



FACULTY SENATE

Est. 1991

Chairperson
Ronald M. Zaccari

Vice Chairperson
Louis Levy

Executive Secretary
Christine James

Parliamentarian
Jim Muncy

Minutes of April 19, 2007

{Members and visitors present}

The Valdosta State University Faculty Senate meeting convened at 3:30 p.m. in the Magnolia Room, University Center.

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

- ◆ President Zaccari updated the Senate on VSU's emergency notification plan. The University System of Georgia appointed a task force several months ago to review each USG institution's plan. Dr. Zaccari encouraged everyone to review the Valdosta State University Emergency Quick Reference Guide that Mr. Bob DeLong, Director of Environmental and Occupational Safety, and the staff of Environmental and Occupational Safety developed. The guide instructs everyone on the proper procedures for handling a crisis situation. Administrators, faculty and staff received a copy of this document during December, 2006. New VSU employees also receive a copy of the document at their orientation session. The document is also available at <http://www.valdosta.edu/finadmin/safety/EmergencyQuickReferenceGuide.shtml>. The number of emergency phones on campus has been increased to 35. There is more patrol on campus and new additional lighting has been installed on campus. Connect-ED, a campus alert system, was purchased in December 2006 and the software has been pilot-tested during the last several months. Connect-ED allows individuals who have entered their telephone or cell phone number into the system to be notified immediately of an emergency. Dr. Zaccari encouraged everyone to enter their information into the system. The link where individuals can enter their information into the VSU Campus Alert System is www.valdosta.edu/editalertinfo.

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

2. Approval of the minutes of the March 22, 2007 meeting of the Faculty Senate <http://www.valdosta.edu/vsu/facsen/Minutes/070322min.pdf>

The minutes were approved.

3. New business

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

Dr. Levy informed the Senate that Dr. Sheri Gravett is chairing the VSU General Education Program review. Additionally, Dr. Dorothy Leland is the chair of a USG committee that is reviewing the framework of the core curriculum. Neither the General Education Program nor the core curriculum has been reviewed since semester conversion. The reports and strategies from these two committees will be discussed at the VSU General Faculty meeting during Fall, 2007.

Dr. Levy moved for approval of the minutes with one noted change – Julia Reffel was present at the Academic Committee meeting. The motion was approved.

b. Report from the Committee on Committees – Jay Rickman

Jay Rickman stated that all colleges but one has held initial senate elections for the term August 1, 2007 through July 31, 2010. The Committee on Committees sent out the committee request form via the VSU faculty listserv and request that the forms are returned to Jay Rickman by April 20, 2007.

c. Report from the Institutional Planning Committee – James LaPlant

James LaPlant stated the Institutional Planning Committee recently met on March 23rd. The IPC is appreciative that the Chair of the IPC is a representative on the University Council. Dr. LaPlant also expressed his appreciation to Michael Noll for updating the IPC website. The IPC provided feedback on a draft of the Environmental Policy which was circulated to the University Council.

c. Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee – Marty Williams

Final vote on the Faculty Evaluation Model with Friendly Amendments, see Appendix B; the Faculty Evaluation Model without the amendments appears immediately after for comparison; the main changes are removal of “Needs Improvement” evaluation categories. Approximately four committee comments in the right margin had to be removed for inclusion of this new draft in the Faculty Senate Agenda, to see those comments, you can download the document from <http://teach.valdosta.edu/chjames/DraftFacultyEvaluationModelamended4-07.doc>

Marty Williams, on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee, presented friendly amendments to the Faculty Evaluation Model for Senate approval. A motion was made to accept the friendly amendments. The motion was approved. Dr. Levy indicated the Faculty Evaluation Model will be posted on the Academic Affairs website. This model goes into effect during the 2007-2008 academic year.

d. Report from the Faculty Grievance Committee – Stephen Lahr

No report.

e. Report from the Senate Executive Secretary – Christine James

(1) The 2008-2009 Academic Schedule prepared by the Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee of the Faculty Senate, Carol Barnett, Chair. The Proposed Schedule and accompanying email is Appendix C.

Dr. Carol Barnett provided some background information regarding the proposed 2008-2009 Academic Schedule. The committee voluntarily surveyed faculty and students during Fall semester, 2006. The results of the survey, along with additional information regarding other USG institutions spring breaks, was presented to the Faculty Senate in November, 2006 and are included in the appendices of these minutes. Also, Dr. Barnett noted that the VSU Student Government Association voted 20 to 1 in favor of keeping Spring Break in the middle of the semester.

As the committee deliberated about the 2008-2009 calendar, they invited several constituencies to address their February meeting. These constituencies included representatives from the Lowndes County and Valdosta City School systems and Michael Noll of VSU. After carefully considering the information gathered, the committee unanimously approved the proposal that is included in these minutes as Appendix C.

Dr. John Hummel called the question. Fifty-four senators voted to proceed with voting on the calendar without any discussion and 12 senators voted no, indicating they preferred to discuss the calendar before voting on it. A motion to pass the calendar as a whole was made and 56 senators voted to approve the calendar as presented by the committee and 10 senators voted against the calendar. The calendar was approved as presented by the Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee.

(2) Information Items: Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee Report (including information from the survey and from other state system schools) From the November 2006 Faculty Senate meeting and discussion, and Michael Noll's report (Appendix D)

(3) Item to be voted on from the Environmental Issues Committee and the University Council: The comprehensive Environmental Policy. (See Appendix E. Also included are two sets of Suggestions/Comments as received on Friday, April 13, 2007: Comments from University Council Members, Comments from COSA Members.)

Vice President Jim Black stated that members of the Environmental Issues Committee and others recently met to review Section 1 of the Environmental Policy. He noted that Section 2 is not eligible for change. A meeting to review Section 3 was also scheduled; however, a quorum was not present so another meeting to review Section 3 had been scheduled for April 20th. The EIC will send its recommendations to the Faculty Senate, the Council on Staff Affairs, and the Student Government Association. A final review of the proposed policy will be presented to the University Council in May. Mr. Black thanked Dr. Richard Carter, Chair of the Environmental Issues Committee, as well as the Student Government Association, members of S.A.V.E., Mr. Ray Sable, Director of Physical Plant and Facilities Planning, and the staff of Physical Plant and Facilities Planning for their assistance.

Mr. Black informed the Senate that Dr. Richard Carter would present the Environmental Policy to the Senate for a vote at a later date.

(4) Minors awarded after degree awarded; issue to be remanded to the Educational Policies Committee (Appendix F)

(5) Information item regarding ORP legislation (Appendix G)

(6) Nominating Committee, Election of Faculty Senate Executive Secretary. Christine James is eligible for re-election to a second year.

The meeting was turned over to Dr. Louis Levy. Dr. Levy stated that one candidate had been recommended for the position of Faculty Senate Executive Secretary for the upcoming academic year – Dr. Christine James. The floor was opened for nominations. Since no nominations were recommended from the floor John Samaras recommended the nominations close and Dr. James be accepted by acclamation. The motion was seconded by Dr. Williams. The motion was approved. Dr. Christine James will serve as the Faculty Senate Executive Secretary during the 2008 academic year. Dr. Christine James expressed her thanks to the Faculty Senate.

4. Old Business

None.

5. Discussion

Dr. Cindy Tori asked if there are working video cameras outside of the buildings on campus. Vice President Jim Black confirmed that a new video system had recently been installed.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:24.

APPENDIX A:

VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC COMMITTEE MINUTES
February 5, 2007

The Academic Committee of the Valdosta State University Faculty Senate met in the University Center Cypress Room on Monday, February 5, 2007. 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 for Dr. Deborah Weaver), Mr. Alan Bernstein (proxy for Mr. Cliff Landis), and Dr. Diane Holliman.

Members Absent: Dr. Deborah Weaver, and Mr. Cliff Landis.

Visitors Present: Dr. L. Wayne Plumly, Jr., Dr. Mike Griffin, Dr. Barbara K. Stanley, Dr. Philip Gunter, Dr. James Shrader, Dr. Carl Cates, Dr. Mylan Redfern, Dr. Edward E. Chatelain, Dr. James T. LaPlant, Dr. Jeffrey Vasseur, Mrs. Teresa Williams, Dr. Julia Reffel, Dr. Reynaldo L. Martinez, Jr., Dr. Marty Giddings, Mr. Patrick McElwain and Mr. Lee Bradley.

The Minutes of the November 13, 2006, Academic Committee meeting were approved with the spelling of dance corrected in item F-2. (pages 1-3)

A. College of Business

1. Revised course description, Accounting (ACCT) 4850, "Accounting Internship", (ACCOUNTING INTERNSHIP – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 4-5).
2. Revised course description, Accounting (FIN) 4980, "Finance Internship", (FINANCE INTERNSHIP – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the course prefix corrected to read FIN, the description changed to read ... academic finance skills... . (pages 6-7).
3. New course, Business Administration (BUSA) 3100, "Introduction to Fraud Examination", (INTRO TO FRAUD EXAMINATION – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with description changed to read ...2102. An introduction... . (pages 8-11).
4. New course, Marketing (MKTG) 3100, "Health Care Marketing", (HEALTH CARE MARKETING – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the description changed to read ... health care markets. (pages 12-18).

B. Division of Social Work

1. Revised Admission requirements for the MSW in Social Work was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 19-20). Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval.

2. Revised degree requirements for the MSW was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 21-22).
3. New course, Social Work (SOWK) 6303, "Practice Skills Lab", (SOWK PRACTICE SKILLS LAB – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with course description changed to read ...Laboratory for practice... . (pages 23-31).
4. Revised course title, credit hours, and description, Social Work (SOWK) 6004, "Social Work Practice with Groups", (SOWK GROUPS – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 32-46).
5. Revised course title, credit hours, and description, Social Work (SOWK) 6100, "Introduction to Professional Social Work Education", (SOWK INTRO TO PROFESSION – 1 credit hour, 1 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 1 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 47-54).
6. Revised credit hours, Social Work (SOWK) 6700, "Practicum II", (PRACTICUM II – 3 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 6 lab hours, and 6 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 55-56).

C. College of Arts and Sciences

1. New course, History (HIST) 5202, "Hellenistic Greece and Rome", (HELLENISTIC GREECE AND ROME – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 57-60).
2. Revised Special Retention Policy for the MS in Sociology was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 61-62).
3. New course, Astronomy (ASTR) 3400, "Planetary Geology", (PLANETARY GEOLOGY – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the description changed to read ...surface, planetary interiors,... . (pages 63-71).
4. New course, Astronomy (ASTR) 5400, "Planetary Geology", (PLANETARY GEOLOGY – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the description changed to read ...surface, planetary interiors,... . (pages 72-80). Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval.
5. New course, Astronomy (ASTR) 3800, "Astrobiology", (ASTROBIOLOGY – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 81-85).
6. New course, Geography (GEOG) 1120, "Introductory Oceanography", (INTRODUCTORY OCEANOGRAPHY – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 86-91).
7. Revised Core Area D – to include GEOG 1120 was approved effective Fall Semester 2007.

(pages 92-93). Pending BOR approval.

