

Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) Report

Given to the University Senate on 31 January 2011

Submitted by Craig Turner

At the 3 Dec 2010 and 14 Jan 2011 meetings,

1. Academic Year Faculty Availability in the Summer

- a. **Issue:** *This issue arose from a concern that academic year faculty were expected to engage in service functions (advising students, participate in summer orientations, serve on committees, etc.) during the summer when they are not compensated or under contract.*
- b. **Actions:** *At the request of the committee, the Provost reviewed letters to students from university level groups, in this case Admissions and Enrollment Management, with respect to the inclusion of language regarding summer faculty service work (advising, availability at orientations, summer accessibility of faculty to students, etc.) finding no such language. At the 3 Dec 2010 committee meeting, the committee requested that the Provost ask the Deans and Department Chairs to perform the same review of letters to students from their respective academic units and departments. At the 14 Jan 2011 meeting, the Provost's update indicated that such a request had been made of Deans and Department Chairs and that reviews of such letters were in progress. A suggestion that the information loop be closed by having the Deans and Department Chairs report back to the Provost with the results of their reviews of letters was made by a committee member. No members of the committee objected to this suggestion nor did the committee formally endorse this suggestion.*
- c. **Observations:** *The committee conjectured that in some cases, contact of a faculty advisor by an entering student during the summer might be triggered by the student getting the faculty name via the advisor hold.*
- d. **Recommendations:** *Exercising its advisory function, the committee charged the committee chair to forward the following motion to the Provost.*
Motion 1 (14 Jan 2011 FAPC Meeting): To recommend that the Provost instruct all academic administrators that no faculty member be required to perform duties while not under contract. Further, that refusal by a faculty member to perform tasks while not under contract shall not be considered during the tenure application process, annual evaluations or merit increase decisions.
A summary of the committee deliberation of this motion:
 - *Faculty asked to work during the summer should be compensated for the requested activity.*
 - *Consideration should be made that faculty have the right to refuse to work during summer months, when not under contract, without negative consequences.*
 - *Open discussions should provide for a mutual agreement between faculty and administrators in the determination of fair and equitable compensation for work done when not under contract.*
 - *The general agreement among committee members was that faculty should not be harmed if refusing to perform service activities with no compensation or contract during the summer.*

2. Student Opinion Surveys: Average Rating Calculation Discrepancy Concern

- a. **Issue:** *A concern, emerging from an email sent to the committee chair, regarding discrepancies in the computations of average ratings for the on-line archive of the paper-and-pencil student opinion surveys was shared as an information item at the 17 Sep 2010 meeting of the Standing Committee Chairs with the Executive Committee AND also at the 1 Oct 2010 FAPC meeting. At each of these meetings, it was noted that appropriate campus officials were aware of these discrepancies and that resolution was in progress.*
- b. **Resolution:** *The Provost provided an update at the 15 Oct 2010 meeting of Standing Committee Chairs with the Executive Committee to indicate that the discrepancies had been completely resolved. This update from the Provost was shared with the members of this committee both via email prior to the 5 Nov 2010 committee meeting and formally at the 5 Nov 2010 committee meeting. The original email expressing the concern also requested that this committee consider ensuring that the communication of these discrepancies and their resolution was consistent across the academic units of the university. The committee members present at the 5 Nov 2010 meeting unanimously recommended that this information be distributed to appropriate parties to include faculty, department chairs, and deans. The Provost concurred and agreed that she would ensure that all university faculty receive an appropriate update on this matter.*
- c. **Communication:** *An email update regarding the resolution of the discrepancy in the calculation of rating averages for Student Opinion Surveys has been sent out by the Provost, received by the Deans and should have been disseminated out to all faculty. Members of the committee that were present at the 3 Dec 2010 meeting reported having received this information from their academic deans in early November. This informational update from the Provost is also accessible by following the link included with item 4.B.iii of the agenda of the 3 Dec 2010 meeting of this committee.*

