

# Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC)

## 2010-2011 Annual Report

Submitted on Friday 22 April 2011

Due Date: Submit in MSWord format to [ecus@list.gcsu.edu](mailto:ecus@list.gcsu.edu) no later than Friday, 22 April 2011

**Committee Name:** Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC)

**Academic Year:** 2010-2011

### Committee Charge:

V.Section2.C. *Standing Committees*. These committees shall have the following three functions (a) develop recommendations for new policy, (b) develop recommendations that revise existing policy, and (c) serve in advisory role, each applied in a manner consistent with the purposes and powers of the University Senate expressed in Article I. The inclusion of an appropriate chief division officer or designee is to improve committee effectiveness through communication and coordination with an appropriate administrator who has authority and responsibility for policy implementation in the general area addressed by the committee.

V.Section2.C.3.b. *Scope*. 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:** Meetings were scheduled for 75 minutes during the common meeting time (12:30-1:45).

MEETING DATE	TYPE OF MEETING
Friday 30 Apr 2010	Organizational Meeting to Elect Committee Officers
Friday 3 Sep 2010	Committee Meeting
Friday 1 Oct 2010	Committee Meeting
Friday 5 Nov 2010	Committee Meeting
Friday 3 Dec 2010	Committee Meeting
Friday 14 Jan 2011	Committee Meeting
Friday 4 Feb 2011	Committee Meeting
Friday 4 Mar 2011	Committee Meeting
Friday 1 Apr 2011	Committee Meeting

### Executive Summary:

The committee membership included representatives from each of the academic units [colleges and the library], a Presidential Appointee [Dean Sandra Gangstead (CoHS)] and a Chief Academic Officer designee [Provost Sandra Jordan with designated representative Associate Provost Tom Ormond during Spring 2011]. Moreover, the committee was populated by seasoned faculty members with historical perspective and experiential wisdom [including one department chair as well as former governance leaders] and junior faculty members with fresh perspectives and insights. An effective symbiosis of these membership threads resulted in thoughtful deliberation and consideration of the items receiving FAPC attention. The committee deliberation was focused on eight issues. For three of the issues [ (1) Academic Year Faculty Availability in the Summer (2) Faculty Evaluation, Triggered Reviews of Department Chairs and (3) Post-Tenure Review ], the committee deliberation was informed by work group recommendations. The committee deliberated as a whole on the issue steered to it by the Executive Committee [Desk Copies: Alternatives to Reselling] as well as the three concerns that were brought to its attention during the academic year [ (1) Summer Pay for Academic Year Faculty and Extra Compensation (2) Student Opinion Surveys: Average Ratings Discrepancy (3) Student Opinion Surveys: Participation Rate ] where it exercised a faculty advocacy role as recommended by the 2009-2010 FAPC. This faculty advocacy work generated a set of advisory motions from the committee to the Provost as the committee exercised its advisory role to the administration. The final issue was an informational update from the Provost providing closure on the Faculty Awards language recommended by the 2009-10 FAPC as the culmination of FAPC deliberation spanning three academic years! The committee commends the diligence of Ms. Susan Allen in exploring alternatives to the Maymester pay date. The reception of the news of the resulting pay date shift [July 1 to June 3] was an enthusiastic ovation complete with cheers from the floor at the 28 Mar 2011 University Senate meeting!

## Committee Membership and Record of Attendance:

Name <i>EFS = Elected Faculty Senator</i>	4/30/2010	9/3/2010	10/1/2010	11/5/2010	12/3/2010	1/14/2011	2/4/2011	3/4/2011	4/1/2011	Present	Absent	Regrets	
Alex Blazer <i>Volunteer (CoAS)</i>	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	8	0	1	
Ben Davis <i>Volunteer (Library)</i>	Present	Regrets	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	7	0	2	
Lee Digiovanni <i>EFS (At-large), Vice-Chair</i>	Present	Present	Regrets	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	6	0	3	
Sandra Gangstead <i>Presidential Appointee</i>	Absent	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Regrets	Regrets	Regrets	Present	4	1	4	
Sally Humphries <i>Volunteer (CoB)</i>	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	7	0	2	
Sandra Jordan <i>Provost (CAO Designee)</i>	Not yet named to FAPC	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Regrets	Regrets	Regrets	Regrets	3	0	5	
Fadhili Mshana <i>EFS (CoAS)</i>	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Regrets	7	0	2	
William Risch <i>EFS (CoAS)</i>	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Absent	6	1	2	
Mike Rose <i>EFS (CoAS), Secretary</i>	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	8	0	1	
Susan Steele <i>Volunteer (CoHS)</i>	Present	Present	Present	Present	Absent	Present	Regrets	Present	Regrets	6	1	2	
Craig Turner <i>EFS (CoAS), Chair</i>	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	9	0	0	
Charles Ubah <i>EFS (CoAS)</i>	Present	Present	Present	Absent	Present	Present	Absent	Present	Present	7	2	0	
Mike Whitfield <i>EFS (CoB)</i>	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	7	0	2	
<b>Guests</b>	Karynne Kleine <i>Committee Officer Election Facilitator</i>	None	None	Tom Nelson <i>Biology Chair NGCSU Shadowing Provost Jordan</i>	None	Mike Digby <i>Interim Associate Provost</i> Tom Ormond <i>Associate Provost</i>	Susan Allen <i>Director of Payroll Services</i> Tom Ormond <i>Associate Provost</i>	Tom Ormond <i>Associate Provost</i>	Susan Allen <i>Director of Payroll Services</i> Paul Jones <i>Vice President for Administration and Operations</i> Tom Ormond <i>Associate Provost</i>				
<b>Present</b>	11	10	9	9	11	8	9	11	7	Averages			
<b>Regrets</b>	0	3	4	3	1	5	3	2	5	9.4			
<b>Absent</b>	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	2.9			
										0.6			

## Committee Operating Procedures: (See pages 3-4)

## 2010-2011 FAPC OPERATING PROCEDURES (ADOPTED BY FAPC at its 3 Sep 2010 meeting)

### RELEVANT UNIVERSITY SENATE BYLAWS

**WHO IS ON FAPC?** V.Section2.C.3.a. Membership. The Faculty Affairs Policy Committee shall have thirteen (13) members distributed as follows: 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 her/his designee in compliance with V.Section2.C, and one (1) member appointed by the University President in compliance with II.Section1.A.5.

**WHO ARE VOTING MEMBERS OF FAPC?** IV.Section 4. Committee Service and Voting. All members of the University Senate shall have at least one University Senate committee assignment. Faculty, staff, administrators and students who are not members of the University Senate may be nominated to University Senate committees if the Subcommittee on Nominations deems that appropriate. **Committee members who are not members of the University Senate shall be afforded all rights of committee membership, including voting unless explicitly designated as a non-voting member of the committee in these bylaws, but shall have none of these rights in the University Senate.**

**WHAT DOES FAPC CONSIDER?** V.Section2.C.3.b. Scope 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

**WHAT ARE UNIVERSITY SENATE FUNCTIONS?** I.Section2. The University Senate exists to promote and implement effective shared governance at the university. It is expressly charged with recommending academic and institutional policy. **In addition to its policy recommending responsibility, the University Senate serves in an advisory role to the administration,** particularly in the implementation of policy or improvement of processes that have broad institutional impact or implications, including but not limited to planning and budgetary processes. **The University Senate strives to be mindful and respectful of matters that are more appropriately handled at the divisional, college, and department levels, but may make recommendations concerning matters within these areas that have broader institutional impact or implications.**

**WHAT ARE COMMITTEE FUNCTIONS?** V.Section2.C. Standing Committees. These committees shall **have the following three functions** (a) develop recommendations for new policy, (b) develop recommendations that revise existing policy, and (c) serve in advisory role, each applied in a manner consistent with the purposes and powers of the University Senate expressed in Article I. The inclusion of an appropriate chief division officer or designee is to improve committee effectiveness through communication and coordination with an appropriate administrator who has authority and responsibility for policy implementation in the general area addressed by the committee.

**COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT** IV.Section 2. Reports. The committees listed in V.Section2.A.1 shall constitute the standing committees of the University Senate. Each standing committee and the Executive Committee **shall present a comprehensive, written, annual report in an appropriate format** to the Executive Committee. This report shall include a summary of the major items considered by the committee during the academic year and the disposition of each. The Executive Committee shall set a due date and the format of these reports in consultation with the standing committee chairs and these reports shall be posted with the minutes of the last University Senate meeting of the academic year.

**OPERATING PROCEDURES** III.Section 1. The University Senate shall discharge its responsibilities through a system of standing committees elected by and directly responsible to the University Senate. These standing committees shall **establish their own operating policies and procedures** consistent with these bylaws and the University Statutes. These must be filed with the Executive Committee and updated as needed.

**COMMITTEE OPERATING PROCEDURES:** A summary of the standard operating procedures used to conduct business during the year.

