



FACULTY SENATE Est. 1991

Chairperson
Louis Levy

Vice Chairperson
Philip Gunter

Executive Secretary
Tracy Woodard-Meyers

Parliamentarian
Ed Walker

Minutes **March 22, 2012**

The Faculty Senate convened on Thursday, March 22, 2012 in the Magnolia Room at 3:32 p.m.

1. Call to Order by Dr. Louis Levy llevy@valdosta.edu

Dr. Levy reported that the new Health Sciences Building has passed the House and Senate and is waiting on the Governor's approval. The Governor has 40 days to decide on the budget. Would like to plan a celebration for 1st of May with faculty and students.

Theresa Thompson will be giving a report from the Grievance Committee. Dr. Levy thanked those that served on the committee.

Had a great Brown's Scholar luncheon today.

Dr. Levy turned the meeting over to Dr. Phil Gunter who will be reporting on behalf of Tracey Woodard-Meyers.

Dr. Gunter reminded everyone of events happening on campus:

- Visitation this Saturday
- College of Sciences/Science Saturday's
- Symphony performance

2. **Approval of the minutes of the February 16, 2012 meeting of the Faculty Senate.**
http://www.valdosta.edu/facsen/meeting/minutes/documents/FacultySenateMinutes_2011-05.pdf

Minutes approved.

3. New business

- a. Report from the Academic Committee – Philip Gunter pgunter@valdosta.edu

See **Attachment A** for Minutes from the November 14, 2011 Academic Committee meeting

See **Attachment B** for Minutes from the February 13, 2012 Academic Committee meeting

See **Attachment C** for Minutes from the March 5, 2012 Academic Committee meeting

Minutes from each meeting approved.

b. Report from the Committee on Committees – Ed Walker eddwalker@valdosta.edu

No Report

c. Report from the Institutional Planning Committee – Said Fares sfares@valdosta.edu

See **Attachment D** for recommendation to adopt Digital Measures software as a university-wide faculty data system. Recommendation was approved as submitted in Attachment D.

d. Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee – Vesta Whisler vrwhisler@valdosta.edu

See **Attachment E** for proposed changes to the Tenure and Promotion document

Committee was asked to clarify terminology relating to the BoR policy and looked at how other Universities handled this. General discussion was held among Senate concerning terminology relating to full/part-time/instructors/lecturers/sr. lecturers.

Proposal was remanded back to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

e. Report from the Faculty Grievance Committee – Theresa Thompson tthompson@valdosta.edu

Formal hearing panel was created from members of the Grievance Committee. A formal grievance hearing was held on March 5, 2012. Hearing was open to the public. Findings available upon request. Copy will be given to Dr. Meyers, Secretary of the Faculty Senate. Dr. Levy will give his response to the parties involved within his 30 day time frame.

f. Report from the Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee – Maren Hyer

mclegghyer@valdosta.edu See **Attachment F** for the final draft of the 2013-2014 University calendar

Calendar for the 2013-14 academic year was approved.

g. Report from the Senate Executive Secretary – Dr. Gunter on behalf of Tracy Woodard-Meyers tmeyers@valdosta.edu

1. See **Attachment G** for proposal to change the membership of the Faculty Senate, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and to add a President Elect and Secretary as Faculty Senate officers.

Dr. Gunter requested Dr. Walker present a PowerPoint presentation on the steps necessary starting with today's meeting to initiate this process all the way through to acceptance/non-acceptance of this proposal. Dr. Walker presented a handout with the necessary timeline. Dr. Walker read the underlined additions to the bylaws and the strikethroughs representing omissions. There was a 20 minute total time allotment for discussion of pros/cons. Dr. Walker called for a vote for those in favor of pursuing the changes to the bylaws.

Vote was taken and motion is tabled until the next meeting.

2. See **Attachment H** from Michael Noll requesting Faculty Senate pass a resolution against concealed weapons on VSU campus. *Remanded to Institutional Planning Committee.*
3. See **Attachment I** for report: “Recommendations of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee.” Dr. Alfred Fuciarelli.

Dr. Gunter reported at the end of the last faculty meeting last year the Senate approved the University-wide Tenure & Promotion Committee requesting a report from the committee after the 1st year of implementation. Procedures indicated that the Graduate School Dean & Asst. V.P. for Research would chair the committee. The Senate did not provide direction as to what to do with this document. Dr. Gunter recommends it be remanded to some committee of the Senate for review and that recommendations be made to the university wide policy and procedures. No motion needed. Document will be sent to T. Meyers.

4. Old Business

Dr. Levy received a complaint from a student senator about buying a \$60 Turning Point Software clicker. Clicker worked for 3 weeks and stopped working. Dr. Levy would like to know if anyone else has had problems with this. Dr. Gravett stated there was a recall on some of the software and it could be returned to the bookstore for replacement. Notice went out to students concerning the recall.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.

ATTACHMENT A

VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC COMMITTEE MINUTES November 14, 2011

The Academic Committee of the Valdosta State University Faculty Senate met in the University Center Cypress Room on Monday, October 17, 2011. Dr. Sharon Gravett, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, presided.

Members Present: Dr. Melissa Benton (Proxy for Dr. Deborah Weaver), Ms. Laura Wright, Dr. Ray Elson (Proxy for Dr. Nathan Moates), Ms. Karen Sodawsky (Proxy Ms. Catherine Schaeffer), Dr. Frank Flaherty, Dr. Frank Flaherty (Proxy for Dr. Kathe Lowney), Dr. Nicole Gibson, Dr. Ann Marie Smith, Dr. Melissa Benton, Dr. Carol Rossiter, and Dr. Colette Drouillard.

Members Absent: Dr. Deborah Weaver, Dr. Amy Aronson-Friedman, Dr. Nathan Moates, Ms. Catherine Schaeffer, Ms. Jessica Goldsmith, Dr. Linda Jurczak, Dr. Kathe Lowney, Dr. Donna Cunningham, and Dr. Selen Lauterbach.

Visitors Present: Dr. Chere Peguesse, Dr. Fred Downing, Dr. Alfred Fuciarelli, and Mr. Lee Bradley.

The Minutes of the October 17, 2011 meeting were approved by email on October 27, 2011. (pages 1-3).

A. College of Nursing

1. Revised Area F requirements for the AAS in Dental Hygiene was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 4-5).

B. Division of Social Work

1. Revised grading mode, Social Work (SOWK) 6600, "Practicum I", (PRACTICUM I – 3 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 6 lab hours, and 6 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2011. (pages 6-8 and 12-22).

2. Revised grading mode, Social Work (SOWK) 6610, "Practicum Seminar I", (PRACTICUM SEMINAR I – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 1 lab hour, and 1 contact hour), was approved effective Fall Semester 2011. (pages 9-22).

3. Revised grading mode, 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 2011. (pages 23-25 and 29-39).

4. Revised grading mode, Social Work (SOWK) 6710, "Practicum Seminar II", (PRACTICUM SEMINAR II – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 1 lab hour, and 1 contact hour), was approved effective Fall Semester 2011. (pages 26-39).

5. Revised grading mode, Social Work (SOWK) 7611, "Advanced Social Work Practicum I", (ADV SOCIAL WORK PRACTICUM I – 4 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 8 lab hours, and 8 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2011. (pages 40-42 and 46-53).

6. Revised grading mode, Social Work (SOWK) 7612, “Advanced Social Work Practicum II”, (ADV SOCIAL WORK PRACTICUM II – 4 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 8 lab hours, and 8 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2011. (pages 43-53).

C. Library Science

1. Revised course title and description, Library Science (MLIS) 7111, “Information Retrieval in Science, Technology, and Medicine”, (INF RETRIEVL SCI, TECH, MEDCNE – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the correction of the spelling of “unique” in the description. (pages 54-56).

2. Revised course title and description, Library Science (MLIS) 7420, “Literature for Children”, (LITERATURE FOR CHILDREN – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the description changed to read ...interests, and abilities... . (pages 57-64).

3. New course, Library Science (MLIS) 7423, “Literature for Young Adults”, (LITERATURE FOR YOUNG ADULTS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the description changed to read ...interests, and abilities. Emphasis... . (pages 65-72).

4. New course, Library Science (MLIS) 7425, “Youth Electronic Resources”, (YOUTH ELECTRONIC RESOURCES – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the description changed to read ...including, web and (pages 73-80).

5. Deactivation of MLIS 7160 was noted effective Fall Semester 2011. (pages 81-82).

6. Revised degree requirements for the MLIS – Optional Track – Health Sciences Librarianship was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the effective year changed from 2011 to 2012. (pages 83-84)

7. Revised degree requirements for the MLIS – New Optional Track – Youth Services Librarianship was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 85-86).

D. College of Arts and Sciences

1. Revised course prefix, Interdisciplinary Studies (INDS) 4000, “Interdisciplinary Studies Capstone”, (INTERDISC STUDIES CAPSTONE – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 87-89). Deactivated GENS 4000.

2. Revised course prefix, Interdisciplinary Studies (INDS) 2000, “Introduction to Interdisciplinary Studies”, (INTR INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 90-92). Deactivation GENS 2000.

3. New degree proposal BA in Interdisciplinary Studies was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 93-113) ***Requires BOR approval****

Approved with the following changes:

(page 96) – Track One Core Curriculum Area F remove the *

Track One Senior College Curriculum remove the sentence “In each concentration... and replace it with the

statement on page 140 of current catalog

Track Two Admission Requirements remove 2nd bullet and replace with statement on page 139 of current

Catalog

Track Two Core Curriculum F remove the *’s and the * statement

(page 97) - Replace the statement at the end of degree requirements “ In each concentration... replace with the

statement on page 140 of current catalog – also last sentence changed to read ...courses in Area F and the Senior Curriculum must...

4. Revised prerequisites, Math Education (MAED) 3500, “Middle Grades Math Methods”, (MIDDLE GRADES MATH METHODS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 114-116).
5. Revised prerequisites, Math Education (MAED) 3510, “Middle Grades Laboratory”, (MIDDLE GRADES LAB – 1 credit hour, 1 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 1 contact hour), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 117-119).
6. Revised degree requirements for the BA in Mathematics – Track Secondary Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 120-122).
7. Revised course description, Religious Studies (REL) 4700, “Topics in Religious Studies”, (TOPICS IN RELIGIOUS STUDIES – 1-3 credit hours, 1-3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 1-3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with description changed to read ...Studies. The course reflects... and effective date changed from Spring to Fall. (pages 123-125).
8. Revised course description, Religious Studies (REL) 4710, “Directed Study in Religious Studies”, (DIR STUDY RELIGIOUS STUDIES – 1-3 credit hours, 1-3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 1-3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the effective date changed from Spring to Fall. (pages 126-128).
9. Revised course description, Philosophy (PHIL) 4810, “Directed Study in Philosophy”, (DIRECTED STUDY IN PHILOSOPHY – 1-3 credit hours, 1-3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 1-3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the effective date changed from Spring to Fall. (pages 129-131).
10. Revised course description, Philosophy (PHIL) 4900, “Special Topics in Ethics”, (SPEC TOPICS IN ETHICS – 1-3 credit hours, 1-3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 1-3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the effective date changed from Spring to Fall. (pages 132-134).
11. Revised course description, Philosophy (PHIL) 4910, “Directed Study in Ethics”, (DIRECTED STUDY IN ETHICS – 1-3 credit hours, 1-3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 1-3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the effective date changed from Spring to Fall. (pages 135-137).
12. Revised course description, Philosophy (PHIL) 4800, “Special Topics in Philosophy”, (SPEC TOPICS IN PHILOSOPHY – 1-3 credit hours, 1-3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 1-3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the effective date changed from Spring to Fall. (pages 138-140).

Respectfully submitted,
Stanley Jones
Registrar

ATTACHMENT B

VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC COMMITTEE MINUTES February 13, 2012

The Academic Committee of the Valdosta State University Faculty Senate met in the University Center Rose Room on Monday, January 23, 2012. Dr. Sharon Gravett, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, presided. Members Present: Dr. Melissa Benton (Proxy for Dr. Deborah Weaver), Dr. Kathe Lowney (Proxy for Ms. Laura Wright), Dr. Ray Elson (Proxy for Dr. Nathan Moates), Ms. Catherine Schaeffer, Dr. Linda Jurczak, Dr. Frank Flaherty, Dr. Kathe Lowney, Dr. Ray Elson, Dr. Donna Cunningham, Dr. Linda Jurczak (Proxy for Dr. Nicole Gibson), Dr. Ann Marie Smith, Dr. Melissa Benton, Dr. Carol Rossiter and Dr. Colette Drouillard.

Members Absent: Dr. Deborah Weaver, Ms. Laura Wright, Dr. Amy Aronson-Friedman, Dr. Nathan Moates, Ms. Jessica Goldsmith, Dr. Nicole Gibson, and Dr. Selen Lauterbach.

Visitors Present: Dr. James Shrader, Dr. Lynn Minor, Dr. Shirley Andrews, Dr. Janet Foster, Mr. Mike Savoie, Dr. Maria Whyte, Dr. Corinne Myers-Jennings, Dr. Alfred Fuciarelli, Dr. Jane Kinney, and Mr. Lee Bradley.

The Minutes of the January 23, 2012 meeting were approved by email on January 30. (pages 1-4).

A. Division of Library and Information Science

1. New/Revised MLIS degree narrative for the graduate catalog was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the following changes. (pages 5-10).

- a. Under Selected MLIS Program Goals – a hyphen was added to “entry-level” (page 8)
- b. Under Examples of Outcome Assessments – was changed to read ...are examples of program assessments: (page 9)
- c. Under Examples of Outcome Assessments in item 4 – cataloging was changed to cataloguing (page 9)
- d. Under Progression, Retention, Dismissal, and Readmission in item 2 – remove “admitted Fall 2011 and thereafter” (page 9)
- e. Under Progression, Retention, Dismissal, and Readmission in item 4 – ...major professor and the Director...Science Program, and approval... (page 9)
- f. Under Progression, Retention, Dismissal, and Readmission in item 5d – ...draft the program of study, and the...(page 10)
- g. Under Program Graduation Requirements in item 2 - ...core courses. These courses are... (page 10)
- h. Under Program Graduation Requirements in item 4 – Submission of graduation application... (page 10)
- i. Under Admission to the MLIS Program – ...of a bachelor’s degree...additional program requirements; all required materials and fees must be submitted by the admission deadline. It is the responsibility... (page 10)
- j. Move the Admission to the MLIS Program and the Admission Deadlines sections to after the Examples of Outcome Assessments section and add the URL

B. College of Education

1. Revised senior college curriculum for the BSED in Communication Disorders was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the effective date changed from summer to fall. (pages 11-12).
2. Revised senior college curriculum for the BSED in Communication Disorders was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the effective date changed from summer to fall. (pages 13-14).
3. Revised curriculum for the MED in Early Childhood Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the effective date changed from summer to fall with “elect to” removed from the note “*Students may elect... . (pages 15-17).

