Georgia Southwestern State University

Americus, Georgia

Minutes of the General Faculty Meeting

Friday, April 29th 2011-10:00 am

Student Success Center, Room 2417

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Ru Story-Huffman, President of the Faculty Senate. A quorum of the faculty was present.

2. Approval of Minutes of December 3, 2010

The motion was made to approve the minutes from the December 3, 2010 meeting. All were in favor and the motion carried.

3. Remarks by the President:

Dr. Blanchard began his remarks by saying that there are many uncertainties in our future that we face as an institution. He stated that enrollment for fall is not clear, and both the HOPE Scholarship and the Pell Grant are changing significantly and most certainly will have an impact on our school. However, the good news is that enrollment for summer term is up. Funding for Phase II for the new Health and Human Sciences building is on the Governor's desk, and when signed, we will receive 8.2 million dollars to complete Phase II. He expressed his sincere thanks to both Senator George Hooks and State Representative Mike Cheokas on their hard work for helping this project to come to fruition.

On another positive note, he reported that our GSW freshmen rank 7th in the state in regards to highest SAT scores, which means that we are doing well in competing and getting the brightest students in the state.

Dr. Blanchard referenced the book, "Academically Adrift," and cited the book's study of the three important aspects of student success; large amounts of required reading, long writing assignments, and faculty engagement. The last point of faculty engagement has perhaps the biggest impact. He imparted to the faculty that this is important for our student's success and thanked them for engaging our learners. He feels that active faculty engagement will not only help our students to succeed but will help to increase the successes of GSW.

He again thanked the entire faculty for doing more with less and for taking on additional classes, but reminded everyone that fiscal year 2012 will be the worst year yet. Although that is not good news, he feels that we should not have any more furloughs or salary cuts. He hopes for a brighter future and

maybe at mid-year things will take a positive turn. He expressed that he is always available and willing to help and listen. He asked for question from the floor, but none were given.

4. Committee Reports:

Academic Affairs

No report.

Academic Grievances-

Chair, Dr. Paul Shapiro, had no report.

Athletics

Dr. Nellie lordanova, chair, reported that the committee had met and discussed issues with student athletes, and also looked at software that monitored a student athlete's progress.

Business and Finance

Chair, Dr. Sam Peavy, reported that there would be a 9% budget cut for this new fiscal year, but we still had funds available for Colum Hall, the HVAC in the Science Building, and the University Dam project. He also noted that it is hopeful that this committee will now be involved more in the budget planning process.

Faculty Affairs

Chair, Dr. Brian Smith, reported that the committee met on multiple issues;

- · developed and approved language for Faculty Instructional Grants
- developed and approved clarifying language for Faculty Development Grants
- completed our recommendations to the VPAA concerning the meaning of the Tenure criteria language: "equivalent to Doctorate in training, ability, and/or experience"; the recommendations matched those delivered to our committee by the Deans or department chairs, essentially the same as the language concerning the similar criteria found under promotion to full professor (Visual Arts Studio MFA) (Library MLS or equivalent Masters)

- Reviewed and voted on recipients of the President's University Service Award and the VPAA's Scholarship Award
- The committee was also able to recommend maximum allowable funding for 29 Faculty Development Grants, totaling \$14,365.60

Graduate Affairs

Chair, Dr. Margaret Ellington, reported that their committee had met three times and will have proposals for the next meeting.

Institutional Effectiveness

Chair, Dr. Gary Kline, reported that this was a new committee and it was necessary to form this committee to address the upcoming SACS review. At the first meeting in February they chose members from each school and from each faculty committee. There are now a total of 19 members. Dr. Kline asked all IE committee members to stand so everyone could see who was on the committee. He also noted that at the first meeting that they had formed four sub-committees; Strategic Planning, Budget Planning and Assessment, SACS COC Reaffirmation, and Academic and Support Unit Assessment. At the second meeting in April, Dr. Kline reported that the IE committee received reports from the subcommittees. Minutes from the meetings will be available on the Institutional Effectiveness web page. Dr. Kline concluded by noting that the next IE meeting will be in June.