- First and foremost the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee is a team and not a set of individuals. To realize this philosophy, we endorse the following:
  - Communicate openly and candidly with each other -- holding back constructive criticism weakens the team
  - Resist communicating *on behalf of the committee* without consultation even if the item feels like a “no-brainer”
  - After committee consultation, copy the entire committee if/when you communicate on its behalf
  - All FAPC members share responsibility to seek out and identify concerns within FAPC scope (V.Section2.B.2)
- The **Chair**
  - **Bylaws Responsibilities:**
    - Presents committee report to University Senate at scheduled University Senate meetings (Article II, Sec 3.A.3)
    - Submit such reports to University Senate Secretary in appropriate format for minutes (Article II Section 3.I)
    - Transfer committee records to the following year's committee (Article IV, Sec 3.B)
    - Meet regularly with the Executive Committee and other chairs to facilitate communication (Article V, Sec 1.C.14)
    - Serve on the Subcommittee on Nominations (Article V, Sec 1.D.1.a)
    - Be notified by a committee member who is going on extended leave (Article II Section 3.H)
    - Be consulted by ECUS on due date and format of comprehensive annual report of committee (Article IV, Sec 2)
  - **Other Responsibilities:**
    - Be contacted by committee members extending regrets prior to a scheduled committee meeting
    - Presides at committee meetings
    - Drafts (in consultation with the committee) the tentative agenda for committee meetings
    - Distributes each tentative agenda to the committee via email prior to the committee meeting
    - Scheduling (in consultation with committee) meeting rooms, times, and dates for committee meetings
    - Entering committee motions proposed for University Senate consideration into the online motion database
    - Advertising committee meeting times and meeting agenda to the university community
    - Others as defined/assigned by the committee

- The **Vice-Chair**
  - **Bylaws Responsibilities:** None
  - **Other Responsibilities:**
    - Assumes all duties and responsibilities of the chair in the absence of the chair
    - Others as defined/assigned by the committee
- The **Secretary**
  - **Bylaws Responsibilities:**
    - The secretary of the committee shall provide minutes of each meeting to the Secretary of the Executive Committee as well as post the minutes electronically within eight (8) calendar days of the meeting. This would include minutes of any subcommittee or ad hoc committee that reports to it. (Article V, Section 2.B.3)
  - **Other Responsibilities:**
    - Be contacted by committee members extending regrets prior to a scheduled committee meeting
    - Posts committee minutes in a manner consistent with University Senate protocol after the minutes have been reviewed by the committee – including any amendments made as a result of the review.
    - Others as defined/assigned by the committee
- **Agenda:** The agenda of committee meetings is set by the following process.
  - At the conclusion of each meeting, any committee member can propose an item for inclusion on the tentative agenda
  - A tentative agenda for the meeting is drafted by the committee chair in consultation with the committee members
  - This tentative agenda is sent to the committee members by the committee chair at least 7 days in advance of the meeting
  - This tentative agenda includes all available supporting documents for items to be considered by the committee
  - The tentative agenda is finalized by the committee at the outset of the meeting immediately following the call to order
- **Communication Tools**
  - Committee email list: [fapc@list.gcsu.edu](mailto:fapc@list.gcsu.edu)
  - Committee web presence: [http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/univ\\_senate/SCs2010-2011/FAPC/](http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/univ_senate/SCs2010-2011/FAPC/)
- **Deliberation**
  - **Advisory Matters** (Committee workgroup requesting committee guidance, advisory function of the committee)
    - Deliberation is informal until there is a motion for committee consideration in which case Robert's Rules apply.
  - **Policy Matters** (Committee deliberation on a draft policy proposed for recommendation for University Senate consideration)
    - Robert's Rules apply meaning a main motion (to recommend the policy for consideration by University Senate) is made and committee deliberation proceeds with a vote determining committee disposition of the motion.
- **Duration**
  - Committee meetings shall be no more than seventy-five (75) minutes in duration unless otherwise agreed to by a motion to extend the meeting duration
- **Minutes** The minutes of the committee shall be drafted by the following process.
  - The committee secretary shall keep notes of the meeting.
  - The committee secretary may request clarification from the committee at any point in the meeting.
  - Immediately prior to adjournment of any meeting, the committee secretary shall have the opportunity to seek clarification on any matter to inform preparation of meeting minutes.
  - The secretary shall prepare a draft of the minutes for committee review in consultation with the committee officers.
  - This draft of the minutes is circulated to the committee for review prior to posting.
  - The committee members shall have a minimum of two business days to review the minutes.
  - If suggested revisions are offered, the revised minutes are again distributed to the committee for review.
  - The minutes are posted in compliance with the university senate bylaws timeline (within 8 calendar days of the meeting).
  - *Except for the minutes of the final meeting of the academic year, the previous meeting minutes are an item on the agenda.*
- **Parliamentary Authority**
  - The rules contained in the current edition of Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised shall govern the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with the University Senate Bylaws, these operating procedures and any special rules of order the University Senate or Faculty Affairs Policy Committee may adopt.
- **Quorum**
  - A majority of the committee membership shall constitute a quorum.
- **Voting**
  - **Voting Members:** Each of the thirteen members listed in the University Senate bylaws is a voting member of the committee.
  - **Abstentions:** In all committee votes, the voting threshold is applied to the number of voting members present at the time of the vote [assuming the presence of quorum] and not to the number eligible to vote.
  - Unless otherwise determined by the committee in advance of the vote, a majority vote is necessary for committee approval.
  - The voting threshold for adoption of a matter to be considered by the committee may be amended by a majority vote.
- **Amendment of these operating procedures**
  - These committee operating procedures may be amended by a majority vote at any scheduled committee meeting provided that committee members receive written notification in advance of the meeting at which the proposed revision is considered. Any such revision(s) that are approved are effective immediately following the committee vote.

**Motions brought to the Senate floor:** None

There were no formal motions brought to the floor of the University Senate by the committee during the 2010-2011 academic year. That said, there were a variety of committee recommendations, some of which were formalized as *advisory motions* at the committee level. While most of these committee level *advisory motions* were directed to the Provost as the committee exercised its advisory function to the administration, some were directed to external groups including the University Chairs Council and the Executive Committee of the University Senate. During the development of some of the advisory motions and recommendations, the committee postponed its deliberation and requested its members to seek guidance from their constituencies. These consultations are explicitly documented in the minutes for the issues of Desk Copies and the use of Student Opinion Surveys in annual faculty evaluation. Details of committee deliberation and recommendations including the *advisory motions* are provided in the “Other Significant Deliberation” section of this report.

**Other Significant Deliberation (Non-Motions):**

As indicated in the executive summary of this report, there were eight issues considered by this committee. The issues are listed in alphabetical order by name and include an italicized annotation of **Work Group** [informed by a committee work group] **Committee of the Whole** [considered as a committee of the whole] or **Informational Update** [received as an informational update]. Each of these issues is significant either as follow-up from the work of FAPC during previous academic years and/or in the amount of committee deliberation time. For each issue, the information provided here includes fields for the **Issue** (a description of the issue), **Significance** (some indication of why the issue might be considered significant), **Summary** (a summary of the committee deliberation), and **Details** (deliberation details as a time line). In some cases, additional details are available in the committee minutes.

**1. Academic Year Faculty Availability in the Summer..... Work Group**

- **Issue:** This issue arose as a concern from the perception that some academic year faculty felt they 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.
- **Significance:** This issue emerged as a follow-up from the 2009-2010 FAPC and resonated with the committee members present at the 30 Apr 2010 organizational meeting.
- **Summary:** The committee deliberation on this issue 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).
- **Details:**
  - 30 April 2010: A committee work group is formed at this organizational meeting consisting of only Alex Blazer (CoAS) to study this matter and prepare recommendations for committee consideration.
  - August 2010: The committee work group surveyed a sample of fifty-four (twenty-five responding) members of the university faculty and organized the survey results to identify the main issues of concern from the respondents. These survey results are available in their entirety by following the link “Work Group Update” under item 6.A of the 3 Sep 2010 committee meeting.
  - 3 Sep 2010: After discussion of the survey results, the committee unanimously agrees that this issue would best be handled at the department/unit level and that Alex Blazer should attend a meeting of the University Chairs Council to present the summary survey information (e.g., uneven or uncompensated summer job responsibilities) and encourage chairs to have conversations at the department/unit level as appropriate and necessary.
  - 27 Oct 2010: Alex Blazer attends a meeting of the University Chairs Council to present the committee recommendations. The university chairs recommend review of letters from the Registrar to transfer students to support faculty awareness of any expectations of access and availability of faculty being communicated to such students.
  - 5 Nov 2010: The committee broadens the recommendation received from university chairs to include a review of letters sent from the university, academic units, or departments for the presence of language communicating faculty expectations [such as advising, availability at orientations, summer

accessibility of faculty to students, etc.] to the students. This recommendation is made to the Provost who agrees to review letters at the university level and is asked by the committee to consider requesting deans and department chairs to provide similar reviews of letters emanating from the academic unit and department levels respectively.