4. New course, Early Childhood Education (ECED) 6000, "Special Topics in Early Childhood Education", (SPECIAL TOPICS IN ECE – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012 with description changed to read ...education. May be repeated under different topics for a total of 6 credit hours with the approval of the program coordinator. . (pages 18-24).
5. Revised course title and description, Early Childhood Education (ECED) 7210, "Assessment in Early Childhood Education", (ASSESSMENT IN EARLY CHLDHD EDU – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012 with the description changed to read ...change. The course examines alternative...education, ethics an assessment, and strategies for...data in the classroom. Interpretation and use of assessment data are emphasized. . (pages 25-30).
6. Revised course title and description, Early Childhood Education (ECED) 7220, "Early Childhood Inclusive Environments", (EARLY CHLDHD INCLUSVE ENVRNMNT – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012 with the description changed to read ...inclusive learning environments for all...disabilities. The area studied include modification of classroom design for visibility, distractibility, and accessibility, and the integration of...young children. . (pages 31-36).
7. New course, Early Childhood Education (ECED) 7340, "Action Research in Early Childhood Education", (ACTION RESEARCH IN ECE – 3 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 4 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012 was approved with the description changed to read – An examination of action research as self-reflective, systemic inquiry. Emphasis is placed on better understanding of teaching practice, reflection on current issues and problems, and discussion of questions, data collection and analysis, and conclusions. (pages 37-43).
8. Revised course title and description, Early Childhood Education (ECED) 7540, "Developing Creativity and Critical Thinking in Early Childhood Education", (DVLPNG CREATIVTY&CRIT THNK ECE – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012 was approved with the description changed to read – An examination of how... and the last sentence deleted. (pages 44-50).
9. Revised course title and description, Early Childhood Education (ECED) 7550, "Differentiating Instruction in P-5 Classrooms", (DIFFERNTIANG INSTR P-5 CLSSRM – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012 with the description changed to read – Investigation of differentiating content, process, and product (universal design) of the Early Childhood Education curriculum to meet the needs of all children. . (pages 51-57).
10. Revised course number, title and description, Early Childhood Education (ECED) 7230, "Teachers as Mentors, Coaches, and Leaders in Early Childhood Education", (TCHRS MENTORS COACH LDRS ECE – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012 was approved with the description changed to read ...research and leadership strategies to mentor... last sentence was deleted. (pages 58-64). Deactivation of ECED 8230.

C. College of Nursing

1. Revised Program Admission Requirements for the MSN program was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with item 3 changed to read - Minimum scores on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) of 400 (if taken before November 2011) or 146 (if taken after November 2011) on the verbal section and 3.5 on the analytical writing section. - and item 6 changed from number 6 in the list to being listed as a note after number 5. (pages 65-68).
2. Remove/Deactivate requirements for the MSN – all students choosing Care Manager, Nurse Educator, and Nurse Administrator roles was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 69-74).
3. Remove/Deactivate requirements for the MSN – RN-MSN option was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 75-78).
4. Revised curriculum for the MSN – Clinical Nurse Leader track was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the effective date changed from Summer to Fall with the NURS 7420 changed from 3 to 6 to 6 and Total of 6

hours required deleted. (pages 79-82).

5. Revised credit hours, Nursing (NURS) 7420, "Clinical Practicum and Residency for Clinical Nurse Leaders", (CLIN PRACT & RESID FOR CNL – 3-6 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 12-24 lab hours, and 12-24 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012 with the description changed to read ...students to enact...particularly team building... . (pages 83-91).

6. Revised curriculum for the MSN – Adult-Gerontology Nurse Practitioner track was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 92-94).

7. Revised course description, Nursing (NURS) 7011, "Statistical Applications in Nursing Research and Practice", (STAT APP IN NSG RESEARCH – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012. (pages 95-100).

8. Revised prerequisites, Nursing (NURS) 7220, "Advanced Evidence-based Practice", (ADVANCED EBP – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012. (pages 101-110).

9. Revised curriculum for the MSN – Certificate Curriculum Pathway was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the effective date changed from summer to fall. (pages 111-113).

10. Revised course title, Nursing (NURS) 7330, "Acute & Self-limiting Disease Management for the Nurse Practitioner, (ACUT/SLF-LIMIT DSEAS MGT NP – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012. (pages 114-122).

11. Revised course title, Nursing (NURS) 7330L, "Acute & Self-limiting Disease Management for the Nurse Practitioner Lab, (ACUT/SLF-LIMIT DSEAS MGT NP LB – 3 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 9 lab hours, and 9 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012. (pages 123-130).

12. Revised course title, Nursing (NURS) 7350, "Chronic & Complex Disease Management for the Nurse Practitioner, (CHRONC/COMPLX DSEAS MGT NP – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012. (pages 131-139).

13. Revised course title, Nursing (NURS) 7350L, "Chronic & Complex Disease Management for the Nurse Practitioner Lab, (CHRONC/COMPLX DSEAS MGT NP LAB – 3 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 9 lab hours, and 9 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012. (pages 140-147).

D. College of the Arts

1. Revised requirements for the minor in Speech Communications was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 148-149).

2. Revised prerequisites, Communication Arts (COMM) 3000, "Qualitative Communication Research Methods, (QUALITATIVE COMM RSCH MTHDS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 150-152).

3. Revised course title, and prerequisites, Communication Arts (COMM) 3200, "Introduction to Public Relations, (INTRO TO PUBLIC RELATIONS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the prerequisite changed to read – COMM 2110, ACED 2400 or CS 1000 or course equivalent, and either COMM 1100 or COMM 1110. (pages 153-155).

4. Revised prerequisites, 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 2012. (pages 156-158).

5. Revised prerequisites, Communication Arts (COMM) 3800, "Quantitative Communication Research Methods, (QUANTITATIVE COMM RSCH MTHDS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 159-161).

6. Reactivated course, revised title, credit hours, and description, Communication Arts (COMM) 4610, "Special Topics in Communication Studies, (SPECIAL TOPICS IN COMM – 1-3 credit hours, 1-3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours,

and 1-3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the description changed to read ...explore topics outside the... . (pages 162-164).

7. Revised credit hours and description, Communication Arts (COMM) 7999, "Thesis, (THESIS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the description changed to read ...thesis undertaken during the final semesters of study. Students...repeated for up to 6 hours of credit. . (pages 165-167). ***Pending Graduate Executive Committee approval***

8. Revised course description, Mass Media (MDIA) 4030, "Selected Topics in Mass Media, (SELECTED TOPICS IN MASS MEDIA – 1-3 credit hours, 1-3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 1-3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the description changed to read ...media. The course introduces alternative approaches to the study of themes, applications, trends, and issues in Media, and provides an opportunity... . (pages 168-170).

9. Revised course description, Mass Media (MDIA) 4600, "Digital Media Production, (DIGITAL MEDIA PRODUCTION – 4 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 4 lab hours, and 6 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with "post production" changed to "post-production" in the description. (pages 171-173).

10. Revised credit hours and description, Music (MUSC) 1131, "Functional Piano I, (FUNCTIONAL PIANO I – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the description changed to read - Prerequisite: Music or Music Education major only. The first course in a two-semester sequence, designed to develop basic keyboard skills essential to music study.. (pages 174-176).

11. Revised credit hours, prerequisites, and description, Music (MUSC) 1132, "Functional Piano II, (FUNCTIONAL PIANO II – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the description changed to read - Prerequisites: MUSC 1011, 1051, 1131, and Music or Music Education majors only. The second course in a two-semester sequence designed to develop basic keyboard skills essential to music study. . (pages 177-179).

****Items 12-26 are pending Graduate Executive Committee approval****

12. Revised narrative for the MMED and MMP degrees was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the narrative changed to read ...University, applicants must... . (pages 180-182).

13. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 5101, "Graduate Diction I, (GRADUATE DICTION I – 2 credit hours, 1 lecture hour, 2 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 183-185).

14. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 5102, "Graduate Diction II, (GRADUATE DICTION II – 2 credit hours, 1 lecture hour, 2 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 186-188).

15. Revised credit hours and prerequisite, Music (MUSC) 5500, "Band Literature, (BAND LITERATURE – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 . (pages 189-191).

16. Revised credit hours and prerequisite, Music (MUSC) 5510, "Choral Literature, (CHORAL LITERATURE – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 192-194).

17. New course, Music (MUSC) 6050, "Aural Skills Pedagogy, (AURAL SKILLS PEDAGOGY – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the prerequisite moved from the end of the description to the beginning. (pages 195-200).

18. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 6510, "Song Literature I, (SONG LITERATURE I – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 201-203).

19. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 6520, "Song Literature II, (SONG LITERATURE II – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 204-206).

20. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 6540, "Piano Literature I, (PIANO LITERATURE I – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 207-209).

21. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 6550, "Piano Literature II, (PIANO LITERATURE II – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 210-212).

22. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 6760, "Jazz Pedagogy, (JAZZ PEDAGOGY – 2 credit hours, 1 lecture hour, 2 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 213-215).
23. Revised credit hours and description, Music (MUSC) 7040, "Computer Applications in Music, (COMPUTER APPLICATIONS MUSIC – 2 credit hours, 1 lecture hour, 2 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 216-218).
24. Revised credit hours and title, Music (MUSC) 7530, "Chamber Music Literature, (CHAMBER MUSIC LITERATURE – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 219-221).
25. Revised credit hours and description, Music (MUSC) 7650, "Conducting, (CONDUCTING – 2 credit hours, 1 lecture hour, 2 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 222-224).
26. Deactivation of MUSC 5170, 6450, 6460, 6570, 6580, and 7722 was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 225-226).

E. Miscellaneous

1. Revised narrative for the Regents' Testing Program was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the narrative changed to read ...English 1102* or an approved substitute... . (pages 227-229).
2. Revised narrative for the Prior Learning Assessment was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the narrative changed to read ...possibly awarded academic credit at Valdosta.... and the correction of the spelling of "International". (pages 230-232).
3. It was also approved that the standard practice would now be to list curriculum using only course prefix and numbers, not titles, and the catalogue editor has permission to remove titles from any catalogue copy that now has them.

Respectfully submitted,
Stanley Jones
Registrar

ATTACHMENT C

VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC COMMITTEE MINUTES March 5, 2012

The Academic Committee of the Valdosta State University Faculty Senate met in the University Center Rose Room on Monday, March 5, 2012. Dr. Sharon Gravett, Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, presided.
Members Present: Dr. Deborah Weaver, Dr. Colette Drouillard (Proxy for Ms. Laura Wright), Dr. Nathan Moates, Ms. Catherine Schaeffer, Dr. Linda Jurczak, Dr. Kathe Lowney (Proxy for Dr. Frank Flaherty), Dr. Kathe Lowney, Dr. Nathan Moates (Proxy for Dr. Ray Elson), Dr. Nicole Gibson, Dr. Ann Marie Smith, Dr. Melissa Benton, Ms. Michelle Dykes, Dr. Carol Rossiter and Dr. Colette Drouillard.

Members Absent: Ms. Laura Wright, Dr. Amy Aronson-Friedman, Ms. Jessica Goldsmith, Dr. Frank Flaherty, Dr. Ray Elson, and Dr. Donna Cunningham.

Visitors Present: Dr. Nolan Argyle, Dr. Alfred Fuciarelli, Dr. Julie Reffel, Dr. Mike Griffin, Dr. James Shrader, Dr. Maria Whyte, Dr. Brenda Dyal, Dr. Anita Hufft, Mr. Mike Savoie, and Dr. Jane Kinney.

The Minutes of the February 13, 2012 meeting were approved by email on February 22. (pages 1-4).

A. Graduate School

1. Revised requirements for undergraduates seeking enrollment in Graduate School was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 5-7).

B. College of Arts and Sciences

1. Revised degree requirements for the MPA degree was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 8-9).
2. New course, Public Administration (PADM) 7600, "Public Policy Formation", (PUBLIC POLICY FORMATION – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Summer Semester 2012. (pages 10-20).

C. College of Education

1. Information item – Termination of EDS – Middle Grades Education (page 21).
2. Information item – Termination of EDS – Pre-Elementary/Early Childhood/Kindergarten Teacher Education (pages 22).
3. Information item – Termination of EDS – Secondary Education (page 23).
4. Revised admission requirements for the BSED in Early Childhood Education, and the BSED in Special Education – Early Childhood Special Education General Curriculum was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with a comma between "curriculum and which" and also add a "s" to the final "require". (pages 204-206).
5. Revised prerequisites, Early Childhood & Special Education (ECSE) 3390, "Early Childhood Inclusive Practicum and Seminar: Pre-K-K, (INCLUSIVE PRACT & SEM PREK-K – 2 credit hours, 1 lecture hours, 4 lab hours, and 5 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (page 207).
6. Revised prerequisites, Early Childhood & Special Education (ECSE) 3490, "Early Childhood Inclusive Practicum and Seminar: Grades 1-3, (INCLUSIVE PRACT & SEM GR 1-3 – 2 credit hours, 1 lecture hours, 4 lab hours, and 5 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (page 207).
7. Revised prerequisites, Early Childhood & Special Education (ECSE) 4390, "Early Childhood Inclusive Practicum and Seminar: Grades 4-5, (INCLUSIVE PRACT & SEM GR 4-5 – 2 credit hours, 1 lecture hours, 4 lab hours, and 5 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (page 207).