8. Revised course description, Geography (GEOG) 3050, “Computer Cartography and Image Analysis”, (COMP CART & IMAGE ANALYSIS – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 94-95).
9. Revised course title, credit hours, and description, Geography (GEOG) 2010, “Tools of Environmental Geoscience”, (TOOLS OF ENVIRONMENTAL GEOSCI – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the description changed to read ...introduction used in geoscience research. This course... . (pages 96-97).
10. New course, Geology (GEOL) 2010, “Tools of Environmental Geoscience”, (TOOLS OF ENVIRONMENTAL GEOSCI – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the description changed to read ...introduction used in geoscience research. This course... . (pages 98-102).
11. Revised Core Area F for the BS in Environmental Geosciences was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 103-104).
12. Revised course title, credit hours, and description, Geography/Geology (GEOG/GEOL) 3020, “Global Climate Change”, (GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the last sentence of the course description deleted.. (pages 105-106).
13. Revised course title, Geography/Geology (GEOG/GEOL) 3300, “Process Geomorphology”, (PROCESS GEOMOPHOLOGY – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 5 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 107-108).
14. Revised credit hours, Physic (PHYS) 4501, “Capstone Seminar I”, (CAPSTONE SEMINAR I – 1 credit hours, 1 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 1 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 109-110). Deactivation of PHYS 4502.
15. Revised senior college curriculum for the BS in Physics was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 111-112).
16. Revised minors in Geology and Environmental Geosciences was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 114-115).
17. Revised course title, and description, English/Creative Writing and Contemporary Literature (ENGL/CWCL) 4410, “Contemporary Poetics: Form and Theory”, (POETICS: FORM AND THEORY – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 116-117). Deactivation of CRWR 4410.
18. Revised course title, and description, English/Creative Writing and Contemporary Literature (ENGL/CWCL) 4420, “Contemporary Narrative: Form and Theory”, (NARRATIVE: FORM AND THEORY – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 118-119). Deactivation of CRWR 4420.
19. New course, English (ENGL) 4640/6000, “Studies in Composition Theory”,

(COMPOSITION THEORY - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 120-127).

20. New course, Creative Writing and Contemporary Literature/English (CWCL/ENGL) 4430/6000, “Contemporary Creative Non-Fiction: Form and Theory”, (CR NONFICTION, FORM & THEORY – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 128-130).
21. Revised Creative Writing track for the BA in English – to the Creative Writing and Contemporary Literature Track – and change all courses with the prefix of CRWR to the prefix of CWCL (3400, 3420, 3440, 3460, 4410, 4420, 4440, and 4460) and deactivate the CRWR courses - eliminate all cross listed components of CRWR effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 131-134).
22. Revised minor in Creative Writing and Contemporary Literature was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 135-138a).
23. Program/minor name change from Women’s Studies Program to Women’s and Gender Studies was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 138b-141).
24. Revised requirements for the minor in Women’s and Gender Studies Program – and revised prefix for all WMST courses to WGST 2010, 2020, 3000, 3010, 3020, 3030, 3330, 3600, 4220, 4261, 4262, 4270, 4280, 4400, 4500, and 4600 was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 142-143).
25. New course, Computer Science (CS) 3340, “Web Programming”, (WEB PROGRAMMING – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the description changed to read – Examination and implementation of foundations... . (pages 144-147). Deactivation of CS 3320.
26. New course, Computer Science (CS) 3700, “Introduction to E-Commerce”, (INTRODUCTION TO E-COMMERCE – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 148-150).
27. New course, Computer Science (CS) 4700, “E-Commerce Design”, (E-COMMERCE DESIGN – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 151-153).
28. New course, Mathematics (MATH) 2008, “Foundations of Numbers & Operations”, (NUMBERS & OPERATIONS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the description changed to read ...113. Introductory... . (pages 154-161).

D. College of the Arts

1. Revised senior college curriculum for the BFA in Art Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 162-163).
2. Revised Core Area F, and senior college curriculum for the BM in Music Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 164-165).

3. Revised admission requirements for the MMED in Music Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 166-167).
4. Revised course description, Music (MUSC) 3430/5430, “History of Jazz”, (HISTORY OF JAZZ – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the description changed to read ...day. Emphasizes the evaluation ... and deleted the last sentence. (pages 168-169). Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval.
5. New course, Communication Arts (COMM) 3550, “Managing Diversity”, (MANAGING DIVERSITY – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 170-172).
6. New course, Communication Arts (COMM) 4430, “Ethics in Human Communication”, (ETHICS IN HUMAN COMMUNICATION – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 173-175).
7. New course, Communication Arts (COMM) 4440, “Intercultural Training”, (INTERCULTURAL TRAINING – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the description changed to read ...4420. Theoretical... . (pages 176-178).
8. Revised International Documentary Production Emphasis for the BFA in Mass Media was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 179-180).
9. Revised Core Area F for the BFA in Speech Communication was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 181-182).
10. Revised General Speech Communication Emphasis for the BFA in Speech Communication was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 183-184).
11. Revised/renaming of the Organizational Communication Emphasis to the Intercultural Organizational Communication Emphasis, and the deactivation of the Intercultural Communication Emphasis for the BFA in Speech Communication was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 185-186).
12. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 3200, “Contemporary Public Relations”, (CONTEMPORARY PUBLIC RELATIONS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 187-188).
13. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 3210, “Electronic Public Relations Applications”, (ELECTRONIC PR APPLICATIONS – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 189-190).
14. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 3220, “Public Relations Writing”, (PUBLIC RELATIONS WRITING – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 191-192).

15. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 3400, “Organizational Communication”, (ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 193-194).
16. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 3410, “Conflict Management and Leadership”, (CONFLICT MANGMNT/LDERSHIP – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 195-196).
17. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 4220, “Integrated Communication”, (INTEGRATED COMMUNICATION – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 197-198).
18. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 4340, “Advanced Interpersonal Communication”, (ADV INTERPERSONAL COMMUNICATIO – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 199-200).
19. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 4400, “Organizational Presentation”, (ORGANIZATIONAL PRESENTATION – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the description changed to read ...study of advanced preparation... . (pages 201-202).
20. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 4420, “Advanced Organizational Communication”, (ADV ORGANIZATIONAL COMM – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the spelling corrected of “forma” to “formal”, and changed to read ...settings are included. . (pages 203-204).
21. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 3230, “Public Relations Practicum”, (PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTICUM – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with Public Relations capitalized in the description, and changed to read ...May be repeated once. . (pages 205-206).
22. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 3240, “Public Relations Document Layout and Design”, (PR DOCUMENT LAYOUT AND DESIGN – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 207-208).
23. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 4200, “Public Relations Techniques”, (PUBLIC RELATIONS TECHNIQUES – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 209-210).
24. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 4230, “Public Relations Plans and Campaigns”, (PR PLAN S AND CAMPAIGNS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 211-212).

25. Revised course description, Communication Arts (COMM) 4240, “Advanced Public Relations Practices”, (ADV PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTICES – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 213-214).
26. Revised course title, Communication Arts (COMM) 4120, “Theories of Public Communication”, (THEORIES OF PUBLIC COMM – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 215-216).
27. Deactivation of COMM 2550, 4500, 4610, and 4700 was noted effective Fall Semester 2007. (page 217).
28. New course, Theatre Arts (THEA) 3200, “Audition Techniques”, (AUDITION TECHNIQUES – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with “Department Head” changed to “Instructor” in the description. (pages 218-220).
29. Revised Performance Track for the BFA in Theatre Arts was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 221-222).
30. Revised course description, Theatre Arts (THEA) 3720, “Theatre Production”, (THEATRE PRODUCTION – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 223-224).
31. Revised course description, Theatre Arts (THEA) 3760, “Lighting Design, (LIGHTING DESIGN – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with “Department Head” changed to “Instructor” in the description. (pages 225-226).
32. Revised course description, Theatre Arts (THEA) 3780, “Scene Design”, (SCENE DESIGN – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 227-228).
33. Revised requirements for the minor in Dance was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 229-230).
34. Deactivation of the Dance emphasis for the BFA in Theatre Arts was noted effective Fall Semester 2007. (page 231).
35. Core Area F and senior college curriculum requirements for the BFA in Dance were approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (page 232).

E. College of Education

1. New course, Education (EDUC) 2110, “Investigating/Critical and Contemporary Issues in Education”, (ISSUES IN EDUCATION – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 1 lab hour, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 was approved with “This course engages students in” deleted from the beginning of the description. (pages 233-243).
2. New course, Education (EDUC) 2120, “Exploring Socio-Cultural Perspectives on Diversity”,

(EXP SOC-CULT PERSP DIV – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 1 lab hour, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 was approved with the description changed to read ...The fundamental knowledge..., and the numbers removed the description. (pages 244-256).

3. New course, Education (EDUC) 2130, “Exploring Learning and Teaching”, (EXPLORING LEARNING AND TEACHING – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 1 lab hour, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 was approved with the description changed to read ...Key aspects of learning and teaching through examination of own... . (pages 257-267).
4. Revised course number, Special Education (SPEC) 3000, “Serving Students with Diverse Needs”, (SERVING STUDENTS DIVERSE NEEDS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 268-269). Deactivation of SPEC 2000.
5. Revised Core Area F for the BSED in Health and Physical Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 270-271).
6. Revised senior college curriculum for the BSED in Health and Physical Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 272-273).
7. Revised Core Area F for the BSED in Early Childhood Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 274-275).
8. Revised senior college curriculum for the BSED in Early Childhood Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 276-277).
9. Revised prerequisite, Early Childhood Education (ECED) 3000, “Integrating and Applying Technology into the ECE Curriculum”, (INTEGRATING TECH INFO ECE CURR – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 278-279).
10. Revised course description, Reading Education (READ) 7110, “Research and Theory in Reading”, (RESEARCH & THEORY IN READING – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 280-281).
11. Revised Core Area F, and the senior college curriculum for the BSED in Middle Grades Education were approved effective all Semester 2007. (pages 282-283).
12. Revised course description, credit hours, and prerequisite, Middle Grades Education (MGED) 3990, “Development and Education of the Middle Grades Students Part I”, (DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION I – 4 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 5 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 284-285).
13. Revised credit hours, and prerequisite, Middle Grades Education (MGED) 3991, “Differentiated Classroom for Middle Grades”, (DIFFERENTIATED CLASSROOM MGE – 4 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 5 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 286-287).

14. Revised credit hours, Middle Grades Education (MGED)4620, “Apprenticeship in Middle Grades Education”, (APPRENTICESHIP MID GRDS TCHNG - 2 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 4 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 288-289).
15. Revised curriculum for the MED in Middle Grades Education or Secondary Education Alternative Certification track was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 290-291).
16. Revised course description, Adult and Career Education (ACED) 2400, “Computer Technology for the Workplace”, (COMPUTER TECHNOLGY WORKPLACE- 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 292-300).
17. Request to revise Core Area D to include ACED 2400 was NOT approved. (pages 301-310).
Vote 8-No, 3-Yes
18. Revised Core Area F, and senior college curriculum for the BSED in Business Education were approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 311-312).
19. Revised Core Area F for the BSED in Technical, Trade and Industrial Education – Secondary Option was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 313-314).
20. Revised senior college curriculum for the BSED in Technical, Trade and Industrial Education – Secondary Option was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 315-316).
21. Revised Core Area F for the BSED in Technical, Trade and Industrial Education – Post-Secondary Option was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 317-318).
22. Revised senior college curriculum for the BS in Administrative Services was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 319-320).
23. Revised course title, description, Adult and Career Education (ACED) 3650, “Ethics and Liability in Adult and Career Education”, (ETHICS AND LIABILITY IN ACED - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 321-322).
24. Revised course description, Adult and Career Education (ACED) 4070, “Office Applications”, (OFFICE APPLICATIONS- 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 323-324).
25. Revised course title, description, Adult and Career Education (ACED) 4560, “Safety and Health in the Career Education Classroom”, (SAFETY AND HEALTH IN CAREER ED- 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 325-326).
26. New course COMD 5999 (pages 327-332). WITHDRAWN
27. New course, Interpreting (INTP) 3150, “English – ASL Translation”, (ENG/ASL TRANSLATION - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 333-339).

