

## **Faculty Affairs Minutes**

**Monday August 14, 2023**

**9:00 a.m., SSC 1243**

**Members Present:** Ellen Cotter, Elizabeth Gurnack, Jessica Watson, Teresa Teasley, Martha Dodd, John LeJeune, Brian Smith, Jesse Russell, Jonathan Hobbs

**1. Chair:** John LeJeune was elected Chair by consensus.

**2. Secretary:** Elizabeth Gurnack was elected Secretary by consensus.

### **3. Discussion Items:**

**Active Shooter Training:** Noting a previous request from Faculty Affairs related to Active Shooter training, Dr. Smith mentioned that the training during this year's Southwestern Week seemed to be responsive to that request but with significant room for improvement. The committee agreed that Dr. LeJeune would draft a letter to GSW Campus Safety to be considered at the next meeting.

**Remote Work:** Dr. Cotter discussed inconsistencies and lack of clarity in GSW's remote work policy. Prior to the next meeting, Dr. Cotter will provide a formal write up of the concern, which will be the basis for further action.

**4. Adjourn:** The meeting adjourned by consensus.

Faculty Affairs Minutes  
Friday, September 19, 2023  
4:15 PM  
BHP 318 Conference Room

Present: Elizabeth Gurnack, Jessica Watson, Jason Cribbs, Suzanne Conner, Ellen Cotter, Jesse Russell, Jonathan Hobbs, Brian Smith, Jill Drake (ex-officio), John LeJeune, Martha Dodd (via telephone)  
Absent: Teresa Teasley, Michael Moir, Robert Bennett

Business:

1. Approval of Minutes: A motion to approve the minutes (see attached document "Faculty Affairs minutes 8-14-2023 APPROVED") from AUGUST 14, 2023 was made by B. Smith and seconded by E. Gurnack. The motion was passed unanimously.
2. Active Shooter Training: The letter regarding active shooter training (see attached document "Letter re Active Shooter Training") was presented and discussed. In addition to the letter, it was brought up that the faculty need to know what the responsibilities of the faculty are with regard to directing students' actions. A motion was made to send the letter to Chief Michael Lewis, Director of Public Safety by E. Gurnack and seconded by E. Cotter. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.
3. Remote Work Issue: A discussion was begun regarding remote work issues and sick leave (see attached document "Remote Work Issues"). The following points were made:
  - a. The USG does not have a clear policy on remote work and sick leave.
  - b. Clarification is needed as to how to use sick leave.
  - c. How does "being present" being defined as in class, face to face, apply to faculty who normally teach online or off campus?
  - d. It should be made clear that faculty cannot work while on sick leave.
  - e. The idea of partial sick leave was discussed, wherein a faculty member could take sick leave for missing required committee or other meetings, but not take sick leave for classes which are covered in some way (i.e. online or other accommodation to ensure the classes are still available to the students).
  - f. Each unit will have special concerns but the handling of sick leave should not be dependent upon who is the Chair/Dean/Supervisor of the faculty member.
  - g. These items should be addressed somewhere in the Faculty Handbook.
  - h. Human Resources needs to be involved in the policy as well.

The following subcommittee was created to discuss these issues and craft language to present to the committee: John LeJeune, Ellen Cotter, Suzanne Conner. Their task is to bring a proposal to the next meeting of the Faculty Affairs Committee. (10/20/2023, 1:00)

4. Pre-Tenure Review: The issue of in what year to have Pre-Tenure Review was discussed in response to a letter from Dr. Mark Grimes (see attached document “Letter from Grimes re Tenure Review”). Dr. Grimes proposes that Pre-tenure review should be delayed to the beginning of the fourth year in order to have 3 years of information on which to base the review. The committee discussed this, but came to a unanimous decision that were that to occur, the faculty member would have no time to respond to any issues that could come up during that review before going up for promotion and tenure. The committee did agree that clarification of the timing of both pre-tenure review and promotion and tenure application needs to be clarified in the handbook. A motion was made by B. Smith and seconded by E Gurnack to change the current handbook language:

**Original Faculty Handbook Language, p. 35:**

All dossiers for pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review will be based on scores from their five prior Annual evaluations (three in the case of Pre-Tenure Review) on each of the five areas (Teaching, Service, Scholarship, Student Success Activities, and Faculty Development Activities).