8. Revised prerequisites, Early Childhood Education (ECED) 3190, “Early Childhood Practicum and Seminar: PreK-K, (ECED PRACTICUM/SEMINAR: PREK-K – 2 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 208-215).
9. Revised prerequisites, Early Childhood Education (ECED) 3690, “Early Childhood Practicum and Seminar: Grades 1-3, (ECED PRACTICUM/SEMINAR: GR 1-3 – 2 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 216-224).
10. Revised prerequisites, Early Childhood & Special Education (ECSE) 4490, “Student Teaching and Reflective Seminar in Early Childhood and Special Education, (STUDENT TEACHING & SEM IN ECSE – 9 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 9 lab hours, and 9 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the prefix corrected in the Current Course Prefix, Title, & Number box from ECED to ECSE. (pages 225-236).
11. Revised prerequisites, Early Childhood Education (ECED) 4690, “Early Childhood Practicum and Seminar: Grades 4-5, (ECED PRACTICUM/SEMINAR – 2 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 237-245).
12. Revised prerequisites, Early Childhood Education (ECED) 4790, “Student Teaching and Reflective Seminar, (STUDENT TEACHING AND SEMINAR – 9 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 9 lab hours, and 9 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 246-256).
13. Revised prerequisites, grading mode, and course description, Early Childhood & Special Education (ECSE) 4420, “Seminar in Classroom Management and Collaboration with Family, School, and Community Agencies, (SEM CLASS MGNT & COLLABORATION – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the description changed to read ...”unsatisfactory”. Examination...various programs, methods, and techniques... . (pages 257-265).
14. Revised prerequisites, Literacy (LITR) 3110, “Emergent Literacy, (EMERGENT LITERACY – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the co-requisite move from the end of the description to the beginning of the description. (pages 266-268).
15. New course, Early Childhood & Special Education (ECSE) 2999, “Entry to the Education Profession, (ENTRY TO EDUCATION – 0 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 0 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 269-278).
16. Revised Area F requirements for the BSED in Special Education – Early Childhood Special Education General Curriculum was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 279-280)
17. Revised Area F requirements for the BSED in Early Childhood Education was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 281-282).
18. Revised name for the EDS in Coaching Pedagogy in Physical Education was approved effective Summer Semester 2012. (pages 283-284). ***Graduate Executive approval*** and BOR notification.

D. College of Nursing

1. New GPA requirements for the Pre-Nursing major students was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 24-26).
2. Revised program objectives for the BSN degree was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 27-29).
3. Revised course title, and prerequisites, Nutrition (NUTR) 3300, “Nutrition, Fitness, and Health, (NUTRITION, FITNESS, AND HEALTH – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 30-32).

4. Degree proposal for the DNP – Doctor of Nursing was approved with “Distance Learning Department” changed to “eLearning Department” page 59 and item D page 62 was changed to read ...CON, Academic Committee, University’s Graduate Executive, and Faculty Senate Committees. Final... . (pages 33-102). ***Pending BOR approval***
5. Degree proposal for the DNP – Doctor of Nursing was approved (pages 103-104).
6. New course, Nursing (NURS) 9011, “Biostatistics”, (BIostatISTICS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the prerequisite removed from the course syllabus and the description changed to read ...problems, and improvement of population... . (pages 105-112).
7. New course, Nursing (NURS) 9100, “DNP Foundations Seminar”, (DNP FOUNDATIONS – 1 credit hour, 1 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 1 contact hour), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the prerequisite removed from the course syllabus . (pages 113-119).
8. New course, Nursing (NURS) 9110, “Principles of Epidemiology”, (PRINCIPLES OF EPIDEMIOLOGY – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the prerequisite removed from the course syllabus. (pages 120-125).
9. New course, Nursing (NURS) 9120, “Policy, Finance, & Health Systems”, (POLICY, FINANCE, & HLTH SYSTMS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the prerequisite removed from the course syllabus and a comma added after Finance in the course title. (pages 126-135).
10. New course, Nursing (NURS) 9130, “Informatics for Advanced Practice Nursing”, (INFORMATICS ADVANCED PRACTICE – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the prerequisite removed from the course syllabus. (pages 136-142).
11. New course, Nursing (NURS) 9200, “Advanced Applications of Evidence-Based Practice”, (ADVANCED APPLICATIONS OF EBP – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the prerequisite removed from the course syllabus and a “evidence based” was changed to “evidence-based” in the description. (pages 143-150).
12. New course, Nursing (NURS) 9210, “Leadership and Role Development for Advanced Practice Nursing”, (LEADERSHIP & ROLE FOR APN – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the prerequisite removed from the course syllabus and the description was changed to read ...entrepreneurship, change, and... . (pages 151-157).
13. New course, Nursing (NURS) 9220, “Population Health for Advanced Practice Nursing”, (POPULATION HEALTH FOR APN – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the prerequisite removed from the course syllabus and the course description changed to read ...disease management, quality, safety... . (pages 158-166).
14. New course, Nursing (NURS) 9230, “Health Ethics”, (HEALTH ETHICS – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the prerequisite removed from the course syllabus. (pages 167-172).
15. New course, Nursing (NURS) 9300, “DNP Residency I”, (DNP RESIDENCY I – 3 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 12 lab hours, and 12 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the course description changed to: Prerequisites: NURS 9011, 9100, 9110, 9120, 9130, 9200, 9210, 9220, and 9230. Intense practice immersion that integrates the role of the DNP into clinical practice, focusing on designing, delivering, and evaluating comprehensive, evidence-based care to individuals, aggregates, and populations.. (pages 173-180).
16. New course, Nursing (NURS) 9310, “DNP Residency II”, (DNP RESIDENCY II – 3 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 12 lab hours, and 12 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with correction of the spelling of “Residency” in the course title and the course description changed to: Prerequisites: NURS 9011, 9100, 9110, 9120, 9130, 9200, 9210, 9220, and 9230. Intense practice immersion that integrates the role of the DNP into clinical practice, focusing on leadership, consultation, advocacy, and interdisciplinary collaboration to improve the safety and quality of health care for diverse populations. . (pages 181-187).

17. New course, Nursing (NURS) 9400, “DNP Clinical Project I”, (DNP CLINICAL PROJECT I – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the course description change to read: Prerequisites: NURS 9011, 9100, 9110, 9120, 9130, 9200, 9210, 9220, and 9230. Development of the DNP capstone project, demonstrating the student’s ability to evaluate and apply theory and evidence to clinical practice and leadership .. (pages 188-195).

18. New course, Nursing (NURS) 9410, “DNP Clinical Project II”, (DNP CLINICAL PROJECT II – 3 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 10 lab hours, and 10 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the course description changed to read: Prerequisite: NURS 9400. Implementation, evaluation, and dissemination of the DNP capstone project. . (pages 196-203).

E. College of the Arts

1. Department of Art mission statement was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 285-287).

2. Revised course description, Art (ART) 3072, “Digital Photography”, (DIGITAL PHOTOGRAPHY – 3 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 6 lab hours, and 6 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the description changed to read ...course emphasizing the technical... . (pages 288-290).

3. Revised title, prerequisites, and course description, Art (ART) 3072, “Color Photography”, (COLOR PHOTOGRAPHY – 3 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 6 lab hours, and 6 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the description changed to read ...photography emphasizing practical... . (pages 291-293).

4. Revised prerequisites, Art History (ARTH) 4170, “Prehistoric Through Historic Native American Art”, (PREHIST/HIST NATIVE AM ART – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 294-296).

5. Revised prerequisites, Art History (ARTH) 4180, “Modern and Contemporary Native American Art”, (MOD/CONT NATIVE AM ART – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 297-299).

6. New course, Art (ART) 4071, “Advanced Black and White Photography”, (ADV B&W PHOTOGRAPHY – 3 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 6 lab hours, and 6 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the black and white photography changed to lower case in the course description, and the comma was removed after control. (pages 300-302).

7. New course, Art (ART) 4073, “Photographic Lighting Techniques”, (PHOTOGRAPHIC LIGHTING – 3 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 6 lab hours, and 6 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 303-305).

8. Revised course prefix, number, and title, Music (MUSC) 3120, “Rhythm Section Techniques and Pedagogy”, (RHYTHM SECTION TECH PEDAGOGY – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 306-308). Deactivation of MUE 3740.

9. Revised credit hours, Music Education (MUE) 4720, “Advanced String Methods”, (ADV STRING METHODS – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 3 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 309-311).

10. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 4750, “Vocal Pedagogy”, (ADV STRING METHODS – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the prefix corrected from MUE to MUSC in Current Course Prefix, Title, & Number box. (pages 312-314).

11. Revised course prefix, and description, Music (MUSC) 4760, “Jazz Pedagogy”, (JAZZ PEDAGOGY – 2 credit hours, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 315-317). Deactivation of MUE 4760.

12. Revised prerequisite, Music (MUSC) 1011, “Music Theory I”, (MUSIC THEORY I – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 318-320).

13. Revised prerequisite, Music (MUSC) 1012, “Music Theory II”, (MUSIC THEORY II – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the removal of the co-requisite. (pages 321-323).
14. Revised prerequisite, Music (MUSC) 1051, “Music Theory Lab I”, (MUSIC THEORY LAB I – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 324-326).
15. Revised prerequisite, Music (MUSC) 1052, “Music Theory Lab II”, (MUSIC THEORY LAB II – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 2 lab hours, and 2 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the removal of the co-requisite. (pages 327-329).
16. Revised prerequisite, Music (MUSC) 2011, “Music Theory III”, (MUSIC THEORY III – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the removal of the co-requisite. (pages 330-332).
17. Revised prerequisite, Music (MUSC) 2012, “Music Theory IV”, (MUSIC THEORY IV – 3 credit hours, 3 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the removal of the co-requisite. (pages 333-335).
18. Revised prerequisite, Music (MUSC) 2051, “Music Theory Lab III”, (MUSIC THEORY LAB III – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 3 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the removal of the co-requisite. (pages 336-338).
19. Revised prerequisite, Music (MUSC) 2052, “Music Theory Lab IV”, (MUSIC THEORY LAB IV – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 3 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012 with the removal of the co-requisite. (pages 339-341).
20. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 3830, “The Spotlighters”, (THE SPOTLIGHTERS – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 3 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 342-344).
21. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 3840, “Opera and Musical Theatre”, (OPERA AND MUSICAL THEATRE – 1 credit hour, 0 lecture hours, 3 lab hours, and 3 contact hours), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 345-347).
22. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 4731, “Percussion Pedagogy”, (PERCUSSION PEDAGOGY – 1 credit hour, 1 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 1 contact hour), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 348-350).
23. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 4732, “Brass Pedagogy”, (BRASS PEDAGOGY – 1 credit hour, 1 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 1 contact hour), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 351-353).
24. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 4733, “Woodwind Pedagogy”, (WOODWIND PEDAGOGY – 1 credit hour, 1 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 1 contact hour), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 354-356).
25. Revised credit hours, Music (MUSC) 4734, “String Pedagogy”, (STRING PEDAGOGY – 1 credit hour, 1 lecture hour, 0 lab hours, and 1 contact hour), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 357-359).
26. New course, Music (MUSC) 6050, “Aural Skills Pedagogy”, (AURAL SKILLS PEDAGOGY – 2 credit hours, 2 lecture hours, 0 lab hours, and 2 contact hour), was approved effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 360-362).
27. Deactivation of MUE 2640, 4640, MUSC 1110, 2400, 2450, 3450, 3740, 4480, 4880, and 4890 was noted effective Fall Semester 2012. (pages 363-364).

Respectfully submitted,
Stanley Jones
Registrar

ATTACHMENT D:

Valdosta State University
Institutional Planning Committee
February 14, 2012

The Institutional Planning Committee met in the Library Room #1480 on Tuesday, February 14, 2012.

Members Present: Said C Fares (presided), Michael Eaves, Mike Holland, David Seiler, Stephen Shirlock, Hanae Kanno, Sue Fuciarelli, Russ Mast, and Terence Sullivan.

Members Absent: Arlene (Haddon) Corbitt, Steven Kohn, Brian Day, Aubrey Fowler, Alice Kolakowaska, and Philip Gunter.

The senate executive committee remanded the Dean's Council recommendation regarding implementation of Digital Measures to the Institutional Planning Committee.

The Institutional Planning Committee invited Drs. Sharon Gravett, Sanjay Gupta, and Lisa Baldwin to present the Digital Measures software. Dr. Sanjay Gupta showed a video and a demonstration of the Digital Measures software. Drs. Gravett, Gupta, and Baldwin presented to the committee the advantages and limitations of Digital Measures.

The committee approved the recommendation of adopting the Digital Measures software as a university-wide faculty data system to be deployed gradually across various colleges on campus.

ATTACHMENT E

**Valdosta State University
Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures**

Section 3. University-Wide Standards for Tenure and Promotion

Section 3.1 Tenure and Promotion Substantive Standards

3.1.2 General Substantive Expectations for Faculty Performance Based on Rank

<u>SUMMARY OF MINIMUM YEARS IN RANK AT VSU</u>			
<u>Non-Tenure Track Full-Time Faculty</u>		<u>Tenure Track Full-Time Faculty</u>	
<u>For Promotion to</u>	<u>Minimum Service in Previous Rank</u>	<u>For Promotion to</u>	<u>Minimum Service in Previous Rank</u>
<u>Lecturer</u>	<u>Entry-Level Position</u>		
<u>Senior Lecturer</u>	<u>6 years as Lecturer</u>		
		<u>Instructor</u>	<u>Entry-level position</u>
		<u>Assistant Professor</u>	<u>Entry-level position or promotable from Instructor once terminal degree is earned</u>
		<u>Associate Professor</u>	<u>4 years as Assistant Professor</u>
		<u>Professor</u>	<u>5 years as Associate Professor</u>
<p>Note: Minimum Service in Previous Rank meets BoR criteria from <i>4.5 Award of Promotion—USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook</i>. Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors are eligible for tenure according to BoR Policy 8.3.7.2. The maximum time that may be served in combination of full-time instructional appointments (instructor or professorial ranks) without the award of tenure shall be ten (10) years (BoR Policy 8.3.7.6)</p>			

Lecturers – The units of VSU are permitted to employ full-time lecturers “to carry out special instructional functions such as basic skills instruction.” Lecturers are an integral part of the teaching corps of many VSU departments, teaching primarily core and lower-division courses. The Lecturer position is not a tenure-track position and the holder is not eligible for consideration for the award of tenure. Lecturers are not considered to hold professorial academic rank. Full-time lecturers are appointed by the institution on a year-to-year basis. Each unit must establish a policy that governs the review of Lecturer as well as procedures for retention and possible promotion of a Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. These policies must include two types of reviews: a third-year review and a fifth-year review. In these reviews, the primary consideration will be contributions in instruction and service. Lecturers whose reviews do not demonstrate exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value may be terminated at the end of their sixth year.

Promotion to Senior Lecturers – Lecturers who are reappointed after the fifth year review may be considered for promotion to Senior Lecturer, to begin in their seventh year of service. The promotion of Lecturer to Senior Lecturer at VSU is based upon the experience and academic background of the candidate as well as the instructional needs in the position. An eligible candidate must submit an application for promotion which includes a portfolio with only the appropriate items outlined in section 3.2 of this document.

