subtract the standard deviation from the mean. The range between the two calculated values represents where approximately 2/3 of your students' responses fall. For example, if the mean score is 3.3 with a std of 0.4, then 2/3 of the students' responses lie between 2.9 (3.3 - 0.4) and 3.7 (3.3 + 0.4).

The standard deviation represents the degree of similarity among the students' responses. A small standard deviation (as in the example above) reflects a high degree of consensus among the students. Since there is a small numerical range (2.9 - 3.7) in which 2/3 of the ratings fall, the response pattern among your students is very consistent.

A large standard deviation indicates that there was considerable disagreement among the students' responses. For example, if the mean score is 3.3 with a std of 1.0, then 2/3 of the students' responses lie between 2.3 and 4.3. This indicates a wide disparity among the responses to this item, with the mean simply representing a numerical average of the responses and not a consensus rating by the class.

More on Standard Deviation & Mean

<http://www.brevard.edu/fyc/fya/CuseoLink.htm>

The standard deviation for individual items is an index of agreement or disagreement among student raters. Perfect agreement yields a standard deviation of 0. Deviations of less than 1.0 indicate relatively good agreement in a 5-point scale. Deviations of 1.2 and higher indicate that the mean may not be a good measure of student agreement. This situation may occur when opinion in a class is strongly divided between very high and very low ratings or, possibly, is evenly dispersed across the entire response scale, resulting in a mean that does not represent a "typical" student opinion in any meaningful sense. A mean of 3.0 or 3.5 [on a 5-point scale] cannot be construed to represent "average" performance in the sense of middle-range performance when the mean is simply an artifact of strong disagreement among students.

UNDERSTANDING WRITTEN COMMENTS IN THE STUDENT OPINION OF INSTRUCTION (SOI)

Individual written comments should be interpreted only in the context of all written comments and student ratings; an individual comment should not be considered meaningful unless it is supported by other written comments or by the ratings. Any analysis of comments should seek patterns rather than focusing on isolated statements.

<http://www.radford.edu/~mayleswo/sef/Principles.html>

<http://www.uni.edu/vpaa/GuidelinesforStudentEvaluation.pdf>

Appendix B
 Student Opinion on Instruction (SOI)
Revised Draft of University-wide Questions

As you answer the questions below, be aware that successful learning requires effort by both instructor and students.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Course assignments were clearly explained in the syllabus or other handouts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Course policies (for example, attendance, late papers) were clearly explained in the syllabus or other handouts.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. The instructor was well prepared for class.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. The instructor made effective use of class time to cover course content.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Course assignments were returned in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. The instructor explained grading criteria (for example, grammar, content) clearly.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. The instructor was willing to discuss course-related issues either in person or by email / telephone.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. The instructor responded to student questions on course material in a professional manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. This course increased my knowledge of the topic.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. This course helped me further develop my academic skills (for example, reading, writing, speaking, critical analysis, performance, artistic abilities, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1. WHAT WERE THE BEST FEATURES ABOUT THIS COURSE?

2. WHAT ARE YOUR INSTRUCTOR'S STRENGTHS?

3. WHAT SUGGESTIONS WOULD YOU GIVE YOUR INSTRUCTOR FOR IMPROVING THE COURSE?

Appendix C
Annual Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan

Faculty Member: _____

Department/Division: _____

Year: _____

The Annual Faculty Activity Report, Action Plan, and Annual Evaluation document plays an important role for faculty, departments, and the units within the university as part of strategic planning and development. This document is also a critical component of the promotion and tenure process for faculty; it serves as the primary source of information for the university annual report and as a means to evaluate individual units' progress toward meeting strategic goals. Individual programs and departments should develop policies that address specific components of the report such as allocation of loads for service or special assignments. It is important that research and scholarly activities be discussed in departments and colleges so that listings of activities are clearly and consistently reported across the unit.

Faculty members completing this form should make every effort clearly to address all of the areas within this document that relate to individual responsibilities at the university. Activities should be listed only once within the report; do not include the same activity in two different categories.

The role definitions in this document are adapted from Raoul A. Arreola's *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*. Bolton, MA: Anker, 1995.