To the following:

**Suggested Revision, with changes highlighted:**

All dossiers for pre-tenure review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review will be based on scores from **up to** five prior Annual evaluations **at GSW** (**two** in the case of Pre-Tenure Review) on each of the five areas (Teaching, Service, Scholarship, Student Success Activities, and Faculty Development Activities).

The motion was passed unanimously.

5. Faculty work load: The question of how many office hours should be required of a faculty member and who sets those standards was discussed. The following points were made:
  - a. Faculty Work Profiles should be a source for determining fairness of requirements for office hours. The Faculty Work Profiles were discussed by the Faculty Affairs committee in 2017 and the Forms for the work profiles and the wording in the Faculty Handbook was finalized after that. However, they have not been revised or shared with most faculty since that time. New as well as long standing faculty present at this meeting were not aware of the content or, in some cases, existence, of the profiles.
  - b. Different units have different requirements for office hours.
  - c. The Faculty Handbook should have language about expectations of the faculty with regard to office hours.
  - d. The committee generally agreed that the question of how many and what type of office hours that should be required, be left up to the individual units (Departments, Colleges).
  - e. The committee requests clarification of what problems exist with regard to inequity of office hour requirements.

6. Faculty Affairs Website: Due to time constraints, this issue was not discussed. Faculty Affairs Website
7. The next meeting of the Faculty Affairs Committee will be OCTOBER 20 AT 1:00, location to be determined.

Respectfully submitted by Elizabeth Gurnack, Secretary to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Faculty Affairs Minutes  
Friday, October 20, 2023  
1:00 PM  
BHP 318 Conference Room

Present: Elizabeth Gurnack, Teresa Teasley, Brian Smith, Ellen Cotter, Jesse Russell, Michael Moir, John LeJeune, Robert Bennett, Martha Dodd (via phone)

Business:

1. The meeting was called to order at 1:00 pm.
2. Approval of Minutes:
  - a. A motion to amend the minutes was made by J. LeJeune and seconded by R. Bennett. The following corrections were proposed:
    - i. The time of the meeting was corrected to 4:15 instead of 4:13
    - ii. Removal of a carriage return in "committee" in part 3 "Remote Work Issue"
    - iii. Adding the following:
      1. The move to approve the minutes by B. Smith and second by E. Gurnack (Item 1)
      2. The motion to approve the active shooter item by E. Gurnack and seconded by E. Cotter (Item 2)
      3. The motion to approve the pre-tenure review by B. Smith and seconded by E. Gurnack (Item 4)

The motion to correct the minutes was passed unanimously

- b. A motion to approve the minutes was made by E. Cotter and seconded by B. Smith. The motion to approve the amended minutes was passed unanimously.
  3. Remote Work Issues:
    - a. A motion was made by J. LeJeune and seconded by R. Bennett to change the wording of "cannot" to "shall not" in the section "Interpretations of Sick Leave Policy for full Time Faculty" part (4) on Pg 52 of the proposed changes to the handbook. The following items were discussed related to sick leave: The ultimate cost of using sick leave is that you can use it up and then, if sick, you will have unpaid sick leave. Also, for persons having the TRS retirement plan can receive compensation for unused sick leave. The motion was passed unanimously
4. ADA Concerns: (See attached "ADA Concern")
  - a. A general consensus was made that the requirement for a faculty member to put a section of a course online for any student who is sick, was unreasonable. There are many ways such students are accommodated e.g.: some materials may be put online, a student may request a medical withdrawal, a student may request an incomplete. In addition, this requires a great deal of extra effort and the section should be considered an extra section of a course as pertains to teaching load. Also, since we are now under *post*-COVID policies, such a course would have to go through Academic Affairs for approval before it could be offered, if it were a new online course.