Senior Lecturers – The title of Senior Lecturer applies to positions that call for academic background similar to that of a faculty member with professorial rank but that involves primarily teaching. Additional duties may be assigned, including academic advising and working with tenure-track faculty in course and curriculum development. The position is not a tenure-track position and the holder is not eligible for consideration for the award of tenure. Senior Lecturers are not considered to hold professorial academic rank. Full-time Senior Lecturers are appointed by the institution on a year-to-year basis.

Instructors – The Instructorship is an entry-level position for the University. Candidates do not need a minimum number of years as a Lecturer or Senior Lecturer. Candidates usually do not have the terminal degrees appropriate for their disciplines, but it is presumed that the Instructor is pursuing one in a timely manner. An Instructor's primary responsibilities are to establish, develop, and refine an effective teaching style and, based on consultation with the unit head, director, and/or Dean, to contribute effort to academic achievement and service that is consistent with the responsibilities of the position and the goals of the unit. Candidates should show promise of moving toward excellence in the criteria appropriate to their work assignments. The assumption is that the Instructor is working toward a tenure-track position; however, time spent as Instructor does not accrue toward tenure. If, after three years, an Instructor has not earned a terminal degree, he/she may be terminated or reclassified as a Lecturer or Senior Lecturer.

Promotion to Assistant Professor – It is expected that the Instructor has earned a terminal degree in order to be eligible for promotion to Assistant Professor. Typical expectations for assistant professors include: 1) satisfactory teaching, 2) showing promise in the preparation of and dissemination of scholarship or engagement in juried creative works grounded in their areas of expertise, and 3) modest service that is of value to the discipline. An eligible candidate must present a portfolio which includes the items outlined in section 3.2 of this document.

Assistant Professors - Assistant professors hold the highest earned terminal/research degree in their field of specialization. Typical of a regional university, a pattern of effective and productive scholarly work or juried creative works by the assistant professor includes the publication of dissertation research or peer reviews of creative work. Service may be modest, but must be of value to the unit, college or division, university and/or discipline. Teaching performance should be aligned with standards found in comparable institutions and be demonstrated by student satisfaction, student learning, achievement of outcomes, and peer recognition.

Promotion to Associate Professor – Typical expectations for associate professors include: 1) satisfactory teaching, 2) preparation of and dissemination of scholarship or engagement in juried creative works grounded in their areas of expertise, and 3) modest service that is of value to the

discipline. An eligible candidate must present a portfolio which includes the items outlined in section 3.2 of this document.

Associate Professors - The areas of expertise and professional activities of associate professors should be more advanced, more clearly-defined, and more widely-recognized as their academic careers progress. Typically, as the faculty member's roles and contributions grow in significance, leadership, and initiative, the faculty member will have established a strong record of accomplishment in at least two of the following three areas: teaching and student learning, scholarship, and service. Since all three areas are informed by scholarship, the ability to conduct and disseminate scholarship or engage in juried creative activities grounded in their area of expertise are important to the work of associate professors.

Promotion to Professor - Appointment to associate professor does not entail eventual promotion to Professor. The rank of Professor is reserved for those who have demonstrated continuous intellectual development and academic leadership. Candidates for promotion to professor shall have established themselves as leaders, mentors, and scholars, and contributed to the discipline. Typical expectations for professors include: 1) satisfactory teaching, 2) preparation of and dissemination of significant scholarship or engagement in juried creative works grounded in their areas of expertise, and 3) service that is of value to the discipline. An eligible candidate must present a portfolio which includes the items outlined in section 3.2 of this document.

Professors - As faculty members whose careers have advanced to extremely high levels of effectiveness and productivity, professors are typically characterized as leaders, mentors, scholars, experts, and distinguished colleagues.

21 March 2012

Grievance Committee Report to the Faculty Senate

Grievance Committee Chair: Dr. Theresa Thompson

Grievance Hearing Panel Chair: Dr. Wallace Koehler

Grievance Hearing Panel Members: Dr. James Muncy, Dr. Alan Bernstein, Dr. Carl Cates, Dr. Peggy Moch

Just a reminder to everyone. The Grievance Committee and any formal panel formed from that committee act solely as an advisory body to the President.

As outlined by the procedures in the Faculty Senate Bylaws document, the Grievance Committee in a plenary session agreed that Dr. Kolakowska's allegations that Dr. Chatelain, Head of the Department of Physics, Astronomy, and Geosciences, may have violated Board of Regents, VSU, and departmental policies, and in doing so, may have been denied due process. A formal hearing panel was created from members of the Grievance Committee by Drs. Chatelain and Kolakowska—the only parties to the grievance at the time of the initial plenary session. After the initial Grievance Plenary Session, and 10 days prior to the formal hearing, Dr. Francis Flaherty, of the Dept. of Physics, Astronomy, and Geosciences, was named as a co-party with Dr. Chatelain.

On March 5, 2012, the Formal Grievance Hearing Panel convened and considered written and verbal evidence provided by Drs. Chatelain, Flaherty, and Kolakowska. After due consideration of the evidence presented, the Formal Hearing Panel Chair, Dr. Wallace Koehler, submitted their findings. Because the Hearing was open to the public, the complete findings of the committee will be available upon request. I am sending a copy to Dr. Meyers as Secretary of the Faculty Senate.

In summary, the Panel reached the following conclusions regarding Dr. Kolakowska's allegations of policy and due process violations:

1. The Panel concludes that Dr. Chatelain may have acted outside both the spirit and letter of BOR Regulation 8.3.4.2" in his delivery of Dr. Kolakowska's letter of termination.
2. In addition, departmental procedure was violated when "action letters and reports were not placed in the complainant's personnel file" according to the department's policy manual.
3. The Panel notes that the BoR and VSU have "established policies" that should "be followed by its officers and departments to grant promotion and tenure and to make retention decisions for non-tenured faculty." The Panel "considers" that the Department of Physics, Astronomy, and Geosciences' "mixing of tenure and promotion matters and retention matters and the potential for causes for a non-retention decision to be made public may constitute variations from the prescribed procedures of both the Department and the University."
4. The Panel found that "Dr. Kolakowska may not have been advised in a timely manner and that her evaluation by members of the Tenure, Promotion, and Retention Committee, Department of Physics, Astronomy, and Geosciences was not discussed with her. This non-action may constitute a variation from the prescribed procedures of both the Department and the University."
5. Finally, the Panel heard testimony that indicated "the Physics, Astronomy and Geosciences Department's faculty handbook and its tenure, promotion, and retentions policies were not readily or easily available in either print or digital format. The complainant, Dr. Alice Kolakowska made several good faith but

unsuccessful attempts to secure a copy. The unavailability of the document may have hindered Dr. Kolakowska's efforts to reach a solution to the personnel action."

The Hearing Panel made the following recommendations based on the above findings:

1. Drs. Edward Chatelain did not substantially deviate from his responsibilities as Chair of Physics, Astronomy and Geosciences toward Dr. Kolakowska in the matter before the Panel. The Panel does not recommend censure of Dr. Chatelain.
2. Dr. Francis Flaherty did not substantially deviate from his responsibilities as Chair of the Physics, Astronomy and Geosciences Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Retention toward Dr. Kolakowska in the matter before the Panel. The Panel does not recommend censure of Dr. Flaherty.
3. "The Panel recommends department heads and others who might deliver termination letters be instructed to send them by certified mail, return receipt or that the notification be delivered personally and be receipted" as is required by BoR Regulation 8.3.4.2.
4. "The Panel recommends that department administrators be periodically reminded" of their responsibility to follow department procedures regarding filing of personnel action items; that department administrators establish timelines regarding personnel actions such as this one; "that timely discussions of evaluations and other personnel actions be undertaken and documented"; and "that academic departments, colleges, and the University publish personnel policies that may affect tenure, promotion, and retention of faculty."

The President has received a full report from the Hearing Panel and is preparing his response. Thank you.

Report of the March 5, 2012 Grievance Panel Valdosta State University

In January 2012, the VSU Faculty Senate Grievance Committee heard a grievance filed by Dr. Alice Kolakowska, Assistant Professor of Physics, Astronomy, and Geosciences. The Committee determined that sufficient evidence existed to establish a Grievance Panel to hear Dr. Kolakowska's grievance against the VSU Physics, Astronomy, and Geosciences Department in general and Dr. Edward Chatelain and Dr. Francis Flaherty in particular. Dr. Chatelain is chair of the Physics, Astronomy, and Geosciences Department and Dr. Flaherty is chair of the department's Tenure, Promotion, and Retention Committee.

A five-member Panel was created from the Faculty Senate Grievance Committee membership. The members were Dr. Wallace C. Koehler, chair, Dr. Alan M. Bernstein, Dr. Carl M. Cates, Dr. Peggy L. Moch, and Dr. James A. Muncy. Ms. Maura Copeland, Esquire, Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs, Georgia Southern University, served as counsel for the Panel. That Grievance Panel convened a hearing on March 5, 2012.

The complainant, Dr. Alice Kolakowska, received a contract non-renewal letter from Dr. Philip Gunter, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, dated July 1, 2011. That letter stipulated that Dr. Kolakowska would not be offered employment in the academic year 2012-13. Dr. Kolakowska was retained for academic year 2011-12.

In her grievance, Dr. Kolakowska alleged deviations from departmental processes for termination of non-tenured faculty. The Grievance Panel's findings are as follows:

1. Dr. Edward Chatelain did not substantially deviate from his responsibilities as Chair of Physics, Astronomy and Geosciences toward Dr. Kolakowska in the matter before the Panel. The Panel does not recommend censure of Dr. Chatelain.
2. Dr. Francis Flaherty did not substantially deviate from his responsibilities as Chair of the Physics, Astronomy and Geosciences Committee on Tenure, Promotion, and Retention toward Dr. Kolakowska in the matter before the Panel. The Panel does not recommend censure of Dr. Flaherty.
3. It was agreed by Dr. Kolakowska and Dr. Chatelain that the termination letter and other documentation were delivered by placing the notification of termination face up and open on Dr. Kolakowska's desk. The Panel concludes that the delivery may have been outside both the spirit and letter of BOR Regulation 8.3.4.2. This may constitute a deviation from process. The Panel recommends department heads and others who might deliver termination letters be instructed to send them by certified mail, return receipt or that the notification be delivered personally and be receipted.
4. It was acknowledged by both the complainant and a respondent that action letters and reports were not placed in the complainant's personnel file as directed by the department's policy document. This constitutes a deviation from process. The panel recommends that department administrators be periodically reminded of this responsibility to insure compliance.
5. In the discussions between Dr. Kolakowska and Dr. Chatelain concerning her peer course review, Dr. Chatelain recommended that Dr. Kolakowska respond to the negative report "immediately." For a

variety of reasons, the term “immediately” was interpreted differently by each of the parties. The potential for misunderstanding may constitute a deviation from process. The panel recommends that a specific timeline with deadlines be agreed by the parties in personnel actions such as this one.

6. BOR and VSU have established policies to be followed by its officers and departments to grant promotion and tenure and to make retention decisions for non-tenured faculty. These are generally considered to be independent processes. The Physics, Astronomy, and Geosciences Department may mix these processes in the deliberations of its Tenure, Promotion, and Retention Committee. Tenure and promotion decisions are made through prescribed policies and processes. The non-retention decision is more frequently reserved to University administrative officers, to include the President or his designee, college deans, and department heads. When a retention committee deliberates a retention issue, the causes leading to the retention decision may become generally known. The Panel considers that the mixing of tenure and promotion matters and retention matters and the potential for causes for a non-retention decision to be made public may constitute variations from the prescribed procedures of both the Department and the University.
7. Testimony indicates that Dr. Kolakowska may not have been advised in a timely manner and that her evaluation by members of the Tenure, Promotion, and Retention Committee, Department of Physics, Astronomy, and Geosciences was not discussed with her. This non-action may constitute a variation from the prescribed procedures of both the Department and the University. The Panel recommends that timely discussions of evaluations and other personnel actions be undertaken and documented.
8. Testimony indicates that the Physics, Astronomy and Geosciences Department’s faculty handbook and its tenure, promotion, and retentions policies were not readily or easily available in either print or digital format. The complainant, Dr. Alice Kolakowska made several good faith but unsuccessful attempts to secure a copy. The unavailability of the document may have hindered Dr. Kolakowska’s efforts to reach a solution to the personnel action. The unavailability of personnel policy documents constitutes a variation from the prescribed procedures that an academic department should follow. The Panel recommends that academic departments, colleges, and the University publish personnel policies that may affect tenure, promotion, and retention of faculty.

At no time during the March 5, 2012, Grievance Panel proceedings did the complainant, Dr. Alice Kolakowska, nor her representative petition the Grievance Panel for any specific recommendations for relief. In the absence of same, the Grievance Panel concludes that it lacks competence to suggest or recommend specific actions that the University President might undertake on Dr. Kolakowska’s behalf.

The Grievance Panel recommends that the University and the Department of Physics, Astronomy, and Geosciences consider changes and modifications to their procedures and policies.

While the Grievance Panel concludes that no specific evidence of bullying or mobbing was presented to it by the complainant, the possibility for bullying, mobbing, and other inappropriate activity may arise in any social environment, to include academic departments. Testimony before the Grievance Panel suggests that VSU does not now have an independent officer whose function would be to investigate and mitigate such activity. An office of ombudsperson or an expanded competence for the Office of Social Equity might be considered.

This document was submitted March 7, 2012, to Dr. Louis Levy, Interim President of Valdosta State University and Dr. Theresa Thompson, Chair, Faculty Senate Grievance Committee. Copies were provided to Dr. Chatelain, Dr. Flaherty, Dr. Kolakowska, and Ms. Copeland.