28. New course, Special Education (SPEC) 3100, "Serving Individuals with Diverse Needs", (SERV IND DIV NEEDS - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 1 lab hour, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2007 with the description changed to read ...Observation and participation..., and "is" in the last sentence changed to "are". (pages 340-350).
29. New course, Special Education (SPEC) 5230, "Field Experience Lab", (FIELD EXPER LAB - 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 351-355). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.
30. New course, Special Education (SPEC) 5290, "Audiological Considerations for Teachers", (AUDIOLOGICAL CONS TCHERS - 4 credit hours, 4 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 356-362). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.
31. New course, Special Education (SPEC) 5500, "Characteristics of Students with Low Incidence Disabilities", (CHARACT STUDENT LOW INCID DIS - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007 with the title changed to what is stated above, and the description changed to read ...individuals are included. (pages 363-368). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.
32. New course, Special Education (SPEC) 5510, "Curriculum Design for Students with Low Incidence Disabilities", (CURR LOW INCID DISABILITIES - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 369-376). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.
33. New course, Special Education (SPEC) 5520, "Assessment of Students with Low Incidence Disabilities", (ASSESS LOW INCID DISABILITIES - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 377-382). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.
34. New course, Special Education (SPEC) 5530, "Systematic Instruction for Students with Low Incidence Disabilities", (SYST INST LOW INCID DISABIL - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 383-388). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.
35. New course, Special Education (SPEC) 5540, "Positive Behavior Support", (POSITIVE BEHAVIOR SUPPORT - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 389-396). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.
36. New course, Special Education (SPEC) 5550, "Communication Strategies for Students with Low Incidence Disabilities", (COMM STRAT LOW INCID DISABIL - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 397-402). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.
37. New course, Special Education (SPEC) 7600, "Assessment of Children Who Are Talented

and Gifted”, (ASSESS TALENTED/GIFTED - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 403-409). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.

38. New course, Special Education (SPEC) 8110, “Advanced Capstone Experience”, (ADV CAPSTONE - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 410-415). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.
39. Revised Core Area F for the BSED in Communication Disorders was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 416-417).
40. Revised Core Area F for the BSED in American Sign Language Interpreting was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 418-419).
41. Revised senior college curriculum for the BSED in American Sign Language Interpreting was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 420-421).
42. Revised Core Area F for the BSED in Special Education – Deaf Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 422-423).
43. Revised senior college curriculum for the BSED in Special Education – Deaf Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 424-426).
44. Revised curriculum for the MED in Special Education – Deaf Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 427-428). Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval.
45. Renaming of the MED in Special Education – Interrelated Special Education/Early Childhood to Special Education – Early Childhood Special Education General Curriculum was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 429-430). Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval.
46. Renaming of the BSED in Special Education – Interrelated Special Education/Early Childhood to Special Education – Early Childhood Special Education General Curriculum was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 431-432).
47. Revised Core Area F for the BSED in Special Education – Early Childhood Special Education General Curriculum was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 433-434).
48. Revised senior curriculum for the BSED in Special Education – Early Childhood Special Education General Curriculum was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 435-436).
49. Revised curriculum for the EDS in Special Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (pages 437-438). Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval.
50. Revised curriculum for the MED in Communication Disorders was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (page 439). Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval.
51. Revised curriculum for the MED in Special Education – Adapted Curriculum was approved

- effective Fall Semester 2007. (page 440). Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval.
52. Revised curriculum – Endorsement for Talented & Gifted was approved effective Fall Semester 2007. (page 441). Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval.
 53. Revised course title and description, Communication Disorders (COMD) 5110, “Science and Research in Communication Disorders”, (SCIENCE & RESEARCH COMD - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 442-443). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.
 54. Revised prerequisite, Communication Disorders (COMD) 5120, “Aphasia and Other Neurogenic Disorders”, (APHASIA AND OTHER NEURO DIS - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 444-445). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.
 55. Revised prerequisite, Communication Disorders (COMD) 5160, “Voice Disorders”, (VOICE DISORDERS - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 446-447). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.
 56. Revised credit hours, Communication Disorders (COMD) 5450, “Auditory/Oral Methods for Teachers”, (AUDITORY ORAL METH FOR TEACHER - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 448-449). Pending Graduate Executive Committee Approval.
 57. Revised course title, and description, Interpreting (INTP, “Introduction to ASL/English Interpreting”, (INTRO ASL/ENG INTERPRETING - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 450-451).
 58. Revised prerequisite, Special Education (SPEC) 4140, “Clinical Teaching”, (CLINICAL TEACHING - 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 452-453).
 59. Revised course description, and title, Special Education (SPEC) 3120, “Learning, Cognition and Social Development in Deaf Children”, (LEARNING, COG & SOC DEV DEAF - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 454-455).
 60. Revised prerequisite, Special Education (SPEC) 4110, “Methods and Materials for Children and Youth with Mild Disabilities”, (MTHD/MATRI CH/YTH MILD DISAB - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 456-457).
 61. Revised credit hours, Special Education (SPEC) 8010, “Readings and Issues in Special Education”, (RDNG ISS EDU CH/YTH DISAB - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 458-459). Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval.
 62. Revised credit hours, Special Education (SPEC) 8040, “Developing Professional training

Programs in Special Education”, (DEVL PNG PROF TRAINING PROG SPE - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 460-461). Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval.

63. Revised credit hours, Special Education (SPEC) 8060, “Single Subject Designs for Special Education Research”, (SIN SUB DESIGN SPE EDU RES - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 462-463). Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval.

64. Revised course description, and credit hours, Special Education (SPEC) 8999, “Thesis”, (THESIS - 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2007. (pages 464-465). Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval.

65. Deactivation of MSED 2000 was noted effective Fall Semester 2007. (page 466).

F. Miscellaneous

1. Academic Committee by-laws (pages 467-468). TABLED

Respectfully submitted,

Charles L. Hudson
Registrar

DRAFT 08/25/06, Amended 4/07

FACULTY EVALUATION MODEL¹ 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.

¹ "Model" indicates that colleges and units will modify elements of the evaluative procedure (e.g. arrangement of professional categories or addition of questions to the SOI, etc.) to facilitate planning, program evaluation by external accrediting bodies, or other disciplinary requirements.

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 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.

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

Office

Association	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.



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. Areas that need improvement may be listed, though overall category performance is deemed satisfactory.*

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. The department/unit head shall provide clear guidelines to remediate unsatisfactory performance areas.*

1. Teaching and Instruction

___ Satisfactory

___ Unsatisfactory

2. Professional Growth and Productivity

___ Satisfactory

___ Unsatisfactory

3. College and Community Service

___ Satisfactory

___ 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

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:

- (7) Every semester, students are given the opportunity to express their opinions about classroom instruction through the **Student Opinion of Instruction (SOI)**.
- (8) 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**.
- (9) Each year, faculty members are evaluated according to individual departmental standards for the award of **merit pay**.
- (10) 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**.
- (11) 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.

- (12) 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.

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
❖	❖
❖	❖
❖	❖



6. 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

Office

Association	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.



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 C: Report from the Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee

Date: Fri, 09 Mar 2007 14:21:49 -0500

From: "Dr. Carol A. Barnett" <cabarnet@valdosta.edu>

Subject: Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee

To: Christine James <chjames@valdosta.edu>

User-Agent: Thunderbird 1.5.0.10 (Windows/20070221)

X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Filtered: true

X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Result: Ao8CAGpC8UWoEpLV/2dsb2JhbAA

X-IronPort-AV: i="4.14,268,1170651600"; d="scan'208,32";

a="24648168:sNHT27172752"

Original-recipient: rfc822;chjames@valdosta.edu

Christine,

Our committee would like to submit the attached proposal for the 2008-2009 Academic year. Our committee voted to request Dr. Levy to request the BOR to allow us to schedule the final class day for Spring of 2009 as Monday, May 4. Relief was not given for Spring of 2009, but was granted in subsequent years and the Fall of 2008. Therefore, the committee has voted to submit the attached calendar, designating Saturday, May 2 as a make-up day for Monday classes. This Saturday is to be used by instructors who decide to hold an additional class instead of assigning additional work to makeup for the missed class day.

Through our discussion, it was determined that it would place a hardship on the university to community to try to open the Spring semester on W,Th or F (Jan. 7,8 or 9) due to orientation, registration, opening dorms and starting a new semester.

Please discuss this with the Executive Committee and let me know their response so we will know where to go from here.

Thank you.

Carol Barnett

Chair, Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee

Proposed Dates For Fall 2008 through Summer 2009

	FALL 2008
Mon, Aug 18	First Class Day
Mon, Sept 1	Labor Day
Thurs, Oct 9	Midterm
Mon-Tues, Oct 13 - 14	Fall Break
Wed- Fri, Nov 26 - 28	Thanksgiving Holidays
Mon, Dec 8	Last Class Day
Tues, Dec 9	Exam Prep Day
Wed- Fri, Dec 10 - 12	Exams
Sat, Dec 13	Graduation
	SPRING 2009
Mon, Jan 12	First Class Day
Mon, Jan 19	MLK Holiday
Thur, Mar 5	Midterm
Mar 16 - 20	Spring Break
Fri, May 1	Last Class Day
Sat, May 2	Monday- Make-up Day (for all classes that meet on Monday)
Mon, May 4	Exam Prep Day
Tues- Fri, May 5 – May 8	Exams

Sat, May 9

Graduation
SUMMER 2009

Maymester

Thur, May 14

First Class Day – Mayterm

Mon, May 26

Midterm for Maymester

Mon, May 25

Memorial Day- Holiday

Thur, Jun 4

Last Class day – Mayterm

Fri, Jun 5

Maymester exams

Summer II (full term)

Wed, Jun 10

First class day

Thur, Jul 2

Midterm

Fri, Jul 3 (No Class)-July 4-Holiday

Holiday

Mon, Jul 6

No Classes

Tue, Jul 29

Last Class Day

Jul 30-31

Exams

Sat, Aug 1

Graduation

Summer III

Wed, Jun 10

First class day

Fri, June 19

Midterm

Wed, Jul 1

Last class day

Thurs, Jul 2

Exams

Summer IV

Tues, Jul 7

First class day

Thur, Jul 16

Midterm

Tues, Jul 28

Last class day

Wed, Jul 29

Exams

Sat, Aug 2

Graduation

APPENDIX D:

Report from the Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee (Nov. 2006)

The survey of faculty and student satisfaction with new fall and spring break schedules is completed and ready to be shared with the Faculty Senate. This survey was voluntarily undertaken by the Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee after the issue was discussed at a Faculty Senate meeting last spring. Keep in mind that the 2007-2008 university calendar has already been approved by the Senate. The information we are providing here is an attempt to assess satisfaction with the changes for consideration of future calendar preparation. This data is not intended to suggest that changes are needed.

The committee would like the results with the comments and information about breaks at other Georgia colleges and universities, presented and accessible to the Faculty Senate for the November meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Barnett
Chair of Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee

Question 1

Last year, spring break occurred nearer to midterm than it has in recent years.
Do you prefer the new midterm spring break?

Question 2

Last year, a fall break was initiated to provide a break nearer to midterm.
Do you prefer the new fall break?

	Question #	Answered Yes	Answered No	Answered Do Not Care	Total	Yes	No	Don't Care
18-Sep	1	344	295	298	938	36.7%	31.4%	31.8%
	2	469	272	159	900	52.1%	30.2%	17.7%

Data above is total responses

	Question #	Answered Yes	Answered No	Answered Do Not Care	Total	Yes	No	Don't Care
18-Sep	1	87	76	29	192	45.3%	39.6%	16.9%
	2	80	92	22	194	41.2%	47.4%	11.3%

Data above is for faculty

	Question #	Answered Yes	Answered No	Answered Do Not Care	Total	Yes	No	Don't Care
18-Sep	1	243	205	237	685	35.5%	29.9%	34.6%
	2	374	175	124	673	55.6%	26.0%	18.4%

Data above is for students

Participation

Responses	963
Complete	882
Incomplete	69
Declined	12

41% of faculty and 9% of students responded to the survey.

