

2021-2022 Annual Report, FAPC

Officers:

Sabrina Hom, Chair

Katie Stumpf, Vice-Chair

Justin Adeyemi, Secretary

Committee Charge:

V.Section2.C.3.a Membership. The Faculty Affairs Policy Committee shall have no fewer than eleven (11) and no more than thirteen (13) members distributed as follows: no fewer than nine (9) and no more than eleven (11) members selected from the Corps of Instruction faculty, at least seven (7) of whom are elected faculty senators, one (1) member who is the Chief Academic Officer or an individual appointed by the Chief Academic Officer to serve as a designee in compliance with V.Section2.C, and one (1) member appointed by the University President in compliance with II.Section1.A.5.

V.Section2.C.3.b Scope. The Faculty Affairs Policy Committee shall review and recommend for or against 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:

9/3, 10/1, 11/5, 1/7, 2/11, 3/4, 3/11 (ad hoc meeting to discuss evaluation policy revisions), 4/8

Executive Summary:

The committee recommended three policy revisions. The most significant was a revision to faculty evaluation policies throughout the PPPM, made necessary by the revisions of USG policy around post-tenure review and evaluation which occurred in the fall of 2021. We also made revisions of the policy on faculty appointments, to ensure compliance with accreditation requirements, and simplified the extant research misconduct policies (by reaffirming the most robust extant policy and superseding the others) in order to ensure compliance with Federal research policy. The committee also passed resolutions to request greater local autonomy for the university in the area of mask mandates, and to request that the Board of Regents slow their process on the evaluation policy revisions in order to give a full hearing to faculty concerns and insights. The committee also addressed issues around evaluations of teaching effectiveness, pay for part-time faculty, and the possibility of an ongoing salary study.

Committee Membership and Record of Attendance:

Member	9/3	10/1	11/5	1/7	2/11	3/4	3/11	4/8
Adeyemi, Justin	P	P	P	P	P	P	R	P
Biyogmam, Guy	P	P	A	A	P	A	P	P
Blumenthal, Robert	P	P	P	P	R	P	P	P
Clark, Chris	P	P	P	P	P	R	R	R
Edmonson, Hank	P	P	P	P	R	R	P	R
Folk, Jessie	P	P	P	*	*	*	*	*
Hom, Sabrina	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Knox, Julian	P	A	P	P	P	A	P	P
Mizelle, Nancy	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Rudkevich, Gennady	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Smith, Christina	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	R
Stumpf, Katie	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Swinton, John	*	*	*	P	P	P	P	P
Winn, Sheryl	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

*Jessie Folk served in John Swinton’s stead during his sabbatical.

Motions brought to the Senate floor:

[2122.FAPC.005.P] Motion to revise institutional faculty evaluation policies and procedures

[2122.FAPC.004.P] Motion to revise the Policy on Research Misconduct

[2122.FAPC.003.P] To revise the Qualifications for Faculty Appointments in the Faculty Handbook

[2122.FAPC.002.R] Motion to request local campus authority to require masks in the classroom

[2122.FAPC.001.R] Request for Board of Regents to Permit Necessary Discourse and Study of its Proposed Changes to (1) Procedures for Dismissal of Faculty Members, (2) Institutions’ Authority to Grant Tenure, & (3) Post Tenure Review & Annual Review Standards/Process

Other Significant Deliberation (Non-Motions):

- Evaluation of teaching effectiveness. The committee reviewed extensive research showing that student ratings are a poor-quality, often biased tool that mostly reflect “customer satisfaction” and expected grades. Some form of student survey is required by BOR policy, but many faculty expressed an interest in replacing the current survey with a more straightforward, brief factual survey. When discussing alternatives, we discovered that GC policy already requires that alternative means of assessment be used to supplement the SRIS. An extensive survey of chairs (performed mostly by Dr. Blumenthal via the Council of Chairs) indicates that, while some chairs are out of compliance with this policy, many are engaged in diverse and thoughtful evaluation practices. The sense of the committee at the end of the semester was that 1) given the diversity of

high-quality practices, this is likely not a policy issue, as there is no need to impose more stringent policy guidelines on chairs; 2) that there is a place for further research and support to ensure that all chairs are in compliance and to assist in the development of high-quality measures across the board. This might take the form of an ad-hoc committee with the involvement of Jim Berger in CTL; 3) since robust alternatives exist, it might be possible to simplify the existing SRIS now.

- Related to the above discussion, a constituent queried the committee as to whether the existing language on faculty evaluations could be made more specific re: what chairs should and should not take into account when assessing teaching effectiveness. The committee felt that flexibility is necessary to allow chairs the scope to do their jobs well according to their judgment.
- Pay for part-time faculty varies across the university, but it is very low and in many cases has not changed in decades. Some departments expressed particular concern about their ability to hire PTF at given rates for needed classes. This issue originally came to the committee with the request for a salary study of part-time faculty (though given the fact that many ptf are commuting long distances from Atlanta or Athens, it is not clear that GC could compete if we were paying the same rates as schools in those locales.
- While discussing part-time faculty pay, it emerged that the faculty salary study—originally designed, by the volunteer faculty investigators, to be repeated annually with updated data—would not be replicated by our new VP Finance, Mr. Fruitticher. We spoke with Mr. Fruitticher in committee to emphasize that the faculty have a strong interest in tracking salary data, and in doing so in-house when possible (since outside studies are very expensive and have a history of failure), and he agreed to review the previous salary study with Dr. Swinton.
- It was requested that the committee review the Progressive Discipline policy, though we did not have time this year.

Ad hoc committees and other groups:

None

Committee Reflections:

The members of this committee have been exceptionally hard-working and engaged.

Committee Recommendations:

Next year, the committee must address a loose end from the faculty evaluation policy revisions: GC has never had a policy to allow for clock pauses for Post-Tenure Review, but now that Post-TR includes the possibility of “remedial action” such as termination and revocation of tenure, it is a high priority that we implement a clock stoppage policy for faculty with extenuating circumstances. Such a policy could be modeled on a number of tenure-clock stoppage policies that exist in the USG system. This is a priority that should be addressed immediately in the Fall.

The committee will need to check in with M. Fruitticher to followup on our interests re: the continuation of the salary study and the possibility of adding part-time faculty.

The part-time faculty pay issue is both vexing and localized. It will be best addressed with input from both administrators and the chairs of the departments most impacted by shortages (esp. Music), ideally in conversation with one another.

Next year’s committee will need to review the faculty evaluation issue and determine whether there is continued interest in the suggestion of an ad-hoc committee on the subject, or other approaches.

The committee should meet with Carol Ward or a designee from HR to discuss the Progressive Policy document. At the least, the document should be revised to address confusing numbering discrepancies between the punishments listed on the first and subsequent pages. It may also be necessary to clarify that,

for more serious repercussions such as termination, faculty are covered by more extensive policies which provide due process protections (See Board of Regents Policy Manual 8.3.7.9)

Recommend items for consideration at the governance retreat:

See above; the committee should start researching clock stoppage policies as soon as possible. Evaluation of teaching effectiveness should also be discussed, since most meaningful interventions would need to start early in the academic year.

Appendix: Committee Operating Procedures

See attached file