A. TEACHING AND INSTRUCTION

Teaching and instruction are defined as those activities associated with the design and delivery of instructional events to students. For purposes of evaluation, the instructional model will include the following: **classroom performance, materials preparation and relevancy, and record keeping and instructional management.**

1. Courses Taught:

	COURSE NUMBER	NEW PREPARATION*	ENROLLMENT	AVERAGE SOI
Spring				
Summer				
Fall				

* New Preparation is defined as a course taught for the first time or a course which has not been taught for a period of three years.

2. Evaluate what you have learned about your teaching effectiveness through reading your Student Opinions of Instruction (SOI).

3. Briefly cite any innovative or experimental teaching approaches used and the associated results. Modifications 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.

4. Guided independent study, internships, or other teaching responsibilities:

Name of Student

Description of Activity

5. Awards or special recognitions earned in this area.

Please be prepared to include materials supporting your report if requested. Newly developed course materials should be included in departmental files.

GOALS

Planning is an important part of the evaluation process. When completing this section include specific goals and objectives, remembering that goals should be broad and flexible and recognizing that they may be subject to change. Relate your goals to past Faculty Activity Reports; Department Head Evaluations; Departmental, College, and University Goals; and Strategic Plans. Some plans may need specific timelines or may need to be set within the context of other actions taking place within a department. These details should be included in this report.

A. Review and list your goals for last year in teaching and instruction and indicate progress made.

GOAL

ACTION

COMPLETED OR IN-
PROGRESS

B. List goals for next year.

B. PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND PRODUCTIVITY

Professional growth and productivity is defined as improving the competence of faculty members to better fulfill the role and responsibilities of their position within the institution, professional achievement or contribution to the teaching/learning process, or education profession in the faculty member’s area of expertise.

1. Publications, Performances, Exhibitions, and/or Creative Research:

Please list publications, performances, exhibitions, and/or creative research (attach a copy of each publication and use a standard bibliography form, including page reference and date. For artistic or creative activity, include appropriate citations, references, or documentation).

2. Research/Scholarship and/or Artistic Work in Progress:

3. Appearance on professional programs:

Professional Association	Nature of Contribution	Date
--------------------------	------------------------	------

4. Other research completed during the current year and not reported above.

5. Applications for university and external funding/funding received

Title	Funding Agency	Amount Requested/Received
-------	----------------	---------------------------

6. Memberships and offices held in professional associations:

Professional Association	Office Held /Member
--------------------------	---------------------

7. Meetings of professional associations attended:

Professional Association	Location	Important Sessions Attended
--------------------------	----------	-----------------------------

8. Professional Training Sessions/Workshops attended

Professional Development Activity	Date	Topics Covered
-----------------------------------	------	----------------

9. Paid consultancies, workshops, professional development activities provided.

10. Awards or special recognitions earned in this area.

**Please be prepared to include materials supporting your report if requested. Make sure that appropriate final reports for research projects have been submitted.*

GOALS

Planning is an important part of the evaluation process. When completing this section include specific goals and objective, remembering that goals should be broad and flexible and recognizing that they may be subject to change. Relate your goals to past Faculty Activity Reports; Department Head Evaluations; Departmental, College, and University Goals; and Strategic Plans. Some plans may need specific timelines or may need to be set within the context of other actions taking place within a department. These details should be included in this report.

A. Review and list your goals for last year in professional growth and productivity and indicate progress made.

GOAL	ACTION	COMPLETED OR IN-PROGRESS
------	--------	--------------------------

B. List goals for next year.

C. COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

College service is defined as service rendered by a faculty member in support of the division, department, college, or university. Community service is defined as the application of a faculty member’s recognized area of expertise, in the community, without pay. The acceptance of pay constitutes consulting and, as such, is considered under Professional Growth and Productivity. For purposes of evaluation, service to the college or community does not include any functions defined and included elsewhere.

1. Advising:

- a. Estimated Number of _____
Advisees

- Undergraduate _____

- Graduate _____

b. List any positive innovations used in advising.