Wallace Koehler, PhD
Chair, Grievance Panel

ATTACHMENT F

Calendar for 2013 - 2014
FALL 2013

Mon, Aug 12	First Class Day
Mon, Sept 2	Labor Day Holiday
Thurs, Oct 3	Midterm
Mon-Tues, October 14-15	Fall Break
Wed- Fri, Nov 27 – 29	Thanksgiving Holidays
Mon, Dec 2	Last Class Day
Tues, Dec 3	Exam Prep Day
Wed-Fri, Dec 4-6	Exams
Sat, Dec 7	Graduation

SPRING 2014

Mon, Jan 7	First Class Day
Mon, Jan 20	MLK Holiday
Thurs, Feb 27	Midterm
March 17-21	Spring Break
Mon, Apr 28	Last Class Day
Tues, Apr 29	Exam Prep Day
Wed- Fri, Apr 30-May 2	Exams
Sat, May 3	Graduation

SUMMER 2014

Maymester (Summer I)	
Thurs, May 8	First Class Day – Maymester
Mon, May 19	Midterm
Mon, May 26	Memorial Day Holiday
Thurs, May 29	Last Class day
Fri, May 30	Exams
Summer II (full term)	
Wed, Jun 4	First class day
Thurs, Jun 26	Midterm
Fri, Jul 4	Holiday
Tues, Jul 22	Last Class Day
Jul 24 – 25	Exams
Sat, Jul 26	Graduation
Summer III	
Wed, Jun 4	First class day
Fri, Jun 13	Midterm
Wed, Jun 25	Last class day
Thurs, Jun 26	Exams
Summer IV	
Mon, June 30	First class day
Fri, Jul 4	Holiday
Fri, Jul 11	Midterm
Tues, Jul 22	Last class day
Thurs, Jul 23	Exams

Sat, Jul 26	Graduation
-------------	------------

- Changing Senate By-Laws

- Senate Procedures
- University Procedures
- Time Line
- Senate Procedures

Summary

1. To the ES one month before meeting
2. To Senators one week before meeting
3. Changes are read to the Senate and then discussed for no more than 20 minutes total
4. Majority vote of Senate to for further consideration
5. ES forms an Amendment Committee (Two Elected Senators and one ex-officio Senator)

6. A full report and discussion followed by a vote at the NEXT Senate meeting – change requires absolute majority of the Senate
- University Procedures
 - Because the University Statutes dictate the structure of the Faculty Senate (and its standing committees), changes must be made to the statutes.
 - University Procedures
- ### Summary
1. The President of the University has up to 60 days upon receipt of a proposed change to appoint a Committee on Revision
 2. The committee then has up to 60 days to publish its recommendations

to the General Faculty 10 days prior to a regular or called meeting of the faculty

3. Provided that a quorum is present, discussion and vote by 2/3 majority will take place

4. There are procedures for voting should a quorum not be present

- Timeline
- We've been talking about this for months now.
- The proposed changes were emailed and posted online one week ago.
- Timeline
- Today:

- We will discuss for no more than 20 minutes total the pros and cons of the changes;
 - We will vote whether to consider the proposed changes;
 - If passed by a majority, the ES will appoint a committee to review the changes and bring them back to the table at our April meeting.
- Timeline
 - In April:
 - The appointed committee will have made their recommendation to the Senate one week prior to our meeting;
 - We will fully debate and finally vote by ABSOLUTE majority (not a majority of those present)

whether and to what to change the by-laws.

- ***This vote must be conditional upon changing the University Statutes***
- **Timeline**
- **Late April/Early May**
 - After the Senate vote, the President will appoint the Committee on Revision
 - The committee will make their recommendation to the President
 - The President will call a meeting of the General Faculty to be held in 10 days to vote on the changes to the University Statutes.
- ***Amendments to the Statutes are in force when approved by the General Faculty, the President, the Chancellor, and the Board of Regents.***

ATTACHMENT G

Valdosta State University
Bylaws of the Faculty Senate Proposed Amendments
March 9, 2012

It is requested by Tracy Woodard-Meyers, Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate that the current Bylaws of the Faculty Senate (revised April 17, 2008) be amended as submitted in the attached revised version. Additions are indicated by underlines. Omissions are indicated by strikethroughs. Please read for content. The formatting will have to be corrected (the numbering and letter system) by someone who can figure out the automatic formatting issues I encountered.

Revised April 17, 2008

BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

(As adopted January 23, 1992; amended May 28, 1992, April 22, 1993, April 6, 1995, June 22, 1995, Sept.25, 1995, March 4, 1999, October 21, 1999, November 21, 2002, October 20, 2005, April 17, 2008)

ARTICLE I. FACULTY SENATE

SECTION 1.

MEMBERSHIP

a. Voting Members

1. Voting members of the Faculty Senate consist of Elected Senators.

a. All members of the Faculty who hold the academic rank of instructor, lecturer, senior lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, or professor (except those just finishing their second consecutive elected term) are eligible for election to the Senate from the unit in which they hold faculty status.

b. The President of the University, Vice Presidents, the Academic Deans, the Director of the Division of Social Work, the Department Heads (who hold voting status on the Council of Department Heads) are not eligible for election to the Senate.

c. Faculty holding part-time, temporary appointments, or honorary titles are not eligible for election to the Senate.

b. Non-Voting Members

1. The Chairperson of the Council on Staff Affairs serves as a one year term as a non-voting participant.

2. The President of the Student Government Association and one other student appointed by the Student Government Association serve one-year terms as non-voting participants.

SECTION 2.

TERMS OF SERVICE

- a. The term of an Elected Senator is three years.
- b. Elected Senators cannot serve more than two (2) successive full terms.
- c. Terms of service on the Faculty Senate begin on August 1 and end on July 31.
- d. A person filling an unexpired term is eligible for election to two (2) successive full terms.
- e. Terms of Elected Senators are staggered in a manner determined by the Committee on Committees so that approximately one-third (1/3) of the Elected Senators are replaced each year.

SECTION 3. ELECTION OF SENATORS

- a. On or before November 1, the Committee on Committees will notify the University units of the need to elect persons to fill elected Faculty Senate vacancies of elected Senators. Elections must take place before January 15 except as specified herein, all elections to the Senate are conducted according to the latest revision of Robert's Rules of Order. Proxies will be permitted for the duration of such elections, provided that the faculty member is absent for illness or university-related business and that the faculty member submits the proxy in writing to the Dean or Director before the start of such elections. No faculty member may hold more than one (1) proxy for another faculty member.
- b. The names of the new Elected Senators will be forwarded by the Deans, Directors, or Heads of the units to the Chairperson of the Committee on Committees.
- c. The Committee on Committees will certify the election of each Elected Senator and prepare a Faculty Senate roster for the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President of the Faculty Senate and present it no later than the end of May. This roster will be entered in the Faculty Handbook for the coming year. For the election of Senators, one counter will be appointed by the Dean of the College and one counter will be an elected Senator appointed by the Committee on Committees. The Director of the Library and the Director of the Division of Social Work will rotate the appointment of counters and the elected Senator may be appointed from either area.

To certify an election, the counters for each College, Odum library, and Division of Social Work should send the ballots to the chair of the Committee on Committees by the day following the election. The Committee on Committees will recount the ballots. Unless an error in the count that would change the outcome of the election is found, the Committee on Committees will certify the election no later than one week after it occurs. The Committee on Committees will keep the ballots for 31 days after the election.

Procedural challenges to elections should be made within 30 days of the election to the chair of the Grievance Committee, who will inform the chair of the Committee on Committees. If a challenge is filed with the Grievance Committee, the person elected during the challenged election serves until the matter is resolved by the Grievance Committee. If a new election is necessary, the Grievance Committee chair notifies the chair of the Committee on Committees, who notifies the School. The Committee on Committees will supervise the new election if requested by the Grievance Committee.

- d. If an Elected Senator is unable to complete the term of office, the following procedures are to be observed.
1. The Elected Senator will inform in writing the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President of the Faculty Senate no later than fourteen (14) days before the effective date of resignation.
 2. Within five (5) working days of receiving the letter of resignation, the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President will ask the Chairperson of the Committee on Committees to call for a special election in the resigning Elected Senator's unit.
 3. Within five (5) working days, the Chairperson of the Committee on Committees will request that the Dean, Director, or Head of the appropriate unit schedule the election of a person to fill the unexpired term. The faculty will be given ten (10) days advance notice of the election.
- e. Elected Faculty Senate members are expected to attend all Faculty Senate meetings. Two (2) absences by a member of the Faculty Senate from Senate meetings within one (1) academic year shall automatically remove the member from the Senate.

A member of the Faculty Senate who duly designates a proxy for a Senate meeting shall not be counted as absent if the proxy is in attendance at the meeting. Faculty senators must attend a minimum of four meetings per year. Faculty senators on a leave of absence beyond one semester will be removed from their position.

If an Elected Senator is removed from the term of office, the following procedures are to be observed.

1. The Elected Senator will be informed in writing by the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President of the Faculty Senate no later than seven (7) days before the effective date of removal and no later than seven (7) days after the final absence.
2. Within five (5) working days of receiving the letter of removal, the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President will ask the Chairperson of the Committee on Committees to call for a special election in the removed Elected Senator's unit.

Within five (5) working days, the Chairperson of the Committee on Committees will request that the Dean, Director, or Head of the appropriate unit schedule the election of a person to fill the unexpired term. The faculty will be given ten (10) days advance notice of the election.

- f. Except for the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President, a person elected to fill an unexpired term will complete the remaining term of the Senator being replaced and will assume all the senatorial responsibilities of that person.

SECTION 3. NOMINATING COMMITTEE

- a. ~~At the last Faculty Senate meeting of the fall semester, the Executive Secretary will submit a list of three (3) Elected Senators to be considered by the Faculty Senate as a Nominating Committee.~~

- b. ~~Other nominations will be called for from the floor.~~
- c. ~~Selection of the Nominating Committee, consisting of three (3) Elected Senators, will be by vote of the Faculty Senate.~~
- d. ~~The Nominating Committee will submit nominations for the position of the Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate and the vacancies on the Committee on Committees. Once it fulfills this function, it is automatically disbanded.~~

SECTION 4. EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY SENATE

- a. ~~At the second Faculty Senate meeting of the spring semester, the Nominating Committee will submit at least one name (preferably two names) for the office of Executive Secretary, and, after other nominations have been called for from the floor, the vote will be taken in accordance with Article I, Section 8 of these Bylaws.~~
- b. ~~The person elected, whose term begins on the following August 1, will be known as the Executive Secretary Designate. The Executive Secretary Designate will assume a vacancy in the position of Executive Secretary.~~

SECTION 4. OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

- a. President
 - 1. No later than the last meeting of the Senate in the spring semester, the Senate shall elect a President by a majority vote.
 - 2. The President shall serve a one year term beginning in the fall semester. When elected the President will serve the one year term as both President and Senator. In the event of a Senator's election to the presidency, the Senator shall complete the one year term provided for this office without regard to the length of time remaining in the Senator's elected term.
 - 3. The President of the Faculty Senate shall be the presiding officer of the Senate. In the President's absence, the Vice President/President Elect shall preside. The presiding officer shall conduct meetings according to Robert's Rules of Order and may vote only to break a tie.
 - 4. The President chairs the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.
 - 5. The President writes the Senate's annual report, which is submitted to the General Faculty and the President of the University on or about July 1 of each year.
- b. Vice President/President-Elect

1. No later than the last meeting of the Senate in the spring semester, the Senate shall elect a President by a majority vote.
2. The Vice President/President-Elect shall serve a two year term beginning in the fall semester. When elected the Vice President/President-Elect will serve a one year term as Vice President. The second year the Vice President/President-Elect will serve a one year term as President of the Faculty Senate. In the event of a Senator's election to the vice presidency/president-elect, the Senator shall complete the two year term provided for this office without regard to the length of time remaining in the Senator's elected term.
3. In the absence of the Faculty Senate President, The Vice President/President-Elect shall assume the duties of the presiding officer.
4. The Vice President/President-Elect makes reports of all actions taken by the Senate, which are submitted to the President of the University, and the General Faculty at its bi-annual meetings.
5. The Vice President/President-Elect arranges for meetings of the Senate, schedules the room, and oversees details of the meeting.

c. Secretary

1. No later than the last meeting of the Senate in the spring semester, the Senate shall elect a Secretary by a majority vote.
2. The Secretary shall serve a one year term beginning in the fall semester. When elected the Secretary will serve the one year term as both Secretary and Senator. In the event of a Senator's election to Secretary, the Senator shall complete the one year term provided for this office without regard to the length of time remaining in the Senator's elected term.
3. The Secretary reviews and approves detailed minutes of the Senate recorded by the administrative assistant assigned to that task, who after approval sends copies of minutes to members of the faculty and the President of the University, no later than ten (10) days following each Senate meeting.
4. The Secretary acts as liaison to the administrative assistant assigned to record minutes and update the Faculty Senate web page to ensure that all meeting agendas, minutes, reports, and other correspondence are posted on the Faculty Senate web page in a timely manner.
5. The Secretary will send a written notice of the regular Faculty Senate meetings and distribute to the Senators and General Faculty via email the Faculty Senate meeting agenda and accompanying documentation no less than one (1) week before the scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate.

d. Parliamentarian

1. No later than the last meeting of the Senate in the spring semester, the Senate shall elect a Parliamentarian by a majority vote.
2. The Parliamentarian shall serve a one year term beginning in the fall semester. When elected the Parliamentarian will serve the one year term as both Secretary and Senator. In the event of a Senator's election to Parliamentarian, the Senator shall complete the one year term provided for this office without regard to the length of time remaining in the Senator's elected term.
3. The Parliamentarian settles questions regarding the proper application of Robert's Rules of Order.

SECTION 5.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

- a. The Executive Committee of the Senate is composed of the President, the Vice President/President-Elect, the Secretary, and Parliamentarian of the Faculty Senate.
- b. The immediate past President of the Senate serves in a non-voting capacity.
- c. The Executive Committee is chaired by the President of the Senate who arranges meetings of the Executive Committee. In the absence of the President, the Vice President/-President Elect will preside.

SECTION 6.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

- a. ~~The Nominating Committee~~ Chair of the Committee on Committees will, at the second Faculty Senate meeting of the spring semester, submit no more than two (2) names for each of the two (2) committee vacancies, and, after other nominations have been called for from the floor, the vote will be taken in accordance with Article I, Section ~~8~~ 9 of these Bylaws. Nominations from the floor for a vacancy within a particular unit can be made only by Elected Senators from the unit.
- b. The persons elected will assume their duties on the following August 1.

SECTION 7.

MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY SENATE

- a. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will determine dates and times for Faculty Senate meetings. ~~The Executive Secretary will send a written notice of the regular meetings at least one (1) week prior to each meeting.~~

The dates and times for Faculty Senate meetings for the forthcoming year will be distributed no later than the last spring semester meeting of the Faculty Senate.