3. Faculty Awards (Review of Language in the GCSU Academic Affairs Handbook)
 - a. **Issue:** *The 2009-10 Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) brought to completion a review of the Faculty Awards language in the GCSU Academic Affairs Handbook that emerged as a concern at the 1 Feb 2008 meeting of the 2007-08 FAPC. At its 5 March 2010 meeting, the 2009-10 FAPC endorsed a final draft of the proposed revisions. Dr. Lee Digiovanni, 2009-10 FAPC Chair, forwarded this final draft to Provost Jordan as FAPC exercised its advisory role to the academic administration.*
 - b. **Review and Revision:** *As a follow-up to this work, the Provost emailed the current committee chair indicating that the 5 March 2010 document submitted by FAPC had been reviewed by two current committees that review faculty award nominations and had undergone some content modifications. The most substantive content modification was a streamlining of the language for the GCSU Excellence in Scholarly Activity Award(s). In addition, for each of those faculty awards where the recipient would receive a nomination for a corresponding Regents' award, there was a sentence added to allow for appropriate deadlines to be set at the local level to allow the portfolios to be submitted in compliance with the Regents' award deadlines. The Provost expressed her appreciation to the committee members who had participated in the preparation of the draft. She also indicated that the fact that the draft had received only minor modifications upon review by two faculty award committees was a testament to its quality. Finally the Provost indicated that she would ensure the revised draft language on faculty awards was placed in the Academic Affairs Handbook, noting that a transition of existing on-line handbooks to a more conveniently searchable environment was in progress.*
 - c. **Resolution:** *This language on faculty awards (as revised by the faculty awards review committees) is now present as section 2.09.04.2 of the GCSU Academic Affairs Handbook. Those interested in comparing the current language to the former language of 2.09.04.2 may find the former language by following the second link under item 2 from the agenda of the August 2009 meeting of FAPC.*
4. Summer Pay Tax Withholdings concern / Extra Compensation
 - a. **Issue:** *A concern was voiced at the 1 Oct 2010 committee meeting to indicate that for some faculty, summer tax withholdings were distorted (extra large tax withholdings) with combined pay for teaching multiple sections. As this concern was shared at the 15 Oct 2010 joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs with the Executive Committee, it was broadened to include instances of extra compensation during the regular academic year. This issue is primarily a communication issue and appropriate university officials are now aware of the matter and considering ways to improve the communication. Consideration of this matter will be informed by a new ruling regarding extra compensation recently received by all the Chief Academic Officers of institutions in the University System of Georgia. Presently, clarification on the interpretation of this new ruling and its implementation are being sought.*
 - b. **Update Summer Pay:** *The Provost provided the committee a detailed update on summer pay including the implications to tax withholdings. This update is available in its entirety by following the link from the word "Summer" under item 4.B of the agenda of the 14 Jan 2011 meeting of FAPC. As part of her update, the Provost noted that Susan Allen is an excellent resource for details of summer pay and ADP. The committee members present at the meeting unanimously charged the committee chair to invite Ms. Susan Allen to the 4 Feb 2011 FAPC meeting to continue the conversation on this issue. A committee motion on summer pay was proposed at the 14 Jan 2011 meeting. Consideration of this motion was postponed to the 4 Feb 2011 meeting so that deliberation of this motion can be informed by the consultation with Ms. Susan Allen, who graciously accepted the committee chair's invitation to attend the 4 Feb 2011 FAPC meeting.*
 - c. **Provost 14 Jan 2011 Update (Extra Compensation):** *As for the "Extra Comp" issue (new requirement that we modify contracts rather than use an extra comp form), we finally received additional information from the system on Dec. 24th ...so we are still working through the changes and determining what, if any, impact the changes will have on summer pay limits, staff workload, and our processes.*
5. Student Opinion Surveys (SOS): Participation Rate Concern
 - a. **Issue:** *At the 5 Nov 2010 FAPC meeting, a committee member observed that many university faculty are concerned about the fact that the participation rate on Student Opinion Surveys has significantly plummeted since the conversion to the current on-line collection system and asked if mechanisms were in place to attempt to increase the participation rate. The Provost provided a response indicating (1) it is typical to see a short-term dip in Student Opinion Survey participation rates following conversion to an on-line collection system, (2) best practices for increasing student participation are scheduled to be implemented in the Spring 2011 semester and (3) the student opinion survey instrument is under review. **The committee members present indicated a perception that this information is not widely known by university faculty and unanimously recommended that this information be distributed to appropriate parties to include faculty, department chairs, and deans.** The Provost concurred and agreed that she would ensure that all university faculty receive an appropriate update on this matter.*

- b. **Updates 3 Dec 2010:** At the 3 Dec 2010 meeting, the Provost reported that the Student Government Association (SGA) made a recommendation (to the Provost) that all classes with more than ten (10) students be surveyed with the SOS. There was no indication that any distinction was made for whether the class was an undergraduate or graduate class.

c. **Motion to ECUS for steering:** The committee unanimously passed the following motion at the FAPC meeting charging the committee chair to report this motion to ECUS for steering. **Motion 1 (3 Dec 2010): To recommend that Student Opinion Surveys be administered to all classes with ten or more students.** (Note: The committee did not make a recommendation to revise the current procedure wherein there is an identification of two courses per semester (one selected by faculty member, one selected by chair) for use in annual evaluation. This suggests that not every course surveyed would inform annual faculty evaluations.)

