

University Senate Committee Annual Report

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

no later than Fri 11 May 2018.

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: 2017-2018

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 28 April 2017 (organizational meeting), 15 August 2017 (Senate Retreat), 1 September 2017, 6 October 2017, 3 November 2017, 1 December 2017, 2 February 2017, and 30 March 2017.

Executive Summary: The bulk of the committee's time was spent discussing the following:

- 1) The low response rate for the end-of-semester student opinion surveys: most likely caused by its onerous length and the lack of an official, designated survey-completion time allotment.
- 2) How to best fulfill Provost Kelli Brown's charge to create a peer teaching evaluation instrument.
- 3) The streamlining and clarification of the process of awarding emeritus/emerita status.
- 4) Issues related to post-tenure review notification, policies dealing with study-abroad courses, and the composition of the senate's executive committee.

The first three of the above items resulted in motions being sent to senate. These motions were voted on and approved. The other business items were either resolved in-house or through discussion with the appropriate parties.

Committee Membership and Record of Attendance:

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

Members	4/28	8/15	9/1	10/6	11/3	12/1	2/2	3/30
David Johnson, Senator -- Chair	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Robert Blumenthal, Senator	P	P	R	P	R	P	P	P
Linda Golson Bradley, Senator	P	P	P	R	P	P	P	P
Krystal Canady, Volunteer	R	P	R	P	R	P	R	R
Kell Carpenter, Volunteer	P	P	P	P	P	P	R	P
Carrie Cook, Volunteer	R	P	R	P	P	P	R	P
Hedwig Fraunhofer, Senator	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Sarah Handwerker, Senator -- Secretary	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P

Members (continued)	4/28	8/15	9/1	10/6	11/3	12/1	2/2	3/30
Joanna Schwartz, Senator	P	P	P	R	P	P	R	R
Ji Seun Sohn, Volunteer	R	R	P	P	P	R	P	R
Ashley Taylor, Senator -- Vice Chair	P	P	R	P	P	P	P	R
Tom Toney, Senator	P	R	R	P	P	P	R	P
Huaiyu Wang, Volunteer	R	R	R	R	P	P	R	R

Motions brought to the Senate floor:

1718.FAPC.001.P Switch to SRIS Short Form: Concerned with the 47-question length of the current instrument (Student Rating of Instruction Survey), FAPC recommended switching to the 18-question shorter survey form for Fall 2017 and onward. This shorter form is designed and implemented by the same company that does our longer form and has undergone the same professional psychometric testing. The general dissatisfaction with the longer, 47-question form stemmed from the low student response rate. This was an item of unfinished business from the previous year.

Switch to SRIS Short Form: The committee felt that the shorter, 18-question form would likely improve student response rates. It was unanimously sent out of committee to the senate.

1718.FAPC.002.R Peer Teaching Observation Pilot Program: Asking for the endorsement of the creation of a Peer Teaching Observation Pilot Program. This was an item of unfinished business from the previous year, when the provost charged FAPC with the creation of an official peer teaching evaluation instrument. The greatest concerns with a peer evaluation program were that it should be formative, and not summative; that faculty doing the evaluating should be properly trained and equipped; that participation should be voluntary, and not required; and that evaluation should be done from a neutral party outside the department, so as not to negatively affect tenure and promotion.

Peer Teaching Observation Pilot Program: FAPC voted unanimously to send to senate a proposal that would charge the Center for Teaching and Learning with a pilot program. This pilot program would be an expansion on the Group Feedback Technique used in midterm course evaluations, but with the added formative feedback from the peer observer.

1718.FAPC.004.P Policy Emeritus/Emerita Status: Because there was a lack of clarity in the process in which Emeritus/Emerita is conferred, FAPC recommended that Georgia College adopt this new emeritus policy, in an effort to promote a consistent approach to the awarding of Emeritus/Emerita status, and what that status entails. This policy applies to teaching faculty and upper level administrators as defined in the policy.

Policy Emeritus/Emerita Status: Items of most concern amongst committee members were the benefits that accompany emeritus/emmerita status, as well as the timetable used for the application and approval process. FAPC unanimously sent this motion to senate after consultation with senior members of the university senate, the appropriate GCSU compliance officer, and the provost.

Other Significant Deliberation (Non-Motions):

Faculty Notification of Post-Tenure Review: There was concern that faculty up for post-tenure review were not being notified in writing by the Chief Academic Officer in a timely manner. The provost advised that her office would address this concern.

Proposed Change to ECUS: After reviewing a proposed change to the composition of ECUS, FAPC recommended that the composition remain unchanged, but that ECUS might consider meeting just once per month with the standing committee chairs.

Policy Issues Regarding Study Abroad Courses: An issue was brought to FAPC regarding the compensation for study abroad courses, as well as the authority by department chairs to activate/deactivate these courses. Agreement was reached that the Director of the International Education Center, based on calculations of the business office, should make the decisions regarding compensation. Agreement was also reached that if a faculty member felt that a unit director unjustly cancelled a course, this was a situation to be handled by human resources.

Ad hoc committees and other groups:

No ad hoc committees or work groups were created this year. All FAPC business was handled in monthly meetings and useful email follow-up exchanges.

Committee Reflections:

This year's committee members worked well together. The membership found innovative solutions that generated forward movement regarding faculty evaluation in the areas of student opinion surveys, peer teaching evaluation, and the process for conferring emeritus/emerita status. Email exchanges between members, either as precursor or follow-up to scheduled meetings, allowed the committee to make more efficient use of face-to-face meeting time.

During the drafting stages of committee motions, it was often appropriate, as well as advantageous, to first solicit the input and advice of senior senate members, the provost, and the appropriate university compliance officer. This preliminary scrutiny gave us a finished product that was more ironclad.

And this may seem obvious, but it is still worth mentioning: a committee motion has the best chance of senate recommendation or endorsement when the committee chair has a strategy in place for its eloquent characterization *before* questions are asked and the voting begins.

Committee Recommendations:

Although this year's committee completed the sum of its business, there will be new items for next year's committee.

- 1) The committee recommends a future evaluation of SRIS student response rates, looking for improvement since the implementation of the shorter 18-question form. Additionally, there may be another discussion as to whether or not it is the individual faculty member's responsibility to coerce students into completing the student opinion surveys, and whether or not the university should have an official procedure for the survey to be completed during class time.

- 2) The committee also recommends that department chairs encourage new faculty to participate in the Peer Teaching Observation Pilot Program offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning. Once CTL has collected enough data, FAPC should review this program and recommend appropriate modifications to crystallize the further use of a peer teaching evaluation instrument at Georgia College.

Recommended items for consideration at the governance retreat:

Full Senate: None

FAPC: Is it the individual faculty member's responsibility to coerce students into completing the student opinion surveys? Should the university have an official procedure for the survey to be completed during class time?

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.