- b. Except for proposals contained in the report from the Academic Committee, the Faculty Senate may amend from the floor any recommendation or proposal.
 - c. Normally, the report from the Academic Committee will be voted on in its entirety by the Faculty Senate. Any Senator, however, may request that a specific proposal be detached from the report for individual consideration.
5. If a question passes the Faculty Senate, the decision is sent to the President of the University by the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President for approval within five (5) days of passage. A minority report may be filed by a Senator who does not vote with the majority. The President of the University will inform the Executive Committee of action taken on the matter within 30 days of receiving the Faculty Senate's recommendation.
 6. If a vote is not taken on a question, it will be held over to the next scheduled meeting or remanded to the appropriate committee for consideration.
 7. If a question does not receive a favorable vote from the Faculty Senate, it will be dropped until resubmitted.
- c. A complete and permanent set of minutes for each Faculty Senate meeting will be kept by the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President.
1. A copy of the Faculty Senate minutes will be sent to members of the faculty, the President of the University, and the Chancellor no later than ten (10) working days after the Faculty Senate meeting.
 2. The ~~Executive Secretary~~ will ensure the administrative assistant assigned to record minutes downloads places a copy of the Senate minutes on the Faculty Senate webpage ~~reserve in the Odum Library~~ for review by the general University population within ten (10) working days after the Faculty Senate meeting.
 3. By the end of summer semester, the minutes ~~and/or recordings of the Faculty Senate meetings,~~ together with all other documents, will be downloaded on the Faculty Senate webpage ~~collected and placed in the University archives in the Odum Library.~~

SECTION 9.

VOTING PROCEDURE

- a. Voting will be by show of hands unless otherwise ordered by the Senate. Voting for the election of the ~~Executive Secretary~~ Faculty Senate officers and members for the Committee on Committees, however, will be by paper ballot.

- b. Any Senator may request a paper ballot vote on any issue.
- c. Proxies will be allowed for Senators who are unable to attend Faculty Senate meetings and will be given only to another Senator. Proxies must register with the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President prior to the meeting. No person may represent more than one (1) other Senator at a meeting.

ARTICLE II. COMMITTEES

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

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

SECTION 3. MEMBERSHIP OF STANDING COMMITTEES

- a. The Committee on Committees will arrange the membership of each committee so that, wherever possible, each school of the University, the Odum Library, and the Division of Social Work is properly represented.
- b. No fewer than one (1) student recommended by the President of the SGA will sit on each committee.
- c. No fewer than two (2) Senators selected by the Committee on Committees will sit on each committee.
- d. Terms of committee members will be staggered.
- e. Membership of Standing Committees may include persons appointed by the Committee on Committees in *ex officio* capacity, maintaining an appropriate balance to meet the overall goals of Faculty Senate.
- f. As soon as all committee vacancies are filled, the Committee on Committees will prepare a membership list of Statutory and Standing Committees for inclusion in the Faculty Handbook for the coming year.
- g. Committee chairpersons and chairpersons-elect must be Elected Senators and are to be selected by the Committee on Committees for a term of one (1) year, except as provided in VSU Statues or elsewhere in these Bylaws. The terms of the chairpersons may be renewed.
- h. Standing Committees may create sub-committees, which may include non-committee personnel. The Committee on Committees will be informed by each committee chairperson of the membership of sub-committees.
- i. Specific Standing Committees and Their Responsibilities.
 - 1. Academic Scheduling and Procedures Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to the University calendar, class scheduling, final examination scheduling, University catalogs and bulletins, Honors Day, and commencement.

2. Athletic Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to the University programs of intercollegiate and intramural athletics.
3. Educational Policies Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to advising, undergraduate admissions and retention, public services, and registration; and to hear undergraduate petitions for exceptions to academic policy, including graduation.
4. Faculty Scholarship Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to both graduate and undergraduate faculty development, research, and the use of animal and human research subjects; to receive and review research and development proposals; and to allocate research and development funds.
5. Library Affairs Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to the Odum Library and its use, and to review and make recommendations related to library allocations.
6. Minority and Special Student Needs Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to ethnic, religious, and gender minorities; and to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to quality support programs for students with special needs including, but not limited to, those with physical impairments, behavior disorders, and learning disabilities.
7. Student Activities Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to such student activities as student discipline, student publications, student organizations, fraternities and sororities, and concerts and lectures.
8. Student Services Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to such student services as financial aid, housing, health services, counseling services, mail services, and food services.
9. Environmental Issues Committee: to review and recommend policies and procedures pertinent to environmental issues, as they relate to recycling, facilities use, campus beautification, and traffic planning.
10. Academic Honors and Scholarship Committee: to review and recommend college-wide scholarships and honors for students and to arrange for appropriate presentations, including Honors' Day.
11. Technology Committee: to develop and review policies and procedures relating to technology issues and to interface with other statutory and standing committees when such issues overlap their charge.

SECTION 4.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

- a. The Faculty Senate may create Special Committees of the Faculty Senate to deal with matters not within the jurisdiction of an existing Statutory or Standing Committee of the Faculty Senate.

- b. Any member of the Faculty Senate, General Faculty, classified staff, administration, or student body may request in writing to the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President the creation of a Special Committee.
- c. The ~~Executive Secretary~~ President will place the request for a Special Committee on the agenda of the next Faculty Senate meeting.
- d. Upon Faculty Senate approval of the request, the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President will instruct the Committee on Committees to create a Special Committee in accordance with whatever guidelines the Faculty Senate may establish.
- e. Special Committees will operate for no longer than one (1) academic year unless the Faculty Senate renews the mandate of the Special Committee.

SECTION 5. APPOINTMENT AND ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

- a. Unless otherwise specified by the Statutes of the University, terms of appointed and elected Standing Committee members are three (3) years.
- b. Terms of committee members and chairpersons begin on August 1 and end on July 31.
- c. The terms are staggered by the Committee on Committees in a manner so that approximately one-third (1/3) of the appointed and elected membership is replaced each year.
- d. The Committee on Committees will notify the Student Government Association of the number of student vacancies on Standing Committees. The list of student appointments must be submitted to the Committee on Committees no later than April 1.
- e. During spring semester, the Committee on Committees will request members of the faculty and classified staff to indicate the Standing Committees on which they wish to serve. The Committee on Committees will make the necessary appointments to fill vacancies.
- f. On or before November 1, the Committee on Committees will notify the University units of the need to elect representatives to fill Statutory Committee vacancies. Elections must take place before January 15.
- g. No later than midterm spring semester, the Committee on Committees will distribute the names of the tenured faculty. The faculty will vote to fill the vacancies on the Grievance Committee. Those faculty receiving the largest number of votes will be elected. Prior to this election, the Committee on Committees will have appointed and announced the Grievance Committee Chair.
 - 1. Senators will be eligible for election.
 - 2. Serving faculty may be re-elected.
- h. A member of a committee who finds it necessary to resign must provide the committee chairperson written notification no less than seven (7) days in advance of the effective date of resignation. Within seven (7) days of notification, the chairperson will notify the Committee on Committees of the resignation.

1. The Committee on Committees will appoint replacements to fulfill appointed terms of committee membership.
2. Within five (5) working days of notification, the Committee on Committees will notify the appropriate University unit of the need to schedule a special election for a replacement to fulfill an elected term of office. The appropriate University unit will be notified no less than ten (10) days in advance of the scheduled election.

SECTION 6. PROCEDURES FOR STATUTORY COMMITTEES, STANDING COMMITTEES, AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

- a. On or before October 1, Statutory Committees, Standing Committees, and Special Committees will discharge the following responsibilities.
 1. They will set the schedule of their regular meetings and so inform the Committee on Committees. The schedule of committee meetings is published by the Committee on Committees and inserted in the Faculty Handbook.
 2. They will submit to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate a report containing an assessment of their charge and the goals they wish to achieve in the coming year.
 3. They will submit written rules governing their procedures to the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President of the Faculty Senate and the Secretary who will ensure they are placed ~~these written rules on reserve in the Odum Library~~ on the Faculty Senate Webpage.
- b. Except for the Grievance Committee, all proposals, recommendations, reports, and any other material presented for a committee's consideration must be submitted to the committee's chairperson in accordance with the committee's written procedures.
- c. Except in the case of executive sessions of the Grievance Committee and its Hearing Panels, all committee meetings are open.
- d. Each committee will decide whether or not guests of the committee will be heard and under what conditions.
- e. Committees will keep substantive minutes or recordings of their deliberations. Copies of committee minutes or recordings, reports, proposals, recommendations, and all other documents are to be downloaded on the Faculty Senate webpage placed on reserve in the Odum Library no later than two (2) weeks after a committee meeting. ~~At the end of the year, these committee records will be collected and placed in the University archives in the Odum Library.~~
- f. Each committee will prepare an annual report and submit it to the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President of the Faculty Senate by April 30.

ARTICLE III. AMENDMENTS

SECTION 1.

BYLAWS

- a. A Senator must send a copy of the proposed amendment to the ~~Executive Secretary~~ President of the Faculty Senate one (1) month before the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate.
- b. The ~~Executive Secretary~~ President of the Faculty Senate will send a copy of the proposed amendment to each Senator no less than one (1) week before the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate.
- c. At the next regular meeting, the ~~Chairperson~~ President of the Faculty Senate will read the proposal and call for preliminary debate limited to ten (10) minutes for all proponents and ten (10) minutes for all opponents.
- d. For the proposal to be accepted for further study, it must be supported by a majority of the Faculty Senate.
- e. Upon a proposal's acceptance, the President ~~Chairperson~~ of the Faculty Senate will ~~instruct the Executive Secretary to~~ form an Amendment Committee composed of ~~two (2)~~ three (3) Elected Senators and ~~one (1) ex officio Senator~~.
- f. At the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Amendment Committee will make a full report on the proposed amendment.
- g. After the Committee makes its report, the Faculty Senate will debate the question of adopting the amendment.
- h. Ratification by the Faculty Senate requires an absolute majority.

ATTACHMENT H

From: Michael G. Noll
> Sent: Friday, March 02, 2012 12:50 PM
> To: Tracy W. Meyers

How about the Faculty Senate taking up the issue of allowing concealed weapons on our campuses? As done in May 2011 in regard to biomass, the Faculty Senate could pass a resolution against concealed weapons on our campus. I will be happy to help ... and know others (students& faculty) who would be willing to help as well!

HB 981:

http://signon.org/sign/keep-guns-out-of-georgias.fb1?source=s.fb&r_by

Attachment I

Recommendations of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee March 8, 2012

Presented on Behalf of the University Tenure and Promotion Committee by:

Alfred F. Fuciarelli, Ph.D.
University Tenure and Promotion Committee Chair
Assistant Vice President for Research and
Dean of the Graduate School

Committee Members:

Elvan Aktas, Ph.D., Langdale College of Business Administration

Melissa J. Benton, Ph.D., R.N., College of Nursing

Michael J. Davey, Ph.D., College of Arts and Sciences

Deborah S. Davis, M.L.S., Library

Carol M. Glen, Ph.D., Arts and Sciences

Mary Gorham-Rowan, Ph.D., Dewar College of Education

Karin Murray, M.F.A., College of the Arts

Eric Nielsen, M.F.A., College of the Arts

James A. Nienow, Ph.D., College of Arts and Sciences

Anita Ondrusek, Ph.D., Library and Information Sciences

James A. Reffel, Ph.D., Dewar College of Education

Richard Vodde, Ph.D., Division of Social Work

Executive Summary

The University Tenure and Promotion Committee (UTPC) reviewed tenure and promotion dossiers for procedural and substantive due process and conformity with university-wide general and substantive standards for tenure and promotion as described in *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*. We describe the review process developed and used by the UTPC and, based upon our experience after the first review of tenure and promotion personnel action requests by a university-level committee, present a list of recommendations relevant to the tenure and promotion process.

Some of the recommendations of the UTPC include:

Tenure and promotion policy and procedure documents prepared by units must be reviewed, and if necessary revised, to ensure alignment with *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*. Unit tenure and promotion policies and procedures must (a) clearly identify and specify objective standards of excellence for all three areas of teaching and student learning, scholarship (research and juried creative accomplishments), and service; (b) address university-wide General Standards I-IV and General Substantive Standards I-IV; and (c) articulate minimum criteria for the separate personnel actions of tenure and promotion.

Dossiers must closely align with the university-wide guidelines for the contents of tenure and promotion dossiers and include all materials cited in the university-wide guidelines (or have clear explanations as to why such materials are not included). Vitas must be standardized (at least at the unit level), must provide clear evidence that scholarship was peer-reviewed/juried, and clearly distinguish between work that was published before and after the last personnel action.

Dossiers must include letters supporting approval/disapproval recommendations of personnel actions made by all unit tenure and promotion committees (department and college/division as applicable), department heads, and deans.

Additional recommendations presented by the UTPC are also provided with the aim of opening the avenues of discussion across the University regarding tenure and promotion policies and procedures. This document contains a list of recommendations which may apply to more than one unit, a list of recommendations that apply to specific units, and a list of recommendations for general consideration by the UTPC, faculty body, and University administration.

I. General Description of Committee Review Process.

Dossiers were received in the Provost's Office with a deadline of noon on December 9, 2011.

Dossiers were uploaded to an electronic database by staff members in the Provost's Office and UTPC members were informed on December 15, 2011, that the dossiers were ready for review.

The UTPC Chair assigned two Reviewers to review each candidate's dossier with the goal of choosing one Reviewer within the candidate's unit and one Reviewer outside the candidate's College/Division. The Reviewers were responsible for making an initial review of their assigned dossiers and making recommendations to the Chair prior to the review meeting on any dossiers that they felt might elicit significant discussion. The Chair forwarded a list of these candidates to all committee members prior to the review meeting.

Examples of two rubrics were provided to the UTPC members to assist them in their review of the dossiers. Committee members were given the option of using the example rubrics that were provided, developing their own rubric, or not using

any rubric at all. Committee members were informed that they did not have to submit rubrics or any other notes that they made during their review to the Chair at any time.

While the Provost's Office uploaded a significant proportion of each candidate's dossier to the electronic database for review, UTPC members were asked to review the hard copies of the dossiers anytime they felt that there was a lack of information, a potential issue that that needed additional research, or any other reason that impacted their ability to review a candidate's cases. With this instruction, UTPC members were assured access to all information presented in the original dossier as presented to the Provost's Office by the units and were in no way limited to reviewing only the information that was uploaded electronically in the database. UTPC members were informed that they had access to the hard copies of the dossiers anytime during normal business hours (8:00 am to 5:30 pm) in the Provost's Office from Tuesday, January 3, 2012, to Thursday, January 12, 2012.

