

Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC)

2011-2012 Annual Report

Submitted on Tuesday 24 April 2012

Due Date: Submit in MSWord format to ecus@list.gcsu.edu no later than 3:30 p.m. on Friday, 27 Apr 2012

Committee Name: Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC)

Academic Year: 2011-2012

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 (3:30-4:45).

MEETING DATE	TYPE OF MEETING
Friday 29 Apr 2011	Organizational Meeting to Elect Committee Officers
Friday 02 Sep 2011	Committee Meeting
Friday 07 Oct 2011	Committee Meeting
Friday 04 Nov 2011	Committee Meeting
Friday 02 Dec 2011	Committee Meeting
Friday 13 Jan 2012	Committee Meeting
Friday 03 Feb 2012	Committee Meeting
Friday 02 Mar 2012	Committee Meeting
Friday 06 Apr 2012	Committee Meeting

Executive Summary:

The committee membership included representatives from each of the academic colleges, a Presidential Appointee [Dean Baker (CoHS)] and a Chief Academic Officer designee [Provost Sandra Jordan]. 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 sixteen issues. For four of the issues [(1) Faculty Evaluation, (2) Pre-Tenure Review (3) Post-Tenure Review and (4) Student Opinion Survey Instrument Review], the committee deliberation was informed by work groups. The committee deliberated as a whole on the remaining twelve issues, eight of the issues [(1) Academic Year Faculty Contract Questions, (2) Faculty Voice: Presidential Search Committee, (3) Individual Faculty Report (Academic Year to Calendar Year) (4) Mission/Vision of CETL, (5) Standing Committee Officer Mentoring, (6) Syllabus (Required Statements), (7) Twelve-Month Pay Option for Academic Year Faculty, (8) Years of Service Recognition Lag] were from the list of tentative agenda items emerging at either the 29 Apr 2011 organizational meeting or the committee session of the 10 Aug 2011 governance retreat. Of the remaining four issues, one [(1) SACS Review Representative] was in response to a request by the Provost while the other three [(1) Academic Year Faculty Summer Course Pay (2) Common Meeting Time (Concern) (3) Digital Measures Questions] were constituency concerns. Considering issues from a faculty advocacy perspective, a seed planted for consideration of future FAPCs by the 2009-2010 FAPC and fertilized by the 2010-2011 FAPC with its many advisory motions to the Provost, is continuing to take root in committee deliberation of the 2011-2012 FAPC. This faculty advocacy perspective was most explicit in the committee deliberations of the Faculty Evaluation issue.

Committee Membership and Record of Attendance:

Name <i>EFS = Elected Faculty Senator</i>	29-Apr-2011	2-Sep-2011	7-Oct-2011	4-Nov-2010	2-Dec-2011	13-Jan-2012	3-Feb-2012	2-Mar-2012	6-Apr-2012	Present	Absent	Regrets
Dean Baker <i>Presidential Appointee (CoHS)</i>	Not yet named to FAPC	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	6	0	2
David Connolly <i>Volunteer (CoAS)</i>	Present	Present	Regrets	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	Absent	Present	6	1	2
Carrie Cook <i>EFS (CoAS), Secretary</i>	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	9	0	0
Victoria Deneroff <i>Volunteer (CoE)</i>	Not yet named to FAPC	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	6	0	2
David de Posada <i>EFS (CoAS), Vice-Chair</i>	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	Present	8	0	1
Sandra Jordan <i>Provost (CAO Designee)</i>	Present	Present	Regrets	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	Regrets	5	0	4
Karynne Kleine <i>Volunteer (CoE)</i>	Present	Present	Regrets	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	Present	7	0	2
Mary Magoulick <i>EFS (CoAS)</i>	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	Present	Regrets	7	0	2
Leslie Moore <i>EFS (CoHS)</i>	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	8	0	1
Holley Roberts <i>EFS (CoE)</i>	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	Regrets	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	6	0	3
Mike Rose <i>EFS (CoAS)</i>	Present	Present	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Absent	Present	Present	7	1	1
Craig Turner <i>EFS (CoAS), Chair</i>	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	Present	9	0	0
Mike Whitfield <i>EFS (CoB)</i>	Present	Present	Absent	Present	Regrets	Present	Present	Present	Present	7	1	1
Guests	Note that Karynne Kleine was named by 2010-2011 ECUS as the <i>Committee Officer Election Facilitator</i>	None	Tom Ormond <i>Associate Provost</i>	Jason Huffman <i>Director of Strategic Initiatives</i>	None	None	None	Tom Ormond <i>Associate Provost</i>	Tom Ormond <i>Associate Provost</i>	Averages		
Present	11	13	8	8	9	12	10	10	10	10.11		
Regrets	0	0	4	5	4	1	2	2	3	2.33		
Absent	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0.33		

