

Middle Georgia State College Faculty Recognition Standing Committee
AY 2013-2014
Draft Minutes of Meeting No. 2
TEB 345
Friday, November 15, 2013

Present:

Ms. Sydney Chalfa (Associate Professor of Theatre)

Dr. Paul Gladden (Assistant Professor of Psychology)

Dr. Justin Ku (Assistant Professor, School of C.i8(C.i8(C.i8(C.i8.i8(-22.45(P)-3(s)-1(y)3(cP523(s)(u)

Dr. Benita Muth (Associate Professor of English)

Dr. Pushpa Yadav (Assistant Professor of Biology)

Absent:

Ms. Vicki Ball (Assistant Professor, Department of Nursing)

Ms. Rhonda King (Assistant Professor of Education)

Ms. Darla Marchant (Assistant Professor of Aviation)

Dr. Frank E. Ryerson, III (Professor of Business)

After setting up the technology for committee members dialing in, Dr. Benita Muth called the meeting to order at 10:06.

agenda, several people seconded the motion, and the motion passed.

Dr. Benita Muth reminded committee members that we had concluded our meeting by agreeing to research how other institutions selected faculty for recognition. She suggested that we begin our meeting by reporting on the three categories of awards: teaching, scholarship, and service.

Dr. Paul Gladden spoke first to summarize his findings on requirements for teaching awards. He noted that at the other institutions he looked into a lot of weight was put on student evaluations.

Ms. Viktoriya Lanier added that there seemed to be a general trend of giving teaching awards to full-time faculty that had been employed by their institution for at least one year. Ms. Viktoriya Lanier also noticed that some institutions required faculty to submit syllabi to be considered by for faculty recognition awards. Some awards included advising and development as part of teaching. She saw

institution that clearly outlined the process of nomination; as part of that process a division chair could nominate up to three faculty members to the committee.

Dr. Benita Muth took note of the general procedures described by Ms. Viktoriya Lanier and asked for a summary from the group researching scholarship.

Dr. Pushpa Yadav opened up the discussion of scholarship. She summarized how several of the institutions she examined focused a great deal on publications (either books or book chapters) and wondered if it was appropriate to place such a heavy emphasis on publications at MGSC.

Dr. Benita Muth agreed and suggested that we discuss what should constitute scholarship at our institution.

Dr. Charlotte Miller noted that publications were not as heavily emphasized at smaller institutions.

Dr. Justin Ku summarized his findings. He found that at five out of the six schools faculty were required to be tenured on or on the tenure-track to be eligible for faculty awards for scholarship. He also saw that some non-research institutions allowed things like museum exhibits and community programs to count as scholarship. Also some larger institutions considered things like how much research money a faculty member brought in and how many graduate students s/he could attract.

There was a short discussion with general agreement that at MGSC it makes the most sense to describe scholarship broadly.

Dr. Benita Muth voiced her agreement that most institutions do require faculty to be tenured or on the tenure-track to apply for awards for scholarship. She also suggested that the nominator (whether the dean, the chair, or a fellow faculty member) would need to clearly explain the breath and depth of the research in a way that could be understood by people outside that area of specialty. Dr. Benita Muth, then, suggested that the committee consider the service award.

Dr. Benita Muth presented some ideas submitted by Ms. Vicki Ball. Ms. Vicki Ball noted that at some institutions there appeared to be two types of awards for service: an award for excellence in service and an award for longevity of service. Dr. Benita Muth stated that we might consider the awards for longevity in service in the future since they do not seem to be included in our budget at this time.

Ms. Sydney Chalfa added her findings. She found that other institutions included a broad range of activities as service. She mentioned things like: service as mentors, service on college/university committees, and participation in the development of inter-disciplinary courses and programs. Ms. Sydney Chalfa also stated that we

might consider service to the profession and service to the community as we develop our criteria.

Then, Dr. Benita Muth thanked the committee members for their reports with the aforementioned introductory information. She recommended that the committee try to come to some general agreement about procedures, including who can be nominated, who can do the nominating, what documents will need to be submitted to the committee, and a timeline.

Dr. Benita Muth broached the topic of the titles of the awards. There was some brief discussion about the wording, with two possibilities considered: "Outstanding Faculty Service, Scholarship, and Teaching" and "Excellence in Service, Scholarship, and Teaching." There was general agreement that the "Excellence in..." wording best captured the qualitative aspect of the award.