2. Departmental, Division/College, University, and University-System Committees:

Committee	Nature of Service (Chair, Member)	Level (System, University, College, Department)
-----------	-----------------------------------	---

3. Advisor to Student Organizations.

4. Membership/Leadership/Participation in community organizations/activities

Community organization or activity

Role

5. Unpaid consultancies, workshops, professional development activities provided.

6. Awards or special recognitions earned in this area.

- *Please be prepared to include materials supporting your report if requested. Letters of support or appreciation, reports, information from conferences shared or utilized by your department would be appropriate support material for evidence in this area.*

GOALS

Planning is an important part of the evaluation process. When completing this section include specific goals and objectives, remembering that goals should be broad and flexible and recognizing that they may be subject to change. Relate your goals to past Faculty Activity Reports; Department Head Evaluations; Departmental, College, and University Goals; and Strategic Plans. Some plans may need specific timelines or may need to be set within the context of other actions taking place within a department. These details should be included in this report.

A. Review and list your goals for last year in college and community service and indicate progress made.

GOAL

ACTION

COMPLETED OR IN-PROGRESS

B. List goals for next year.

**Valdosta State University
Annual Faculty Evaluation
(Calendar Year _____)**

Date of Evaluation: _____

I. BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

College/Division:

Department:

Name:

Highest Degree Earned:

Year:

Appointment Year:

Appointment Rank:

Present Rank:

Year First Promotion:

Year Second Promotion:

Total Years at VSU:

Years in Present Rank:

Next Scheduled Personnel Action:

Eligibility Date:

FACULTY ANNUAL EVALUATION

After reading the faculty member's Faculty Activity Report and Action Plan, department/unit heads will complete this annual evaluation. The statement should evaluate the faculty member's performance in the areas of teaching and instruction, professional growth and productivity, and college and community service. It should also include recommendations if activity in any given area is determined to need improvement. Attention should be given in cases where a faculty member has any form of load adjustment related to their duties within the department/unit. The department/unit head should address the faculty member's planning and goals for the following year and determine if they are aligned with departmental, college, and university goals, and if they are prioritized in a manner that facilitates appropriate levels of activity that may lead to tenure and promotion. The department/unit head's assessment of the faculty member should be based on departmentally established standards of performance.

***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.*

***NEEDS IMPROVEMENT:** Performance that needs improvement is demonstrated by performance levels that are recognized as deficient in one or more criteria, but evidence suggests that satisfactory performance is possible with appropriate professional development and assistance. Achievements are not well documented or always evident.*

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

1. Teaching and Instruction

___ Satisfactory

___ Needs Improvement

___ Unsatisfactory

2. Professional Growth and Productivity

___ Satisfactory

___ Needs Improvement

___ Unsatisfactory

3. College and Community Service

___ Satisfactory ___ Needs Improvement ___ Unsatisfactory

4. Recommended Activities for Improvement

Progress toward next personnel action (List next scheduled personnel action and earliest date, or due date for that action): _____

Overall Evaluation: Satisfactory Unsatisfactory

Department/Unit Head Date Faculty Member Date

The faculty member's signature on this document does not indicate agreement with its contents but that the faculty member has read the evaluation and discussed it with the evaluator. The faculty member has the right to append a response to this evaluation.

Dean's Signature Date

VPAA Signature Date

APPENDIX F:

VSU Request for Authority to Travel

Authorization # (To be completed by Travel Office): _____

**** THIS REQUEST FOR AUTHORITY TO TRAVEL MUST BE COMPLETED AND ALL APPROVALS OBTAINED BEFORE YOU ACTUALLY TRAVEL. ****

Select: Employee Student/Non Employee Submission Date: _____

Applicant: _____ SSN: _____

Employing Dept/Unit: _____ Dept Contact: _____ Ext: _____

TRAVEL DATA

Purpose: _____

Destination: _____

Dates of Travel: (From) _____ (To) _____ Number where you can be reached while traveling: _____

Individual responsible for day-to-day operations in your absence: _____

ESTIMATED COSTS (Do not include prepaid expenses in estimated costs. If any item is prepaid, submit on Prepaid Form)

- 1. Transportation Cost: Air: _____ Personal Car: _____ Other: _____ Total \$ _____
- 2. Automobile Rental: _____ \$ _____
- 3. Registration Fees: _____ \$ _____
- 4. Hotel and Meals: Hotels: _____ Meals: _____ Total \$ _____
- 5. Other: (Taxi, Parking, Phone) _____ \$ _____

