



FACULTY SENATE

Est. 1991

Chairperson
Ronald M. Zaccari

Vice Chairperson
Louis Levy

Executive Secretary
Christine James

Parliamentarian
Jim Muncy

Minutes of March 22, 2007

{Members and visitors present}

The Valdosta State University Faculty Senate meeting convened at 3:30 p.m. in the Odum Library Auditorium.

R. Zaccari called the meeting to order and informed the Faculty Senate of the following:

- ◆ President Zaccari announced that a developer will be selected at the end of March for upcoming projects that include the demolition of Hopper Hall and the renovation of Georgia and Reade Halls. VSU received permission from the Board of Regents to demolish three existing buildings including the old white warehouse located on North Campus, 114 Georgia Avenue (currently occupied by Parking and Transportation) and the former Auxiliary Services building on Georgia Avenue.

R. Zaccari turned the meeting over to Christine James. Christine read the list of proxies.

2. **Approval of the minutes of the February 15, 2007 meeting of the Faculty Senate.** These may be found at: <http://www.valdosta.edu/vsu/facsen/Minutes/070215min.pdf>

The minutes were approved.

3. New business

- a. Report from the Academic Committee – Louis Levy
(See Appendix A)

At the previous Deans' Council meeting Louis Levy charged all deans to assist their respective departments in reviewing the catalog listing of assessments and general educational outcomes in preparation for the upcoming SACS visit.

Louis Levy moved for approval of action items. The report was approved.

- b. Report from the Committee on Committees – Jay Rickman

No report.

- c. Report from the Institutional Planning Committee – James LaPlant

No report.

- d. Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee – Marty Williams
Brief update on the committee’s continuing review of the **Faculty Evaluation Model**
(See Appendix B)

The committee recently met and reviewed the Faculty Evaluation Model. The committee plans to present a couple of friendly amendments at the Faculty Senate meeting in April.

- e. Report from the Faculty Grievance Committee – Stephen Lahr

No report.

- f. Report from the Senate Executive Secretary – Christine James

(1) Report from the Educational Policies Committee, on revised withdrawal policies
(See Appendix C)

Chuck Hudson, VSU Registrar and member of the Educational Policies Committee, recommended revisions to the “withdrawal from courses policy” as indicated in Appendix C of this document. These changes would not allow students to withdraw from courses to avoid sanction for academic dishonesty.

The revisions to the policy were approved as presented by the Educational Policies Committee.

(2) 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.

Christine asked that any recommended changes to the by laws be sent to her prior to the next Faculty Senate Executive Committee meeting.

(3) Information item: Please begin to schedule meetings to prepare the Yearly Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees. If you would like to review what your committee’s report looked like last year, please refer to the attachments in the Minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting from May 18, 2006:

<http://www.valdosta.edu/vsu/facsen/Minutes/060518min.pdf> Committee reports should be sent to Christine James chjames@valdosta.edu in Word .doc format before the Executive Committee meeting prior to the Faculty Senate meeting, and the Committee chair should be prepared to make a brief oral summary report for the Senate.

The order of Standing Committee reports followed last year is as follows:

- (1) Academic Scheduling and Procedures – Carol Barnett
This committee was reviewed and renewed in Spring 06, and will be reviewed again Spring 09.
- (2) Academic Honors and Scholarships - Michael Davey
This committee was reviewed and renewed in Spring 06, and will be reviewed again Spring 09.
- (3) Athletics – Jim Muncy
This committee was reviewed and renewed in Spring 06, and will be reviewed again in Spring 09. Although the committee did not produce a yearly report in 06, the Faculty Senate would like to have a short yearly report about their activities in 06-07.
- (4) Educational Policies – Peggy Moch
This committee was reviewed and renewed in Spring 06, and will be reviewed again Spring 09. Yearly report to be given in May 07.
- (5) Environmental Issues – Richard Carter
This committee was reviewed and renewed in Spring 06, and will be reviewed again Spring 09. Yearly report to be given in May 07.
- (6) Faculty Development and Research – Richard Amesbury
This committee was reviewed and renewed in Spring 06, and will be reviewed again Spring 09. Yearly report to be given in May 07.
- (7) Library Affairs – Apryl Price
This committee was reviewed and renewed in Spring 06, and will be reviewed again Spring 09. Yearly report to be given in May 07.
- (8) Minority and Diversity Issues – Clemente Hudson
This committee was reviewed and renewed in Spring 06, and will be reviewed again Spring 09. Yearly report to be given in May 07.
- (9) Student Activities – Kenny Ott
This committee was reviewed but renewed for only one year in Spring 06. During the year of 06-07, the committee reviewed its status with help from Kurt Keppler. Yearly report to be given in May 07. The current yearly report will include information and a call for a vote on the renewal or dissolution of this committee.
- (10) Student Services – Cheré Peguesse
This committee was reviewed and renewed in Spring 06, and will be reviewed again Spring 09. Yearly report to be given in May 07.
- (11) Technology – John Samaras
This committee was reviewed and renewed in Spring 06, and will be reviewed again Spring 09. Yearly report to be given in May 07.