School	Spring Break (2007)	Public School Break	Local School System	Source of Break Data
Research Universities				
Georgia Tech	Mar 19 - 23	Apr 2 -6	Fulton County	Note 5.
Georgia State	Mar 5 - 11	Apr 2 -6	Fulton County	Note 6.
Medical College of GA	Apr 2 - 6	Mar 30 - Apr 6	Richmond County	Note 7.
University of GA	Mar 12 - 16	Mar 12- 16	Clarke County	
Regional Universities				
Georgia Southern	Mar 12 - 16	Apr 2- 6	Bulloch County	
Valdosta State University	Mar 12 - 16	Apr 2 - 6	Lowndes/Valdosta	
State Universities				
Albany State	Mar 5 - 9	Apr 2- 6	Dougherty County	
Armstrong Atlantic	Mar 12 - 17	Apr 2 - 6	Chatham County	
Augusta State	Mar 8 - 9, Apr 2- 7	Mar 30 - Apr 6	Richmond County	Note 8.
Clayton State	Mar 5 - 11	Apr 2 - 6	Clayton County	Note 9.
Columbus State	Mar 5 - 11	Apr 2 - 6	Muscogee County	
Fort Valley State	Feb 26 - Mar 2, Apr 6	Apr 2 - 9	Peach County	Note 10.
Georgia College & State Univresity	Mar 26 - 30	Apr 2 - 6	Baldwin County	
Georgia Southwestern	Mar 5 - 10	Apr 2- 6	Sumter County	
Kennesaw State	Mar 3 - 9	Apr 2 - 6	Cobb County	
North Georgia	Mar 12 - 16	Apr 2 - 6	Lumpkin County	
Savannah State	Mar 12 - 16	Apr 2 - 6	Chatham County	
Southern Polytech	Mar 4 - 10	Apr 2 - 6	Cobb County	
Univ of West GA	Mar 19 - 23	Apr 2 - 6	Carroll County	
State Colleges				
Dalton State	Mar 5 - 9	Apr 16 - 20	Whitfield County	Note 11.
Gainesville State	Mar 5 - 11	Apr 2 -6	Hall County/Gainesville City	Note 12.
Macon State	Mar 5 - 10	Apr 16 - 20	Bibb County	Note 13.

Notes:

- Information not presented for 2 year, junior colleges
- Only 3 schools (those shaded) have concurrent spring breaks with local schools
- MCG and Augusta State are reported to coincide because of National Golf Championship held annually (April 2 - 8 in 2007)
- Note that Clark County schools match UGA rather than UGA matching a traditional K-12 holiday schedule

Source of data for colleges/universities:

<http://www.usg.edu/academics/calendars/calendars.phtml?showCal=4>

- http://www.fultonschools.org/media-bin/documents/2006_Calendars.pdf
- http://www.fultonschools.org/media-bin/documents/2006_Calendars.pdf
- <http://www.rcboe.org/www/rcboe/site/hosting/Calendars/RCBE%20Full%20Calendar-2006-2007.pdf>
- <http://www.rcboe.org/www/rcboe/site/hosting/Calendars/RCBE%20Full%20Calendar-2006-2007.pdf>
- <http://www.clayton.k12.ga.us/administration/calendars/schoolcal0607.pdf>
- <http://www.peachschools.org/docs/SchoolCalendar0607%20Final.pdf>
- <http://www.whitfield.k12.ga.us/uhome/startup/startup2.pdf>
- <http://www.gcssk12.net/downloadables/calendars/Traditional06-07.pdf> <http://www.hallco.org/main/calend.asp>
- http://www.bibb.k12.ga.us/Front%20Page%20Files/Instructional%20Calendar%2006_07.pdf

2007 Schedule of Spring Breaks

	Albany State				
	Atlanta Metro				
	Bainbridge College				
	Clayton State				
	Coastal Georgia				
	Columbus State				
	Dalton State	Armstrong Atlantic			
	Gainesville State	East Georgia College			
	Georgia Perimeter	Georgia Southern			
	Ga. Southwestern	North Georgia			
	Georgia State	Savannah State			
	Gordon College	UGA	ABAC		
	Kennesaw State	Univ West Georgia	Georgia Highlands		
	Macon State	Valdosta State	Georgia Tech		Augusta State
Fort Valley State	Southern Polytech	Waycross College	South Georgia	Ga Coll & State Univ	MCG

Feb 26 – Mar 2	Mar 5-10	Mar 12- 16	Mar 19 - 23	Mar 26- 30	Apr 2 - 6
-----------------------	-----------------	-------------------	--------------------	-------------------	------------------

Date: Tue, 31 Oct 2006 16:31:44 -0500
From: Michael Noll <mgnoll@valdosta.edu>
Subject: Report for the November meeting of the Faculty Senate
To: Christine James <chjames@valdosta.edu>
User-Agent: Thunderbird 1.5.0.7 (Windows/20060909)
X-PMX-Version: 5.2.1.279297, Antispam-Engine: 2.4.0.264935,
Antispam-Data: 2006.10.18.132442
Original-recipient: rfc822;chjames@valdosta.edu

Hi Christine.

Please find attached the promised report on my findings in regard to the spring and fall break question. Thanks so much for putting the issue on the agenda.

Here are some thoughts of what I would like to accomplish at our meeting, so that there is no confusion:

1) I would like to have the opportunity to briefly address general concerns of our current spring and fall break arrangements based on my research (see attached report). The timing of my report seems appropriate, as it connects with the survey that will be presented the same day. It also seems important, since the Faculty Senate will soon vote on a new academic schedule (as early as February) depending on how quickly the Academic Scheduling Committee will be able to finish its work. Based on both reports given at our next meeting, we then will be able to discuss the merits or shortfalls of the current scheduling system, so that when the next academic calendar(s) come around, we can make a better decision of whether we want to keep it as it is, or if we perhaps should change it.

2) If the survey presented by the Academic Scheduling Committee indicates that a majority of students and faculty are stating that they "do not like" the current set-up or "don't care" about the current set-up, I also think it would be appropriate to "reconsider" the scheduling of (and only of!) the 2008 Spring Break. (The breaks of 2007 are out of the question at this late point in time.) This, of course, is a bit more tricky as we already decided on this issue in the past. However (as clarified by John Samaras), Robert's Rules provide for such a situation in that the Faculty Senate can "reconsider" such things as the Spring Break of 2008 if (and only if!) a "motion to suspend the rules" has been approved by a 2/3 majority of the Faculty Senate. Only when that "motion to suspend the rules" carries with the required 2/3 majority, will we be able to reconsider (and discuss) the fall break of 2008.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns about this.

Thanks, Michael.

Observations Concerning the Scheduling of Spring & Fall Breaks at VSU and Local Schools

1) When did VSU and the local schools schedule their spring break since the year 2000?

VSULocal Schools

March 27 - 31, 2000	same as VSU
March 26 - 30, 2001	same as VSU
March 25 - 29, 2002	same as VSU
March 31 - April 4, 2003	same as VSU
April 5 - 9, 2004	same as VSU
March 28 - April 1, 2005	same as VSU
March 13 - 17, 2006*	April 3 - 7, 2006
March 12 - 16, 2007*	April 2 - 6, 2007
March 10 - 14, 2008*	March 31 - April 4, 2008

* Based on a recommendation by the Academic Scheduling Committee and a vote of the Faculty Senate in April 2004 (35 - 22), a new academic calendar was approved which practically disaligned VSU's spring break from the spring break of local schools. The same vote also approved an amendment introduced by Ken Stanley, creating the new fall break.

Note: It appears that representatives of the local schools have not been invited anymore to meetings of the Academic Scheduling Committee since 2004. This lack of communication has, among other things, led to this year's fall break dilemma, a break which could have easily been aligned with the local schools.

2) What are some side-effects of a disaligned spring break, or the creation of our new fall break? Here are some voices:

"I teach Nursing for VSU and we utilize the high schools and Head Start for clinical sites. If they have a different spring break than we do, that is two weeks we cannot have clinicals at those sites."
(Gayle Taylor, College of Nursing)

"Our students in the COMD program missed many more contact hours in their practicum due to the difference in spring breaks. Many of our students either do their practicum in the schools or see school-aged children here in our speech and hearing clinic. Because we close one week and the schools another, the loss of contact / services to the clients was doubled.... The fall break was also a problem as we must inform all of our clients about our holidays when they differ."
(Tish Consolini, Communication Disorders Program)

"For all education students doing field experience and/or school observations, the non-aligned schedules of K-12 schools and the university limits the students' opportunities to complete these assignments."
(Lynn Corbin, Music Department)

"I have two sections of Human Anatomy and Physiology this semester. Out of 36 students, 8 used the fall break to take off the entire week, and 5 of them could ill afford this. The same thing happened last year in my Zoology class of 72 students with a very high percentage of the poorest students taking the full week off. Last year the same students in Zoology also then took off the entire week of Thanksgiving.... As to offering labs in the sciences, here the problem becomes more difficult. When breaks are split between two weeks such as fall break and Thanksgiving, we have to then start shifting the labs around so that we start a lab on a particular topic one week and then finish it the next week. This becomes problematic for giving tests as it provides students more time to pass information around between those that have already taken the test and those that still are going to take the test.... If you are working with a lab that requires live organism with limited life expectancies, then you find that as you go into the second week of offering a lab, the animals start dying out and students taking the lab after the weekend do not get the same experience as those that took the lab prior to the weekend.... Also, we have a certain number of students that live in other states or counties. Why not

give them more travel time at Thanksgiving to get home and spend time with their families? The current split break schedule discriminates against these students.”

(David Bechler, Biology Department)

3) Approximately how many members of the VSU community are negatively impacted by the current scheduling of our spring break?

Although the results of the recent survey were not known at the time this report was written, my research leads to the following estimate:

- a minimum of 30% of the faculty (or 150 faculty members)
- a minimum of 10% of our students (or 1000 students)
- a minimum of 5% of our staff members (or 40 staff members)

These estimates are based on e-mail surveys, conversations with students, faculty & staff, a consideration of students in the Nursing School, COMD, and the COE, and interpolation.

Negative consequences of disaligned breaks are:

- loss of clinical, service & observation hours for students in the COE, and programs like Nursing and COMD
- daycare issues for parents among all three groups at VSU (students, staff, & faculty), with the resulting extra costs
- loss of quality time for parents at VSU with their children.

4) Two issues that need to be addressed in regard to the spring break question:

A) A statement was made during the discussion of the new academic calendar at the March 2006 Faculty Senate meeting that a survey in the past had shown that “60% of our students support a Midterm Spring Break.”

This statement was actually referring to a 2004 survey asking students what they thought of the idea to get rid of “dead day”. (See minutes of the November 2004 meeting.)

B) In the recent survey on spring and fall breaks, staff members at VSU were not included because the belief exists that “*they* don’t get spring or fall break anyway”. Technically speaking this may be correct, but practically speaking this is misleading.