TOTAL ESTIMATED COST \$ _____
To Be Paid As Outlined Below

REIMBURSABLE COSTS

The following account numbers are to be used for reimbursement, if expenses are shared by different budget units, list each number and the amount each will pay:

(Account-Fund-Department-Program-Class-Grant)

- 1. _____ \$ _____ Limit Reimbursement Charged To This Account
 Pay Actual Expenses If Trip Cost Exceeds This Estimate
- 2. _____ \$ _____ Limit Reimbursement Charged To This Account
 Pay Actual Expenses If Trip Cost Exceeds This Estimate
- 3. _____ \$ _____ Limit Reimbursement Charged To This Account
 Pay Actual Expenses If Trip Cost Exceeds This Estimate

TOTAL REIMBURSABLE COST \$ _____
Should Equal Total Estimated Cost Unless Reimbursement Is Limited

AUTHORIZATIONS

Applicant's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Department Head : _____ Date: _____

Dean/ Director: _____ Date: _____

Vice Pres. /Cabinet Officer: _____ Date: _____

Travel Supervisor/ Business Office: _____ Date: _____

PLEASE NOTIFY THE FINANCIAL SERVICES/TRAVEL OFFICE PROMPTLY IF THIS TRIP IS NOT TAKEN BY RETURNING YOUR APPROVED COPY MARKED CANCELLED OR EMAILING travel@valdosta.edu .

Revised January 10, 2007

Appendix G: Half Time Annual Report of the Faculty Senate



FACULTY SENATE

Est. 1991

Chairperson
Ronald M. Zaccari

Vice Chairperson
Louis Levy

Executive Secretary
Christine James

Parliamentarian
Jim Muncy

MEMORANDUM

To: Ronald M. Zaccari, President

From: Christine James, Executive Secretary

Date: Thursday, June 8, 2007

Subject: 2007 Annual Report of the Faculty Senate

Each senate meeting of the academic year 2006-2007 began with opening remarks by the President, keeping the Senators updated on campus issues and projects. After his remarks, the meeting was turned over to the Executive Secretary. During each meeting, the statutory committees updated the Senate on their activities since the previous meeting.

In addition, there were several major issues considered. The following presents a summary of these activities during each meeting of the academic year.

SEPTEMBER:

The President began the meeting by updating the members of the Faculty Senate on the current status of the salary studies being undertaken on faculty and staff salary data. An external audit of Valdosta State University's financial processes was positive, and enrollment and credit hour production was up more than 4% over the previous academic year. A new Director of Plant Operations, Ray Sable, was hired and began to work with Faculty Senate committees, including the Environmental Issues Committee. Building plans for a new Student Union were finalized, with demolition and reconfiguration of Hopper residence hall to follow. The future of the University Council was addressed, and plans were made to allow a General Faculty vote on changes to the University Statutes, updating a variety of titles in the Statutes, and including the previous year's Faculty Senate language regarding items that the Faculty Senate approves and the procedures to follow if the President either signs or does not sign those items. Louis Levy discussed the new Student Success Center, and

the new advising manual and advising workshops to be held on campus. The Institutional Planning Committee revisited its charge, and began to assess its role as a potential planning unit with representation on the University Council. The Faculty Senate voted to approve a Core Commonality spreadsheet to assist advising of transfer students in the University System of Georgia schools. New signs were introduced in the Nevins Hall parking lot at the request of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate voted to approve a new Portal (Email and web usage) Policy for the University. A Sick Leave Hours Bank was being discussed at the state system level, with our campus contact, Denise Bogart. A variety of changes to the institutional contribution to Optional Retirement Plans (ORP) were announced in August, and our Faculty Senate as well as a number of other Faculty Senates around the state addressed the issue in open discussion and followed discussions of the Ad Hoc Council at the state level. Faculty Senators asked about raising the amounts available for Faculty Development awards, and were encouraged to submit proposals in Word .doc format. Louis Levy entered an initiative in the Strategic Planning Database asking for additional Faculty Development funding. Faculty Senators expressed interest in TurnItIn.com software licensing for the University, and Louis Levy entered an initiative to fund the cost through the Strategic Planning database. Faculty Senate orientations were presented by the Executive Secretary.