4. Old Business

None.

5. New Business

- Cindy Tori stated that several faculty members had contacted her and expressed their disapproval about the current dates for spring break and they wanted the Scheduling Committee to be aware of this when preparing the next calendar. John Hummel stated that several faculty members had contacted him in support of the current schedule for spring break. Louis Levy noted that VSU students have spoken on this issue more than once, and that a vote was held at a Student Government Association meeting at which 20

students voted in favor of keeping spring break during the middle of the semester (March timeframe) and one student voted against same.

Jim Muncy asked if there would be an opportunity for further discussion about the spring break issue at the Faculty Senate meeting in April. Christine James stated that when a committee makes a recommendation there is an opportunity for discussion and parliamentary procedures must be followed regarding the length of time for discussion.

- Dr. Zaccari noted that the demolition of the three buildings mentioned in his opening statements has been reviewed and approved by the Georgia Department of Natural Resources Historic Preservation Division.

6. Discussion

Brad Bergstrom inquired about the Faculty Salary Model. How are years of service being accounted for if everyone within rank, regardless of how long they have been at VSU, has the same target salary?

Louis Levy noted that the external market comparison portion of the faculty salary model is based on CUPA data, which does not take years of service into account. {It is important to note that at the time of the survey only 2005 data was available from CUPA. Therefore, all data used in the study was from 2005.} The Internal Equity component does take years of service into account along with a variety of other characteristics including rank, discipline, tenure, highest degree, etc., to see if the salary is significantly lower than expected. The best predictors were rank and discipline. The result was a predicted amount – if someone fell below 85% of the predicted amount, then internal equity was allocated. The results of the first part of the analysis – the external market comparison – resulted in 49 adjustments made at the 85% level. The results of the second part of the analysis – the internal equity component – resulted in 6 adjustments.

Louis Levy noted that salary compression was also run and after external and internal adjustments were made the measures that were developed did not show problems with compression. Louis Levy indicated that Marsha Krotseng, Associate Vice President for Strategic Research and Analysis, would share the coefficients and regression equations with Brad.

It is important to note that merit has not been factored into the study at this point.

Theresa Thompson inquired, for the purpose of future promotions, if VSU would keep the equity up so people will stay above the 85% level. Louis Levy responded that reports will be run annually and hopefully the percentage will be increased each year as funds are available.

Dr. Zaccari stressed the fact that merit is not currently factored in to the study. In three years, when the \$1.8 million in adjustments have been fulfilled, then merit will be considered as a possible addition to the study. It is important to note that VSU's salary model was approved by the Board of Regents because of sound methodology.

Christine James noted that VSU's salary model is similar to the Delaware Study which compares faculty within the same rank.

Stephen Lahr noted that, even though merit is not currently included, everyone will benefit significantly at the end of three years when there is a strong possibility that merit will be included in the study.

Christine James noted that merit pay has been approved for state employees.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

APPENDIX A:

VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC COMMITTEE MINUTES
November 13, 2006

The Academic Committee of the Valdosta State University Faculty Senate met in the University Center Rose Room on Monday, November 13, 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. Deborah Weaver, Mr. Alan Bernstein (proxy for Mr. Cliff Landis), and Dr. Diane Holliman.

Members Absent: Mr. Cliff Landis.