The UTPC convened on Friday, January 13, 2012, for the university-wide tenure and promotion review meeting in the Hall of Fame Board Room in West Hall at Valdosta State University. Based on teaching commitments, a morning session (8:00-10:30 am) and an afternoon session (1:00 -3:30 pm) were scheduled to enable all committee members to participate in the meeting. Committee members signed attendance sheets for each session attesting to their participation. UTPC members had ready access to the electronic database containing all dossiers if they chose to bring a laptop computer to the meeting. Additionally, the original dossiers presented to the Provost's Office were present in the meeting room and available to UTPC members from 8:15 am to 3:40 pm.

The initial ~30 min of the meeting was used to review the format of the meeting and address any questions posed by UTPC members. As discussed in UTPC meetings held during the fall semester, TurningPoint Clicker technology was used to assist the committee in carrying out their charge which included reviewing all tenure and promotion dossiers for procedural and substantive due process and conformity with university-wide general and substantive standards for tenure and promotion as documented in *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*.

There was a process followed for each candidate under consideration during the meeting. Candidates, along with the personnel action(s) under review, were introduced by the Chair. The Chair called upon each Reviewer in succession to comment on the case. Following the comments of the two Reviewers, the Chair called for additional comments from all committee members and opened the floor for general discussion. Following general discussion of the case, UTPC members were asked to respond to four polling questions to address the issues of due-process and university-wide standards for promotion and tenure as documented in *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*.

The four polling questions were as follows:

Polling Question 1: (Section 2.1, Procedural Due-Process)

DUE PROCESS STANDARDS-GENERAL PROCEDURAL REVIEW:

- (1) Was the review process consistent with university-wide procedural standards and practices for tenure or promotion?
- (2) Are recommendations consistent with explicit written criteria for tenure or promotion applicable to the candidate at all levels of the review process?
- (3) Was the review process free from any error or default in procedure when such error or default has had a prejudicial effect on the fair consideration of the candidate's case for tenure or promotion?

Polling Question 2: (Section 2.2, Substantive Due-Process)

DUE PROCESS STANDARDS-GENERAL SUBSTANTIVE REVIEW:

- (1) Does there appear to be a failure to give adequate consideration either to the candidate's qualifications or to the

relevant criteria for tenure or promotion when such failure has had a prejudicial effect on fair consideration of the candidate's case?

(2) Does there appear to be a recommendation that is significantly based on any consideration which violates academic freedom, or which involves discrimination on the basis of race, gender, religion, national origin, age, physical handicap, marital status, or sexual orientation?

(3) Does a recommendation at a lower level appear to be arbitrary, capricious, or not supported by factual data?

(4) Does there appear to be any other substantive due-process errors?

Polling Question 3: (Section 3, University-Wide General Standards for Tenure and Promotion)

UNIVERSITY-WIDE STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION-GENERAL STANDARDS:

Are all criteria and processes for the review of tenure and/or promotion applicable to the candidate's case consistent with University-wide General Standards I-IV:

General Standard I: Focus on teaching/student learning, scholarship, and service;

General Standard II: Mission of VSU;

General Standard III: Practices at peer institutes; and

General Standard IV: Workload assignment?

Polling Question 4: (Section 3.1, University-Wide Tenure and Promotion Substantive Standards)

UNIVERSITY-WIDE STANDARDS FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION-GENERAL SUBSTANTIVE STANDARDS:

Are all criteria and processes for the review of tenure and/or promotion applicable to the candidate's case consistent with University-wide General Substantive Standards I-IV:

General Substantive Standard I: Mastery of Knowledge and Methods;

General Substantive Standard II: Effectiveness of Communication;

General Substantive Standard III: Significance of Results; and

General Substantive Standard IV: Consistently Professional Behavior?

Using this approach, the UTPC reviewed personnel actions for 34 candidates during the morning session from 8:30 -11:00 am. (We were able to continue the morning session until 11:00 am because one faculty member with a teaching commitment had made arrangements to cover his class earlier in the week but had not informed the Chair of this arrangement until mid-morning). Requests were made by UTPC members to move the review of personnel actions for two candidates that were originally scheduled for review in the morning session to the afternoon session. During the afternoon session (1:00-3:40 pm), the UTPC reviewed personnel actions for the remaining 13 candidates.

A meeting of the UTPC with Provost Gunter was held on Friday, January 20, 2012, from 1:00 -3:00 pm in the Hall of Fame Board Room to advise Provost Gunter on matters related to the charge of the committee.

II. Procedural/Process Recommendations by the University-Wide Tenure and Promotion Committee

Valuable experience was gained by the UTPC in carrying out their charge of reviewing all tenure and promotion dossiers for procedural and substantive due process and conformity with university-wide general and substantive standards for tenure and promotion as documented in *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*. With the aim of opening the avenues of discussion across the University regarding tenure and promotion policies and procedures, the UTPC has presented a list of recommendations that may apply to more than one unit, a list of recommendations for specific units, and a list of general recommendations for consideration by the UTPC, faculty body, and University administration. These recommendations are presented in the following sections.

A. Recommendations Potentially Applicable to All Units

1. Closer alignment of dossiers to the university-wide guidelines for the contents of promotion and tenure dossiers as described in Part 3, Section 3.2.1 of *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures* is necessary. The UTPC allowed greater deviation from the university-wide policies and procedures this year than it will permit in subsequent years in recognition that procedures are new and that some units are still in the process of finalizing their own guidelines.
2. Dossiers are a reflection of the professional standards of the candidate under review. While individual candidates are ultimately responsible for the content and presentation of their dossiers, at all levels of review there should be a mechanism to help candidates better conform to unit and university standards applicable to their case. This is particularly important at the college/division level where dossiers should be checked for content, clarity, and completeness before submission to the Provost's Office.
3. Standardization of the vita would provide better clarity and make the work done at each review level easier. One member proposed a modified version of the National Science Foundation vita, but added that the format doesn't really matter so long as it is uniform and concise. Another member indicated that the greatest challenge in interpreting vitas was identifying juried/peer reviewed scholarship. The review would be expedited if candidates created separate sections on their vitas for peer reviewed v. non-peer reviewed publications, juried v. non-juried artistic scholarship, conference presentations published in conference proceedings as papers v. non-published conference presentations, and invited lectures v. talks in forums where every applicant is accepted. The candidate is responsible for providing clear evidence that can be recognized by non-specialists that a work is juried. The UTPC especially found this matter difficult to judge when there was a difference of opinion at different stages of the review process. Review letters should clearly address such differences of opinion when they occur. Judging when scholarship was juried becomes especially difficult for works published in electronic media, works published in foreign press, works of creative writing, and works in the performing and visual arts.
4. Candidates must clearly distinguish between works that were published before and after their last personnel action. Any discrepancy should be clearly addressed in decision letters. Currently, works presented since the last personnel action are considered appropriate. However, the actual process leading up to a tenure and promotion decision extends almost a year, since personnel actions do not take effect until the August following a September application. Clarification is required to articulate how activities that take place during this review period are counted because they are not in the application and occur before the completion of the action. One member indicated that they had trouble counting publications in one of the packets for precisely this reason.
5. *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures* require that certain documents are included in all dossiers. As specified in Part 3.2.1, Section II, these documents include: "D. Unit tenure and/or promotion review letter(s) (by both the T and P Committee and head if applicable to that unit)" and "E. College or division Tenure and/or Promotion letter(s) (by both the T and P Committee and Dean or Director)." These letters are of particular importance when the recommendations at different levels of review are inconsistent so that there is sufficient information available to the UTPC to ensure that decisions were free of substantive due-process errors.
6. *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures* require certain items to be included in the dossier which are not specified in some unit tenure and promotion documents even though they are applicable to the personnel action under consideration. Examples may include peer evaluation of teaching or evidence of student learning. As the university-wide policies and procedures document is written, these items must be included in the dossiers. Hence, all of the unit tenure and promotion documents should be revised to include such documentation.

7. There should be consistency between annual evaluations, pre-tenure reviews, and the recommendations provided for tenure and promotion personnel actions. Inconsistencies should be addressed in review letters by unit (department and college) promotion and tenure committees, department heads, and deans to assist the UTPC in their review of the dossier.
8. The appeals process seems to add an unnecessary level of complexity. As it stands, appeals are made to the committee or administrator who made the initial unfavorable ruling. It is hard to imagine that an entity would willingly admit that it made a mistake and reverse itself. More logically, the appeal should go directly to the next level and should cite the specific errors made at the previous level.
9. One of the issues noted with some candidates from the College of Education (COE) and the College of Nursing (CON) was that they had not yet acquired the terminal degree for their respective fields (i.e., the clinical supervisors from the COE and the instructors from the CON). Given that these are both clinical professions, it may be beneficial to have instructors/supervisors/teachers who have not yet achieved the terminal degree to have a different title - for example, "clinical assistant/associate in communication sciences and disorders" or "clinical assistant/associate in nursing." This allows them to be promoted and thus rewarded for their efforts but not tenured as they haven't achieved the terminal degree. This process is utilized in the Communication Sciences & Disorders department at Florida State University and seems to work well. If they achieve a terminal degree, then they may choose to pursue a tenure track position (such as for nursing). In some allied health departments, such as at the University of Florida, doctorate-level clinicians may be referred to as a "clinical assistant/associate professor" - indicating that they have achieved the terminal degree in the field but do not hold a tenure-track position. Under these conditions, there are different responsibilities/requirements that go along with their primary faculty assignment.
10. *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures* in Section 3.1.1 General Substantive Standards considers Effectiveness of Communication (Substantive Standard II) and Consistently Professional Behavior (Substantive Standard IV) as key standards for tenure and promotion. As the university-wide policies and procedures document is written, the UTPC is tasked with reviewing dossiers for evidence that these standards have been met. Hence, all of the unit tenure and promotion documents should be revised to reflect the importance of these general substantive standards.
11. Tenure and promotion are separate personnel actions at Valdosta State University. Therefore, all unit tenure and promotion policies and procedures documents must clearly separate and articulate the criteria and standards for the two different types of personnel actions.

B. Recommendations Applicable to Specific Units

College of the Arts

1. The College of the Arts (COA) Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures document should more clearly identify and specify objective standards of excellence for all three areas of teaching and student learning, scholarship (research and juried creative accomplishments), and service. Candidates should know exactly what is expected of them and what to expect. Additionally, UTPC members discovered that evaluation of scholarship was, at times, difficult. In particular the evaluation of the scholarship for PhD level faculty could be aided by more specific articulation of the standards for excellence in scholarship for PhD faculty as well as attention on the part of candidates in the inclusion of more information about referenced publications in the dossier.
2. Closer alignment to the university-wide guidelines for the contents of dossiers (*Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*, Section 3.2.1) is required for faculty members petitioning for tenure and/or promotion. Omission of materials specifically cited in the COA or university-wide tenure and promotion policies and procedures

documents means that the UTPC does not have the necessary information to adequately review dossiers for procedural and substantive due-process errors or to review dossiers against the university-wide standards for tenure and promotion.

3. The COA must adhere to the University-wide policies and procedures which specific (Part 3.2.1, Section II) that dossiers include: "D. Unit tenure and/or promotion review letter(s) (by both the T and P Committee and head if applicable to that unit)" and "E. College or division Tenure and/or Promotion letter(s) (by both the T and P Committee and Dean or Director)." Dossiers should have included letters supporting the recommendations of the department tenure and promotion committee, department head, college tenure and promotion committee, and dean. In order for due diligence to continue in the review process, evidence for prior dispositions and decisions are just as relevant as the evidence for achievement required from each candidate

4. The UTPC recommends reconfiguration of the use of sub-committee reviewers in small departments. Reviews and recommendations crafted by a very small number of participants might not be valid and one member suggested that reviews should be done by more than three faculty members.

5. The COA might consider the inclusion of more PhD level faculty in the review process for those candidates whose position requires the PhD. While it is quite clear that the Masters level faculty works assiduously and diligently within the review process, it is possible that the inclusion of more PhD level faculty might lessen the burden on the MFA faculty. Some departments use faculty from other disciplines in order to fill a doctoral level review committee. This alteration can also have the added benefit of including faculty from other disciplines that perhaps understand the ethos of the COA or even to include faculty from without in order to further inform them of the ethos of the COA.

College of Arts and Sciences

1. In the College of Arts and Sciences (COA&S) Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures (Revised 2005) there are several statements to the effect that achieving the required point totals does not mean that the candidate will necessarily be recommended for promotion or tenure. This seems to give the committees, department heads, and deans the power to reject candidates for any or no reason. There should be some clarification about why a candidate who has achieved the required number of votes might be rejected.

2. More transparent and specific standards of achievement are needed within departments. Although some standards are quite clear to external reviewers, often it was difficult to determine the standard. This was most apparent in the area of scholarship. Some review committees did a fine job clarifying the scholarly ethos of a particular department, other did not. Following the review process at each level, there was at least one disagreement as to how many refereed publications a candidate had.

3. Closer alignment to the university-wide guidelines for the contents of dossiers (*Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*, Section 3.2.1) is required for faculty members petitioning for tenure and/or promotion. Omission of materials specifically cited in the COA&S or university-wide tenure and promotion policies and procedures documents means that the UTPC does not have the necessary information to adequately review dossiers for procedural and substantive due-process errors or to review dossiers against the university-wide standards for tenure and promotion.

4. The COA&S must adhere to the university-wide policies and procedures which specific (Part 3.2.1, Section II) that dossiers include: "D. Unit tenure and/or promotion review letter(s) (by both the T and P Committee and head if applicable to that unit)" and "E. College or division Tenure and/or Promotion letter(s) (by both the T and P Committee and Dean or Director)." Dossiers should have included letters supporting the recommendations of the department tenure and promotion committee, department head, college tenure and promotion committee, and dean. Omission of some of these letters meant that the UTPC did not have the necessary information to adequately review dossiers for procedural and substantive

due-process errors. Evidence supporting recommendations rendered at each level of the review process are just as relevant as the evidence for achievement required from each candidate.

Langdale College of Business Administration

1. The Langdale College of Business Administration (COBA) tenure and promotion policies and procedures document includes reference to “collegiality” and “institutional fit.” However, these terms are not found in *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*. It seems that the intent of this focus is to attend to Substantive Standard IV which focuses on “respectful relationships with students, colleagues, and others....and professional conduct”. Although this attempt is commendable, the UTPC recommends that the COBA better align verbiage in their tenure and promotion policies and procedures document with the University-wide tenure and promotion document. For this purpose, the COBA should refer to Section 3.1.1, Substantive Standards II and IV, which refer to “Effective Communication” and “Consistently Professional Behavior”, respectively, and make appropriate changes.