Certain staff members with children now have difficulties to get annual leave days approved because their children are on spring break when VSU is in session. Here are some who have verified this in conversations, and who have agreed to have their names listed:

Lisa Wagner (Assistant Clinic Director / Communication Disorders Program);
Janice Inman (Secretary / Mathematics Department);
Valerie Holton (Secretary / Music Department);
Barbara Gilbert-Jones (Secretary / Department of Philosophy & Religious Studies)
Karen Jarvis (Secretary / Department of Kinesiology & Physical Education)
Patricia Mincy (Secretary / History Department)
Bonnie O’Steen (Secretary / Department of Marketing & Economics)
Diane Guess (Assistant Director / Student Advising Center / COBA)
Regina Lee (Secretary / Office for Employee & Organizational Development / UC)
Terry Morton (Secretary / Art Department)
Tina Muncy (Secretary to the Dean / College of the Arts)
Patricia Stone (Secretary / Department of Modern and Classical Languages)

5) What stipulates the timing of spring breaks for local schools?

Two tests, the GHSGT (Georgia High School Graduation Test) and the CRCT (Criterion-Referenced Competency Test). Local schools must place their spring breaks between these two tests. The GHSGT comes first, takes 5 days to administer, and has to be scheduled within a two week window. The CRCT comes last, but is not truly a scheduling problem, since it can be administered within a four week window.

In general, the GHSGT is administered in the last two weeks of March, while the CRCT is administered throughout April. Thus, local schools (as seen in the past) like to schedule their spring break in the last week of March or the first week of April, depending on the exact test dates given by the BOE, which may vary slightly from year to year.

(In 2007, the GHSGT can be administered March 19 - 30, and the CRCT April 2 - 27.)

6) When do other institutions in the University System of Georgia have spring break?

Anywhere from the beginning of March to the beginning of April. Most institutions, however, have their spring break within the first half of March. Some examples for 2007:

March 5-9: Georgia State University
March 12-16: University of Georgia
March 19-23: Georgia Institute of Technology
March 26-30: Georgia College & State University
April 2-6: Augusta State University

7) What were/are some common reasons given to justify a change in the scheduling of our spring break?

a) Academic relevance: Students benefit from an earlier spring break.

The question is, how important is this academic relevance for students when looking at the side effect of our new fall break (i.e. students taken off two weeks in the fall)? Moreover, based on conversations some of my colleagues and I had with students, there doesn't seem to be a consensus among them of what (academically speaking) the best time would be for a spring break. Later, so that they can write their term papers? Earlier, so that they can have a break closer to midterm?

b) Student desire: Students want an earlier spring break, so that they can be with their friends from other USG institutions at the beach or elsewhere.

Based on the information above, the question is: what friends, from what institution?

OVERVIEW

This policy represents a collaborative effort from groups across the Valdosta State University campus to develop a comprehensive environmental policy that includes specific sections addressing waste prevention and recycling, energy, outdoor lighting, and tree preservation and maintenance. The policies developed within were written with the assistance of the Environmental Issues Committee of the Faculty Senate, The Environmental Health and Occupation Safety Office, and the Department of Physical Plant. This collaboration sought to produce a document that is evocative of the University’s commitment to environmental stewardship, while providing cohesive and realistic guidelines for implementation.

RELATED POLICES AND PROCEDURES

VSU Policy and Procedure Manual (PPM)

SCOPE

This policy applies to all facilities and property under the jurisdiction of VSU, and to office practices and purchases made both through the Purchasing office and by individual departments.

CONTENTS

Waste Prevention and Recycling Policy	pg. 2-5
Energy Policy	pg. 6-8
Outdoor Lighting Policy	pg. 9-10
Tree Preservation and Maintenance Policy	pg. 11-13

WASTE PREVENTION AND RECYCLING POLICY

PURPOSE

VSU recognizes its role as a leader in the community with regards to environmental policies and, with the adoption of this policy, demonstrates its intention to ensure responsible stewardship of the environmental resources under its influence. More specifically, the purpose of this policy is to set forth standards and organizational processes aimed at: 1) reducing waste at the source; 2) encouraging the purchase and use of durable and reusable products; 3) encouraging the purchase of high post-consumer content recycled products; 4) increasing the total volume of waste materials diverted from landfills to recycling processes; 5) ensuring the long term viability of campus recycling operations through appropriate educational programs, coordination, management and oversight; and 6) remaining in compliance with Federal and Georgia State Law.

Valdosta State University will have a campus-wide program for the collection of waste and recycling of materials used in large quantities by the campus community and otherwise discarded on campus, to include, but not necessarily limited to the following: white paper, newspaper, cardboard, aluminum cans, and plastic beverage bottles. In addition to the fact that we are an agency of the State of Georgia, and therefore mandated by the 1990 Georgia Solid Waste Management Act to have a waste reduction and recycling program, and that we are a unit of the University System of Georgia, which mandates that each campus "practice waste minimization and pollution prevention by adopting recycling programs for all appropriate materials, purchasing recycled products, substituting less hazardous materials and establishing micro-scale chemistry operations (USG Board of Regents Policy Manual 916.g)," we should also recycle for all of the following reasons:

- Recycling saves landfill space (each ton of paper saves three cubic yards, a ton of aluminum cans 10 cubic yards, a ton of plastic bottles 30 cubic yards) and land filling costs, which are rising;
- Recycling saves natural resources; each ton of recycled paper can save 17 trees, 380 gallons of oil and 7,000 gallons of water; a ton of recycled aluminum saves over 16,000 gallons of water;
- Recycling saves energy; each ton of recycled paper can save 4,000 kilowatt-hours, a ton of aluminum can save 14,000 kilowatt-hours;
- Recycling reduces pollution; each ton of recycled paper reduces air pollutants by 60 pounds and produces virtually no dioxin (the most carcinogenic chemical known), which is a water-polluting byproduct of the bleaching of raw wood pulp;
- Recycling is an engine of economic development, creating jobs in the local community; recycling a ton of paper creates 5 times as many jobs as producing paper from raw materials; incinerating 10,000 tons of waste creates one job, land filling the same amount creates 6 jobs, and recycling that amount creates 36 jobs;
- VSU, as the leading educational institution for the south Georgia region, must lead by example in an effort to increase recycling regionally; our increasingly cosmopolitan student body and faculty expect it; a 2005 study by the South Georgia Regional Development Commission found that annually in the ten-county region over 45,000 tons (62% of the municipal waste stream, and including over 13,000 tons of cardboard alone) of recyclable materials are land filled.

PROCEDURES

The following practices shall be implemented and maintained through all VSU operations.

Reduce the Amount of Waste Generated

- 1) Departments will consider the purchase of durable and reusable products by evaluating the total cost of ownership for any products specified or purchased.
- 2) Suppliers will be required to utilize minimal and reusable packaging materials as deemed appropriate in the products packaging specifications. Suppliers with contracts that require installation will be required to take back their packaging materials/containers when written in their contract requirements.
- 3) Copying and Printing
 - a) Whenever feasible, electronic distribution of correspondence shall replace written correspondence. On campus correspondence shall be by email, list serves, and electronic bulletin boards. Only one printed copy of the correspondence should be sent to each department to be routed or posted for interested parties to read. Unnecessary printed copies of electronic correspondence are discouraged.
 - b) All office paper shall meet or exceed the State and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requirements for recycled content.
 - c) Office paper shall be recycled by each department.
 - d) Employees will reuse office paper whenever practical.
 - e) Letters, reports and documents produced by campus departments should be printed on both sides when feasible for the intended use.
 - f) Departments shall encourage two-sided copying and printing.
 - g) Whenever practical, scrap paper printed only on one side shall be used for either producing rough drafts or as scratch pads.
 - h) All requests for proposals and reports from outside vendors and consultants shall include the request that these be printed on both sides and using recycled content paper.
 - i) When electronic communication is not feasible any forms used on the campus should include only the necessary information and number of copies. Necessary instruction sheets shall be printed on the back of the last page of the form.
 - j) Annually, staff shall review mailing lists and delete out of date subscribers.

Standards and Specifications

VSU shall, at a minimum, conform to State of Georgia requirements and the federal purchasing guidelines developed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). For products which have been designated by either the State or EPA, all bid specifications shall include products with the minimum recycled content and purchases must contain the minimum recycled content as long as the products are available and meet the performance needs. See EPA website for minimum percentage of recycled content and listings of the most common recyclable materials.

Purchasing

- 1) General

VSU shall continue to improve its efforts toward recycling and waste reduction goals by defining purchasing policies aimed at encouraging the procurement of recycled products.

Initially the focus of this policy is on toner and inkjet cartridges for printers and copiers, paper products for printers and copiers, and papers in items printed off campus because these groups of products are the largest volumes of recycled commodities ordered by the campus. Detailed expenditure policies shall be recommended by the Vice President for Finance and Administration to the Faculty Senate Environmental Committee and coordinated policy will be forwarded through the Faculty Senate and COSA for the President's approval and signature.

2) Requirement to Purchase Recycled Paper Products

The VSU Central Stores should be used for the purchase of all bond paper products used in copiers and printers

The VSU Central Stores shall procure paper products meeting the State of Georgia regulations for price and recycled content.

3) Elimination of Prohibitions

Purchasing Department shall be responsible for informing the Faculty Senate, COSA, and the SGA of purchasing policy changes that limit or restrict purchases of bond paper, inkjet cartridges, or toner cartridges based on recycled content or ability to be recycled. Additionally, VSU and individual departmental policy and procedures shall be updated to reflect any changes.

Recycling

- 1) All University employees shall be instructed with regard to their responsibility to participate in campus recycling efforts.
- 2) General practices regarding recycling, reuse and waste reduction shall be included as part of the standard job orientation for all new employees.
- 3) The Physical Plant and Facilities Planning Department shall ensure that all new construction is designed to facilitate recycling in both interior and exterior locations.
- 4) Whenever possible and economically feasible, the University and its contractors shall reuse or recycle materials resulting from the demolition or remodeling of campus facilities.
- 5) Physical Plant will be responsible for providing educational programs and materials for faculty and staff. Education will include a discussion of VSU's commitment and responsibilities regarding waste prevention and recycling instructions on how various commodities can be recycled, information contacts and phone numbers, and any applicable incentives.
- 6) Departmental Contacts: Each Department should appoint a primary contact person for recycling
- 7) Students: Educational presentations regarding the need for recycling and waste reduction and ways to participate in campus recycling efforts will be made to all new students as part of their orientation. Additional educational programs shall be devised and implemented as the program improves.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Recycling Coordinator

The Assistant Director for Physical Plant Operations shall coordinate the recycling program and at a minimum include the following materials: Aluminum, Corrugated Cardboard, Non-Corrugated Cardboard, Computer paper, Glass, Yard Wastes, Mixed paper (White paper), Newspaper, Plastic, Metal Tin & Steel cans, Building Materials, Auto Waste from campus vehicle maintenance (Oil, Batteries, Tires, etc)

Waste Prevention

Each campus department shall coordinate the purchase of materials to ensure durable, recycled and recyclable goods and materials are purchased when feasible.

The Director of Occupational Safety and Environmental Services shall coordinate the storage of all hazardous materials on campus. Keeping an inventory of all materials and maximum amounts that can be stored at each site. The Director shall inform the President and Cabinet of amount and location of toxic chemicals annually and recommend changes to reduce the severely hazardous chemicals.

Departments and Organizations

All departments and organizations engaged in individual recycling programs shall coordinate their activities with the Assistant Director for Physical Plant Operations and provide records of their operations (if separate from the campus-wide program) on a quarterly basis within fifteen days following the end of each calendar quarter.

Faculty Senate Environmental Affairs Committee

VSU encourages the Faculty Senate to maintain a standing "Environmental Committee" to recommend university policy (through the Faculty Senate and in coordination with COSA), and to review the recycling program and make recommendations for the campus waste prevention and recycling operations. The Committee should review quarterly recycling reports and determine whether any commodities should be added to or deleted from VSU's recycling operations.