Visitors Present: Dr. Philip Gunter, Dr. Fred Downing, Dr. Robert Gannon, Dr. Paul Riggs, Dr. Ralph Allen, Dr. Mike Meacham, Mrs. Teresa Williams, Dr. Don Leech, Dr. Donna Gosnell, Ms. Sarah McAllister, and Mr. Lee Bradley.

The Minutes of the September 11, 2006, Academic Committee meeting were approved with the spelling of Dr. Elson name corrected and the it's changed to its in item C-2. (pages 1-2)

A. College of Education

1. Revised degree requirements for the EDS in Educational Leadership: L-6 Option was approved effective Fall Semester 2006. (pages 150-151).

B. Division of Social Work

1. Letter of intent for the Ph.D. in Social Work was noted – Dr. Gravett is to check on the response to question 2 under the Institutional Mission section. (pages 3-14).
2. Revised degree requirements for the MSW was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 15-16).
3. New course, Social Work (SOWK) 7890, “Spirituality in Social Work”, (SPIRITUALITY IN SOWK PRACTICE – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with course description changed to read A framework of... . (pages 17-28).

C. College of Business

1. Revised mission, objectives, and admission requirements for the BBA degree was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 29-32).
2. Revised senior curriculum for the BBA in Accounting was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 33-34).

3. New course, Economics (ECON) 3850, “Sustainability: An Economic Perspective”, (SUSTAINABILITY: ECON PERSP – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007 with both of the “the” taken out of the first sentence of the course description . (pages 35-39).
4. Revised objectives for the MBA degree was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 40-43).

D. College of Arts and Sciences

1. Revised special admission requirements for the MS in Marriage and Family Therapy was approved effective Spring Semester 2007. (pages 44-45).
2. New course, Biology (BIOL) 7010, “Special Topics in Ecology and Evolution”, (SPECIAL TOPICS – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2007 with the course description changed to read ...reading. The specific topic... . (pages 46-49).
3. New track for the BS in Chemistry – track Biochemistry Option was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 50-55).
4. New course, History (HIST) 4226, “Southeastern Colonial Experience”, (SOUTHEASTERN COLONIAL EXPER – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 56-61).
5. New course, History (HIST) 6226, “Southeastern Colonial Experience”, (SOUTHEASTERN COLONIAL EXPER – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 62-67).
6. New course, History (HIST) 4243, “Native People in the American Southeast”, (NATIVE PEOPLE IN THE AMER SE – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 68-73).
7. New course, History (HIST) 6243, “Native People in the American Southeast”, (NATIVE PEOPLE IN THE AMER SE – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 74-79).
8. Revised senior college curriculum for the BA in History was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 80-81).

E. College of Nursing

1. Revised special admission requirements for the MSN in Nursing was approved effective Fall Semester 2006. (pages 82-83).
2. Reactivation of the Nurse Practitioner track for the MSN in Nursing was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 84-90).
3. Reactivation, Nursing (NURS) 7594, “Synthesis Seminar”, (SYNTHESIS SEMINAR – 2 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 6 lab hours, and 6 contact hours), was approved effective Fall

Semester 2007. (pages 91-92).

4. Revised course description, Nursing (NURS) 7230, “Pharmacotherapeutics”, (PHARMACOTHERAPUETICS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 93-94).
5. Reactivation, Nursing (NURS) 7291, “Advanced Nursing: Health Promotion of Adults Clinical Laboratory - NP”, (ADV NUR HLTH AD CL LAB NP – 3 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 9 lab hours, and 9 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (page 95).
6. Reactivation, Nursing (NURS) 7292, “Advanced Nursing: Health Restoration of Adults Clinical Laboratory - NP”, (ADV NUR-HLTH REST AD CL LAB-NP – 3 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 9 lab hours, and 9 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (page 96).
7. Reactivation, Nursing (NURS) 7391, “Nurse Practitioner: Diagnostic and Therapeutic”, (NUR PRACT-DIAGNSTC/THRPUTC PAR – 4 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 6 lab hours, and 8 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 97-98).
8. Reactivation, Nursing (NURS) 7492, “Nurse Practitioner: Therapeutic Interventions and Role Implementation”, (NUR PRACTNR-THR INTRV/ROLE IMP – 6 credit hours, 1 lecture hour, 15 lab hours, and 16 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 99-100).
9. Reactivation, Nursing (NURS) 7590, “Nurse Practitioner Practicum”, (NURSE PRACTITIONER PRACTICUM – 6 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 18 lab hours, and 18 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 101-102).