2. *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*, Part 3.2.1, Section III requests illustrative evidence of the quality and significance of the faculty member’s teaching and student learning, supervision, and mentoring. The UTPC recommends that the COBA review and revise accordingly their tenure and promotion policies and procedures to ensure that faculty are aware of the need for peer evaluation of teaching and evidence of student learning in their dossiers.

Dewar College of Education

1. Clear and specific guidelines at both the Dewar College of Education (COE) and University level for promotion of non-tenured assistant professors (clinical faculty) need to be formally established. There is also a question as to whether such a promotion, since it is not part of the tenure process, should be exclusively administrative, as are most other non-tenured promotion decisions on campus. Moreover, promotion of instructors to the rank of assistant professor may be in conflict with *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures* specifically with reference to the terminal degree depending on the definition of a terminal degree. Once these matters are thoroughly vetted, the COE should incorporate information related to the expectations for promotion of non-tenure track faculty in their tenure and promotion policies and procedures document.

2. Standards of achievement for each level of review, up to and including the Dean, should be consistent.

3. The COE must adhere to the university-wide policies and procedures which specific (Part 3.2.1, Section II) that dossiers include: “D. Unit tenure and/or promotion review letter(s) (by both the T and P Committee and head if applicable to that unit) “ and “E. College or division Tenure and/or Promotion letter(s) (by both the T and P Committee and Dean or Director).” Dossiers should have included letters supporting the recommendations of the college tenure and promotion committee. Omission of these letters meant that the UTPC did not have the necessary information to adequately review dossiers for procedural and substantive due-process errors. Evidence supporting recommendations rendered at each level of the review process is just as relevant as the evidence for achievement required from each candidate.

College of Nursing

1. The College of Nursing (CON) should clarify their definition of the terminal degree in their tenure and promotion policies and procedures.

2. The CON should review, and revise as necessary, their expectations for tenure and promotion of instructors to the rank of assistant professor as this may be in conflict with *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures* specifically with reference to the subjective nature of progress towards a terminal degree. Dossiers should clearly document that candidates have completed more than 50% of the work towards their degree.

3. Closer alignment to the university-wide guidelines for the contents of dossiers (*Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*, Section 3.2.1) is required for faculty members petitioning for tenure and/or promotion. Omission of materials specifically cited in the CON or university-wide tenure and promotion policies and procedures documents means that the UTPC does not have the necessary information to adequately review dossiers for procedural and substantive due-process errors or to review dossiers against the university-wide standards for tenure and promotion.

4. The CON must adhere to the university-wide policies and procedures which specific (Part 3.2.1, Section II) that dossiers include: “D. Unit tenure and/or promotion review letter(s) (by both the T and P Committee and head if applicable to that unit)” and “E. College or division Tenure and/or Promotion letter(s) (by both the T and P Committee and Dean or Director).” Dossiers should have included letters supporting the recommendations of the college tenure and promotion committee. Omission of these letters meant that the UTPC did not have the necessary information to adequately review dossiers for procedural and substantive due-process errors. Evidence supporting recommendations rendered at each level of the review process is just as relevant as the evidence for achievement required from each candidate.

5. Is the CON large enough and specialized enough to warrant departmental levels of review? With most other colleges, there are departments within the college and each department forms a committee to review dossiers. If the college of nursing subscribes to this organizational paradigm, then it might be helpful to have the review process reflect that organization.

6. The CON must develop clearer standards for scholarship for tenure and promotion.

Library

1. The Library should make clear in their tenure and promotion policies and procedures that the terminal degree in the library is the Master of Library Science.

2. The Library should develop clear standards for tenure and promotion for all faculty positions. These standards need to align with *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures* and should be based on comparisons with peer and aspirational peer institutes.

3. The Library should consider 'translating' the many and varied academic/professional tasks in which library faculty engage, into the three academic arenas outlined in *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*. In the area of teaching, academic librarians may not teach per se, but they do have a “primary faculty assignment” reflecting the nature of their professional role in an academic institute. Therefore, it is the responsibility of the Library to ensure, through their tenure and promotion policies and procedures, that UTPC members are adequately informed of the nature of the primary faculty assignments and reasonably assured that these assignments are consistent with those in peer and aspirational peer institutes where academic librarians have faculty status that includes the possibility of tenure. This could be similar to the 'clinical' framework used in nursing, education, and social work.

4. The Library should develop an effective way to report in-house instruction results to the rest of the VSU Faculty because it is part of the primary faculty assignment and reflects the nature of a librarian’s role in an academic institute.

5. The Library should develop a method of peer review of academic/professional tasks in which library faculty engage.

6. The Library should better articulate the nature of scholarship for academic librarians and the standards of performance related to scholarly productivity in their tenure and promotion policies and procedures. According to one member, presentations are important to the library profession and to the professional development of VSU librarians. Given their importance, the Library should ensure that this point is well emphasized in their tenure and promotion policies and

procedures. Scholarship for academic librarians should be based on a national survey of academic librarians and in-depth surveys of peers and aspirational peers.

7. The Library should develop evaluative mechanisms other than the annual performance review which demonstrate success in the primary faculty assignment. This may include assessment tools like focus groups, archival metrics and other tools. Tenured and advanced faculty members are recognizable because they are evaluated transparently in the arena of the academy by numerous others; peers, students, consumers, clients, and supervisors. Annual performance reviews would be only one dimension of this evaluative process.

Library and Information Sciences

No personal actions were requested from faculty members from the Library and Information Sciences (LIS) program during the 2011-2012 tenure and promotion cycle. Therefore, apart from the general recommendations for all units as discussed earlier, the UTPC does not have any specific recommendations to give to the LIS program based on the review of dossiers from LIS candidates.

Division of Social Work

No personal actions were requested from faculty members from the Division of Social Work (DSW) during the 2011-2012 tenure and promotion cycle. Therefore, apart from the general recommendations for all units as discussed earlier, the UTPC does not have any specific recommendations to give to the DSW based on the review of dossiers from DSW candidates.

C. General Recommendations for Consideration by the UTPC, Faculty Body, and University Administration

1. Procedures need to be developed for handling (a) incomplete dossiers, (b) dossiers lacking signatures reflecting the decision at one level of review, and (c) dossiers containing parts that are not internally consistent.
2. A model vita should be uploaded to the UTPC web site to guide faculty in the preparation of their vita. The model vita should have separate sections for peer reviewed v. non-peer reviewed publications, juried v. non-juried artistic scholarship, conference presentations published in conference proceedings as papers v. non-published conference presentations, and invited lectures v. talks in forums where every applicant is accepted.
3. A model dossier should be uploaded to the UTPC web site to guide faculty in the preparation of their entire dossier to ensure consistency with reference to the university-wide guidelines for the contents of promotion and tenure dossiers as described in Part 3, Section 3.2.1 of *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*.
4. The tenure and promotion process extends almost a year from the time that a request for a personnel action is made by a faculty member to the Department Head (~August) to the time that the personnel action(s) become effective (September of the next year). Clarification is required in unit and university-wide tenure and promotion documents to articulate how activities that take place during this review period are counted because they are not in the application and may occur before the completion of the decision and/or personal action.
5. *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures* presents flowcharts (Appendix C) which are confusing in structure and the workflow needs to be clarified. If flowcharts are deemed useful, they should clearly indicate that all requests for personnel actions are made to the unit administrator (department head, dean, provost), who then forwards documents to the respective tenure and promotion committees for analysis and recommendations. The unit administrator then makes their decision and forwards the dossier up the line. One possible interpretation of the flowcharts

which is inconsistent with the established procedure is that documents may be forwarded directly to the tenure and promotion committees. This caused the UTPC to have some discussion about whether the UTPC would even see appeals.

6. The process for appealing a decision as outlined in *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures* seems to add an unnecessary level of complexity. As it stands, appeals are made to the committee or administrator who made the initial unfavorable ruling. It is hard to imagine that an entity would willingly admit that it made a mistake and reverse itself. More logically, the appeal should go directly to the next level and should cite the specific errors made at the previous level.

7. *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures* makes a very strong statement regarding a “professional behavior” standard. “Collegiality” has also been used, outside of this document, to describe this standard. Section 3.1.1 (General Substantive Standards) describes this standard as follows:

Substantive Standard IV: Consistently Professional Behavior - Faculty members should conduct their work with honesty, integrity, and objectivity. They should foster a respectful relationship with students, colleagues and others who participate in or benefit from their work. Faculty members should uphold recognized standards for academic integrity and professional conduct.

Unfortunately, this standard is not adequately addressed in the unit tenure and promotion policies and procedures documents. The COBA has specific language addressing collegiality with colleagues as a criterion in their policy, although the wording is not consistent with the University-wide policy. Other units do not have such clauses in their tenure and promotion policies and procedures documents, or else the clauses were not cited for the UTPC in support of cases where collegiality seemed to be an issue. Therefore, in cases where a recommendation to deny a personnel action at any level occurred prior to the UTPC review, these were judged to violate section 2.2 Substantive Due Process Errors because of lack of discussion of what seemed to be the “real issue.” According to *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*, lack of consistently professional behavior is a standard on which to deny tenure or promotion. However, where there is no “paper-trail” or documentation at levels of review prior to the UTPC, in most cases, this denial seemed capricious or arbitrary. Language defining the professional behavior standard needs to be included in all unit tenure and promotion policies and procedures documents. Moreover, any negative comments regarding the professional behavior standard need to be documented in evaluations and/or pre-tenure review. In order to apply this standard effectively the committee needs much more information.

8. *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures* requires, as outlined in Part 3.2.1, Section II, that dossiers include “D. Unit tenure and/or promotion review letter(s) (by both the T and P Committee and head if applicable to that unit)” and “E. College or division Tenure and/or Promotion letter(s) (by both the T and P Committee and Dean or Director).” These review letters (also referenced as recommendation memos in Appendix C) directly support approval or disapproval recommendations for personnel actions and are of particular importance when the recommendations at different levels of review are inconsistent. The Committee noted that letters supporting approval/disapproval recommendations for requested personnel actions were not found in several of the dossiers. While not specifically mentioned in the main body of *Valdosta State University Tenure and Promotion Policies and Procedures*, Appendix C *Flowchart for VSU Tenure and Promotion Review Process*, illustrates that recommendation memos for each personnel action requested should be prepared by the UTPC for the dossiers and copied to the candidates. However, unlike unit (department and college) T&P, committees, department heads, and deans, the UTPC functions as an advisory committee to the Provost and does not submit a formal approval/disapproval recommendation on the cover page of the personnel action. Therefore, UTPC members agreed that it would be more appropriate to deliver their input verbally to the Provost pending further vetting and clarification.

9. The UTPC experienced difficulty assessing whether tenure and promotion policies and procedures at the college/division or university-wide levels were consistent with peer and/or aspirational peer institutions.

10. Further discussion is required at all levels regarding how faculty members whose primary faculty assignment involves significant administrative duties are evaluated in the tenure and promotion process.

Members and Visitors Present

*Indicates proxy

Executive Committee:

L. Levy, Interim President
P. Gunter, Provost/VP for Academic Affairs
T. Woodard-Meyers, Executive Secretary (absent)
E. Walker, Parliamentarian

Ex Officio:

N. Argyle (absent)
A. Bernstein
J. Crawford (absent)
A. Fuciarelli
S. Fuciarelli
J. Gaston*
M. Giddings*

K. Hull (absent)
A. Hufft (absent)
R. Mast (absent)
W. Plumly*
C. Richards

College of Arts:

B. Day*
B. Finson (absent)
P. McNeill
E. Nielsen
K. Paoletti
L. Orenduff
C. Schaeffer

College of Arts & Sciences:

J. Allard (absent)
A. Aronson-Friedman*
D. Baracskay
S. Barron
L. Bejarano*
L. De La Garza
N. Elliott (absent)
M. Espinosa-Dulanto
S. Fares
V. Foyou*
R. Gladwin*

D. Hall*
M. Hyer
J. Kassel (absent)
A. Kumar
A. Lazari
O. Nikolova
E. Parra
G. Rogers
T. Thompson
S. Wilfred
T. Woodard-Meyers (absent)

College of Business Administration:

D. Cunningham (absent)
A. Cseh
A. Fowler
N. Moates
E. Walker

College of Education:

K. Adams (absent)
D. Briehl (absent)
C. Conner
T. Darling*
G. Doepker
M. Gorham-Rowan*
R. Green
R. Hannibal*
S. Kohn*
L. Leader
D. Long (absent)
B. Radcliffe
A. Rieger
S. Sanderson
C. Talor
V. Whisler

College of Nursing:

A. Corbitt (absent)
D. Weaver

Division of Social Work:

D. Holliman

Odum Library:

E. Rogers
L. Wright

COSA Representative (non-voting):

Y. Landers

Student Senators (non-voting):

G. Davis (absent)
M. Richardson (absent)

Proxies:

Chuck Conner for Tom V. Darling
Ericka Parra for Luis G. Bejarano
Shani P. Wilfred for Ruth Hannibal
Eric Nielsen for Brian Day
Dr. Lai Orenduff for Steven Kohn
Diane Holliman for Martha Giddings
Dr. Daniel Baracskey for Viviane E. Foyou
Attila Cseh for Lester W. Plumly
Said Fares for Ranson Gladwin
Myriam Espinosa-Dulanto for Amy I. Aronson-Friedman
Theresa Thompson for Deborah Hall

Alan Bernstein for John Gaston
Karl Paoletti for Mary Gorham-Rowan

Visitors:

Ricardo Horne – Archibald/Org. & Gov.
Jack Fischer – Archibald/Org. & Gov.
Chad Akins – Archibald/Org. & Gov.
Loren Bass – Archibald/Org. & Gov.
Ginger Williams – Odum Library
Delia DeLaTorre – Archibald/Org. & Gov.
James Archibald - CLT
Sheri Gravett – Academic Affairs
Nigel Richardson – Archibald/Org. & Gov.
Keith Lee – Archibald/Org. & Gov.
Mark Smith - English
Rich Vodde – Social Work
Shepard Allen – Archibald/Org. & Gov.
Meaghan Bitters – Org. & Gov.
Peggy Moch – Math/CS Dept.
Josh Gilbert – Archibald/Org. & Gov.