- i. **ECUS response from the 21 January 2011:** A summary of the deliberation at the 21 January 2011 joint meeting of ECUS and Standing Committee Chairs follows.
- ECUS indicated its position is that the policy for student opinion surveys is that they are administered and that the details (how frequently, to what classes, how they are administered (on-line, paper and pencil), how the Student Opinions Surveys used for annual faculty evaluations are selected, etc) are procedural matters.
 - In light of this position, ECUS indicated that this motion was procedural and recommended that FAPC apply its advisory function to offer advice to the Provost on this matter.
 - There was an additional recommendation that the language in the GCSU Academic Affairs Handbook regarding the use of Student Opinion Surveys for faculty evaluation be reviewed by FAPC for consistency with current practice given the recent transition to on-line administration of these student opinion surveys.
 - Finally there was a lengthy conversation with no consensus on how soon this motion should be implemented.
 - i. One observation offered was that the practice of administering Student Opinion Surveys to (essentially) ALL classes would be administratively simpler.
 - ii. Another observation was a recommendation that the practice of administering Student Opinion Surveys to ALL classes might be delayed until the current review by the Council of Department Chairs of the current survey instrument concludes.
- ii. **FAPC invites feedback** from faculty to inform its continuing deliberation on this matter. Feedback can be shared with any committee member.
- d. **Advisory Motion to Provost:** A second motion was made, seconded and approved concerning the need for standard language for all course syllabi. **Motion 2 (3 Dec 2010): To recommend to the Provost that standard language be developed that will appear on all course syllabi to inform and encourage students to participate in completing Student Opinion Surveys.** The Provost was present at the meeting to receive Motion 2. FAPC members sought clarification as to how narratives (written student comments from the surveys) were being managed and disseminated. Reportedly, the Chairs have been receiving a CD with narratives on it and they may or may not have been passing the raw information on to faculty. **The committee asked the Provost to address the apparent inconsistency of passing on SOS narratives within colleges.** In a related comment, the Provost cited a need to look into benchmarking surveys in the future.
- e. **Updates 14 Jan 2011:** Updates from the Provost were received by the committee chair by email and shared with the committee members at the 14 Jan 2011 meeting. These updates are available in their entirety by following the links under 4.C. of the agenda for the 14 Jan 2011 meeting of this committee.
- 1) **Update on SOS Participation Rate (18 Jan 2011):** The Provost provided a comprehensive update on this issue to faculty, including a brief history, findings, and plans including a strategy to increase the participation rates, as item 6 of her 18 Jan 2011 email to faculty@list.gcsu.edu. This comprehensive update on this issue is also accessible by following the link from the first bulleted item under 4.C of the agenda of the 4 Feb 2011 meeting of this committee.
 - 2) **Provost Update (14 Jan 2011) on SOS Narratives and Syllabi Language:** On the topic of the SOS narratives and the language on the syllabi, I want to pull a small "writing" team together to develop the language to be included on the syllabi and the narrative used by faculty. That will take place in a week or so.

6. Faculty Evaluation, Triggering Reviews of Department Chairs

- a. **Issue:** *This issue arose from a concern about the current faculty evaluation process and from an interest in exploring the options available to faculty for informing the evaluation of a department chair or immediate supervisor. Given university-wide reconsideration of the faculty evaluation process at the department level, the work group has deferred indefinitely any investigation of faculty evaluation. The conversation on triggered reviews of department chairs concluded that a mechanism for faculty to inform a department chair review is desirable. This resulted in the committee asking the work group to review the existing mechanism, called the Part IV Academic Administrator Evaluation Form, and provide an update and its recommendations (if any) at a future committee meeting. The work group reported that its primary recommendation is to provide a mechanism by which faculty can inform the review of their department chair with an emphasis on professional development. This perspective resonated with the committee members that were present and the committee requested that the work group continue its deliberation and report back at a future committee meeting.*
- b. **Update:** *The workgroup will share its recommendations to the committee at the 4 Feb 2011 meeting.*