- 3 Dec 2010: The Provost had reviewed letters to students from university level groups, specifically Admissions as well as Enrollment Management, finding no such language. The committee reiterates its request to the Provost that deans and department chairs be asked to provide similar reviews of letters emanating from the academic unit and department levels respectively.
  - 1 Apr 2011: There was no definitive information to indicate that this review had concluded in all the academic units but there was confirmation that this request had been circulated to deans earlier in the academic year (as reported at earlier meetings of this committee).
- 14 Jan 2011: A written report of the Provost indicates that deans and department chairs were asked to provide similar reviews of letters from their respective academic unit or department yet no information on the results of these reviews had been received at the time of this report. A request to close the loop on this matter is offered for consideration by the Provost.
- 14 Jan 2011: Exercising its advisory function, the committee charges 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.
- 4 Feb 2011: Provost Jordan is consulting with collegiate deans to discuss the ramifications of the advisory motion (Motion 1 (14 Jan 2011)). Committee deliberation produces some curiosity question seeking legal perspective on the liability (workman's compensation insurance) and university facilities access for academic year faculty while not under formal contract.
- 4 Mar 2011: Provost Jordan continues consultations with collegiate deans who in turn are consulting with department chairs on the advisory motion (Motion 1 (14 Jan 2011)). The 4 Feb 2010 curiosity questions of liability and facilities access are a matter of considering whether the work of the faculty member is promoting the good of the institution. It is also pointed out that workman's compensation insurance is provided by the state not the institution yet an institution recommendation may be sought when the state considers the disposition of such claims.
- 1 Apr 2011: Associate Provost Tom Ormond provides an update from the Provost communicating
  - a. This motion is still under consideration by the Provost and has stimulated a rich dialogue with and among the academic deans. One of the threads of this dialogue has been an interest toward developing a "best practice," rather than a policy.
  - b. The many job responsibilities and different types of contracts at the institution will all need to be considered in any final decision.

A brief discussion includes questions about status of scholarship on campus during the summer, weekend contact by students, and consideration for availability to students of faculty who teach online courses. The Associate Provost agrees to inform the ongoing dialogue with these questions.

## **2. Desk Copies: Alternatives to Reselling .....Committee of the Whole**

- **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.

- **Significance:** This issue periodically emerges in faculty email list conversations and was forwarded to Executive Committee for clarification and consideration. The Executive Committee charged this committee to consider this issue.
- **Summary:** After being charged to consider this issue by the Executive Committee on 8 Nov 2010, the committee deliberation commenced on 3 Dec 2010, at the outset of which the Provost clarified the charge requesting a list of recommendations for alternatives to reselling unwanted desk copies. The committee agreed that each of its members should consult with their constituencies to inform continued deliberation at the next meeting. At the 14 Jan 2011 meeting, the committee generated a list of alternatives which was reviewed by ECUS, the University Senate, and FAPC resulting in the removal of one of the suggestions. The final list of suggestions is included under the 4 Feb 2011 entry in the Details section below. At the 1 Apr 2011 meeting, the committee was requested by the Provost to consider recommending a single best option rather than the previous menu of recommendations. The committee responded to this request with a recommendation that the feasibility that the GCSU library be a clearinghouse for unwanted desk copies be explored.
- **Details:**
  - 8 Nov 2010: The committee chair receives a charge to consider this issue from the ECUS chair.
  - 3 Dec 2010: The committee receives an informational update from its chair on this issue including the relevant language from the BoR Policy Manual and USG Academic Affairs Handbook as well as the institution's Academic Affairs Handbook and Policy Manual. The Provost clarifies the ECUS charge and asks the committee to make recommendations for alternatives to reselling the desk copies. Committee members agree to consult with their constituencies for suggestions and continue deliberation at the 14 Jan 2011 FAPC meeting.
  - 14 Jan 2011: The committee prepares a list of alternatives to reselling textbooks informed by constituency consultation. Among the information shared by members of the committee are policies for handling unsolicited and solicited publisher books from other institutions including Georgia State University, Calvin College, and Richmond Community College and a position statement, entitled "Stomp the Comp" from the Text and Academic Authors Association (TAA), that is available online at [www.taaonline.net](http://www.taaonline.net). The committee chair is charged to forward the list of alternatives as well as the two aforementioned documents (policies and the TAA position statement) to the Provost.
  - 20 Jan 2011: The committee chair forwards aforementioned items (14 Jan 2011 entry) to the Provost.
  - 20 Jan 2011: The Provost acknowledges receipt of the information supplied by FAPC.
  - 21 Jan 2011: At the joint meeting of the Executive Committee and Standing Committee Chairs, there is general agreement that item k, 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 is a recommendation to remove item k from the list of FAPC recommendations prior to wider circulation.
  - 31 Jan 2011: The University Senate offers feedback to the FAPC report on this matter to echo the concern of item k expressed at the 21 Jan 2011 joint meeting.
  - 4 Feb 2011: During the electronic review of the 14 Jan 2011 FAPC minutes, a concern of the inclusion of item k is expressed and its removal from these minutes is endorsed at this meeting.
    - Final List of Suggestions: The final list (with the original item k removed) of suggested alternatives to reselling desk copies from the committee for consideration by the Provost is as follows.
      - a. return unwanted desk copies to the publisher
      - b. donate unwanted desk copies to the library (GCSU or public library)
      - c. donate unwanted desk copies to develop a department library for department faculty and reference resources for student majors
      - d. donate unwanted desk copies to a book recycling center
      - e. donate unwanted desk copies to local "service groups" (nursing faculty donate such copies to local nursing clinics for reference materials)
      - f. donate unwanted desk copies to interested institutions that may be clinical partners of this university
      - g. donate and send unwanted desk copies overseas to a needy university (some needy universities might exist within this country)
      - h. leave unwanted desk copies outside the office door to be picked up by students or colleagues
      - i. donate unwanted desk copies to underprivileged students
      - j. give extra textbooks out as prizes within a department

- k. centralize the disposition of unwanted desk copies at GCSU to an appropriate academic unit (possibly library acquisitions)

- 1 Apr 2011: The Associate Provost communicates an update from the Provost to indicate that a committee recommendation for a single best option is preferable to the menu of suggestions previously submitted. After some deliberation, a recommendation is made by the committee that the feasibility of the institution's library serving as a clearing house for unwanted text books be explored. Ben Davis of the library and a FAPC member indicates his intention to explore this feasibility with his administrative chain and appropriate library personnel.
- 7 Apr 2011: The committee chair forwards the entry from 1 Apr 2011 to the Provost as an information item and the Provost acknowledges receipt of this information.

### 3. Faculty Awards .....*Informational Update*

- **Issue:** The 2009-10 FAPC brought to completion a review of the Faculty Awards language in the institution's Academic Affairs Handbook that emerged as a concern at the 1 Feb 2008 FAPC meeting. At its 5 Mar 2010 meeting, the 2009-2010 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.
- **Significance:** This item had been considered by FAPC since 1 Feb 2008 and combined work of the 2007-08 FAPC and 2008-09 FAPC and was the central item of consideration by the 2009-10 FAPC.
- **Summary:** Concerns of inconsistencies in the faculty awards language in the institution's Academic Affairs Handbook resulted in a comprehensive review of the faculty awards by FAPC during the 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10 academic years. The university senate and all university faculty were provided opportunities to inform the deliberation of FAPC. After receiving the 5 Mar 2010 recommendations of FAPC, the Provost had two 2010-11 faculty award committees, that were to review nomination portfolios during the 2010-11 academic year, review the proposed language. The result was some modifications to the 5 Mar 2010 FAPC proposed revisions and these modified revisions replaced the existing language in the institution's Academic Affairs Handbook in late 2010.
- **Details:**
  - 8 Feb 2008: FAPC deliberation of faculty awards commences by the 2007-08 FAPC.
  - 5 Mar 2010: FAPC deliberation of faculty awards is completed by the 2009-10 FAPC. Dr. Lee Digiovanni, 2009-10 FAPC Chair, forwards this final draft to Provost Jordan as FAPC exercises its advisory role to the academic administration.
  - 2 Nov 2010: As a follow-up to this work, the Provost emails the 2010-11 committee chair indicating that the 5 Mar 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 is 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 is a sentence added to allow for appropriate deadlines to be set at the local level so that the portfolios could be submitted in compliance with the Regents' award deadlines. The Provost expresses her appreciation to the committee members who had participated in the preparation of the draft. She also indicates that the draft had received only minor modifications upon review by two faculty award committees which is a testament to its quality.
  - 5 Nov 2010: The committee receives a comprehensive informational update on faculty awards deliberation by FAPC since 8 Feb 2008 as well as the information from the Provost regarding its subsequent review. The Provost indicates that she will ensure the revised draft language on faculty awards is placed in the Academic Affairs Handbook.
  - 3 Dec 2010: The revised language on faculty awards is now present as section 2.09.04.2 of the institution's Academic Affairs Handbook. Those interested in comparing the current language to the former language of 2.09.04.2 may find the former language linked from the agenda of the 28 Aug 2009 FAPC meeting. **This completes committee activity on this issue.**

### 4. Faculty Evaluation, Triggering Review of Department Chairs .....*Work Group*

- **Issue:** This issue emerged during the 30 Apr 2010 organizational committee meeting when, a concern about the current faculty evaluation process and an interest in exploring the options available for faculty to inform the evaluation of a department chair or immediate supervisor were expressed.



