

University Senate Committee Annual Report

Due Date: Submit in MSWord or pdf format to senate@gcsu.edu

no later than Wed 3 May 2017.

Note: This report should represent consensus of the entire committee and serve as a historical record of committee deliberations over the academic year.

Committee Name: Faculty Affairs Policy Committee

Academic Year: 2016-2017

Committee Charge:

V.Section2.C.3.b. The Faculty Affairs Policy Committee shall be concerned with policy relating to faculty welfare (e.g. authorities, responsibilities, rights, recognitions, privileges, and opportunities), which includes, but is not limited to, policies relating to academic freedom, workload, compensation, recruitment, retention, promotion, tenure, recognitions, development, and instructional support. This committee also provides advice, as appropriate, on procedural matters that affect the welfare of the faculty.

Committee Calendar: The Committee met on 29 April 2016 (organizational meeting), 9 August 2016 (Senate Retreat), 7 October 2016, 4 November 2016, 2 December 2016, 3 February 2017, 3 March 2017, and 31 March 2017.

Executive Summary: After concluding discussions on matters begun in 2015-2016 such as how the university uses international faculty Credentialing Services and questions about the Provost's Memo to Deans, Directors, and Chairs in February 2016, much of the Committee's time was spent researching and debating Student Opinion Surveys and Peer Teaching Evaluation, issues which carried over from 2015-2016 and which will carry over to 2017-2018. Dissatisfied with the long and convoluted Student Rating of Instruction Survey, the Committee requested a change to the shorter form and expressed interest in looking at other instruments before tasking a Work Group that proposed switching to an in-house Student Satisfaction Survey; however, questions arose regarding returning to an in-house model. In terms of Peer Teaching Evaluation, after conducting research and hearing from the Interim Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Committee thought a two-person team of a department member and a trained evaluator from outside the department would be a good model. The Peer Teaching Evaluation recommended a pilot program for new teachers in which two evaluators from each college were trained in the fall and evaluations were performed in the spring; however, the Committee could not reach consensus on who should conduct the peer evaluations and who should be evaluated. The Committee also worked on issues of faculty evaluation and promotion and tenure. It recommended changing the Individual Faculty Report deadline, reminded administrators that policy mandates that faculty receive copies of recommendations for and against tenure, and recommended changing the policy that faculty could only respond to recommendations against tenure (because of an irregularity with a sabotaging recommendation letter from a chair). Finally, the Committee deliberated on the Provost's ideas regarding streamlining the timetable of Five-Year Review of Academic Administrators and using an external review service; finding both valuable but desiring to keep faculty on Review Teams.

Committee Membership and Record of Attendance:

P = Present, R = Regrets, NA = Not Applicable (not on the committee at this time)

Members	4/29	8/9	10/7	11/4	12/2	2/3	3/3	3/31
Alex Blazer, Senator, Chair	P	P	P	R	P	P	P	P
Robert Blumenthal, Presidential Appointee	P	P	P	P	P	P	R	P
Louis Bourne, Senator	P	P	P	R	P	P	P	P
Ryan Brown, Volunteer (Fall)	P	P	P	P	P	NA	NA	NA
Kell Carpenter (Spring)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	R	P	R
Carrie Cook, CAO Designee	A	P	P	P	P	R	P	P
David Johnson, Senator, Secretary	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Monica Ketchie, Volunteer	P	P	R	R	R	P	P	P
Mary Jean Land, Senator	R	P	R	P	P	P	P	P
Joe Mocnik, Volunteer (Fall)	P	P	R	P	R	NA	NA	NA
Barbara Roquemore, Senator	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Patrick Simmons, Volunteer	P	P	P	R	P	P	R	P
Christina Smith, Volunteer (Spring)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	R	R	P
Ashley Taylor, Senator	P	P	P	P	P	R	P	P
Tom Toney, Senator, Vice-Chair	P	R	R	P	P	P	P	P

Motions brought to the Senate floor:

1617.FAPC.001.P Individual Faculty Report Deadline: To recommend the proposed Individual Faculty Report deadline in the supporting document entitled “Individual Faculty Report Deadline” as University Policy, and to endorse the guidelines, directions, and procedural recommendations therein. The faculty member completes the Individual Faculty Report (IFR) and submits it to the chairperson on January 21 [or the first business day following January 21 should January 21 be a Saturday or Sunday]. While the Committee decided, in a vote of 5-4, on January 21 as the deadline to recommend to Senate, the Committee deliberated on other dates such as January 15 and January 31; and the Committee also discussed changing the chairperson’s annual scheduled conference with faculty members from May 1.