F. College of the Arts

1. Revised credit hours, Dance (DANC) 2600, “Ballet II”, (BALLET II – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2008. (pages 103-104).
2. Revised credit hours, Dance (DANC) 2700, “Modern Dance II”, (MODERN DANCE II – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2008. (pages 105-106).
3. Revised credit hours, Dance (DANC) 3000, “Dance Composition”, (DANCE COMPOSITION – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2008. (pages 107-108).
4. Revised credit hours, Dance (DANC) 3100, “Choreography”, (CHOREOGRAPHY – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2009. (pages 109-110).
5. Revised credit hours, Dance (DANC) 3200, “Dance Ensemble”, (DANCE ENSEMBLE – 2 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 4 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2009. (pages 111-112).

6. New course, Dance (DANC) 3420, "Music Analysis for Dancers", (DANCE MUSIC ANALYSIS – 2 credit hours, 1 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 6 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 113-115).
7. Revised credit hours, Dance (DANC) 3600, "Ballet III", (BALLET III – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2009. (pages 116-117).
8. Revised credit hours, Dance (DANC) 3700, "Modern Dance III", (MODERN DANCE III – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2009. (pages 118-119).
9. New course, Dance (DANC) 4010, "Dance Kinesiology", (DANCE KINESIOLOGY – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Spring Semester 2008. (pages 120-122).
10. New course, Dance (DANC) 4020, "Conditioning and Wellness for Dance", (DANCE CONDITIONING WELLNESS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2008. (pages 123-125).
11. New course, Dance (DANC) 4600, "Ballet IV", (BALLET IV – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 126-128).
12. New course, Dance (DANC) 4700, "Modern Dance IV", (MODERN DANCE IV – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2008. (pages 129-131).
13. New course, Dance (DANC) 4800, "Jazz Dance III", (JAZZ DANCE III – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 132-134).
14. New Area F for the BFA in Dance was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 135-137). Pending BOR approval of the BFA in Dance.
15. New senior curriculum for the BFA in Dance was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 138-140). Pending BOR approval of the BFA in Dance.
16. Proposal for the MA in Communication was approved. (pages 141-149). Pending BOR approval.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles L. Hudson
Registrar

**APPENDIX B: Faculty Evaluation Model reviewed by the Faculty Affairs Committee,
Marty Williams, Chair**

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"/>				
2. Course policies (for example, attendance, late papers) were clearly explained in the syllabus or other handouts.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
3. The instructor was well prepared for class.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
4. The instructor made effective use of class time to cover course content.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
5. Course assignments were returned in a timely manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
6. The instructor explained grading criteria (for example, grammar, content) clearly.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
7. The instructor was willing to discuss course-related issues either in person or by email / telephone.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
8. The instructor responded to student questions on course material in a professional manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
9. This course increased my knowledge of the topic.	<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"/>				

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.

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

2006-2007 UNDERGRADUATE CATALOG

WITHDRAWAL FROM COURSES POLICY – p. 77-78

Students may withdraw from courses following the drop/add period until mid-term by completing the withdrawal process on BANNER. A withdrawal before mid-term is non-punitive, and a grade of “W” is assigned. However, a student may not exercise this right to withdraw to avoid sanction for academic dishonesty. Instructors may assign a “W” on the proof roll for students not attending class. However, It is the responsibility of the student to complete the withdrawal process. A withdrawal is official when it is received and processed by the Office of the Registrar.

Students will not be allowed to withdraw after the mid-term point of the semester as published in the school calendar as required by Board of Regents’ policy; however, students may petition an exception to the Board of Regents’ withdrawal deadline for cases of hardship by completing a petition for withdrawal form available in the Office of the Registrar. The petition will become a permanent part of the student’s file. If the petition is approved, the instructor may assign a grade of “W” or “WF” after mid-term. Note that “WF” is calculated in the grade point average the same as “F.” Any student who discontinues class attendance after mid-term and does not officially withdraw may be assigned a grade of “F.”