- **Significance:** This emerged at the 30 Apr 2010 organizational meeting and resonated with the committee members present at that meeting.
- **Summary:** The title of this issue is not reflective of the ultimate focus of the committee deliberation. Early in its deliberation, the committee postponed consideration of faculty evaluation indefinitely noting that faculty evaluation was presently 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 were often articulated in the context of a faculty member offering suggestions for administrative professional development for her/his department chair. Ultimately, the committee endorsed the work group's recommendations that (1) each committee member educate her/his constituency that faculty have an opportunity to inform evaluation of an academic administrator and (2) the Provost ensure that the academic administrative evaluation process include a mechanism by which appropriate personnel solicit developmental feedback (on an annual basis) from faculty, particularly in the review of her/his department chair of unit supervisor, and that care be taken to ensure confidentiality in the collection of this feedback. A modified version of the existing Part IV was offered as a sample form that could be used to collect this feedback. The formal motion is included below in the details for the date of 4 Mar 2010 and identified as *FAPC Motion 1 (4 Mar 2010)*.
- **Details:**
  - 30 Apr 2011: The issues of faculty evaluation and triggered reviews of department chairs are identified as topics for the agenda of the committee for the 2010-2011 academic year. A committee work group is formed at this organizational meeting consisting of Sally Humphries (CoB) and Susan Steele (CoHS) to study these matters and prepare recommendations for committee consideration.
  - 1 Oct 2011: Given the university-wide reconsideration of the faculty evaluation process at the department level, the work group recommends that further investigation of faculty evaluation be postponed indefinitely. The work group recommendation on triggered reviews of department chairs concludes that a mechanism for faculty to inform a department chair review is desirable. Both of these recommendations are endorsed by the committee who asks the work group to review the existing mechanism, called the Part IV Academic Administrator Evaluation Form, and provide an update and work group recommendations (if any) at the next committee meeting.
  - 5 Nov 2011: The work group reports 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 resonates with the committee members who are present and the committee requests the work group to continue deliberation and report at a future committee meeting.
  - 17 Jan 2011: The work group forwards its recommendations to the committee chair via email and this issue is added to the tentative agenda of the 4 Feb 2011 committee meeting.
  - 4 Feb 2011: The deliberation on the issue is postponed to the 4 Mar 2011 meeting due to a full agenda and the committee is not able to deliberate on all agenda items before its meeting time is consumed.
  - 4 Mar 2011: The issue receives priority on this agenda as its consideration was postponed from the previous meeting. Exercising its advisory function, the committee unanimously approves the recommendations of the work group [Sally Humphries (CoB) and, 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. The committee chair is charged by the committee to forward this motion to the Provost.
    - **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.

- **Note regarding the Sample Form:** The aforementioned sample form entitled “Faculty Recommendations for Administrative Development” is linked to the agenda of the 4 Mar 2011 committee meeting.

- 10 Mar 2011: The committee chair forwards this motion to the Provost.
- 13 Mar 2011: The Provost acknowledges receipt of the motion indicating that she will study the information provided and take the recommendations under advisement and update the FAPC at its next meeting.
- 1 Apr 2011: The committee chair indicates that this motion was forwarded on behalf of the committee via email to the Provost on 10 Mar 2011 with a response on 13 Mar 2011 from the Provost to indicate this motion would be studied and taken under advisement with an update provided to the committee at its 1 Apr 2011 meeting. The Associate Provost communicates an update from the Provost to indicate that this motion is still under consideration.

## 5. Post-Tenure Review..... *Work Group*

- **Issue:** This issue arose from a concern about the post-tenure review appeal process and was discussed at the 2 Apr 2010 meeting of the 2009-2010 FAPC and passed by means of the 2009-2010 FAPC annual report to the 2010-2011 FAPC for further deliberation.
- **Significance:** This issue emerged as a follow-up from the 2009-2010 FAPC and resonated with the committee members present at the 30 Apr 2010 organizational meeting.
- **Summary:** A work group was formed and charged to review the post-tenure review language in the institution’s Academic Affairs Handbook, particularly the appeal process, and prepare recommendations for committee consideration. The work group periodically reported its progress to the committee during the academic year, reporting at the Nov 2010, Dec 2010, and Mar 2011 meetings with its final recommendations provided at the Apr 2011 meeting, the final meeting of the academic year. At the 1 Apr 2011 meeting, the work group offered for committee consideration a recommendation that it be permitted to continue its work and provide a report of its progress at the 29 Apr 2011 organizational meeting of the 2011-2012 FAPC and this recommendation was endorsed by those members of the committee who were present.
- **Website:** The work group has a website, linked from the 2010-2011 FAPC website, at which supporting documents that informed its work and working drafts of the proposed revisions to the institution’s Academic Affairs Handbook can be found. In short, this website documents the work group activity.
- **Details:**
  - 30 Apr 2010: A committee work group is formed at this organizational meeting consisting of Lee Digiovanni (CoE), Mike Rose (CoAS), and Craig Turner (CoAS) to consider this matter over the summer recess and prepare recommendations for committee consideration.
  - 3 Sep 2010: The committee receives an oral report from the work group that
    - indicates that the work group had consulted with Ken Farr (CoB) over the summer who contributed significantly to the deliberation of the work group,
    - provides a brief history of the emergence and development of post-tenure review within the University System of Georgia and this institution, and
    - indicates that the university system level guidance calls for post-tenure review to focus on professional development of the faculty member under review and that post-tenure review is thus formative rather than summative.
  - 3 Sep 2010: The committee unanimously recommends 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.
  - 25 Sep 2010: The work group membership is expanded to comply with the 3 Sep 2010 charge of the committee and is now populated by Martha Colvin (CoHS), Lee Digiovanni (CoE), Nancy Davis Bray (Library), Ken Farr (CoB), Mike Rose (CoAS), and Craig Turner (CoAS).
  - 4 Oct 2010: Organizational meeting of this work group. All members of the work group receive an update including a brief history of the emergence of post-tenure review within the University System of Georgia and this institution as well as working drafts that were developed by the summer 2010 work group including a set of guiding questions for consideration.

- 25 Oct 2010: The work group meets again to begin in earnest its work of reviewing the post-tenure review language in section 3.07.03.6 of the institution's Academic Affairs Handbook.
- 4 Nov 2010: The work group reports to the committee indicating that the review is in progress.
- 22 Nov 2010: The work group meets again and its deliberation generates some questions for which guidance from the University Counsel is deemed necessary. Craig Turner is charged to meet with the University Counsel to seek this guidance.
- 1 Dec 2010: Craig Turner meets with University Counsel Marc Cardinalli. In short, the response of the University Counsel 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) is "This is not a legal question, but rather a policy question." In other words, no decision or comments are warranted by Legal Affairs at this time.
- 9 Feb 2011: The work group meets again and continues deliberation on the post-tenure language. At this meeting, the work group decides to schedule a standing weekly meeting to facilitate its work.
- Feb and Mar 2011: The work group meets weekly, meeting on 15 Feb, 22 Feb, 1 Mar, 8 Mar, 15 Mar, 22 Mar, and 29 Mar, and informs its work with Board of Regents Policy, University System of Georgia Academic Affair Handbook language, and a position statement of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP).
- 1 Apr 2011: At this meeting, the work group reports to the committee and
  - circulates a draft (8 Mar 2011) of the working document under review by the work group
  - reports that the work group maintains a web presence accessible by following the "Post Tenure Review Work Group" link at the top of the FAPC web presence and
  - offers for committee consideration a recommendation that this work group continue its work during April 2011 and provide an update to the 2011-2012 FAPC at its organizational meeting which is scheduled for 29 Apr 2011. This recommendation is endorsed by the committee members who were present.

## 6. Student Opinion Surveys: Average Rating Discrepancy (Concern).....*Committee of the Whole*

- **Issue:** A concern, emerging from an email received by the committee chair on 16 Sep 2010, regarding discrepancies in the computations of average ratings for the online archive of the paper-and-pencil student opinion surveys was shared with the committee as an information item at the 1 Oct 2010 meeting. In the email the committee was asked to seek resolution of the discrepancy and consider ensuring that the communication of these discrepancies and their resolution be consistent across all academic units of the university.
- **Significance:** This emerged on 16 Sep 2010 as a concern from a university faculty member to the committee chair and resonated with the committee members present at the 1 Oct 2010 meeting.
- **Summary:** Upon becoming aware of this concern, each group [ECUS and Standing Committee Chairs on 17 Sep 2010 and FAPC on 1 Oct 2010] shared the concern and worked together with appropriate university personnel (Institutional Research and database managers of the information) to resolve the matter as soon as possible and communicate the information regarding the concern and its resolution to all university faculty. The Provost facilitated the communication among the aforementioned groups. The calculation discrepancy was acknowledged and then quickly corrected with an informational update on this concern and its resolution issued from the Provost via the academic deans to all university faculty.
- **Details:**
  - 16 Sep 2010: The committee chair receives an email articulating the concern requesting the committee seek resolution of the discrepancy and ensure consistent communication to faculty across all academic units of the institution regarding the concern and its resolution.
  - 17 Sep 2010: The concern is shared both as a point of information and for steering with the Executive Committee at its monthly joint meeting with Standing Committee Chairs. The Provost agrees to facilitate communication with Institutional Research to request resolution of the discrepancy in the calculation of the averages on the student opinion survey ratings. The concern is steered to FAPC as an information item and FAPC is requested to monitor progress in consultation with the Provost.
  - 1 Oct 2010: The committee receives a report including the email expressing the concern, the summary of the 17 Sep 2010 ECUS consultation, and a report that appropriate campus officials are aware of the matter and that corrections and resolution are progressing with expectations of a 3 Oct 2010 completion date. The committee agrees that committee action would be informed by an update from

the Provost who had extended regrets for this committee meeting. Thus, committee action is postponed to the 5 Nov 2010 FAPC meeting.