- b. In the requirement for students' accommodations, faculty are required to provide "reasonable" accommodations. The committee wonders who decides what is reasonable and for whom should it be reasonable? The student? The Faculty? Both?
  - c. B. Smith asked J. LeJeune to contact the Faculty member who brought the question to the attention of the committee and ask him/her if he/she was in any way coerced to acquiesce to the demand. He also suggested HR and/or a university lawyer may be needed to solve the issue.
  - d. E. Cotter asked to find out from whom the request to make such an accommodation came: Dean? Chair? Student?
  - e. A committee was formed of: J. LeJeune, B. Smith, M. Moir, E. Cotter to meet with Evelyn Oliver to discuss this issue.
5. Faculty Affairs Website
- a. A discussion was had about what should be on the Faculty Affairs Committee website when it is available. The committee suggests:
    - i. The mission of the committee
    - ii. Agenda and minutes (approved)
    - iii. Current members with contact links
    - iv. A statement of what semester and year the committee is required to review the handbook for corrections (must be done every 2 years). (This may look like: Fall of every odd numbered year)
    - v. Procedure of how to have matters brought to the committee
6. The meeting was adjourned at 1:53 pm

Respectfully submitted by Elizabeth Gurnack, Secretary to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Faculty Affairs Minutes  
Friday, February 16, 2024  
12:00 PM  
BHP 318 Conference Room

Approved March 29, 2024

Present: Elizabeth Gurnack, Teresa Teasley, Brian Smith, Ellen Cotter, Jesse Russell, Michael Moir, John LeJeune, Jessica Watson, Martha Dodd (via phone), Provost Jill Drake, Dean of Arts and Sciences, Mark Laughlin

Business:

1. The meeting was called to order at 12:02 pm.
2. Approval of Minutes:
  - a. A motion to amend the minutes was made by E. Cotter and seconded by M. Moir. The motion to approve the minutes was passed unanimously.
3. ADA Concerns: (See attached “ADA Concern UPDATE”)
  - a. A subcommittee (M. Moir and J. Lejeune) met with Evelyn Oliver. See “ADA Concern UPDATE” for synopsis of discussion from that meeting.
  - b. It is important to note that Evelyn Oliver must vet all decisions regarding student accommodations with USG legal representatives.
  - c. A subcommittee will compose a draft policy for submission to E. Oliver regarding these accommodation issues. (M Moir, B. Smith, J. LeJeune). The policy should:
    - i. Include discussion with the faculty member to determine if an accommodation would “substantially alter essential elements of the course or program”.
    - ii. Distinguish between when a student should receive an incomplete or an accommodation.
  - d. Discussion included if there should be a maximum number of withdrawals (W) vs. incompletes (I) that a student should have since that may impact their need for accommodations. Also, it was pointed out that currently, the official policy allows an incomplete if the student would be missing ONE graded assignment/exam.
  - e. HOMEWORK: Everyone on the committee was asked to send in any scenarios, real or imagined, that include points that would need to be addressed by the draft policy, to J. LeJeune.
4. Tenure and Pre-Tenure Policy:
  - a. B. Smith pointed out again how the number of Annual Faculty evaluations a faculty member has may be different than the expected number due to either not receiving an evaluation from one’s supervisor or because a faculty member may have received years credit toward tenure upon hiring.
  - b. E. Cotter made a motion to approve the replacement of:
    - i. **From Original Faculty Handbook Language, p 35:**  
*All dossiers for pre -tenure review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure will be based on scores from their five prior Annual evaluations (three in the case of Pre-*

*Tenure Review) on each of the five areas (Teaching, Service, Scholarship, Student Success, and Faculty Development Activities).*

**To proposed language: (Change highlighted in yellow)**

- ii. *All dossiers for pre -tenure review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure will be based on scores from all prior faculty annual evaluations for the period under review on each of the five areas (Teaching, Service, Scholarship, Student Success, and Faculty Development Activities)”*

The motion was seconded by T. Teasley. The motion was approved unanimously.