ENERGY POLICY

PURPOSE

Valdosta State University is committed to a policy of energy efficiency and energy conservation in its current facilities and all new construction on campus. This policy identifies energy conservation as a significant issue for the entire campus community and outlines steps to address these issues and reach the energy goals of the University.

POLICY

It is the University's policy to reduce energy consumption whenever possible through the active efforts of its faculty, staff, and students in closing doors, turning off lights, and generally making positive efforts to conserve energy and through passive means such as installing energy-saving devices and lights, pursuing energy savings in its infrastructure and facilities construction plans, and continued implementation of the University's environmental control system.

PROCEDURES

Buildings

Windows and doors of conditioned spaces should be kept closed. Office equipment, lights, window air conditioners and personal heaters should be turned off when not in use. Power management features of personal computers should be enabled. As time and funding allow, buildings' mechanical systems will be tied into the University's environmental control system permitting central monitoring and change of building temperatures and energy consumption.

New Construction

New construction should be designed and built to minimize energy use. The most recent version of *ASHRAE Standard 90.1 – Energy Efficient Design of New Buildings Except Low Rise Residential Buildings* should be set as the minimum energy efficiency guideline, since it has been shown that further reductions in energy use are economically achievable. The design process should include energy life cycle costing analyses. New construction should be added to the University's existing environmental control system for enhanced energy management capabilities. Primary consideration should be given to connecting and/or extending central systems for heating, cooling, and other electrical and lighting systems. Year-round cooling needs should be met by utilizing the most energy efficient systems. All new construction should include utility metering (electricity, natural gas, steam, and water).

Alternative Energy

Alternative energy sources such as passive solar heating and heat recovery should be considered, as well as day lighting and other strategies for decreasing building energy consumption in accordance with green building concepts.

Lighting

Most lighting on campus has been retrofitted or upgraded to high efficiency lighting. Remaining areas should be upgraded as funding is available. New construction and remodels should use high efficiency lighting and minimize incandescent lighting. Excessive interior decorative lighting should be kept at a minimum and exterior decorative lighting should be limited and use the most efficient fixtures available. Lighting levels recommended by the *Illuminating Engineering Society Lighting Handbook* should be used as guidelines to avoid over-lit spaces. Motion-activated light controls are used throughout campus and will continue to be implemented as funding allows

The University will strive to make outdoor lighting increasingly more efficient while maintaining the standards established by the University's *Outdoor Lighting Policy*.

Heating and Cooling

For occupied rooms, control of room temperatures should be maintained at 70-75° F. This is generally accomplished by the Physical Plant Department setting the temperatures then locking down thermostats. The University's environmental control system will be used to control nighttime temperatures or other extended periods when facilities are unoccupied.

Research from the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) over many years has shown the following thermostat settings will keep the most occupants comfortable in the typical office setting.

Maintain Temperatures between:

Winter	70° F and 74° F
Spring & Fall	71° F and 75° F
Summer	72° F and 75° F

The Physical Plant Department strives to maintain temperatures in facilities within those ranges. Those utility systems under direct control of building occupants should be operated in an economical manner. It is imperative that someone be designated in each facility to ensure proper system operation to prevent damage to building systems or waste of utilities.

If facilities are uncomfortably cold or warm, employees should contact the Physical Plant Work Order Center at X7854.

Purchasing

Energy efficient products should be purchased whenever possible. For example, see the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Energy Star products list. Recyclable and reusable products should also be purchased when feasible to reduce disposal costs.

Green Computing

The university will continue to enhance the energy efficiency of computers as resources permit. Faculty, staff, and students are encouraged to adopt green computing practices.

Campus Education

Faculty, staff, and students will be informed of the campus energy policy and encouraged to adopt practices which contribute to its achievement.

Fleet Fuel Economy

New campus vehicles will be purchased with the maximum feasible fuel efficiency. Alternative energy vehicles will be gradually phased into the campus fleet, as it is practical and economically to do so.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Yearly Review

Plant Operations will conduct yearly review of campus energy policy.

Suggestions

Faculty, staff, or students with suggestions that may reduce energy consumption or costs should contact the Physical Plant Department at X5875.

Notes:

Second Draft 11.10.2006, 03.22.2007

PURPOSE

This policy is predicated on the need to balance the following objectives and concerns:

- 1) To ensure nighttime safety and security for VSU students and personnel, and to provide optimum nighttime visibility on the VSU campus.
- 2) To avoid unnecessary hazards to motorists and pedestrians created by lateral glare from building, street, or parking lot light fixtures. Lateral glare is defined as a light beam projecting from a fixture more than 70 degrees above straight downward.
- 3) To minimize undesirable light trespass and illumination of Valdosta's night sky.
- 4) To conserve energy, for both environmental and economic reasons.
- 5) To minimize adverse effects of artificial nighttime illumination on local nocturnal animals.
- 6) To restore and preserve a suitable level of night-sky darkness to ensure adequate visibility of celestial objects from the VSU Observatory, a scientific and educational facility of regional importance.

POLICY

It is the University's policy to provide optimum nighttime campus lighting for maximum security, while minimizing risks to safety and adverse effects on the environment and night sky.

PROCEDURES

- 1) Specifics of design and installation of new lighting and retrofitting of existing lighting should be done after a survey and consulting the IDA Outdoor Lighting Code Handbook Version 1.11, including the USA Pattern Lighting Code and the EPA Green Lights Program (<http://es.epa.gov/partners/green/green.html>).
- 2) Any currently existing lighting fixture which does not satisfy these guidelines should be removed, redirected, or shielded within a reasonable period of time, budget permitting, so as to minimize light trespass, light pollution of the night sky, and over-illumination within the VSU campus area. The VSU Administration cooperates with the Environmental Issues Committee (a standing committee of the VSU Faculty Senate, with representation from SGA and the administration), in collaboration with SGA and COSA, in the design and retrofitting of campus outdoor lighting fixtures to be in compliance with this policy.
- 3) Full consideration should be given to the appropriate placement, density, and elevation of lights, so as to avoid over-illumination of any given area and to minimize glare and light trespass. As an example, a higher density of lower-elevation, lower-intensity light fixtures might be chosen over a smaller number of high-elevation, high intensity fixtures providing comparable illumination. High-elevation lights particularly should be adequately shielded to minimize lateral glare. Properly shielded and well-placed fixtures should allow adequate illumination of the ground generally not exceeding 200,000 net lumens per acre for parking lots, and 20,000-100,000 net lumens per acre for other campus areas, depending on level of use; sport-field lighting levels will be higher (exception 8c).

- 4) No single lamp should exceed 1800 lumens unless housed in a “full cut-off” fixture (i.e. it is fully shielded) so that all light is directed downward with no lateral glare. Full cut-off fixtures are recommended for *all* outdoor lighting. A recommended maximum per fixture of 180 watts Low Pressure Sodium (LPS), 250 watts High Pressure Sodium (HPS) or Metal Halide (MH), and 400 watts Mercury Vapor (MV, see 8c below) should provide adequate brightness for most campus uses (this equals 20,000 to 33,000 lumens per fixture depending on lamp type), especially when proper design and placement of fixtures is considered.
- 5) Because energy conservation is and will increasingly be an important consideration, preference should be given to the most efficient lamp type (highest lumens/watt) that is feasibly and effectively used in a given lighting situation. For light intensities typical of large-scale outdoor uses, LPS is the most efficient lamp type, followed by HPS, and then MH; MV lamps are substantially less energy efficient; these and MH also produce potentially toxic mercury waste when disposed of, and should therefore be avoided, except in special circumstances where a case can be made for their necessity. Compact fluorescent is very energy efficient and may be feasibly used for some smaller-scale lighting needs. LPS lamps may be effectively used where true color rendering is not deemed important for security or other purposes (or where the latter could be provided for by additional individual lights of other types) and are particularly advantageous near the astronomical observatory. Although somewhat true of all lamp types, MH and especially MV lamps fade in intensity over time, providing less luminance and sometimes altered quality while drawing the same wattage.
- 6) For any areas (such as outdoor sports facilities and outlying parking lots) which are not intended to be used after a certain hour of the night, lights should be turned off after hours of use in order to conserve energy and to limit light trespass onto streets and residential neighborhoods.
- 7) In campus areas which experience very little nighttime usage, it is suggested that illumination be triggered by motion detectors or manual on/off switches wherever feasible. This could be done on an experimental basis.
- 8) Exceptions
 - 1) Any state or federal regulations which may take precedence.
 - 2) Temporary emergency or construction situations which may require additional lighting for performance of specific tasks.
 - 3) Sporting or other special events, where the special lighting is used only during the event.
 - 4) Illumination of monuments, structures, or flagpoles, providing every effort is made to direct the illumination so as to minimize light trespass and lateral glare.
 - 5) Any other situation in which the VSU Administration can make a special case for a variance, subject to consultation with the Environmental Issues Committee of the Faculty Senate.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Overall responsibility for implementation is assumed by Physical Plant unless otherwise noted.

Notes:

This policy has been developed with the aid of guidelines established by the Illuminating Engineering Society

5/2/2007

Page 96 of 110

of North America and by the International Dark-Sky Association.

Passed by VSU Faculty Senate, 15 November 2001.

Adopted as VSU Policy, 14 January 2002, according to VSU Statutes, Chapt. 4, Art. I, Sect. 3.

Draft revision 03.22.2007.

TREE PRESERVATION AND MAINTENANCE POLICY

PURPOSE

As the leading center for higher learning in southern Georgia, Valdosta State University recognizes its obligation to preserve and manage an abundance and diversity of trees on campus for the benefit of the public and future generations of students. By its example of environmental stewardship, the University will take the lead in promoting and developing a sound preservation ethic for the region's natural heritage. Included among the many benefits of preserving trees on campus and promoting additional plantings are: (1) improved air quality; (2) noise abatement and temperature amelioration; (3) mitigating the natural processes of water runoff, erosion, and sedimentation; (4) shading and consequently energy savings; (5) education; (6) aesthetics; (7) historical significance, and (8) intrinsic value.

POLICY

It is the University's policy to preserve and manage all trees on campus, particularly species native to south-central Georgia, in such a way as to minimize damage and prolong their life. Especially important are stands of mature native trees and native species no longer abundant on campus or in the area. Existing trees should not be removed for merely aesthetic, design, or landscaping reasons. Long-term plans should promote new plantings that will increase the diversity of native species, contain more canopy species, and enhance fall color.

PROCEDURES

Special Management Zones

The following special zones are established on campus in order to protect and manage critical or sensitive areas of mature trees:

- 1) the entire stand of mostly mature longleaf pine, between Patterson Street and Oak Street, extending southward from Georgia Avenue onto the main campus. This stand pre-dates the settlement of Valdosta, contributes substantially to the unique character of the University campus, and is especially vulnerable to changes in environmental conditions
- 2) stands of mature native trees along One Mile Branch, especially near the intersection of Patterson Street and Brookwood Drive
- 3) the mature mixed woodland at north campus bisected by Two Mile Branch
- 4) the dense woodland/swamp along the southern bank of One Mile Branch west

of the Student Recreation Center parking lot.

Activities resulting in soil compaction, root damage, and depletion of air and water supply to the roots should be avoided in these zones. Also, thinning of groves, especially pines, increases susceptibility of remaining trees to storm damage and should be avoided. Specifically, the following practices are to be avoided, in proximity to trees which may be affected:

- 1) trenching, filling, or other soil disturbances
- 2) unabated erosion;
- 3) driving or operation of heavy equipment over the ground
- 4) parking of vehicles or heavy equipment
- 5) storage of materials
- 6) paving or introduction of impermeable surfaces on the ground
- 7) thinning of groves, especially pines.