OCTOBER:

The President began the meeting by updating the senate on the proposed Health Sciences and Business Administration Center as well as the North Campus Master Plan. The plan includes a variety of partnership ventures between VSU, South Georgia Medical Center, and the Medical College of Georgia. A new parking deck is also planned. Louis Levy presented the work of the Academic Committee. A variety of new degrees have been proposed: the Doctorate of Public Administration degree, to be acted upon during this academic year; The full proposal for an undergraduate degree in Dance, and the final draft of the letters of intent for a Ph.D. in Social Work, a Ph.D. in Communication Disorders, and a master's degree in Communication Arts were prepared. Betty Paulk presented on the LibQual study of library service satisfaction, to be taken by a broad selection of campus members. The Faculty Senate received updates about the ORP changes including communications with the Chancellor and the American Association of University Professors. VSU and AAUP held a forum on campus to discuss the ORP changes. The Committee on Committees and the Executive Committee reviewed the constituency of the Faculty Senate, and it was noted that most other Senates in the state system do not determine their number of senators based on a ratio with the Ex Officio/Administrative members of committees; rather most state system schools determine the number of senators in relation to the total number of faculty members on campus. Because of recent hiring and adding of 40+ new faculty positions, we discussed the possibility of moving from a 4-senators-to-1-ex-officio ratio to an 1-senator-for-every-8-faculty-members ratio. No determination was made as of January 2007, but the issue may be revisited. Jay Rickman suggested that a student photo

feature be introduced in Banner, and the issue was remanded to the Technology Committee. The members of the Environmental Issues Committee worked with Jim Black, Bart Greer, Ray Sable and other members of campus leadership holding meetings and retreats to combine efforts and create a comprehensive, campus wide Environmental Policy. Michael Noll requested that an official crosswalk be created on Georgia Avenue, leading to the gravel parking lot, similar to the new crosswalks on Patterson and Brookwood. Committees of the Faculty Senate were reminded to place their contact information and By Laws on Reserve in the Odum Library to comply with requirements for open meetings. The Statutes changes were edited to include reference to our direct contact with the Executive Vice Chancellor, rather than the Chancellor. Michael Noll requested that the Student Health Center send faculty members notification whenever any student visits the Student Health Center, and the issue was remanded to the Student Services Committee to address whether or not the extensive legal and privacy issues would prohibit such notification. Members of the Faculty Senate requested that table microphones be given out during the meeting to address concerns with the acoustics in the Magnolia Room.

NOVEMBER:

The President began the meeting by reminding the Faculty Senators of the General Faculty meeting to be held to discuss the changes to the Statutes in January and the need to have a quorum at the meeting, and that if no quorum was made, then online voting procedures would need to be utilized two weeks after the General Faculty meeting and discussion. Louis Levy discussed a new film on plagiarism, produced by the Odum Library. The enrollment numbers for the Spring semester were up by approximately 5%. Several site visits for accreditation took place on the campus during the semester, and the results were excellent. NCATE recommended that all teacher certification programs within the College of Education were met at all levels. Marriage and Family Therapy had their initial accreditation with one recommendation. VSU's collaborative program with Valdosta Technical College in the area of Dental Hygiene had two recommendations and one commendation. The Committee on Committees planned next elections of Faculty Senators and at large committee members for the Spring of 2007. The Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee presented its data concerning the timing of Spring Break at University System of Georgia schools, and concluded that the great majority of schools do not assume or guarantee that their spring break will match local grade, junior high or high school spring breaks. Michael Noll presented a report detailing the arguments in favor of spring break matching local schools. The motion made by Michael Noll after presenting the report was not seconded. The Technology Committee had been asked during the previous academic year to review the possibility of e-rates for online courses; while the committee itself felt positively disposed toward e-rates, the staff members in Finance and Administration and Distance Education would need to be consulted and address the issue after reviewing e-rate policies of other University System Schools. The next legislative breakfast with local elected officials, state representatives, and members of the

AAUP was announced, and the Faculty Senate voted to give five minutes to a presentation by students on the activities of their environmental group and working towards green energy policies and projects on the VSU campus.