5. Faculty Conduct Policy (See memorandum Faculty Conduct Policy).

- a. M. Laughlin explained that Department Chairs have requested that there be an official policy regarding faculty behavior separate from the 5 pillars on which we are evaluated for promotion and tenure. There are faculty who adequately fulfill the requirements for teaching, scholarship, service, student success, and faculty development, however they act in a way that is unprofessional or in some way neglect their duties. He also stated that this is not just a problem in the College of Arts and Sciences; and that other Deans have mentioned this as well. He requested that the committee come up with some policy regarding expected faculty conduct and what would happen if a faculty member violated that conduct policy.
- b. M. Laughlin pointed out that the USG policy is clear that “Professional incompetency and neglect of duty that are not identified as part of the post-tenure review process...” is grounds for removal (8.3.9.1) but it also mandates that “Each institution should provide for standards governing faculty conduct, including sanctions short of dismissal and procedures for implementing such sanctions...”
- c. He also pointed out that at each stage of whatever the policy is, there should be a requirement for documentation, even were it simply an email. This is in order to have some “paper trail” of the procedures.
- d. A committee will look into the policy for professional incompetency and neglect of duty and report back to Faculty Affairs Committee. (J. Watson, J. Russell, J. Drake, T. Teasley, E. Cotter)

6. J. LeJeune announced that he will be asking for feedback regarding two topics:

- a. Artificial Intelligence: What would you like to learn about AI during a Southwestern Week presentation?
- b. FYE: What are the questions and concerns that faculty have regarding the First Year Experience? This information will be gathered together to make a FAQ for a Faculty facing page. J. Hobbs suggested the FAQ/page for faculty regarding FYE be located on faculty “MyGSW” pages.



7. Student Success and Faculty Development Achievements Language: A proposal was sent from the Social Theory Teaching Circle (Carter, Dahlgren, LeJeune), to amend the following statement in the Faculty Handbook (p16: on Achievements in Student Success Activities):

Current wording:

**Examples of activities which could be included as Student Success Activities (some of which may also count as Faculty Development Activities) under the pillars are, but are not limited to, such things as these:**

- facilitating study review sessions, tutoring, or supplemental instruction,
- engaging in Transparency in Learning and Teaching (TILT) activities or other High Impact Practices (HIP),
- teaching a practicum and/or internship course,
- teaching a section of UNIV 1000,
- guiding an independent study,
- supervising student teachers,
- mentoring senior seminar or capstone projects,
- pedagogical approaches such as student peer interaction, workshopping, Reacting to the Past pedagogy, other similar activities designed to develop more student-centered teaching approaches.

Proposed wording: (Change highlighted in yellow)

**Examples of activities which could be included as Student Success Activities (some of which may also count as Faculty Development Activities) under the pillars are, but are not limited to, such things as these:**

- facilitating study review sessions, tutoring, or supplemental instruction,
- engaging in Transparency in Learning and Teaching (TILT) activities or other High Impact Practices (HIP),
- teaching a practicum and/or internship course,
- teaching a section of UNIV 1000,
- guiding an independent study,
- supervising student teachers,
- mentoring senior seminar or capstone projects,

- pedagogical approaches such as student peer interaction, workshopping, Reacting to the Past pedagogy, other similar activities designed to develop more student-centered teaching approaches,

- Pedagogical approaches, including but not limited to those consistent with “Universal Design for Learning” (UDL), that work to accommodate the needs and abilities of all learners and eliminate unnecessary hurdles in the learning process. (see <https://teaching.cornell.edu/teaching-resources/designing-your-course/universal-design-learning>)

Analogous handbook additions were approved in the area of Faculty Development Activities.