- 18 Oct 2010: The Provost provides an update at the monthly joint meeting of the Executive Committee with Standing Committee Chairs indicating that the discrepancy had been resolved completely. This update is shared via email with the FAPC members.
- 5 Nov 2010: After hearing a summary of the information available on this matter, the committee recommends that the Provost communicate information of this concern and its resolution to all appropriate parties to include faculty, department chairs, and deans. The Provost concurs and agrees to communicate the requested information to all university faculty.
- Early Nov 2010: The Provost communicates the requested information on the concern and its resolution to collegiate deans who in turn were requested to disseminate the information to faculty in their respective academic units.
- 3 Dec 2010: The committee members present indicate receiving the informational update from their respective deans and this informational update from the Provost is linked to item 4.B.iii of the agenda of this committee meeting. **This completes committee activity on this issue.**

## 7. Student Opinion Surveys: Participation Rate (Concern) .....Committee of the Whole

- **Issue**: 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 online collection system and asked if mechanisms were in place to attempt to increase the participation rate.
- **Significance**: This issue provided the committee an opportunity to advocate for faculty at the institution level, a role that was encouraged in the annual report by the 2009-2010 FAPC.
- **Summary**: This deliberation began with the observation of the drop in student participation rate as the administration of Student Opinion Surveys (SOS) transitioned from a paper and pencil forms to an online environment. This drop in participate rate had already been observed by upper administration who had formulated a plan to implement strategies to increase the participation rate commencing in the Spring 2011 semester. The committee recommended the development of standard language for inclusion on all course syllabi to inform and encourage student participation on SOS. This position was formalized as an advisory motion referenced as *FAPC Motion 2 (3 Dec 2010)*. It was also noted that the student narratives (student comments on SOS) from the online SOS are not received by all faculty. At present, these narratives are sent from the collector (Institutional Research) to each department chair who in turn should be providing it to the individual faculty member to whom it applies. The committee asked the Provost to investigate the apparent inconsistency of the distribution of the student narratives. On 18 Jan 2011, the Provost provided an update to the university faculty on the student participation rates on SOS including a brief history, findings, and plans detailing a strategy to increase the participation rates. Prior to this update, the Provost consulted with the Student Government Association who recommended that all classes with ten or more students be surveyed with the SOS. The committee endorsed this recommendation with an advisory motion, referenced as *FAPC Motion 1 (3 Dec 2010)*. This motion was forwarded to ECUS for steering, steered by ECUS back to the committee, and finally endorsed by the committee and sent to the Provost as an advisory motion. Following consideration of this motion, the committee deliberation turned to the question of how the SOS should inform faculty evaluation. This deliberation spanned the February, March and April meetings. In light of FAPC Motion 1 (1 Apr 2011) recommending to the Provost a review of the SOS language in Section 3.07.03.3 of the Academic Affairs Handbook, consideration of this motion was postponed by FAPC Motion 2 (1 Apr 2011) until proposed revisions to the SOS language in Section 3.07.03.3 of the institution's Academic Affairs Handbook are returned to the committee for its review.
- **Details**:
  - 5 Nov 2010: The aforementioned issue is brought up under unfinished business at this meeting noting that it is a different branch under the umbrella of Student Opinion Surveys. The Provost provides a response indicating (1) it is typical to see a short-term dip in Student Opinion Survey participation rates following conversion to an online 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 by the University Chairs Council. The committee members present indicate a perception that this information is not widely known by university faculty and unanimously recommend that this information be distributed to appropriate parties to include faculty,

department chairs, and deans. The Provost concurs and indicates that she will ensure that all university faculty receive an appropriate update on this matter.

- 18 Jan 2011 Update on SOS Participation Rate: The Provost provides 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](mailto: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.
- 3 Dec 2010 SGA Information: At the 3 Dec 2010 meeting, the Provost reports that the Student Government Association (SGA) made a recommendation (to the Provost) that all classes with ten (10) or more students be surveyed with the SOS. There is no indication that any distinction was made for whether the class was an undergraduate or graduate class.
- 3 Dec 2010 Motion to ECUS for steering: The committee unanimously passes the following motion at the FAPC meeting charging the committee chair to report this motion to ECUS for steering.
  - **FAPC 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 necessarily inform annual faculty evaluations.
  - 21 Jan 2011 ECUS response: A summary of the deliberation at the 21 Jan 2011 joint meeting of ECUS and Standing Committee Chairs follows.
    - ECUS indicates 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 (online, paper and pencil), how the Student Opinions Surveys used to inform annual faculty evaluations are selected, etc) are procedural matters.
    - In light of this position, ECUS indicates that this motion is procedural and recommends that FAPC apply its advisory function to offer advice to the Provost on this matter.
    - There is 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 online administration of these student opinion surveys.
    - Finally there is a lengthy conversation with no consensus on how soon this motion should be implemented.
      - One observation offered is that the practice of administering Student Opinion Surveys to (essentially) ALL classes would be administratively simpler.
      - Another observation is a recommendation that the practice of administering Student Opinion Surveys to ALL classes might be delayed until the current review by the University Chairs Council of the current survey instrument concludes.
  - 4 Feb 2011: A motion to endorse *FAPC Motion 1 (3 Dec 2010)* as originally formulated is made, seconded and approved with the understanding that the committee chair direct this motion to the Provost within the scope of the advisory function of this committee.
    - 15 Feb 2011: The committee chair forwards *FAPC Motion 1 (3 Dec 2010)* to the Provost. This email is available in its entirety by following the link to the phrase “forwarded [15 Feb 2011] by committee chair to Provost” under the second bullet of item 4.C. of the agenda of the 4 Mar 2011 committee meeting.
    - 1 Apr 2011: The Associate Provost provides an update from the Provost to indicate that the Provost has accepted this recommendation and that it will be implemented this semester. It is also noted that a mechanism is in development to allow a faculty member in consultation with her/his department chair to request that an online SOS be administered to a class with fewer than ten students. This mechanism is anticipated to be available for the Fall 2011 semester.
      - Note: It should be noted that the number of classes to which SOS are administered that are selected to inform annual faculty evaluation is articulated in the aforementioned section 3.07.03.3 of the institution’s Academic Affairs Handbook, and its consideration is thus included in the motion identified as FAPC Motion 1 (1 Apr 2011).
  - 4 Feb 2011: As a follow-up to the note under the aforementioned FAPC Motion 1 (3 Dec 2010), committee deliberation on how the Student Opinion Surveys might inform annual faculty evaluation begins when the following motion is made and seconded.
    - **FAPC Motion 1 (4 Feb 2011)**: *To recommend to the Provost that all student opinion survey results be used for faculty performance evaluation purposes.*

- 4 Feb 2011: After lively discussion, a motion to postpone committee consideration of this motion to the 4 March 2011 FAPC meeting is made, seconded and approved with the agreement that FAPC members seek feedback from their constituencies to inform the committee deliberation on this motion.
- 4 Mar 2011: After hearing the variety of perspectives and opinions in the constituency feedback, details of which are available in the 4 Mar 2011 meeting minutes, a motion to amend FAPC Motion 1 (4 Feb 2011) is made, seconded and approved.
  - **FAPC Motion 1 (4 Feb 2011) (as amended)**: *To recommend to the Provost that student opinion survey results be used for both formative and summative faculty evaluation purposes.*
  - As discussion of the motion (as amended) continues, the time for meeting adjournment intervenes and the committee agrees to extend the meeting to continue deliberation. After a short time, this continued deliberation is curtailed with a motion to postpone committee deliberation to its 1 Apr 2011 meeting.
- 1 Apr 2011: A motion is made, seconded and approved and identified as
  - **FAPC Motion 2 (1 Apr 2011)** *To postpone consideration of FAPC Motion 1 (4 Feb 2011) (as amended) to be coincident with committee review of the modified language from Section 3.07.03.3 of the Academic Affairs Handbook indicated in part two of FAPC Motion 1 (1 Apr 2011).*
- **1 Apr 2011: SOS language from Section 3.07.03.3 of the Academic Affairs Handbook.**
  - At its 21 Jan 2011 meeting, ECUS requested that FAPC consider reviewing this language in the Academic Affairs Handbook. A two-part motion was made, seconded, discussed and approved, identified as
    - **FAPC Motion 1 (1 Apr 2011)** *To recommend to the Provost that*
      - (1) *the language in Section 3.07.03.3 of the institution's Academic Affairs Handbook be updated to reflect the online delivery of the student opinion survey, with particular emphasis on items 1 and 5 of Section A as well as all of Section C.*
      - (2) *the modified language be sent back to this committee for review.*
  - 7 Apr 2011: The committee chair forwards *FAPC Motion 1 (1 Apr 2011)* to the Provost. This email is available in its entirety by following the link to the phrase “7 Apr 2011 Email from Committee Chair to Provost regarding SOS Academic Affairs Handbook Language” under the Follow-up section of the 1 Apr 2011 meeting entry on the main FAPC web page.
- **3 Dec 2010 Advisory Motion to Provost**: A second motion is made, seconded and approved promoting the development of standard language for all course syllabi.
  - **FAPC 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.*
  - 3 Dec 2010: The Provost is present at the meeting to receive *FAPC Motion 2 (3 Dec 2010)*.
  - 14 Jan 2011 Provost Update 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.
  - 7 Feb 2011: The Provost emails a draft of proposed language for review to the committee chair who in turn forwards the draft to the committee. This email is available in its entirety by following the link to the phrase “Update” under the third bullet of item 4.C of the agenda of the 4 Mar 2011 committee meeting.
  - 4 Mar 2011: The aforementioned 7 Feb 2011 draft, *prepared by a writing group chaired by Tom Ormond with members Stephanie McClure, Lisa Griffin, and Ed Hale*, of proposed language is reviewed by the committee and feedback is offered.
  - 8 Mar 2011: The 4 Mar 2011 feedback results in a second draft of the proposed syllabus language which is received by the committee chair and circulated to FAPC members by email. This email is available in its entirety by following the link to the phrase “Update” under the first bullet of item 5.B of the agenda of the 1 Apr 2011 committee meeting.
  - 1 Apr 2011: Associate Provost Tom Ormond served as point person of the drafting committee [other members were Lisa Griffin, Stephanie McClure, and Ed Hale]. The second draft, informed by the recommended revisions from the 4 Mar 2011 FAPC meeting, is