No fee adjustment will be made for withdrawals except as outlined in the Tuition, Fees, and Costs Section of this *Catalog*. The Business and Finance Office will receive a copy of the withdrawal form for refunding if applicable. Students receiving financial aid should be aware that withdrawal from courses may affect continued financial aid eligibility. Refer to the section on Financial Aid Academic Requirements for additional information.

2006-2007 GRADUATE CATALOG

WITHDRAWAL FROM COURSES POLICY – p. 15

Students may withdraw from courses following the drop/add period until mid-term by completing the withdrawal process on BANNER. A withdrawal before mid-term is non-punitive, and a grade of “W” is assigned. However, a student may not exercise this right to withdraw to avoid sanction for academic dishonesty. Instructors may assign a “W” on the proof roll for students not attending class. However, It is the responsibility of the student to complete the withdrawal process. A withdrawal is official when it is received and processed by the Office of the Registrar.

Board of Regents policy does not allow students to withdraw after the midterm date published in the school calendar. Students may petition for an exception to the withdrawal deadline for cases of hardship. Petition forms are available in the Office of the Registrar. The petition will become a permanent part of the student’s file. Any student who discontinues class attendance after mid-term and does not officially withdraw may be assigned a grade of “F.” No fee adjustment will be made for withdrawals except as outlined in this catalog. The Finance and Administration Office will receive a copy of the withdrawal form for refunding if applicable.

Members and Visitors present:

R.M. Zaccari, President
L. Levy, Vice President, Academic Affairs
C. James, Executive Secretary
J. Muncy, Parliamentarian

*Indicates the individual assigned a proxy

Ex-Officio Senators:

B. Adler	R. Allen
N. Argyle	J. Black
L. Calendrillo (absent)	J. Gaston
G. Gaumond	M. Giddings
P. Gunter	A. Hufft (absent)
K. Keppler	S. Sikes

College of the Arts:

J. Bowland	R. Haptonstall
*L. Indergaard	S. Lahr
P. McGuire	K. Murray (absent)
E. Nielsen	M. Schmidt

College Of Arts and Sciences:

*R. Amesbury	*A. Aronson-Friedman
B. Blake	R. Carter
C. James	A. Kumar
B. Mboup	*P. Moch
*J. Rickman	J. Samaras
*J. Wang	J. Whitehead

C. Barnbaum	B. Bergstrom
M. Davey	D. Hill (absent)
J. LaPlant	*A. Lazari
M. Noll (absent)	C. Peguesse
T. Thompson	C. Tillman
M. Williams	

College Of Business Administration:

*B. Caster	J. Muncy
B. Williams	

C. Tori	F. Ware
---------	---------

College of Education:

S. Andrews	C. Barnett
B. Browne	R. Fulton
L. Leader	D. Leech
K. Ott	S. Sanderson

H. Brasell	D. Briihl
*C. Hudson	J. Hummel
Y. Mat Som	L. Minor
*N. Scheetz	R. Schmertzling

College Of Nursing

S. Lauterbach	J. Temple
---------------	-----------

Division Of Social Work:

M. Meacham	*C. Tandy
------------	-----------

Odum Library:

A. Bernstein	A. Price
--------------	----------

Proxies:

Bob Williams for Bruce Caster
Lynn Minor for Peggy Moch
James LaPlant for Jay Rickman
Theresa Thompson for Richard Amesbury
Ashok Kumar for Jin Wang
Eric Nielsen for Lyle Indergaard
John Samaras for Andreas Lazari
Mike Meacham for Cindy Tandy
Jane Whitehead for Amy Aronson-Friedman
Yahya Mat Som for Clemente Hudson
Carol Barnett for Nanci Scheetz

Student Government Association (non-voting)

President of the SGA: Jeremy Baker (absent)

Visitors:

Chuck Hudson, Registrar

Honey Coppage, Academic Affairs

Lisa Copeland, Academic Affairs

Sheri Gravett, Academic Affairs

Marsha Krotseng, Strategic Research and Analysis

Walter Peacock, Admissions and Enrollment Management

Thressea Boyd, Office of the President