Institutional Review Board

Chair, Dr. Elizabeth Gurnack, reported that their committee had met twice as a full committee and had reviewed 14 proposals.

Instructional Technology

Chair, Dr. Charles Huffman, reported that their committee had met twice and that Cloud Computing was beginning to unfold. He thanked all of the members for their hard work.

Scholarships and Financial Aid

Chair, Dr. Svilen Kostov, reported that this committee had met with Dr. Gaye Hayes and discussed changes to the Honors Scholarship, and had voted on the function of the committee to serve as an oversight committee. Dr. Kostov hopes that next year this committee will work even more closely with Admissions.

Student Affairs

Chair, Dr. D. Jason Berggren, reported on the committee's actions on the following;

- Considered and conditionally approved petitions for Recognition and Constitutions for 4 new student organizations: Chinese Students Association, Bass Club, Hurricane Otaku, and Frisbee Club
- Considered two student disciplinary cases.
- · Approved new editors for the Sirocco.
- Extended congratulations to Dr. Genie Bryan for her tremendous work with Sirocco.
- Informed the Student Government Association of each action taken by the Student Affairs committee.

University and Alumni Relations

Chair, Dr. John Stovall, reported that this committee had met one time and that they were in the process of collecting items of the Alumni Luncheon and auction. He reminded everyone of the Alumni Luncheon and events that were forthcoming this weekend.

5. New Business

A. Academic Proposals

(1) Academic Affairs

(a) Policy Change-Online Courses-Approved by the Faculty Senate

Proposed Online Course Policies

- Verification of Participation: Online course developers and instructors must provide a
 substantive means of determining participation in a course to facilitate the accurate completion
 of verification roster. An assignment, such as a syllabus quiz or the assessment from the
 prepackaged learning module on using the course tools provided by OHT, must be set for each
 course and must be due no more than 72 hours after the drop/add period ends.
- Access to Course for Withdrawn Students: Online instructors must monitor course rosters in
 Banner Web in the same way they keep track of students in traditional classes, and disable the
 course access of any student who withdraws themselves or is administratively withdrawn as
 they would keep such students from attending traditional classes. Re-enabling course access for
 administratively withdrawn students follows the same procedures as for students
 administratively withdrawn from traditional classes. A weekly check of course rosters in Banner
 should allow compliance with this policy.
- Course Syllabus Online instructors must provide a course syllabus that mirrors the syllabus
 used in face-to-face classes, but which highlights the difference of learning strategy inherent in
 the online course, and specified on the online version of the course outline. For instance, it must
 be clear to a student how they will get answers to questions they would normally pose during a
 class meeting, or how substantive participation in the online class will be measured and
- Verification of Identity: Online course developers and instructors must demonstrate that the
 student who registers in a distance or correspondence education course or program is the same
 student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the credit by
 verifying the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework by using, at the option
 of the institution, methods such as (1) a secure login and pass code, (2) proctored examinations,
 and (3) new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student
 identification.

Online Course Policy Proposals 1

Rationales

- Verification of Participation: Assure that there is a consistent and substantive means of verifying participation of students in online classes
- Access to Course for Withdrawn Students: Avoid students participating in courses who are not officially registered
- Course Syllabus: Set up consisterit expectations for course syllabilin online courses, and
 insure that learning outcomes for individual iterations of courses conform to the course
 outlines for those courses.
- Verification of Identity to comply with the revision of the Higher Education Act of 1965 that
 passed the US Congress in 2008. The legislation requires "an institution that offers distance
 education to have processes through which the institution establishes that the student who
 registers in a distance education course or program is the same student who participates in
 and completes the program and receives the academic credit."