Notes:

- Effective 10 Aug 2011, Dean Baker replaced Jason Huffman as the Presidential Appointee to FAPC. Jason Huffman did not attend the 29 April 2011 FAPC meeting.
- Effective 10 Aug 2011, Victoria Deneroff replaced Sally Humphries as the faculty volunteer to FAPC. Sally Humphries did not attend the 29 April 2011 FAPC meeting.

Committee Operating Procedures: (See pages 3-4)

2011-2012 FAPC OPERATING PROCEDURES

(ADOPTED by FAPC at its 2 Sep 2011 meeting, after which they were FILED with ECUS as called for by Article III Section 1 of the bylaws.)

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.

MEETINGS, CALL, NOTICE, QUORUM

IV.Section 6. Meetings. The standing committees, as listed in V.Section2.A.1, shall meet as needed throughout the year, including recesses between academic semesters, to facilitate the functioning of the University Senate. **The governance calendar designates meeting times for the standing committees throughout the academic year.**

IV.Section6.A. Call. In addition, **a meeting shall be called** by the standing committee chair within ten (10) calendar days of receiving a written request, which must include specification of the proposed purpose for such a meeting, from either (1) the Executive Committee or (2) at least twenty percent (20%) of the membership of the standing committee. **A meeting of a standing committee also may be called by** the University President, the Presiding Officer of the University Senate, or the chair of the standing committee. Individuals calling such a meeting should apply this responsibility judiciously, in particular, for a meeting scheduled during a recess between academic semesters.

IV.Section6.B. Notice. **Written notice of any meeting of a standing committee shall be distributed to every member of the standing committee** by the individual calling the meeting and made accessible to members of the University Senate at least three (3) calendar days prior to the meeting. Such notice shall include the date, time, location and agenda for the meeting.

IV.Section6.C. Quorum. A majority of the standing committee membership shall constitute a quorum.

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 will work cooperatively and respectfully on behalf of the faculty. To realize these goals, 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 (Article V, Section 2.B.2)
- The **Chair**
 - **Bylaws Responsibilities:**
 - Presents committee report to University Senate at scheduled University Senate meetings (Article II, Section 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, Section 3.B)
 - Meet regularly with the Executive Committee and other chairs to facilitate communication (Article V, Section 1.C.14)
 - Serve on the Subcommittee on Nominations (Article V, Section 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, Section 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
 - Committee web presence: http://info.gcsu.edu/intranet/univ_senate/SCs2011-2012/FAPC/index.htm
- **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 the 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. (Article IV, Section 6.C)
- **Voting**
 - **Voting Members:** Each of the thirteen members listed in the University Senate bylaws is a voting member of the committee.
 - **Voting Threshold:** 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.*
 - 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 2011-2012 academic year. That said, there were committee recommendations, some of which were formalized as *committee-level motions*. While one of these *committee-level motions* was directed to Interim President Preczewski [Twelve-Month Pay Option for Academic Year Faculty] as the committee exercised its advisory function to the administration, some committee recommendations were directed to external groups including the University Chairs Council [Individual Faculty Report (Academic Year to Calendar Year), Student Opinion Survey Instrument Review] and the Executive Committee of the University Senate [Academic Year Faculty Contract Questions, Common Meeting Time (Concern), Standing Committee Officer Mentoring, Years of Service Recognition Lag]. Details of committee deliberation and recommendations including the *committee-level 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 sixteen issues considered by this committee over the 2011-2012 academic year. These issues are divided into two categories based on deliberation time. The issues in each category are summarized below.