T. Teasley moved to approve the motion. J. Watson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

8. J. LeJeune passed along a reminder that Faculty Development Awards will be sent to the

Committee by April 1, 2024. He also encouraged us, and all faculty, to please nominate our peers for these awards as very few nominations had been received the previous year.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:55 pm

Respectfully submitted by Elizabeth Gurnack, Secretary to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

### 3. ADA Concern (Update)

At the October 20, 2023 Faculty Affairs meeting a subcommittee (Cotter, Moir, Smith, and LeJeune) was established to meet with Evelyn Oliver to discuss the issue of accommodations that require face-to-face to online conversions.

Recall, the issue (in truncated form) was as follows:

*First, is converting a course to online a reasonable accommodation?...The word "reasonable" is the key. Converting can be a huge task, with different pedagogy and the need to convert materials into a computer format. A discussion is needed about what our standards should be on these requests. We don't really have a standard at the moment. It's all ad-hoc, case-by-case. It would be important to know what the standards are at other institutions and possibly legal precedents.*

On November 16, Moir and LeJeune met with Ms. Oliver and the bullet points were as follows:

- The key legal language cuts two ways on the issue:

"Students who have self-identified, provided documentation of disability, and requested reasonable accommodations are entitled to receive approved modifications of programs, appropriate academic adjustments, or auxiliary aids that enable them to participate in and benefit from all educational programs and activities." **Section 504**

"Accommodation need not be made if the institution can demonstrate that the changes requested would substantially alter essential elements of the course or program."

- The challenge then, is to establish a process that, at least in the context of online conversions, both (a) allows for students to receive the accommodations they need and to which they are entitled, and which (presumably) may include online conversion (whether full or partial) in some circumstances, while also (b) gathering sufficient information from instructors about their course, to be considered alongside a reliable set of guidelines, to determine whether a requested online conversion would "substantially alter essential elements of the course or program," and if so, whether other options are available that address the needs of the student without altering these essential elements.
- Relevant to the above bullet, Ms. Oliver said that when such requests are made, she contacts the instructor to ask if this accommodation can be done. However, after follow-up with the faculty member, it seems also fair to say that the process can easily, and unfairly, place both the moral (and possibly legal) burden on the faculty member by making him/her responsible for either agreeing to redesign their course in full, or deny the request point blank. There are many slippery slopes here, and as of now there seems to be no clear and objective standard or process that protects both the student and the faculty member. Having a student request an online conversion, and then forwarding that

request to the professor, without any objective process or mediation, isn't a fair solution to either party.

- Ms. Oliver was gracious in our discussion – she said if we could write up a procedural policy that addressed our concerns, she would review it herself and then run that by her USG HR contacts to gauge its viability. Any draft policy should be sensitive to the legal language and general guidelines outlined in the existing “Faculty & Staff Policies and Procedures: Office of Accommodations and Access” document.

MEMORADUM

TO: Faculty Affairs Committee

FROM: Dr. Mark Laughlin, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

DATE: November 7, 2023

RE: GSW Policy and Procedures- Professional incompetency and neglect of duty

Dear Faculty Affairs Committee:

I have received several requests from Department Chairs, within the College of Arts and Sciences, on the proper course of action toward faculty members that are neglecting duties which do not fall neatly within areas of the annual evaluation process (e.g. not attending department meetings, not returning emails, abrasive attitudes toward members of the department, yelling at colleagues, etc.). To my knowledge, there is no current GSW policy that specifically addresses faculty conduct or neglect of duties beyond requirements for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure; however, the USG's policy is clear that "Professional incompetency and neglect of duty that are not identified as part of the post-tenure review process..." is grounds for removal (8.3.9.1), but it also mandates that "Each institution should provide for standards governing faculty conduct, including sanctions short of dismissal and procedures for implementing such sanctions. In imposing sanctions, the burden of proof lies with the institution."