Individual Faculty Report Deadline: Following up on a request for University Senate to weigh in on Deans Council’s decision to shift the Individual Faculty Report Deadline to allow chairs more time to evaluate faculty in case of potential merit-based raises, in a 5-4 vote the Committee sent a motion to senate to move the faculty IFR deadline to January 21 from March 15 in order to give chairs extra time to do evaluations.

1617.FAPC.002.P Faculty Response to Tenure and Promotion Recommendations: To recommend the proposed Faculty Response to Tenure & Promotion Recommendations in the supporting document entitled “Faculty Response to Tenure & Promotion Recommendations” as University Policy, and to endorse the guidelines, directions, and procedural recommendations therein. The faculty member may respond to tenure or promotion recommendations by peer faculty, the Chairperson, the Dean, and the Provost by submitting to the next “line of authority” a written statement in support of his or her candidacy for tenure or promotion within ten (10) calendar days from receipt of such notice.

Promotion and Tenure Irregularities: Following up on a backhanded recommendation that was discovered by the CoAS P&T Committee that promotion and tenure policy prevented the candidate from responding to, the Committee made a policy recommendation for changing the promotion and tenure language from faculty members may respond “if a recommendation is made against” promotion and/or tenure to “The faculty member may respond within 10 days....”

Other Significant Deliberation (Non-Motions):

Credentialing Services: Jason Wynn, Assistant Director of the International Center, walked the committee through the various types of international credential evaluating agencies and the evaluation process itself. The Committee tabled the credentialing services inquiry because most of our questions were answered.

Provost's Memo to Deans, Directors, and Chairs from February 2016: The Committee reached consensus that the memo is a clarification of how Dr. Kelli Brown intends to do business.

Faculty Rights and Responsibilities while Off-Contract: Following up on a concern regarding an election taking place during the summer, the Committee reminded the university community (in ECUS/SCC and University Senate) that shared governance should be done during the school year when possible.

Student Opinion Surveys: Concerned with the 47 question length of the current instrument (Student Rating of Instruction Survey), the Committee requested the Provost's Office to use the 23 question shorter survey form next academic year. Committee guest Dr. Cynthia Alby, Professor, College of Education, shared academic research demonstrating concerns about the limited value of student opinion surveys in evaluating teaching. She recommended moving from a paid instrument to an in-house instrument and using a range of other kinds of evidence for teaching evaluation, such as peer teaching evaluation. A Student Opinion Survey Work Group proposed the use of a short, simple student feedback form, as well as university-mandated use of class time for students to complete the survey. A concern was raised about using a survey that has not undergone thorough psychometric testing if it is used for personnel decisions. *The 2017-2018 Committee will have to decide what to do with the work group recommendation.*

Peer Teaching Evaluation: A work group reviewed peer observation policy in other schools: when peer observations happen, who does them, how many are there, is there peer observation training, what are the evaluation guidelines. The Committee tentatively thought about the creation of a two-person peer teaching evaluation committee consisting of a department peers and an outside observer trained by CTL to perform either formative or evaluative observations. Guest Jeanne Sewell, Interim Director of the Center of Teaching and Learning, shared research on peer teaching evaluation and affirmed that the committee's preliminary thoughts are a good model that are logistically possible given CTL resources. A Peer Teaching Evaluation Work Group proposed that GCSU begin a pilot program in which two people per college do training with CTL in the fall and then begin performing evaluations in the spring. There were questions about who would be evaluated, and there was disagreement regarding whether the pilot program evaluators have expertise in the fields being observed and/or be department members as well as whether there should be one or two member review teams. The Committee voted to postpone recommending the Pilot Program at this time in a vote of 6 to 3. *The 2017-2018 Committee will have to decide what to do with the work group recommendation.*

Promotion & Tenure Irregularities: Following up on reports of candidates for promotion and/or tenure not receiving copies of their recommendations for or against promotion and/or tenure by chairpersons, P&T committees, deans, etc., the Committee reminded administrators (in ECUS/SCC and University Senate) that that copies of recommendations for and against promotion and tenure from chairpersons, deans, etc. should be provided to faculty members.

