

Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) Report

Given to the University Senate on 28 March 2011

Submitted by Craig Turner

At the 4 Mar 2011 meeting,

1. Work Group Update: Faculty Evaluation, Triggered Review of Department Chairs

- a. **Issue:** *This issue emerged during the 30 April 2010 organizational committee meeting when those present brainstormed on the generation of a list of tentative agenda items for FAPC for the 2010-2011 academic year. At that meeting, work groups were formed to consider and review the items identified and report back to the committee. Since that time, FAPC postponed consideration of faculty evaluation indefinitely [at its 1 Oct 2010 meeting] noting that faculty evaluation was under review at the department level across all academic units of the university. The triggered review of department chairs ultimately centered on interest in identifying and promoting a mechanism by which faculty might inform the evaluation of an academic administrator. Specific illustrative conversation points during committee deliberation have usually been articulated in the context of a faculty member offering suggestions for administrative professional development for her/his department chair.*
- b. **Update:** *Exercising its advisory function, the committee unanimously approved the recommendations of the work group (Sally Humphries – CoB, Susan Steele – CoHS) formalized into the following two part motion. The first part of the motion is advisory to the current members of FAPC while the second part is advisory to the academic administration and directed to the Provost for consideration.*
- c. **FAPC Motion 1 (4 Mar 2010):** *To recommend that*
 - (1) *each member of the 2010-2011 Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) educate her/his constituency (faculty colleagues) that faculty have an opportunity to inform the evaluation of an academic administrator [see Section 3.07.01 of the Georgia College Academic Affairs Handbook].*
 - (2) *the Provost ensure that the administrative evaluation process include a mechanism by which the appropriate personnel solicit developmental feedback, on an annual basis, from the faculty to inform an administrative evaluation. In particular, a recommendation that each Academic Dean actively solicit developmental feedback, on an annual basis, from faculty to inform the administrative evaluation of the department chair or unit supervisor of the faculty. Care should be taken to ensure confidentiality in the collection of this developmental feedback from the faculty. The “Faculty Recommendations for Administrative Development” form (modified version of the existing Part IV) is provided as a sample form that could be used to collect this feedback.*
- d. **Sample Form:** *The aforementioned sample form entitled “Faculty Recommendations for Administrative Development” is linked to the agenda of the 4 Mar 2011 committee meeting.*

2. Work Group Update: 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 by means of the annual report to the 2010-2011 FAPC for further deliberation.*
- b. **Update:** *The work group [Martha Colvin - CoHS, Nancy Davis Bray - Library, Lee Digiovanni - CoE, Ken Farr - CoB, Mike Rose - CoAS, Craig Turner – CoAS] continues its review of the existing language pertaining to post-tenure review in section 3.07.03.6 of the Georgia College Academic Affairs Handbook and will provide its recommendations to FAPC at the next and final committee meeting scheduled for 1 Apr 2011. The Post-Tenure Review work group maintains a web presence accessible by following the “Post Tenure Review Work Group” link at the top of the FAPC web presence.*

3. 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. **Motion:** *Provost Jordan continues consultations with academic deans, who are in turn consulting with department chairs, to consider and discuss the ramifications of the advisory motion forwarded by FAPC.*
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.*
- c. **Update:**
 - *Two main issues of curiosity from 4 Feb 2011 regarding off-contract faculty time:*
 - o **Liability (workman’s compensation insurance):** *If faculty who are not under contract yet using university facilities (studios (art faculty), labs (science faculty), offices (all faculty)) are injured, would they be covered by workman’s compensation insurance?*
 - o **University Facilities Access:** *What is the standing agreement (legal) regarding the use of university facilities by faculty not under formal contract (during the time between the end of one academic year contract and the beginning of the next contract)?*

- *The issue of whether or not faculty would be covered by Worker Compensation benefits, i.e., injury on the campus while working without a contract, was a complex subject that legal advice failed to fully elucidate. It was pointed out that Workman's Compensation is a state benefit not an institutional benefit. The legal implications became a matter of considering whether the work of the faculty member was promoting the good of the institution.*

d. **Summary:** *The committee deliberation on this item throughout this academic year has found this to be a communication matter. The ideals identified as desirable are to ensure that faculty (1) are aware of expectations placed on them AND (2) have a voice (the right to accept or decline, the right to negotiate compensation) with respect to work, particularly in the area of service (advising, orientations, availability to students, etc.) that is desirable or necessary during the time when faculty are not formally under contract (most prominently summer).*