I am requesting that the Faculty Affairs Committee exam current policies to provide clarification on this issue or produce new policies to help us address these on-going issues within the institution.

I appreciate your time and service to the institution.

All the best,

Mark Laughlin

Please see the link or QR code below to the USG policy manual and GSW's handbook.

University System of Georgia Policy Manual link and QR code:

[https://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/C245/#p8.3.5\\_evaluation\\_of\\_personnel](https://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section8/C245/#p8.3.5_evaluation_of_personnel)



### 8.3.9 Discipline and Removal of Faculty Members

#### Subsection 8.3.9.1 Grounds for Removal

A tenured or non-tenured faculty member may be dismissed before the end of his or her contract term for any of the following reasons, provided that the institution has complied with procedural due process requirements:

1. Conviction or admission of guilt of a felony or of a crime involving moral turpitude during the period of employment or prior thereto if the conviction or admission of guilt was willfully concealed;
2. Professional incompetency and neglect of duty that are not identified as part of the post-tenure review process, or default of academic integrity in teaching, research, or scholarship;
3. Unlawful manufacture, distribution, sale, use, or possession of marijuana, a controlled substance, or other drugs as defined by applicable laws; teaching or working under the influence of alcohol or illegal or dangerous drugs, which interferes with the faculty member's performance of duties or responsibilities to the institution or his or her profession;
4. Conviction or admission of guilt in a court proceeding of any criminal drug offense;
5. Physical or mental incompetency as determined by law or by a medical board of three or more licensed physicians and reviewed by a committee of the faculty;
6. False swearing with respect to official documents or statements filed with or given to the institution;
7. Disruption of any teaching, research, administrative, disciplinary, public service, or other authorized activity;
8. Violation of Board of Regents' policies; and,
9. Other grounds for dismissal as may be specified in the institution statutes of the institution, which may supplement the Board of Regents' policies governing causes and procedures for dismissal.

Each institution should provide for standards governing faculty conduct, including sanctions short of dismissal and procedures for implementing such sanctions. In imposing sanctions, the burden of proof lies with the institution.

Faculty handbook link and QR code: <https://www.gsw.edu/faculty-resources/>



Excerpt from the GSW Faculty Handbook:

#### Section 6. Employment, Resignation, or Removal of Faculty Members

1. Employment. The current policies related to faculty employment and resignation as adopted by the Board of Regents are incorporated into these Statutes by this reference.
2. Removal of Faculty Member. The President of the University may at any time remove any faculty member or other employee of the institution for cause. The cause or grounds for dismissal adopted by the Board of Regents are incorporated into these Statutes by this reference.
3. Procedures for the Removal of Faculty Members. The current policies stating the procedures for the removal of faculty members adopted by the Board of Regents are incorporated into these Statutes by this reference.

#### Section 8. Individual Faculty Members

In a changing educational environment, the role of the individual faculty member will necessarily be in a continuous process of evolution. Therefore, the responsibilities and duties of the faculty are best defined in a regularly revised document, the Faculty Handbook, and in conformity with these Statutes.

The primary responsibility of the corps of instruction faculty is to teach and, in doing this, to assist students in the acquisitions of skills, attitudes, and understanding relevant to course objectives. Each instructor is responsible for the quality and content of instruction in his or her classroom and for the evaluation of student academic performance relative to course objectives.

The faculty member also plays an essential role in university life outside the classroom through academic advisement, service on individual or departmental committees, and supervision of student activities. A faculty member is expected to assume professional responsibilities with the above and additional areas to which he or she might reasonably be assigned by the University, division or departmental administration in accordance with these Statutes and the Policies of the Board of Regents.