Evaluation of Administrators: Dr. Kelli Brown, Provost, talked with the Committee about the Five-Year Administrative Review process (shortening the year-long process to a spring timetable and using an *FAPC Annual Report 2016-17*

external reviewing company). The Committee is interested in working with the Provost's Office to revise the Five-Year Administrative Review policy. The Committee has questions about preserving the in-house Review Team, and it fully supports streamlining the time table, updating the way evaluations are gathered, and making the process less burdensome. *The 2017-2018 Committee will continue to work with the Provost.*

Promotion & Tenure Task Force: In the fall, Ryan Brown and David Johnson served on the Task Force; in the spring, Alex Blazer and David Johnson served on the Task Force. In the fall, open fora were held and a survey was circulated. Only a small fraction of faculty participated. In the spring, the task force met when both FAPC representatives were unavailable.

Ad hoc committees and other groups:

SRIS and Peer Teaching Evaluation Work Group: Alex Blazer reviewed the SRIS instrument, asked Cara Smith if it was used for accreditation purposes, asked Cara Smith about other instruments that are used around the University System of Georgia, and asked Dr. Lee Gillis and Dr. Indiren Pillay about their previous research on finding an instrument. He researched peer teaching policies and evaluation materials in our institution and other universities, noting when peer teaching evaluation occurred, how many peer teaching evaluations occurred, who performed peer teaching evaluation, what criteria and training occurred for peer teaching evaluation, and how peer teaching evaluation was used (i.e., for formative or evaluative purposes).

Student Opinion Survey Work Group: David Johnson and Patrick Simmons used Dr. Cynthia Alby's research to propose an in-house Student Satisfaction Survey. *The 2017-2018 Committee should decide what to do with the work group's recommendation.*

Peer Teaching Evaluation Work Group: Monica Ketchie, Mary Jean Land, and Barb Roquemore proposed a peer teaching evaluation pilot program involving the training of two faculty from each college in the fall by the Center for Teaching and Learning and the evaluation of new faculty in the spring by the newly trained peer evaluators. *The 2017-2018 Committee should decide what to do with the work group's recommendation.*

Committee Reflections:

What worked well this year was the Committee's ability to review existing policies, procedures, and practices for fairness, as in the cases of faculty rights and responsibilities while off-contract, credentialing services, individual faculty report deadlines, and tenure and promotion irregularities. The initial stages of the Committee's research into student opinion surveys and peer teaching evaluation maintained this quality. What did not work as well was creating forward movement on debates and deliberations regarding faculty evaluation in the areas of student opinion surveys and peer teaching evaluation. While the Committee agrees that modification to surveys is necessary and peer teaching evaluation pilot program is a proper first step, it is divided on how to change the surveys (create an in-house satisfaction survey or look for a new paid instrument) and who should conduct the evaluations and who should be evaluated (two-person review teams or one-person review teams, department reviewers or outside reviewers, all new teachers or a subset of new teachers, etc.). Given the significance of these two issues, it is to the good that another committee will also debate the issues.

Committee Recommendations:

This year's committee was unable to complete its work on Student Opinion Surveys and Peer Teaching Evaluation. Although the Committee did recommend moving to a shorter SRIS survey next academic year, the Committee has not reached consensus on how to proceed with Student Opinion Surveys in the long-term. The Work Group recommends adopting a short in-house Student Satisfaction Survey; next year's committee must decide what to do with the recommendation. Although the Committee deliberated Peer Teaching Evaluation research and policies, it did not reach consensus on what to do with the Work Group's recommended pilot program; therefore, next year's committee must continue the process. Given the complexity of the issues, next year's Committee may want to adopt more formal deliberative rules when discussing these topics.

The Committee recommends that this year's Student Opinion Survey Work Group recommendation be debated during the following year. The Committee recommends that this year's Peer Teaching Evaluation Work Group recommendation be debated during the following year. The Committee recommends that next year's committee continue working with Dr. Brown on the Five-Year Review of Academic Administrators policy and be mindful about Review Teams which afford faculty representation in the evaluation process.

Recommend items for consideration at the governance retreat:

Full Senate: None

FAPC: In-House Student Satisfaction Survey and Peer Teaching Evaluation Pilot Program

Appendix: Committee Operating Procedures

A summary of the standard operating procedures used to conduct business during the year.

Faculty Affairs Policy Committee communicate openly and candidly with each other without judgment or repercussion. All FAPC members share responsibility to seek out and identify concerns of broad institutional impact within FAPC scope. The Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary follow duties outlined in University Senate bylaws; meeting minutes are circulated among members for review prior to posting in compliance with University Senate bylaws. Deliberation is informal until there is a motion for committee consideration in which case Robert's Rules apply.