Preventive Maintenance and Care of Existing Trees

Prevention of tree damage or disease should be an ongoing commitment, particularly of older, still-healthy trees. The following preventative maintenance measures will be taken to enhance the vigor and prolong the life of trees and to reduce susceptibility to disease and weather damage: 1) application of pesticide treatment; 2) aeration of soil within the drip line of trees where compaction has occurred; 3) bedding of individual trees or groups of trees to prevent future physical damage and soil compaction by mowers and other vehicles or equipment; 4) cordoning of drip-lines of trees with a 4-foot high, high-visibility fence prior to the initiation of renovation or construction activities, according to the *Community Tree Planting and Establishment Guidelines* (Georgia Forestry Commission, 2002); 5) restriction of equipment and any construction and renovation activities from cordoned areas; and 6) inclusion of language in contracts issued by the University, which prohibits construction and renovation activities from cordoned areas and specifies penalties for violations.

Prior Consultation

The University administration shall work in consultation with the Campus Beautification and Stewardship Subcommittee of the Faculty Senate's Environmental Issues Committee in all Pre-Design Phase and Design-Phase meetings involving the VSU Administration, campus planners, state officials, and private contractors, during which any decisions can and will be made affecting the fate of campus trees. This policy also designates Campus Beautification and Stewardship Subcommittee as the consultative body to be integrally involved in environmental, historical, and cultural impacts reviews of proposed campus projects as mandated by the Georgia Environmental Policy Act of 1991 (Georgia Code Title 12, Chapter 16).

Before trees are removed or plans are finalized for tree removal, or for construction or other activities that may result in tree removal or potential tree damage, the Physical Plant Department will consult with the Campus Beautification and Stewardship Subcommittee of the Environmental Issues Committee, except in emergency situations, where imminent damage to property or individuals is involved. In the latter event, the subcommittee is to be immediately notified by the Physical Plant Department of the action to be taken.

Reasons to be considered as valid for proposed tree removals will generally include the following:

- 1) prevention of the impending spread of disease by the affected tree
- 2) likelihood of imminent damage to property;
- 3) existence of a threatening safety hazard to individuals
- 4) any unavoidable constraints of construction or renovation that remain after completion of the planning and consultation requirements as specified above.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Monitoring and Enforcement

The Physical Plant Department shall ensure that any trees scheduled to be removed after consultation shall be clearly marked at least 14 days before their scheduled removal and the Campus Beautification and Stewardship Subcommittee be notified and given the opportunity to inspect the marked trees before removal. For any construction projects, the Physical Plant Department shall periodically throughout the duration of the construction make arrangements for the Campus Beautification and Stewardship Subcommittee to inspect the site and ensure that the protection provisions previously specified are being observed. If they are not being observed, the Physical Plant Department shall immediately report the failure to the contractor and/or the Georgia State Finance and Investment Commission official. In accordance with Board of Regents contracts, appropriate action will be taken to remedy the situation.

Notes:

Amended and Passed by VSC Faculty Senate: May 27, 1993

Adopted as VSU Policy 27 July 1993, according to VSU Statutes, Chapt. 4, Art. I, Sect. 3.

Revised by the Environmental Issues Committee: 9 May, 31 May, 2 November 2000.

Amended and adopted by the VSU Faculty Senate 15 February 2001.

Adopted as VSU Policy 16 April 2001, according to VSU Statutes, Chapt. 4, Art. I, Sect. 3.

Draft Revision 02.09.2007, 03.22.2007

Questions and Suggestions from University Council Members

Waste management:

Should we consider advising individuals how to determine total cost of ownership? Perhaps we don't in the policy itself, but could the Council recommend that Purchasing develop this? Furthermore, are we really doing anything if we don't say that departments are RESPONSIBLE for total cost of ownership?

Why will the VPFA make a detailed expenditure policy recommendation to the Faculty Senate – shouldn't that be the University Council?

Who will manage departmental recycling contacts? What records are these contact required to keep as noted later in the policy?

Will each department have a recycling box? Who pays for this? If we don't have a box, who is responsible for sorting/delivering recyclables to appropriate place?

p. 3 under departments. Who will collect those reports?

p.3, Should we include language that recommends use of electronic format?

p. 3, last paragraph: list the website URL for EPA

p. 4 point 1 under recycling: Who is responsible for this instruction?

p. 5 How can students be involved in the educational process under point 7?

last section on p. 5-- change "Environmental Affairs Committee" (subheading in bold, italics) and ""Environmental Committee"" (in text below above) both to read "Environmental Issues Committee". This is the actual name of the Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate as stipulated in the Senate bylaws (current and since 1991), and the committee was renewed last year for an additional 3-year period. Also, do a global search for other occurrences of "Environmental Committee" and change accordingly.

Bottom of page 3, for purchase decision between new and recycle-content products, performance considerations are allowed. Decision should also be affected by any cost differential between new and recycled-content products.

On page 4, policy stresses the use of recycled toner and inkjet cartridges. Some of these recycles damage the printers and create higher equipment maintenance and replacement costs. Performance, cost, and equipment impact should be considered in decision.

Policy does not consider the effect that recycling containers have on the aesthetics of the campus (i.e., do not create visual pollution).

Purchasing catalogs will identify all recyclable items with a known symbol so all customers will know which items are recyclable and/or better for the environment.

Tree:

Tree Policy: I am strongly opposed to the elimination of what is Section V in the current policy--Campus Planning to Minimize Tree Loss. Having been chair of the CBS subcommittee for several years, a member for many years before that (in fact, pre-dating the Faculty Senate), and past chair of EIC, I know only too well that the best and maybe only way to ensure the long-term preservation of this campus's natural heritage is for whatever administration is in charge to adopt the ethos of minimal damage through maximally benign development. We should always write policy with the next generation in mind--our successors among the faculty and EIC as well as among the administration. These people will not have had the same experiences or instincts that we have acquired over the years in working on this issue.

Before pencil is put to paper, knowledge and consideration of what we have that is too valuable to destroy should be at the forefront of the minds of those with the authority to make the decisions. Locations of the trees should be mapped before sites are even proposed for development and certainly before footprints are drawn on plans. This is pro-active minimization of tree loss, and really the only effective means. Once a specific site has been chosen, and perhaps even a footprint drawn--if it has been blind to the existing tree resources--the best we can hope for is some minor tweaking to save a tree here or there, if even that.

The remaining "Prior Consultation" section (Section VI in the current policy), even if it is adhered to strictly (i.e., involves our input from the Pre-Design phase meetings henceforth), only kicks in after the siting decisions have been made. The caveats under the "Special Management Zones" section could, conceivably, be interpreted as not applying to new development. That is why the "Campus Planning..." section was and is vital. It obligates future administrations to adopt the ethos of preservation that has characterized the previous dozen or so, which is the only reason we still have 250-year-old longleaf pine trees on the VSU campus.

Additionally, the next sentence in the section is the one and only place in the policy that establishes the need for mitigation and a "no-net-loss" provision (trees unavoidably lost must be replaced). Therefore, it is absolutely vital.

Finally, although I'd prefer not to abandon entirely any sense that there will be true accountability for violations of the policy, I can live with some reduction in the section on enforcement. Perhaps the phrase "appropriate action" could be explicated.

Should it be in our policy to "enhance fall color" – this seems like someone's personal preference.

In reference to thinning of pine groves – this is common practice with some value – although I recognize it is debatable. But should we reference some standard here to give us flexibility if a true need arises? Maybe contact the Forestry department? I think doing so in other areas of the policy is very convincing (lighting, etc).

Energy:

p. 8 How and by whom will the campus education occur?

I am somewhat disappointed to see a meager three lines on Alternative Energy and no mention of photovoltaics (solar panels) (which is different from passive solar heating) or the possible use of bio-fuels for university operated vehicles (busses, vans).

I am also curious of what would happen if the University would approach local car dealers, who sell true hybrids (min. of 50-60 mpg) to see if they can give us a "special deal" (better ticket price or better financing plan) under which faculty and staff get the help needed to buy their hybrid cars.

And how about not just having the overhead lights (which I never use in my office by the way) become more energy efficient, but also supply the hundreds of office lamps (I have two) with more energy efficient bulbs. Perhaps I overlooked this part, but that too would add to the larger picture of energy conservation.

Policy stresses energy efficiency but never mentions cost (e.g., would not make sense to pay an extra \$100,000 for a car that only saves an extra gallon of gas in its life time). Policy should have an "efficiency per dollar cost" consideration.

In addition to a review of the written policy (pg. 8), is there a yearly review of energy usage planned?

VSU Environmental Policy

Questions and Suggestions from COSA

Page 2, under section on "Purpose" second paragraph 3rd sentence near the end, take out *and*. 4th sentence after bottles insert, *and yard waste*.

Page 4, Purchasing

Sect. 1 General Second paragraph, Omit second sentence entirely. This statement is too demanding and unnecessary. No single body is allowed to demand information from upper administration.

A better way to ask,

A detailed purchasing policy would be ask by the Vice President for Finance and Administration and shared with the Campus Environmental Committee for review and on to the President for approval. The Campus Environmental Committee make up would be, two or three reps for SGA, Faculty Senate, and COSA and the Chair Appointed by the President.

Section 3, Sentence one, omit be responsible for informing the Faculty Senate, COSA, and the SGA, replace with, *advise the Campus Environmental Committee*.

Page 4, Recycling

Sect. 1 omit, shall be instructed with regard to their responsibility, insert *should be encourage*

Sect. 5 omit Physical Plant and insert *Campus Environmental Committee*

Add Sect 8, to read something like, *Compost shall be use where possible as mulch in landscape beds where visible. The compost shall be the by product from yard waste that has been properly composted by US Compost Society specs.*

Page #5 Responsibilities

Recycling Coordinator

First sentence, omit Assist. Director for Physical Plant Operation, to *Recycling Coordinator*.

Add a paragraph to define *Recycling Coordinator*: *Recycling Coordinator shall be knowledgeable in **all** aspects of recycling including all EPA and EPD regulation concerning recyclable items. The coordinator will report to the Director of Physical Plant Operations.*

Departments and Organizations

Second line omits Assist. Director for Physical Plant Operations, insert *Recycling coordinator*.

Faculty Senate Environmental Affairs Committee omit this title and insert *Campus Environmental Committee*. Line 1 VSU to COSA) change to *VSU encourages the Campus Environmental Committee to recommend university policy, and....*

Page 10 Sect. 8 sub e) second line omit Environmental Issues Committee of the Faculty Senate to *Campus Environmental Committee*.

Page 12, Preventive Maint. Papagraph,

Line 4 after 1) application of pesticide treatment, add *(pesticide treatments to follow Integrated Pest Management practices)*

APPENDIX F: Minors after receiving a degree

Date: Tue, 03 Apr 2007 12:13:29 -0400

From: "Dr. Louis Levy" <llevy@valdosta.edu>

Subject: Minors after receiving a degree

To: 'Chuck Hudson' <chudson@valdosta.edu>,
"Dr. Sharon Gravett" <sgravett@valdosta.edu>,

'Christine James' <chjames@valdosta.edu>

Reply-to: llevy@valdosta.edu

Organization: Valdosta State University

X-Mailer: Microsoft Office Outlook, Build 11.0.6353

Thread-index: Acd2B1I+AtO+R0jURQe/noNtjsa6OwAAw7Kw

X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Filtered: true

X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Result: Ao8CAOgZEkaoEpBf/2dsb2JhbACDCQ

X-IronPort-AV: i="4.14,366,1170651600"; d="scan'208,217";
a="40439139:sNHT77488392"

I am sending the issue of minors to Christine James for the faculty senate. I like the UGA policy as well.