The faculty member is also expected to be a professional in his or her own discipline, to stay abreast of current developments, and to be professionally active and productive by whatever means are pertinent to this discipline (i.e., conferences, performances, publications, etc.).

## **Georgia Southwestern State University**

### **Faculty Affairs Minutes (Approved, April 17, 2024)**

Friday, March 29, 2024 at 9:15 a.m.

BHP 318 Conference Room

**Committee Members Present:** Elizabeth Gurnack (Secretary), Jessica Watson, Teresa Teasley, Martha Dodd (by phone), John LeJeune (Chair), Brian Smith, Jesse Russell, Jonathan Hobbs, Robert Bennett, Jill Drake

**1. Call to Order:** John LeJeune called the meeting to order at 9:18 a.m.

#### **2. Approval of Minutes**

**a) February 16, 2024:** John LeJeune motioned to approve the February 16 minutes with two changes: 1) Amend language on the approved Tenure and Pre-Tenure Action item (4.b.i.) to read as “all **prior** faculty annual evaluations”; and 2) On Item 7 Re: ‘Student Success and Faculty Development Achievements Language,’ add a sentence to indicate that language similar to what was approved for Student Success achievement was also approved for Faculty Development achievement. Seconded by Brian Smith, and approved unanimously.

**3. ADA Virtual Accommodation Follow-up:** John LeJeune discussed a draft policy sent to Evelyn Oliver. Ms. Oliver’s legal contacts have requested some revisions; new draft will be presented at next meeting.

**4. Faculty Conduct Policy:** Jessica Watson presented the results of the subcommittee meeting re: development of a faculty conduct policy. After discussion, the committee approved ideas of having the existence of faculty conduct-related PIP’s indicated on annual evaluations, and revising the submitted proposal for a multi-step process including (1) consultation, (2) two-year written agreement/contract, and (3) PIP. The committee did not support the idea of making faculty conduct a standing evaluation pillar. Jessica Watson and John LeJeune will correspond regarding the next draft to present at the next meeting.

**5. Probationary Credit Issue:** John LeJeune motioned to approve the drafted probationary credit policy, seconded by Jill Drake, and approved unanimously.



**6. Faculty Evaluation Language** (MacLennan): Dr. LeJeune motioned to amend language in the current Faculty Handbook as follows. On pg. 10, “1. Because GSW is primarily a teaching institution, performing at a ‘noteworthy evaluation’ in the area of Teaching is expected **for Pre-Tenure, Tenure, and Promotion.**” Seconded by Robert Bennett, and approved unanimously.

**7. Faculty Awards:** Nominations due by end of week. We will select winners between April 1-April 12.

**8. Adjourn:** Motion to adjourn by Jessica Watson, seconded by Teresa Teasley, and approved unanimously.

**Georgia Southwestern State University**  
**Faculty Affairs Minutes (Unapproved)**

Wednesday, April 17, 2024 at 2:00 p.m.

BHP 318 Conference Room

**Committee Members Present:** Ellen Cotter, Martha Dodd (phone), John LeJeune (Chair), Michael Moir, Brian Smith, Jesse Russell, Jonathan Hobbs, Robert Bennett, Suzanne Conner

**1. Call to Order:** John LeJeune called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

**2. Approval of Minutes**

a) **March 29, 2024:** Ellen Cotter motioned to approve the minutes, seconded by Suzanne Conner, and approved unanimously.

**3. ADA Accommodation Policy:**

Jonathan Hobbs motioned to approve the ADA Accommodation Policy draft as presented in the meeting folder, seconded by Suzanne Conner, and approved unanimously.

**4. Faculty Conduct Policy:**

Michael Moir motioned to approve the Faculty Conduct Policy as presented in the meeting folder, seconded by Suzanne Conner, and approved unanimously.

**5. Other outstanding items:**

John LeJeune discussed how survey results related to FYE and Artificial Intelligence questions will be used.

**6. Adjourn:** The meeting adjourned by consensus at 2:45 p.m.