Contacts: Bryan Davis/Brian Adler

Online Course Policy Proposals 2

Motion to approve: Dr. Kuipers

Second: Ms. Laurel Robinson

All approved

(2.) School of Computing and Mathematics

(1) Substantive Change-Program-Approved by the Faculty Senate

General Core

Present requirement: MATH 1111, 1113, or 1120

Proposed requirement: MATH 1111, 1113, 1120 or MATH 1101. All courses taken in AREA A as of Fall Semester 2011 or after, must result in a grade of C or better.

Motion to approve: Dr. Margaret Ellington

Second: Ms. Laurel Robinson

All approved

(b.) General

(1) Substantive Change- Approved by the Faculty Senate

Women's Studies Certificate Program

Present requirement: The only required class is WMST 2001. Students must then complete 18 hours of approved coursework to earn the certificate.

Proposed requirement: No changes are being made to the requirements. The curriculum sheet has been changed to reflect current course offerings and provide information about program assessment.

Motion to approve: Dr. Elizabeth Kuipers

Second: Dr. Mark McLaughlin

All approved

(2.) Substantive Change-Approved by the Faculty Senate

(2.) Substantive Change-Approved by the Faculty Senate

Global Studies Certificate Program

Present requirement: Students must then complete 18 hours or approved coursework to earn the certificate, distributed across 3 core areas and requiring 9 hours at the 3000 level of above.

Proposed requirement: The curriculum sheet has been changed to reflect current course offerings and add a portfolio requirement to conduct program assessment.

Motion to approve: Dr. Elizabeth Gurnack

Second: Dr. Gabriele Stauf

All approved

B. Graduate Affairs

- (a) School of Nursing
 - (1) Addition-Program- Approved by Graduate Affairs and the Faculty Senate

Master of Nursing

This proposal will be the MSN offered collaboratively with Clayton State University. The curriculum of Clayton State's MSN program is presented which will be adopted by the GSW's School of Nursing.

Motion to approve: Ms. Janet Wills

Second: Dr. Margaret Ellington

All approved

(2) Graduate Faculty Applications- Approved by Graduate Affairs and the Faculty Senate

Sheryl Venable

Motion to approve: Dr. Bola Tilghman

Second: Ms. Lynda Lee Purvis

All approved

C. Records Retention Policy for Faculty

Records Retention Policy for Faculty

Last update: March 2011

- 1. Key principles of confidentiality for student records.
 - a) The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) states that student information must be kept confidential. In short, faculty can discuss a student's grades privately with each individual student, but are not allowed to share grades with the student's friends, family members, or other students. Students must sign a waiver form before grade information can be shared with parents or guardians.
 - · Detailed statement of FERPA principles and policies
 - FERPA waiver form
 - b) Minor students: The grades and records of students who are minors must be kept confidential according to FERPA guidelines. Like adult students, waiver forms must be signed before grades and other student information can be shared with parents or guardians.
 - · FERPA waiver form
 - c) High school students in the ACCEI, program have signed waiver forms that permit the sending of final grades to the high school's Registrar and/or Guidance Counselor. Midterm grades are not covered by this waiver. Midterm grades should only be sent to the high school if the student has a waiver form on file with the Registrar that allows midterm grades to be sent to the high school.
 - d) Information that must be kept confidential includes (but is not limited to):
 - Grades and coursework: Exams, term papers, and projects.
 - Records of daily attendance.
 - · Personal information: Addresses, telephone numbers, email, and student ID numbers
- Storage of student records: The need for confidentiality requires that records must be retained, stored, and destroyed in a secure manner. The goal is to prevent possible breaches of confidentiality.
 - a) Electronic records
 - All electronic forms of student records (e.g., spreadsheets) must be stored on systems that are password-protected. The following systems are approved and recommended for storing student grades:
 - · Password-protected faculty computers
 - · Networked storage from GSW
 - Course management systems (examples: GeorgiaView, online systems from textbook publishers)
 - Turnitin.com, LiveText, and similar online educational services that have password protection.

