

martha colvin, 09:56 AM 10/25/2010, comments

From: martha colvin <martha.colvin@gcsu.edu>

To: Craig Turner <craig.turner@gcsu.edu>, Nancy Davis Bray  
<nancy.davisbray@gcsu.edu>, Mike Rose <mike.rose@gcsu.edu>, Ken Farr  
<ken.farr@gcsu.edu>, Lee Digiovanni <lee.digiovanni@gcsu.edu>

Date: Mon, 25 Oct 2010 09:56:35 -0400

Subject: comments

Thread-Topic: comments

Thread-Index: AQHLdExvWJg8HFqCPEuzJZdXDQUkrQ==

Accept-Language: en-US

X-MS-Exchange-Organization-AuthAs: Internal

X-MS-Exchange-Organization-AuthMechanism: 04

X-MS-Exchange-Organization-AuthSource: ex07-mta.gc.local

X-MS-Has-Attach:

X-MS-Exchange-Organization-SCL: -1

X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:

acceptlanguage: en-US

Comments  
from  
Martha Colvin  
25 Oct 2010

Craig, I don't know what happened to that file and now it says document can't be found. here is an earlier version. The one I thought I sent was written directly on the fapc post tenure review discussion sheet you gave us. This one is a little messier but the numbers and letters should correspond to the fapc post tenure review discussion sheet.

Craig and committee,

I am out of town due to a family illness. I requested that faculty in the COHS send me any questions, comments or concerns they had about post tenure review. I only had one response and that was related to what was the impetus for the review and did we have an idea of how many people had a negative post tenure review. I responded with the background and Craig told me he knew of one but we did not have a number. Seems to me at one point in my tenure as chair we had to report this information to academic affairs so they should know but...

Responses to FAPC post tenure review group discussion worksheet:

O) I think this document mixes policy with procedure. The policy is clearly stated in the BOR manual 8.3.5.4 and parts of the BOR policy are stated in statement of purpose, faculty member submitting, etc.

My preference would be to use the BOR policy and list the procedures underneath. This is from my healthcare background where procedures and policies are clearly separated but follow one another in the policy and procedure manual. It seems as if GCSU has never had a consistent method of writing policies and procedures but that is another committee!

1) I've reviewed the items listed here and have none to add.

2) issues for possible modification

--appeal process--

the BOR policy does not specifically mention for a second opportunity for post tenure review but gives us the freedom to make our procedures. I believe appeals should always be available. I do not think we can bring anyone else into a situation that may become a personnel matter other than the supervisor of the immediate supervisor or possibly someone from human resources that is a mediator. I am fine with the way the suggested appeal process has been presented.

--clarity of language!

i have no problems with the language changes that were suggested.

--intentional funding for exceptional reviews

This needs to be decided for exceptional as well as developmental activities for those that need developmental

Printed for Craig Turner <craig.turner@gcsu.edu>

10/25/2010

activities. The lower and upper amounts should be designated and more importantly the funding source. It may be good to leave the exact amount out, but have something that states that it will be decided by the dean's council (or whoever) each January and paid from the provost's budget (or whatever). This one may be tough but I would want to see some standard set for equity among the various schools.

--role of dept chair in post tenure review

The bor policy only addresses the role of the chair in the case of deficiencies. I believe the procedure outline in VIII (with the clarity revisions) of the Gcsu document is fair. I do not believe the chair needs to sit down alone with the faculty member to discuss the results whether favorable or unfavorable (Gcsu X discussion of results). I believe the chair of the post tenure committee should present the results and the dept. Chair be present and listen. Although there is a paper document, I think the committee chair would be the best one to answer any question the faculty member may have--positive or negative review.

3) processes for consideration

3a. FAPC work group composition-

- i. don't think any others, at this point, need to be involved
- ii. Yes-send it to the Chairs committee and get comments then back to us
- iii. Yes we may as well

iv-I think if we send the drafts to Dean's council for review and Chairs then a keeping ECUS appraised as a point of information is sufficient. We could all get comments from our schools/senators, etc as well for any final revisions, questions, concerns, prior to final action on the senate floor.

3C. Review

I don't think this is going to cause a big uproar. Possibly some on line review and maybe a FAQs sheet would be sufficient. Depending on the comments we could have a forum.

4. Other issues-On the last page where it talks about if the second review is favorable the first one may be destroyed. I don't know that we should destroy anything that may at some point be associated with a personnel issue. If this goes back to the senate, I doubt this part would make it past our current legal council or HR. If it is decided to leave it, we need to a stronger word other than may be replaced. This leaves too much discretion to the chair and also will lead to inequities across campus.

Martha M. Colvin, Ph.D., RN  
Associate Dean & Professor  
School of Nursing  
College of Health Sciences  
Parks Memorial 127 CBX 064  
Georgia College & State University  
Milledgeville, GA 31061  
478-445-2633