Issues with Significant Deliberation Time or Committed to Work Groups

These six issues are listed in alphabetical order by name and include an italicized annotation of **Work Group** [informed by a committee work group] or **Committee of the Whole** [considered as a committee of the whole]. Some of these issues are longstanding concerns of some university faculty [Twelve-Month Pay Option for Academic Year Faculty, Student Opinion Survey Instrument Review]. 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 timeline). In some cases, additional details are available in the committee minutes. The supporting documents associated with these topics that were distributed to the committee members are linked to the committee meeting agendas at the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee web presence.

1. Faculty Evaluation..... Work Group

- **Issue:** Academic year faculty should have meaningful and substantive involvement in issues relating to faculty evaluation including the selection of instruments used to assess faculty performance.
- **Significance:** This is a faculty advocacy issue and advocates for faculty primacy in matters pertaining to faculty evaluation.
- **Summary:** This issue was raised for consideration by the FAPC Student Opinion Survey Work Group as an extension of the position that academic year faculty be involved in the development and selection of instruments that serve as student opinion surveys to inform the assessment of teaching effectiveness. The work group offered the position that this role of faculty extend to instruments that are used to inform the evaluation and assessment of faculty performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The deliberation of this issue spanned the academic year and was introduced at the Sep 2011 meeting, postponed in Oct 2011, committed to the work group in Nov 2011 asking for the development of language appropriate for inclusion in a university manual. The first draft of the new language was discussed in Dec 2011, postponed in Jan 2012, and discussed further in Feb 2012 when the committee approved a motion to postpone consideration of this matter to the next meeting charging the student opinion survey work group to prepare at least one alternative version of the language for consideration by the committee. The second draft of the new language [called Draft 3] from the work group received committee consideration in Mar 2012. During that consideration, the Provost’s proxy, Associate Provost Tom Ormond, distributed a document from the Provost to the committee. This document from the Provost included (1) a summary of the Provost’s objections to previous drafts of the recommendation and (2) a suggestion

for an alternative approach for FAPC consideration. At the 06 Apr 2012 FAPC meeting, the committee received another draft resolution on this issue and recommended the three documents [the 02 Mar 2012 *Work Group Recommendation (Draft 3)*, the 02 Mar 2012 *Memo from Provost to FAPC*, the 06 Apr 2012 *Draft Resolution on Faculty Evaluation*] and the issue be forwarded to the 2012-2013 FAPC for its consideration.