- Encryption: Encryption makes it more difficult for unauthorized people to view confidential documents. The use of encryption for student records and information is highly recommended and should be used whenever possible. The following examples are encrypted systems:
 - Networked storage from GSW
 - · The GeorgiaView online system
- Electronic documents should <u>not</u> be stored on systems that can be easily accessed by other people. The following storage formats are unsuitable for the storage of student records:
 - Removable storage media (examples: USB memory drives, CD-ROMS, floppy disks, and zip drives) are inherently insecure because they are portable. They can be easily lost or stolen. Data storage on removable media should be avoided or minimized whenever possible. If data must be stored on removable media, encryption of the data is recommended.
 - File sharing and Internet-based file storage systems that are unencrypted.
- Data segregation: Work files (e.g., Powerpoint presentations, student grades) and
 personal files (e.g., family photos) must have segregated data storage. USG policy does
 not specifically forbid the storage of personal files on work computers. However,
 personal files should be stored in a different location than work files in order to prevent
 possible mix-ups of work and personal information.
 - Data segregation example: Store all work-related files in the "my documents" folder
 of the computer's hard drive. Store all personal files in a "personal" folder that is not
 inside the "my documents" folder.
- b) Paper records: Paper records (examples: grades, exams) should be stored in filing cabinets that are in locked rooms. The filing cabinets should be locked preferably. Paper records should not be kept in areas where students or student workers might be able to access them.

3. Communication of student records

- a) An individual student's grades can be communicated to him/her through:
 - Paper records handed directly to the student.
 - The grade book features of password-protected course management systems (example: GeorgiaView).
 - The email feature of course management systems (example: GeorgiaView).
 - Online educational systems that are password-protected (examples: Turnitin.com, Live lext).
- b) The following means of communication are insecure, therefore, unacceptable:
 - Posting grade lists on an office door is insecure. Even when names are not used, students may be able to determine the grades of other students. Do not post lists of student grades on paper in public places.
 - Sharing grades over the telephone is insecure because there is no way to verify the
 identity of the person to whom one is speaking.
 - Unofficial email addresses (example: hotmail.com or yahoo.com email addresses) are insecure because there is no way to verify the identity of the people who own these email addresses.

4. Retention of student records.

- a) USG policy on student coursework records (e.g., exams, homeworks, term papers, quizzes, etc.) is that these materials should be retained for one term after completion of the course except for grades that are contested.
 - Reference: Page 110, #38 of the USG Records Retention Series A.
- b) If grades are contested, the coursework records must be retained until the grade dispute is resolved.
 - Reference: Page 110, #38 of the USG Records Retention Series A.
- c) Final grades will be stored by the Registrar's Office. There is no need for faculty to keep long-term records of final grades. These records should not be retained by faculty members.
 - Reference: Page 107, #26 of the USG Records Retention Series A.

5. Destroying student records.

- a) When the retention policy has expired (see #4 above), all student records in the faculty member's possession should be destroyed.
 - Electronic records: These should be deleted from the computer hard drive or the network drive.
 - · Paper records: These should be destroyed through shredding.
- b) Grades and other student records that are stored on the GeorgiaView system should be destroyed in accordance with the GeorgiaView and online learning policy.
- e) Records in other proprietary systems (e.g., turnitin.com) are governed by user agreements. For example, students who submit papers to turnitin.com agree to turnitin.com's privacy agreement.
 - turnitin.com's privacy pledge
 - · turnitin.com's statement on legality, ethics, and FERPA compliance

6. Access to records and computer networks.

- a) Records and other sensitive data must be preserved in locations that cannot be accessed by students, student workers, and the general public.
- b) Classroom computers: Steps should be taken to prevent students and other unauthorized users from accessing computers and the network.
 - Faculty should log off or shut down classroom PCs when the class is finished. Leaving classroom PCs on and logged into the network makes network resources available to students and other unauthorized users.
 - Empty classrooms should be locked whenever possible to prevent unauthorized access.
- c) Faculty offices: Faculty should lock their offices when they are not present in order to prevent possible access to confidential material.