7. Post-Tenure Review

- a. **Issue:** *This issue arose from a concern about the post-tenure review appeal process and was discussed at the April 2010 meeting of the 2009-2010 FAPC and passed to the 2010-11 FAPC for further deliberation. At its September 2010 meeting, the committee unanimously recommended that the post-tenure review work group be expanded to include at least one representative from each academic unit (colleges and library) and that the work group review the post-tenure review language in the GCSU Academic Affairs Handbook ensuring clarity and a careful review of the appeal process. Since that time this work group has been expanded and is now populated by Martha Colvin (CoHS), Nancy Davis Bray (Library), Lee Digiovanni (CoE), Ken Farr (CoB), Mike Rose (CoAS), and Craig Turner (CoAS). This work group has had two meetings: an organizational meeting 4 October 2010 and a second meeting 25 October 2010. It is premature to provide detailed information on the particular recommendations as they are still in development and none of the proposed recommendations under consideration have received a formal endorsement from members of the work group. The work group will report on its progress at the 3 Dec 2010 committee meeting.*
- b. **Update (3 Dec 2010):** *An early draft proposal was reviewed by the work group members and a recommendation was made to consult with the GCSU Counsel (Marc Cardinalli). In short, his response to the request to review language regarding the disposition of information for pre-tenure (final repository of all documentation is the candidate) and post-tenure (destroying the documentation of an unfavorable review in the presence of a subsequent favorable review) was "This is not a legal question, but rather a policy question." In other words, no decision or comments were warranted by Legal Affairs at this time. The work group will meet again in 2011 to consider several recommendations and comments made by its members concerning the initial draft document.*
- c. **Update (14 Jan 2011):** *No additional information was provided by the work group at this meeting.*

8. Desk Copies

- a. **Issue:** *This issue was steered to the committee on 8 Nov 2010 by the Executive Committee. Given that Board of Regents Policy 3.10 includes language to "disallow faculty to resell sample texts provided by publishers or to take advantage of any financial incentives offered by publishers in the assignment of specific texts," the committee was asked to propose a procedure for the disposition of textbooks provided by publishers. At the 3 Dec 2010 meeting, the Provost clarified this request by asking that the committee make recommendations for alternatives to reselling the books. Committee members agreed to consult with their constituencies for suggestions and will continue this discussion at the 14 Jan 2011 FAPC meeting.*
- b. **Constituency Feedback:** *The committee charged the committee chair to forward all recommendations provided at this meeting to the Provost. The recommendations from the constituencies of the members of the committee included a variety of alternatives to reselling the books including*
 1. *returning unwanted desk copies to the publisher*
 2. *donating unwanted desk copies to a variety of sources such as libraries (department, GCSU, public), recycling centers, service groups, clinical partners of the university, needy universities (overseas or domestic), underprivileged students*
 3. *giving unwanted desk copies out as prizes within a department*
 4. *leaving unwanted desk copies outside of the office door to be picked up by students or colleagues*
 5. *centralizing the disposition of unwanted desk copies at GCSU to an appropriate academic unit (possibly library acquisitions)*
 6. *selling unwanted desk copies and donating the proceeds to a department foundation account.*
- c. **Other Recommendations:** *There were two other committee recommendations that were forwarded to the Provost by the committee chair.*

- *A collection of other university policies for the handling of unsolicited and solicited publisher books was provided (Georgia State University, Calvin College, Richmond Community College) and is also accessible by following the first link included with item 5.C.vi of the agenda of the 14 Jan 2011 meeting of this committee.*
 - *Awareness of the “Text and Academic Authors Association” website (url: www.taaonline.net) including a pamphlet that articulates this organization’s position statement on complimentary copies and used books. The position statement is entitled “Stomp the Comp” and can be found online by starting at the homepage (url given above) and following the action issues tab and finding the “Stomp the Comp” link near the bottom of the page. This pamphlet is also accessible by following the second link included with item 5.C.vi of the agenda of the 14 Jan 2011 meeting of this committee.*
- d. **ECUS and Standing Committee Chairs [SCC] 21 Jan 2011:** *At the 21 January 2011 joint meeting of the Executive Committee and Standing Committee Chairs, there was general agreement that item 8.b.6, specifically “selling unwanted desk copies and donating the proceeds to a department foundation account,” is a violation of the BoR policy that includes language to “disallow faculty to resell sample texts provided by publishers.” There was a recommendation to remove 8.b.6 from the list of FAPC recommendations prior to wider circulation. This observation was also made independently by members of the committee during the review of the 14 Jan 2011 FAPC minutes. The consideration of the removal of item 8.b.6 from these minutes by the committee is ongoing and will be settled no later than 4 Feb 2011.*

Tentative Agenda for 4 Feb 2011 meeting (12:30-1:45 in Arts & Sciences 1-16)

1. Faculty Evaluation, Triggering Reviews of Department Chairs (work group update)
2. Post-Tenure Review (work group update)
3. Informational (Academic Year Faculty Availability in the Summer, Summer Pay Tax Withholdings / Extra Compensation (Susan Allen will be present at the 4 Feb 2011 meeting), Student Opinion Surveys Participation Rate, Desk Copies)