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 sessions [Maymester and Summer I]. 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 received by all the Chief Academic Officers of institutions in the University System of Georgia. Clarification on the interpretation of this new ruling and its implementation are in progress.*

b. **Update Summer Pay:** *Ms. Susan Allen has been invited and will attend the 1 Apr 2011 FAPC meeting to provide information on the fiscal policy that makes July 1 the earliest possible pay date for Maymester as well as field questions from members of the committee regarding this information.*

c. **Pay Dates:** *As a reminder, the pay dates presently scheduled for Summer 2011 are as follows.*

- *Maymester 2011 July 1, 2011 (earliest allowed by USG financial policy) [as of 16 Mar 2011, 3 June 2011]*
- *Summer I 2011 July 8, 2011 (normal ADP run July 15 or with Maymester)*
- *Summer II 2011 August 5, 2011 (normal ADP run August 15)*

*Each date corresponds with the grades requested date for the stated term with the exception of Maymester which is subject to USG financial policy guidelines from which July 1 is the earliest allowable date. Subsequent to the 4 Mar 2011 FAPC meeting, Dr. Paul Jones sent an email 16 Mar 2011 to the faculty email list crediting the diligence of Ms. Susan Allen for finding a viable way to shift the Maymester pay date to a date closer to the end of Maymester. **The result: Maymester pay date 1 July 2011 is now 3 June 2011.***

d. **Update (Extra Compensation):** *No new information.*

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.*

b. **Update on advisory FAPC Motion 1 (3 Dec 2010) to Provost:** ***Motion 1 (3 Dec 2010): To recommend that Student Opinion Surveys be administered to all classes with ten or more students. No new information on this motion. A summary of the committee deliberation follows. This motion was made by FAPC 3 Dec 2010, taken to ECUS for steering at the 21 Jan 2011 joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and ECUS, steered back to FAPC at that 21 Jan 2011 meeting, and endorsed as an advisory motion from FAPC to the Provost at its 4 Feb 2011 meeting, and emailed by the FAPC chair on behalf of the committee to the Provost on 15 Feb 2011.***

c. **Update on advisory FAPC Motion 2 (3 Dec 2010) to Provost:** ***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 7 Feb 2011 draft of proposed language was reviewed by the committee and feedback was offered. This feedback resulted in a second draft of the proposed syllabus language which has been received by the committee chair and circulated to FAPC members by email. The second draft will be placed on the tentative agenda of the 1 Apr 2011 FAPC meeting for continued review and consideration by the committee.***

d. **Update on advisory FAPC Motion 1 (4 Feb 2011):** *At the 4 Feb 2011 FAPC meeting, consideration of FAPC Motion 1 (4 Feb 2011) To recommend to the Provost that all student opinion survey results be used for faculty performance evaluation purposes was postponed to the 4 Mar 2011 FAPC meeting with the agreement that FAPC members would seek feedback from their constituencies to inform the committee deliberation on this motion. After hearing the variety of perspectives and opinions in the constituency feedback, the details of which are available in the 4 Mar 2011 meeting minutes, a motion to amend FAPC Motion 2 (4 Feb 2011) to read as **To recommend to the Provost that student opinion survey results be used for both formative and summative faculty evaluation purposes** was made, seconded, and approved. As discussion of the motion (as amended) continued, the time for meeting adjournment intervened and the committee agreed to extend the meeting to continue deliberation. After a short time, this continued deliberation was curtailed with a motion to postpone committee deliberation to its 1 Apr 2011 meeting.*

6. Postponed agenda items: Remaining agenda items were postponed to the 1 Apr 2011 FAPC meeting.

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

Post-Tenure Review (work group update), Committee Annual Report, Informational updates on motions and continued committee deliberation (if necessary) on the topics of Academic Year Faculty Availability in the Summer, Summer Pay Tax Withholdings / Extra Compensation (summer pay informed by Ms. Susan Allen as guest), Student Opinion Surveys Participation Rate, and Desk Copies