reviewed by the committee. One modification is made to draft two [changing the word “virtual” to the word technological], after which a **motion is made, seconded and approved**, with no discussion, *to endorse the wording of the second draft as amended [given below] and that this language be recommended for inclusion on all course syllabi.*

- **DRAFT two of proposed syllabi language as amended:** *Given the technological sophistication of Georgia College students, the student opinion survey is being delivered through an online process. Your constructive feedback plays an indispensable role in shaping quality education at Georgia College. All responses are completely confidential and your name is not stored with your responses in any way. In addition, instructors will not see any results of the opinion survey until after final grades are submitted to the University. An invitation to complete the online opinion survey is distributed to students near the end of the semester. Your participation in this very important process is greatly appreciated.*
- 7 Apr 2011: The committee chair forwards the motion regarding DRAFT two of syllabi language (endorsed by the committee on 1 Apr 2011) to the Provost. This email is available in its entirety by following the link to the phrase “7 Apr 2011 Email from Committee Chair to Provost regarding SOS Syllabi Language” under the Follow-up section of the 1 Apr 2011 meeting entry on the main FAPC web page.
- 3 Dec 2010 SOS Narratives: FAPC members seek clarification as to how narratives (written student comments from the surveys) are being managed and disseminated. Reportedly, the Department Chairs receive a CD containing the narratives and they might or might not pass the narratives on to faculty. The committee asks the Provost to address the apparent inconsistency of passing on SOS narratives within colleges. In a related comment, the Provost cites a need and her intent to look into benchmarking student opinion surveys in the future.
  - 14 Jan 2011 Provost Update 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.
  - 4 Mar 2011: An update provided by one of the members of the committee indicates that Student Opinion Survey (SOS) narratives (the specific student comments) are no longer provided to Chairs on a CD but are now accessible on the Department Chairs menu within Banner / PAWS and thus could now be provided to faculty by their department chair.
  - 1 Apr 2011: An update is provided by the Associate Provost to indicate that narratives (student comments submitted via the online SOS) are now available electronically to each department chair who can download the information from the Department Chairs Menu within PAWS and disseminate the information to the faculty in her/his department. In addition to the email reminders being sent from Institutional Research personnel to the department chairs, the Provost’s Office recently provided the academic deans with the proper procedure by which department chairs should provide SOS narratives to their respective faculty.

## 8. Summer Pay: Academic Year Faculty / Extra Compensation (Concern)...*Committee of the Whole*

- **Issue:** A concern was voiced to indicate that for some faculty, summer tax withholdings were distorted (extra large tax withholdings) with combined pay for teaching multiple sections. This was also the case for faculty who taught both Maymester and Summer I when the pay dates were the same day. In addition, this might also occur for faculty (or staff) receiving extra compensation during any pay period. The primary interest was seeking options for compensating such faculty (or staff) that would reduce the tax liability.
- **Significance:** This issue provided the committee an opportunity to advocate for faculty at the institution level, a role that was encouraged in the annual report by the 2009-2010 FAPC.
- **Summary:** This concern was voiced at the 1 Oct 2010 FAPC meeting under new business, and reported by the committee chair at the 15 Oct 2010 joint meeting of Executive Committee with Standing Committee Chairs, at which it was broadened to include the similar situation of extra compensation awarded to a faculty member during the academic year sometimes resulting in a similarly extra large tax withholding from the paycheck of the faculty member. Given the connection to the extra compensation matter and the intervening ruling from the University System of Georgia received by all Chief Academic Officers, the committee deliberation was put on temporary hold. When an email update from the Provost on the extra compensation ruling was considered at the 14

Jan 2011 meeting, the committee elected to decouple consideration of summer pay from the extra compensation and, at the recommendation of the Provost, invited Ms. Susan Allen, Director of Payroll Services, to attend the 4 Feb 2011 meeting to provide additional details regarding summer pay date options. After hearing from Ms. Susan Allen on 4 Feb 2011, the committee was satisfied and thought its deliberation on this matter was concluded. During the review of the 4 Feb 2011, an error in the information supplied to the committee was discovered (the Maymester pay date was mistakenly given as June 1, 2011 while the correct pay date was July 1, 2011). In light of this correction, the committee extended another invitation to Ms. Susan Allen to attend the 1 Apr 2011 meeting requesting that she provide information on why 1 July 2011 was the earliest allowable pay date for Maymester. Shortly after the invitation was accepted, an email from Dr. Paul Jones was sent to all university faculty indicating that due to the diligence of Ms. Susan Allen, the Maymester pay date could be shifted back from 1 July 2011 to 3 June 2011 so that now all three summer pay dates (Maymester, Summer I, and Summer II) fall on the date that final course grades are requested of the faculty. Ms. Susan Allen attended the 1 April 2011 meeting and provided a brief financial history of Maymester and provided some details on the new practice to be implemented for Maymester payroll.

○ **Details:**

- 1 Oct 2010: This concern is voiced near the conclusion of this meeting as new business. The committee chair is charged to obtain additional information from appropriate individuals on campus and to share this concern at the October 2010 joint meeting of the Executive Committee with Standing Committee Chairs and then to provide the committee an update at its 5 Nov 2010 meeting.
- 15 Oct 2010: As this concern is shared at this joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs with the Executive Committee, it is 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.
- 5 Nov 2010: The information from the 15 Oct 2010 joint meeting is shared with the committee. Given the aforementioned new ruling regarding extra compensation, the committee agrees to defer deliberation until more information on the local implementation on this new ruling is available.
- 3 Dec 2010: As no new information is available, deliberation is postponed to the next meeting.
- 24 Dec 2010: A revised ruling on extra compensation is received by all the Chief Academic Officers of the institutions in the University System of Georgia.
- 14 Jan 2011: The Provost provides 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. As part of her update, the Provost notes that Susan Allen is an excellent resource for details of summer pay and ADP. The committee members present at the meeting unanimously charge the committee chair to invite Ms. Susan Allen to the 4 Feb 2011 meeting to continue the conversation on this issue. A committee motion on summer pay is proposed at the 14 Jan 2011 meeting. Consideration of this motion is postponed to the 4 Feb 2011 meeting so that deliberation of this motion can be informed by the consultation with Ms. Susan Allen.
- Provost 01-14-2011 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.
- 20 Jan 2011: Ms. Susan Allen accepts the invitation from the committee chair for the 4 Feb meeting.
- 4 Feb 2011: Ms. Susan Allen indicates that her department filed an official request by email with USG Shared Services requesting that summer pay be distributed to faculty on a day in close proximity to the end of each summer session. The particular pay dates for Summer 2011 that have been requested are.
  - Maymester 2011 July 1, 2011\*\* (earliest allowed by USG financial policy)
  - 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)

*\*\*Note: The Maymester pay date was mistakenly communicated as 1 June 2011 at the 4 Feb 2011 FAPC meeting and was corrected to 1 July 2011 during the review of the minutes following this meeting.*



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. In light of the pay dates given at the meeting [in particular the June 1 date for the Maymester], the motion from the 14 Jan 2011 meeting was withdrawn.