- 7. Miscellaneous records that need to be secured
 - a) Advisement records that contain student grades
 - Any electronic files (example: spreadsheets) and paper records (example: midterm grade reports) used for advisement should be maintained similarly to course materials described above.
 - Midterm grade reports should be used to identify advisees who are struggling. Reports should be destroyed through shredding.
 - Advisee information on forms such as graduation checklists should be periodically reviewed for old or outdated files. Old electronic files and paper records should be destroyed.
 - b) Other records that should be treated in the same manner as course data (secure storage of electronic and paper documents) include:
 - Scholarship and award applications
 - Job candidate records (e.g., letters of reference, grade transcripts)

Motion to approve: Ms. Lynda Lee Purvis

Second: Dr. Gary Fisk

Discussion on the floor began with Dr. Elizabeth Kuipers who asked the question of how she was to deal with departmental assessment if she was to only keep students records one term as proposed. She sees this as very problematic. Dr. Bryan Davis asked if this applied to individuals and departments. Dr. Gary Fisk offered clarification and said that yes, it was for faculty and that the proposal was only the minimum, that there is flexibility in this. No maximum limit has been set, just the minimum has been proposed in the one semester. Dr. Fisk went on to say that the BOR says that we must have a policy, that this is not an option. He reminded everyone that this proposal was brought up last year in the spring, but was blocked, and said that we all need to work in agreement to set forth a policy. Dr. Sam Peavy said that a friendly amendment needs to be made to the document; the main issue will be that this does not change "one term" to "however long we need it." Dr. Fisk asked what would be the SACS view on this. Dr. Bryan Davis replied that the records are needed for assessment purposes, but whether they have names and grades are immaterial to SACS. Ms. Lynda Lee Purvis proposed a change in number 4A on the policy, that we change "USG" to "GSW" and insert "at least" before one term. The will give us the needed flexibility. Dr. Brian Smith made a motion to approve the first friendly amendment, second by Dr. Sam Peavy. There was more discussion and clarification needed from Ms. Purivs on the amendment. Then Dr. Fisk then proposed a second friendly amendment of "for program" assessment, grade and other coursework information can be retained for the period of assessment without identifying information." Dr. Gary Fisk made the motion to approve the second friendly amendment, second by Dr. Bola Tilghman; Ru Story-Huffman called for a vote, all approved, none opposed, and the motion carried to add both friendly amendments and approve the proposed Record Retention Policy for Faculty.

D. RCI Caregiving Issues and Management Certificate Program

Motion to approve: Dr. Elizabeth Kuipers

Second: Ms. Laurel Robinson

All approved

E. Amendment of Faculty Handbook

Proposal: to amend the Faculty Handbook by adding a new section in Section IV University Policies creating a procedure for Faculty Instructional Grants.

Motion to approve: Dr. Brian Smith

Second: Dr. Gary Kline

All approved

F. Amendment of Faculty Handbook

Proposal: to amend section AE (Faculty Development Grants) in order to create clarity and consistency in the awarding of Faculty Development Grants.

Motion to approve: Dr. Gary Kline

Second: Dr. Brian Smith

All approve

7. Announcements

President: Dr. Blanchard reminded everyone that the Featured Public Servant reception to honor Dr. Elizabeth Gurnack would be held May 3, at 4:00 pm in the Rotunda of the Wheatley Administration Building.

Faculty Senate: Ms. Ru Story-Huffman, president of Faculty Senate thanked all who served for a good year.

English and Modern Languages: Dr. Elizabeth Kuipers congratulated Anish Dave on being awarded his Ph.D.

Academic Affairs: Ms. Lynda Lee Purvis reminded everyone of graduation exercise next Saturday, May 7th, at 11:00 am in the Student Success Center.

8. Adjourn

Ms. Ru Story-Huffman thanked all who attended and adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cheri Paradise

Administrative Assistant

Vice President for Academic Affairs

Approved:

Dr. Kendall Blanchard

President