Louis

Louis Levy, Ph.D. Phone: 229/333-5950 (office)
Vice President for Academic Affairs 229/244-6116 (home)
Valdosta State University FAX: 229/333-7400
Valdosta, GA 31698 Office: West Hall Room 107
USA E-mail: llevy@valdosta.edu

From: Chuck Hudson [mailto:chudson@valdosta.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 11:33 AM
To: Dr. Sharon Gravett
Cc: Louis Levy
Subject: RE: VSU Registrar's Contact Form

Dr. Gravett and Dr. Levy,

I rather agree with UGA's policy and wording. Directly above the catalog entry on minors is the entry on "Second Baccalaureate Degree". If a student can add a second degree by taking the courses required, where is the big distinction in allowing a minor by completing the courses required? If we wanted to proceed along this route, I would suggest taking to the Faculty Senate and asking that they assign to committee (Educational Policies?). Or could I simply take to the Senate as a recommendation for approval? There are, however, some significant Banner issues that would have to be dealt with.

Thanks,
Chuck

At 10:59 AM 4/3/2007, Dr. Sharon Gravett wrote:

Dear Chuck,

I agree with you that the practice here has been that a student should apply for the minor when applying for graduation. That said, I can find no policy that specifically says that a student cannot receive a minor after graduation. Just out of curiosity, I went to the UGA website and found the following information about minors:

A student may select a minor in consultation with his or her advisor. The student may then consult an advisor in the minor field who can inform the student of remaining requirements for the minor. When the student has met the requirements for the minor, the advisor in the minor field will then certify that fact to the student's dean. The completed minor will be recorded on the student's permanent transcript, but not on the diploma. For students completing a minor after graduation, the statement shall appear on the transcript in chronological order following the courses taken subsequent to graduation. A student must be enrolled at the time a minor is approved by the Board of Regents, or subsequent to that date, to receive credit for the minor. A student may have more than one minor. (http://bulletin.uga.edu/bulletin/prg/minors_listing.html)

It seems like we may need to do a couple of things:

- (1) explore our policy on minors and consider whether or not students should have the opportunity to earn minors after their graduation (and then put suitable language in our catalogue)
- (2) for this specific case, adopt your work around solution since the student has spent time and money in completing this minor.

I am sharing this email with Dr. Levy to see what he thinks of this situation,
Sheri

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

-----Original Message-----

From: Chuck Hudson [<mailto:chudson@valdosta.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 10:07 AM
To: sgravett@valdosta.edu
Cc: llevy@valdosta.edu; kshepard@valdosta.edu
Subject: Fwd: VSU Registrar's Contact Form

Sheri,

This is an unusual situation that I want to discuss with you beforehand. Elizabeth Coram, graduated in May 2006 with a degree in Biology. At that time, she made no mention of a Minor in her graduation application.

Today, I received the e-mail below with the statement and questions: "[and then decided i wanted to finish my minor i will finish my minor for psychology this semester. Do i have to submit a graduate application for my minor?](#)"

Ms. Coram completed 9 hours of Psychology and a statistics course in Fall 2006 and is currently enrolled in 9 hours of upper level psychology. Traditional practice in the Registrar's office has been that a person cannot add a minor after graduation. In order to have a minor, the student must apply for the minor at graduation and complete the work with their undergraduate degree. That's practice, however, and I can find nothing to support this as policy in our catalog. Minors are described in very limited detail in the catalog on page 66. I find no reference to "minors" (as an academic area of study) in the BOR Policy Manual and limited guidance in the USG

Ms. Coram had her advising flag lifted by O'Drobinak in Fall 2006 and by Kohn in Spring 2007.

Administrative Issue: Generally speaking, there is no way to post the minor without entering a degree to the student's record through SHADEGR. Trying to use this process after the fact would create an erroneous record with issues in SIRS reporting. A "work around solution" to deal with this could be to place a comment on the transcript which simply says, "Minor in Psychology awarded May 5, 2007". This comment would then be a part of the academic record and would appear on all transcripts printed.

Questions:

1. Do you agree with our practice of not allowing minors to be added after a degree has been awarded?
2. Do we have policy written somewhere that I can quote when enforcing this?
3. If we wish to continue operating in this minor (i.e. minor only awarded with degree and not after the fact) should we not modify the text in our catalog?
4. How to deal with the student at hand who has attended two additional semesters and has been advised (?) by two faculty members in getting to where she is now?

If I engage this student in this battle along with her parents and state representatives, I want you aware of the situation before we begin.

I appreciate your help.

Chuck

Date: Mon, 02 Apr 2007 17:02:40 -0400
From: ehcoram@valdosta.edu ()
Subject: VSU Registrar's Contact Form
To: registrar@valdosta.edu
X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Filtered: true
X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Result: Ao8CACYMEUaoEoKi/2dsb2JhbAA
X-IronPort-AV: i="4.14,362,1170651600"; d="scan'208";
a="39886527:sNHT14552814"
Original-recipient: rfc822;registrar@valdosta.edu

Here is what was submitted:

date: 4/2/2007

time: 17:02

IP# : 168.18.155.163

Referrer : <http://www.valdosta.edu/registrar/contact.html>

Browser: Mozilla/4.0 (compatible; MSIE 6.0; Windows NT 5.1; SV1; .NET CLR 1.1.4322; .NET CLR 2.0.50727; InfoPath.1)

Name: Elizabeth Hope Coram

Telephone: 2296720631

Status: student

Subject: Minor

Comments: I graduated last may with a degree in biology and then decided i wanted to finish my minor i will finish my minor for psychology this semester. Do i have to submitt a graduate application for my minor?

APPENDIX G: ORP Legislation

Date: Sun, 08 Apr 2007 17:40:14 -0400
From: "Dr. Louis Levy" <llevy@valdosta.edu>
Subject: FW: ORP Legislation
To: 'Christine James' <chjames@valdosta.edu>
Reply-to: llevy@valdosta.edu

FYI

Louis Levy, Ph.D. Phone: 229/333-5950 (office)
Vice President for Academic Affairs 229/244-6116 (home)
Valdosta State University FAX: 229/333-7400
Valdosta, GA 31698 Office: West Hall Room 107
USA E-mail: llevy@valdosta.edu

-----Original Message-----

From: James L. Black [<mailto:jblack@valdosta.edu>]
Sent: Sunday, April 08, 2007 5:22 PM
To: Dr. Ronald M. Zaccari; llevy@valdosta.edu
Cc: 'Traycee Martin'; 'Thressea H. Boyd'; 'Denise Bogart'
Subject: FW: ORP Legislation

Colleagues,

Just in case you have not heard or seen this proposed legislation I forward Vice Chancellor Bowes mail to you. You will recall recent concerns that the Optional Retirement Programs did not receive sufficient contributions by the University System. This proposed legislation seeks to address that issue and who may elect such plans.

Jim

James L. Black, M.A., M.B.A., M.P.A.
Vice President for Finance and Administration and
Assistant Professor Emeritus of Modern and Classical Languages
Valdosta State University
1500 North Patterson Street
Valdosta, Georgia 31698
Office (229) 333-5710
Facsimile (229) 259-5020
Mobile (229) 630-3672

-----Original Message-----

From: William Bowes [<mailto:William.Bowes@usg.edu>]
Sent: Monday, April 02, 2007 8:53 AM
To: robert.thompson@carnegie.gatech.edu; jracklif@gsu.edu; dwwray@mcg.edu; ebeauchea@ggc.usg.edu; dwhitfield@aug.edu; marc.mascolo@skio.usg.edu; helton_tom@colstate.edu; hendersona@fvsu.edu; davidheflin@mail.clayton.edu; harry.keim@gcsu.edu; jfrankli@georgiasouthern.edu; aparks@canes.gsw.edu; rhinds@kennesaw.edu; mmccconnell@ngcsu.edu; brignaji@mail.armstrong.edu; bgauthie@westga.edu; fwright@abac.edu; trobinson@atlm.edu;

saunders@cgcc.edu; sbailey@daltonstate.edu; henryr@darton.edu;
rcarruth@gpc.edu; galloway@ega.edu; pglaser@gsc.edu; jerryt@gdn.edu;
lyoumans@mail.maconstate.edu; lhobbs@mgc.edu; wlloyd@sga.edu;
wdeason@waycross.edu; timb@uga.edu; debbie.lasher@usg.edu; pmccord@spsu.edu;
wshuler@highlands.edu; william.bowes@usg.edu; angelia.thomas@usg.edu;
usha.ramachandran@usg.edu; campbele@savstate.edu; jblack@valdosta.edu;
nhigley@bainbridge.edu; Larry Wakefield; jmock@westga.edu
Cc: Tom Daniel; Rob Watts
Subject: ORP Legislation

To all:

Please review the attached. This is the new proposed legislation for the
Optional Retirement Program (ORP)

http://www.legis.ga.gov/legis/2007_08/sum/hb797.htm

Bill

--

William R. Bowes
Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs
Board of Regents, University System of Georgia
404-656-2232
404-657-7433 (Fax)

PDF Version link from the page above:

http://www.legis.ga.gov/legis/2007_08/pdf/hb797.pdf

03/30/07 - House First Readers

First Reader Summary

A BILL to be entitled an Act to amend Title 47 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to retirement and pensions, so as to change the definition of employees of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia who may opt not to participate in the Teachers Retirement System of Georgia; to increase the employer contribution to the members' accounts in the Regents Retirement Plan; to provide conditions for an effective date and automatic repeal; to repeal conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

Status History

Bill History

Date	Action
-------------	---------------

03/30/2007	House First Readers
------------	---------------------

Members and Visitors present:

5/2/2007

Page 108 of 110

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	*J. Gaston
G. Gaumond	M. Giddings
P. Gunter (absent)	A. Hufft (absent)
K. Keppler	S. Sikes

College of the Arts:

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

College Of Arts and Sciences:

R. Amesbury	*A. Aronson-Friedman	C. Barnbaum	B. Bergstrom
B. Blake	R. Carter	M. Davey	D. Hill
C. James	A. Kumar	J. LaPlant	*A. Lazari
B. Mboup	P. Moch	M. Noll	C. Peguesse
J. Rickman	J. Samaras	T. Thompson	*C. Tillman
J. Wang	J. Whitehead	M. Williams	

College Of Business Administration:

*B. Caster	J. Muncy	C. Tori	F. Ware
B. Williams			

College of Education:

S. Andrews	C. Barnett	H. Brasell	D. Briihl
B. Browne	R. Fulton	*C. Hudson	J. Hummel
L. Leader	D. Leech	*Y. Mat Som	L. Minor
K. Ott	S. Sanderson	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
Eric Nielsen for Lyle Indergaard
James LaPlant for Linda Calendrillo
Kenny Ott for Patrick McGuire
Michael Noll for Andreas Lazari
Beverly Richardson-Blake for Cheri Tillman
Jane Whitehead for Amy Aronson-Friedman
Richard Schmertzling for Clemente Hudson
Ralph Allen for John Gaston
Lars Leader for Yahya Mat Som

Student Government Association (non-voting)

President of the SGA: Jeremy Baker (absent)

Visitors:

Honey Coppage, Academic Affairs

Lisa Copeland, Academic Affairs

Sheri Gravett, Academic Affairs

Linda Gooden, Strategic Research and Analysis

Walter Peacock, Admissions and Enrollment Management

Thressea Boyd, Office of the President

Mylan Redfern, Mathematics and Computer Science

Tim Yorkey, Council on Staff Affairs

Denise Bogart, Human Resources and Employee Development