- 4 Feb 2011: To the committee's knowledge, the BoR/USG has not released additional information (since 24 Dec 2010) for how USG institutions should amend contracts to account for extra compensation. A question is raised (with no current resolution) concerning how extra compensation would affect the current 33-1/3% cap found in Section 8.3.12.3 of BoR policy.
- 4 Mar 2011: In light of the correction on the Maymester payroll date [from 1 Jun 2011 to 1 July 2011] made in the 4 Feb 2011 minutes, the committee charges the committee chair to invite Ms. Susan Allen to attend the 1 Apr 2011 committee meeting to provide information on the fiscal policy that makes July 1 the earliest possible pay date for Maymester.
- 8 Mar 2011: Ms. Susan Allen accepts the invitation from the committee chair for the 1 Apr meeting.
- 16 Mar 2011: Dr. Paul Jones sends an email 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. This update is available in its entirety by following the link to the phrase "Dr. Paul Jones Email 16 Mar 2011" under item 5.A of the agenda of the 1 Apr 2011 committee meeting.
- 1 Apr 2011: An update from the Provost is communicated by the Associate Provost to indicate that no new information is available on the extra compensation ruling from the USG/BoR and that current practice is expected to remain in effect until further notice.
- 1 Apr 2011: Ms. Susan Allen attends the 1 Apr 2011 FAPC meeting to provide information on the Maymester pay date. She provides the committee a financial history of the Maymester operation indicating the established practice has been to record summer receipts and expenditures in the fiscal year that most of the summer teaching activity has taken place [i.e. the fiscal year after Maymester]. That practice will continue, with the payroll office arranging to provide a prepayment to faculty teaching Maymester with an early June payroll [3 June in 2011].
  - Ms. Allen asks that constituents (primarily unit administrators) turn in accurate and complete payroll information for the faculty who will teach courses during Maymester to ensure that these faculty receive their Maymester compensation during the prepayment [June payroll]. Ms. Allen points out that errant or incomplete information may result in delaying disbursement to the July payroll date.
  - Ms. Allen is asked if an email, providing the deadline by which Maymester payroll information must be filed to ensure the faculty member teaching Maymester would be eligible for the prepayment (June pay), could be sent to the faculty email list. This would allow each faculty member who is planning to teach during the Maymester an opportunity to coordinate with her/his supervisor to assist in meeting the payroll information submission deadline. Ms. Allen indicated that such an email will be sent to faculty.
  - The committee members present express appreciation to Ms. Susan Allen for her diligence and persistence in exploring and finding a way for faculty teaching Maymester to be paid at the end of Maymester [early June] rather than having to wait for the next fiscal year [July 1]

## Ad hoc committees and other groups:

The following work groups facilitated the work of the committee during the academic year.

- The **Academic Year Faculty Availability in the Summer work group** was formed at the 30 Apr 2010 organizational meeting and consisted only of Alex Blazer (CoAS). This work group
  - drafted and implemented a survey for faculty and organized the survey results [August 2010],
  - distributed a copy of the survey results as part of the report to the members of the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee at its 3 Sep 2010 meeting,
  - communicated the recommendations of the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee to the University Chairs Council at its 27 Oct 2010 meeting, and
  - **completed its work** by providing a written report on the 27 Oct 2010 University Chairs Council meeting for distribution to the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee at its 5 November 2010 meeting.
- The **Faculty Evaluation, Triggered Reviews of Department Chairs work group** was formed at the April 2010 organizational meeting and consisted of Sally Humphries (CoB) and Susan Steele (CoHS). This work group

- reported to the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee at its 1 Oct 2010 meeting receiving FAPC endorsement for the recommendations that the
  - committee deliberation of faculty evaluation be postponed indefinitely as faculty evaluation is under university-wide review at the department level during the 2010-2011 academic year,
  - triggered review of department chairs be focused on the development of a mechanism by which faculty could have an opportunity to inform the evaluation of academic administrators including department chairs,
- was asked by the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee during the 1 Oct 2010 committee meeting to review the existing Part IV Academic Administrator Evaluation Form,
- recommended to the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee at its 5 Nov 2010 committee meeting that the mechanism for faculty to have the opportunity to inform the evaluation of academic administrators have as its emphasis the providing of recommendations for professional development of the academic administrator rather than be an evaluation of the academic administrator. This recommendation resonated with and was endorsed by the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee and the work group was asked to continue its deliberation,
- **completed its work** by providing a report to the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee at its 4 Mar 2010 meeting receiving FAPC endorsement for the recommendations that
  - each member of FAPC educate her/his constituency that faculty have an opportunity to inform the evaluation of an academic administrator,
  - 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 and that care be taken to ensure confidentiality in the collection of this developmental feedback, and
  - the “Faculty Recommendations for Administrative Development” form be considered as a sample form by which this developmental feedback might be collected.

*Note: The formal motion articulation of these recommendations is provided as FAPC Motion 1 (4 Mar 2011) in the “Other Significant Deliberation” section of this report*

- The **Post-Tenure Review work group** was formed at the April 2010 organizational meeting and consisted of Lee Digiovanni (CoE), Mike Rose (CoAS), and Craig Turner (CoAS). This work group
  - reported to the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee at its 3 Sep 2010 meeting
    - providing a brief history of the emergence and development of post-tenure review within the University System of Georgia as well as the institution,
    - indicating the university system level guidance calls for post-tenure review to focus on professional development of the faculty member under review,
  - received a charge from the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee at the 3 Sep 2010 FAPC meeting to
    - expand the work group to include at least one representative from each academic unit (colleges and library),
    - review the post-tenure review language in the institution’s Academic Affairs Handbook ensuring clarity and a careful review of the appeal process,
  - reported to the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee at its 1 Oct 2010 meeting that the composition of this work group has been expanded as directed and that the work group consisted of Martha Colvin (CoHS), Nancy Davis Bray (Library) Lee Digiovanni (CoE), Ken Farr (CoB), Mike Rose (CoAS) and Craig Turner (CoAS).
  - reported to the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee at its 4 Nov 2010 meeting that the review was in progress but there were no formal work group recommendations for FAPC yet,
  - reported to the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee at its 3 Dec 2010 meeting that
    - the review was in progress but there were no formal work group recommendations for FAPC yet, and
    - a 1 Dec 2011 consultation with University Counsel (Marc Cardinalli) indicating that language regarding the disposition of documentation 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 not a legal question but rather an academic policy question. In other words, no decision or comments were warranted by Legal Affairs at that time.
  - reported to the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee at its 4 Mar 2011 meeting that

- the review of section 3.07.03.6 of the institution’s Academic Affairs Handbook is continuing to progress but there are no formal work group recommendations for FAPC yet,
- although working drafts of proposed revisions are still in development, dated snap shots of the working drafts are archived at the post-tenure review committee web presence linked from the FAPC website, and
- the work group expects to provide its recommendations at the 1 Apr 2011 FAPC meeting.
- reported to the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee at its 1 Apr 2011 meeting and
  - circulated a draft (8 Mar 2011) of the working document under review by the work group,
  - reported that the work group maintains a web presence accessible by following the “Post Tenure Review Work Group” link at the top of the FAPC web presence, and
  - offered for committee consideration a recommendation that this work group continue its work during April 2011 and provide an update to the 2011-2012 FAPC at its organizational meeting which is scheduled for 29 Apr 2011. This recommendation was endorsed by the committee members who were present.

## Committee Reflections:

**Tracking:** Tracking of the issues that merited ongoing committee deliberation throughout the year worked well.

**Operating Procedures:** The use of work groups, identification of possible agenda items at the organizational meeting to permit committee work groups the opportunity to convene during the summer, and tentative agenda with flexibility to consider “as they come” issues all worked well.

## Committee Recommendations:

### *Advice to the membership of the 2011-2012 Faculty Affairs Policy Committee*

**Use of Work groups:** The institution of work groups around various issues helped make committee meetings more productive. Continuing this practice is suggested in order to facilitate committee business.

**Committee Membership:** As membership is determined for committees each academic year, we recommend FAPC membership have as many continuing members as possible due to the complexity of the issues and need for a historical perspective as the committee deliberates.

**Advocacy role of FAPC:** Continue to advocate for faculty concerns.

#### **Pre-processing of Concerns Received by Committee:**

- A recommendation that an exploration of just how widely a concern that is submitted to the committee for its consideration extends [one faculty member, several faculty members] inform the committee deliberation of that concern. As one example, this practice was implemented during 2010-2011 by means of a survey to inform committee deliberation of the matter of “Academic Year Faculty Availability in the Summer.”
- A recommendation that the committee continue to respect the language in Article I Section 2 the University Senate bylaws, which is “*The University Senate strives to be mindful and respectful of matters that are more appropriately handled at the divisional, college, and department levels, but may make recommendations concerning matters within these areas that have broader institutional impact or implications.*”

### *Are there any issues that should be considered by this committee next year?*

**Required Language for Syllabi:** At the 18 Apr 2011 meeting of the University Senate, a recommendation from the floor was to review the increasing number of standardized statements that are required for inclusion on all course syllabi. Such statements include language regarding Learning Disabilities, Fire Drills, and possibly the Encouragement to Participate on Student Opinion Surveys Statement (as recommended by 2010-2011 FAPC). If the language of these statements is standardized for all course syllabi, what is the most efficient way of handling this language? Is there a centralized location where this “required” language is stored and accessible to faculty members? The response from the committee chair to this recommendation was that it would be passed on to the 2011-2012 FAPC for its consideration, which is why this matter is listed here.