Dr. Benita Muth next asked who should be able to nominate candidates for these awards. She observed that at other institutions various members of the college communities (deans, chairs, faculty, students, and staff) can nominate the candidates. Dr. Pushpa Yadav asked whether it was appropriate for faculty to be able to nominate themselves. Dr. Justin Ku stated that he noticed that self-nomination was allowed at Georgia College, but that he would tend not to support self-nomination for the service category. A brief discussion ensued that seemed to lean towards not allowing self-nomination for the teaching and service awards, but undecided about whether it was appropriate for the scholarship award.

~~Dr. Benita Muth thanked the committee members for their reports with the aforementioned introductory information. She recommended that the committee try to come to some general agreement about procedures, including who can be nominated, who can do the nominating, what documents will need to be submitted to the committee, and a timeline.~~
Dr. Benita Muth broached the topic of the titles of the awards. There was some brief discussion about the wording, with two possibilities considered: "Outstanding Faculty Service, Scholarship, and Teaching" and "Excellence in Service, Scholarship, and Teaching." There was general agreement that the "Excellence in..." wording best captured the qualitative aspect of the award.

Dr. Benita Muth asked about material required for the committee to assess nominees. She recommended requiring a letter of nomination since the letter was required at all other institutions. With the exception of the letter, Dr. Benita Muth said that the requirements varied greatly at other institutions.

Dr. Charlotte Miller suggested keeping the process as streamlined as possible to avoid placing unnecessary burdens on the faculty nominees.

Ms. Sydney Chalfa asked what the process had been previously at MSC. Dr. Benita Muth stated that in the past, MSC had used various processes. In general, a person was nominated, asked to provide CV, and then the different awards asked for different things. If nominated for a teaching award, the nominee was usually asked to sign a waiver to say committee could look at teaching evaluations; the scholarship nominees were asked for examples of their scholarship; and service nominees were invited to give any additional support materials to demonstrate their service. Dr. Benita Muth wondered if we wanted to require additional letters of support for our nominees.

Ms. Sydney Chalfa asked whether candidates knew of their nomination. Dr. Benita Muth answered that most recently candidates did know, but that previously at MSC they had not.

Dr. Benita Muth began a list of things that we might require of nominees.

Dr. Benita Muth suggested a CV and the committee

Dr. Benita Muth expressed that scholarship may be the most difficult to assess. Dr. Justin Ku wondered what else besides publications can show evidence of excellence in faculty scholarship. Ms. Sydney Chalfa suggested defining scholarship broadly. For example, she said that things like preparation for creative activities in the theater department should count as scholarship. Dr. Benita Muth read some pieces of the former MSC definition of scholarship. Dr. Pushpa Yadav brought up the need to be able to establish criteria to judge ongoing scholarship that has not yet been published. Dr. Justin Ku noted that at other institutions there was some discussion of journal rankings. Dr. Benita Muth recommended that the committee require nominees to submit copies of publications and something that will impart to the committee the significance of the scholarship. Dr. Benita Muth also asked if we want to consider publications and scholarly activities that predate the creation of the new consolidated institution (MGSC). Dr. Paul Gladden stated that he was in favor of including scholarly activities completed at either the former MSC or MGC. Dr. Benita Muth recommended requiring the nominator to address the impact of the nominee's scholarship in his/her letter of nomination. Dr. Justin Ku concurred, stating that all the institutions he had examined required evidence of impact.

Dr. Benita Muth then posed whether the committee intends to limit these awards to tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Several members of the committee spoke out in favor of this limitation. Dr. Paul Gladden added that many awarding committees said that recipients of awards within the last three, four, or five years were ineligible for awards. And Dr. Benita Muth proposed that members of the Faculty Award Committee should not be able to receive awards.

Next, Dr. Benita Muth turned our attention to the schedule. She gave the committee a sense of how MSC had timed the nominations and awards previously. MSC had required nominations to be submitted by January 20, giving nominees several weeks to turn in supporting materials, before the committee met several times in March, and then the awards were generally given out in April. Dr. Benita Muth stated that classes will not start until January 13, 2014, for the Spring 2014 semester, which may necessitate an adjustment in our timeline. Dr. Pushpa Yadav affirmed that January 20 seemed like an early deadline for nominations, given that the semester started on January 13. Dr. Benita Muth suggested setting the deadline for nominations for early February, continuing to give nominees about two weeks to turn in materials, and then using March for the committee to assess the candidates and make recommendations for awards.

Ms. Viktoriya Lanier asked if we would want to do a pre-screening of nominees and then ask for additional materials from just the people who made it through a pre-screening process. Ms. Viktoriya Lanier asked if the committee needs to send names through the Faculty Senate before recommending awards or if we might use a pre-screening process and then send names through the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Benita Muth said that she would seek clarification about what needs to go through the Faculty Senate. Dr. Benita Muth stated that she thinks that our