## *Are there issues on which the 2010-11 FAPC was unable to complete its work?*

**Post-Tenure Review:** At the outset of the academic year, a work group was charged to review the Academic Affairs Handbook language on post-tenure review and return to the committee with recommendations on proposed revisions to this language. This work is still in progress and the work group requested permission to continue its work in April 2011 and provide a report to the 2011-2012 FAPC at its 29 Apr 2011 organizational meeting. Additional details are available in the Significant Deliberations section of this report.

## *Do any of the 2010-11 FAPC actions require follow-up?*

There are a number of matters which will be referenced here as “**open questions,**” to indicate that a conversation between the Provost and the committee is still in progress or “open” as the academic year ends. Some of these conversations were informed by committee recommendations formalized as advisory motions to the Provost. While each of these “open questions” are addressed in the Significant Deliberations section of this report, a summary annotated list of these “open questions” is provided here along with the suggestion that the 2011-2012 FAPC consider continuing these conversations with the Provost.

### **1. Academic Year Faculty Availability in the Summer**

- **Review of Letters:** Closing the loop on the review of letters at the department and academic unit level by department chairs and deans respectively for the presence of language communicating faculty expectations [such as advising, availability at orientations, summer accessibility of faculty to students, etc.] to the students. While there is a clear indication that the Provost requested deans to ensure these reviews were done within their unit, there was no closure to indicate that this review was completed [nor is there information to suggest this review is incomplete].
- **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.*
  - Consideration by the Provost in consultation with the Academic Deans of this motion is still in progress.

### **2. Desk Copies**

- **Library as a Clearinghouse:** At the final committee meeting of the academic year, a recommendation was made by the committee that the feasibility of the institution’s library serving as a clearinghouse for unwanted text books be explored. Ben Davis of the library who is also a 2010-11 FAPC member indicated his intention to explore this feasibility with his administrative chain and appropriate library personnel

### **3. Faculty Awards**

- The committee deliberation on this matter was receiving follow-up information on work done by the 2009-2010 FAPC. There are no open questions on this matter.

### **4. Faculty Evaluation, Triggering Review of Department Chairs**

- As of 1 Apr 2011, consideration of part (2) of the following motion by the Provost was in progress.  
*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.*

### **5. Post-Tenure Review**

- **Review of Academic Affairs Handbook:** A Post-Tenure Review Work Group was formed at the outset of the 2010-2011 and charged to review the post-tenure review language in the Academic Affairs Handbook. At the conclusion of the academic year, this review was still in progress and this work group intends to share information on its progress with the 2011-2012 FAPC at its organizational meeting on 29 Apr 2011.

## 6. Student Opinion Surveys: Average Rating Discrepancy (Concern)

- Committee deliberation was “closed” on this matter after its timely resolution; no open questions remain on this matter.

## 7. Student Opinion Surveys: Participation Rate (Concern)

- **Participation Rate:** Strategies that were anticipated to increase the participate rate of students on SOS were developed in consultation with Institutional Research, FAPC, SGA, and possibly others and implemented for the first time during the Spring 2011 semester. We recommend that the 2011-12 FAPC consider continuing to monitor this matter.

- **Review of SOS language in the Academic Affairs Handbook:** This motion was made at the 1 Apr 2011 meeting and forwarded by email to the Provost by the FAPC chair on 7 Apr 2011.

FAPC Motion 1 (1 Apr 2011) To recommend to the Provost that

(1) *the language in Section 3.07.03.3 of the institution’s Academic Affairs Handbook be updated to reflect the online delivery of the student opinion survey, with particular emphasis on items 1 and 5 of Section A as well as all of Section C.*

(2) *the modified language be sent back to this committee for review.*

- **SOS Informing Faculty Annual Evaluation:** This motion was made at the 1 Apr 2011 meeting

- FAPC Motion 2 (1 Apr 2011) To postpone consideration of FAPC Motion 1 (4 Feb 2011) (as amended) to be coincident with committee review of the modified language from Section 3.07.03.3 of the Academic Affairs Handbook indicated in part two of FAPC Motion 1 (1 Apr 2011).

- **FAPC Motion 1 (4 Feb 2011) (as amended):** To recommend to the Provost that student opinion survey results be used for both formative and summative faculty evaluation purposes

- **SOS Language on All Course Syllabi:** This motion was made at the 1 Apr 2011 meeting and forwarded by email to the Provost by the FAPC chair on 7 Apr 2011

a **motion** was made, seconded and approved, with no discussion, to endorse the wording of the second draft as amended [given below] and that this language be recommended for inclusion on all course syllabi.

**DRAFT two of syllabi proposed language as amended:** *Given the technological sophistication of Georgia College students, the student opinion survey is being delivered through an online process. Your constructive feedback plays an indispensable role in shaping quality education at Georgia College. All responses are completely confidential and your name is not stored with your responses in any way. In addition, instructors will not see any results of the opinion survey until after final grades are submitted to the University. An invitation to complete the online opinion survey is distributed to students near the end of the semester. Your participation in this very important process is greatly appreciated.*

## 8. Summer Pay: Academic Year Faculty / Extra Compensation

- **Extra Compensation:** During the 2010-2011 academic year, there was a conversation between USG/BoR and the Chief Academic Officers of all USG institutions regarding the possibility of modifying the procedure for providing employees “extra compensation” and possibly requiring contract modifications. At the last committee meeting of the academic year, the update on this matter was no new information was available on the extra compensation ruling from the USG/BoR and that current practice is expected to remain in effect until further notice. This is primarily here as a FYI notification from the 2010-2011 FAPC to the 2011-2012 FAPC.

- 4 Feb 2011: A question is raised (with no current resolution) concerning how extra compensation would affect the current 33-1/3% cap found in Section 8.3.12.3 of BoR policy

- **Tax Liability:** A concern was voiced to indicate that for some faculty, tax withholdings were distorted (extra large tax withholdings) with combined pay for teaching multiple sections. This was also the case for faculty who taught both Maymester and Summer I where the pay dates were the same day. In addition, this might also occur for faculty (or staff) receiving extra compensation during any pay period. The primary interest was seeking options for compensating such faculty (or staff) that would reduce the tax liability.

- Committee consideration and deliberation of this tax liability concern was deferred when the aforementioned extra compensation ruling from the USG/BoR was received by Chief Academic Officers of the USG as this extra compensation ruling was anticipated to impact the point of concern. In light of the aforementioned 1 Apr 2011 extra compensation ruling update – indicating that “current practice on extra compensation remains in effect until further notice” – the 2011-2012 FAPC may wish to reconsider this matter to see if there is any action that should be taken.

**Recommend items for consideration at the governance retreat:** None.

## **APPENDIX: Recognitions and Appreciation**

**Recognitions:** Each faculty members who served as a “volunteer” on the committee (faculty who did not serve as university senators during the 2010-2011 academic year) were awarded a certificate of recognition, complete with an impressive gold seal, signed by President Leland for their service on FAPC during the 2010-2011 academic year. The committee chair expressed appreciation to these faculty for their service and contributions to FAPC during the 2010-2011 academic year. Those recognized were Alex Blazer (CoAS), Ben Davis (Library), and Sally Humphries (CoB). Susan Steele (CoHS) was recognized in absentia and her certificate was delivered to her by the committee chair.

**Appreciation:** The committee chair expresses his appreciation to

- a. **each of the committee members** for their service and contributions to the work of the committee over the 2010-2011 academic year;
- b. **each of the committee work groups** for the time they spent between committee meetings to prepare drafts and recommendations for committee consideration;
- c. **the Secretary, Mike Rose**, for the care, diligence, and timely manner in which he prepared and posted the minutes of each meeting of the committee;
- d. **the Vice Chair, Lee Digiovanni**, for her guidance on continuing issues as she had chaired FAPC during the 2008-9 and 2009-10 academic years **and** for representing the committee at the 18 Feb 2011 joint meeting of standing committee chairs with the Executive Committee;
- e. **Associate Provost Ormond** for his increasingly active participation on the committee during the Spring 2011 semester as designee for Provost Jordan when she had a conflict with the meeting time culminating with him obtaining and providing the committee updates from the Provost for nearly every matter under committee consideration at the 1 Apr 2011 meeting;
- f. **Provost Jordan** for her gracious reception of each advisory motion from the committee and her timely responses and informational updates regarding progress on each of these motions to include the topics of
  - o **Academic Year Faculty: Summer Availability**
    - o reviews of letters to students at university, academic unit and department levels
    - o ensuring 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)
  - o **Desk Copies: Alternatives to Reselling**
  - o **Faculty Awards:** follow-up from and closure on the 2009-10 FAPC proposed revisions to language in the Academic Affairs Handbook
  - o **Faculty Evaluation / Triggered Department Chair Reviews:**, mechanism for faculty-informed academic administrative reviews
  - o **SOS: Average Ratings Discrepancy Concern:** communication with Institutional Research to facilitate a timely resolution
  - o **SOS: Participation Rate** update to faculty on actions to increase participation rate, language proposed for inclusion on all syllabi, all courses with ten or more surveyed, dissemination of student narratives (student responses),
  - o **Summer Pay / Extra Compensation:** informational updates and recommendation for consulting Ms. Susan Allen
- g. **Director of Payroll Services, Susan Allen**, for her diligence, persistence and ultimate success in finding a way to shift the Maymester pay date closer to the end of the Maymester [from July 1 to early June].