○ **Details:**

- 02 Sep 2011: As part of its report to the committee, the FAPC Student Opinion Survey Work Group – Karynne Kleine (Chair), Carrie Cook, Craig Turner – recommended that meaningful involvement of faculty extend to faculty evaluation policy and procedures in general and not be limited to work with the University Chairs Council on student opinion surveys. Specifically, the work group *recommended that FAPC should put forward a motion to the effect that faculty should have meaningful and substantive involvement in issues related to faculty evaluation, including the selection and/or creation of instruments used to assess or evaluate faculty performance.* This recommendation was not formally acted upon (endorsed, not endorsed) by the full committee at this meeting. The Provost expressed concern about the language of the proposed motion noting that it does not specify explicitly what comes to FAPC for consideration and what should be considered through departments. The proposed motion may be too specific in its language and does not direct departments to support the culture of faculty involvement through discussion and recommendations that come forward from faculty to departmental chairs or deans or directly to the Provost for action. There was further discussion about whether this proposed motion is redundant with our current system of shared governance. The work group noted that its intent when authoring the proposed motion was to formalize the level of faculty involvement in decision-making that is currently evident in the culture of the university. A motion was made, seconded and approved to postpone further consideration of this matter to the next meeting of the committee given the allotted meeting time was nearly expired.
- 07 Oct 2011: The committee chair asked the committee if there should be further discussion about the action recommended by the student opinion survey work group that was introduced at the 02 Sep 2011 meeting. A motion to postpone consideration of this item to the 04 Nov 2011 FAPC meeting was made, seconded and approved given the allotted meeting time was nearly expired.
- 04 Nov 2011: The work group members offered rationale to the committee for this recommendation as a form of advocating for faculty voice in such matters and affording the faculty formal documentation in the institutional policy manual of the right to have this voice. As at previous FAPC meetings, committee members expressed concern about the wording of the recommendation and suggested avoiding language that was too broad or too specific. There was discussion about whether FAPC should forward this recommendation as presently worded in the form of a motion to the University Senate or if alternate language should be developed prior to being considered for submission as a motion to the University Senate. The work group members advocated for the development of alternate language indicating the current language had not been drafted with publication in the policy manual in mind. There were several suggestions made for revisions, including the inclusion of specific examples to illustrate the context in which faculty should have meaningful involvement, and wording revisions [revisions indicated in bold] such as “**Academic year** faculty should have meaningful and substantive involvement in **all** issues related to faculty evaluation.” There was further discussion about whether the wording in these suggested revisions was too broad or too specific. A motion charging the FAPC Student Opinion Survey Work Group (Karynne Kleine, Carrie Cook, Craig Turner) to prepare a revision of the language in this recommendation for FAPC consideration informed by the committee deliberation was made, seconded and approved.
- 02 Dec 2011: Carrie Cook reported that the work group revised the language in the original recommendation (provided as a supporting document linked to the agenda) and asked the committee to consider the revised language. The revised recommendation for committee consideration was “*Recognizing that faculty in the academy share responsibility for developing and upholding standards of professionalism in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, academic-year faculty shall actively participate in the determination and modification of policies governing faculty evaluation, and have meaningful and substantive involvement in reviewing and informing the development of procedures and practices appertaining. This includes but is not limited to the selection and/or creation of instruments used to assess or evaluate faculty performance.*” The Provost asked Carrie to identify the underlying issue this recommendation is addressing. Carrie responded that the work group sees this recommendation as a form of faculty advocacy. Provost Jordan indicated her view is that the University Senate (faculty) recommends policy but does not develop procedure. Some committee members expressed a concern that the proposed language “*reviewing and informing the development of procedures and practices appertaining*” seems to extend the role of faculty into the administrative

role of developing the procedures that implement policy. The FAPC Student Opinion Survey Work Group members present (Carrie Cook, Craig Turner) indicated that the work group's intent was to formalize the role of faculty in decision-making and acknowledged there can be a disconnect between intent and reception. A lively discussion ensued where FAPC members expressed varying opinions about the recommendation, including: agreement that the recommendation formalizes appropriate involvement by faculty, concern that it will create an unnecessary divide between faculty and administrators, concern about the wording of the language being too broad or too narrow, a desire to abandon the recommendation altogether given that its adoption would not significantly affect the existing university culture, concern that the recommendation is redundant given the formal mechanisms for faculty voice that currently exist, and identification of relevant language from the American Association of University Professors (section 5 of the AAUP *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*) and BOR policy (3.2.4 Faculty Rules and Regulations). There was discussion about how the recommendation, if adopted, would be put forward. The FAPC Student Opinion Survey Work Group members present (Carrie Cook, Craig Turner) indicated that the work group's deliberation focused its efforts on the development of the language rather than its final destination. Upon request, the committee chair offered possibilities for the committee's consideration (a motion to the University Senate or publication in the policy manual etc.). During discussion of this item, the time (4:45 pm) for adjournment was reached. The Chair reminded the committee that the committee operating procedures called for adjournment unless the committee votes to extend the meeting. In response, a motion was made to postpone further discussion of this item and postpone discussion of the remaining items on the agenda to the next meeting and to adjourn this meeting. This motion was seconded and approved.

- 13 Jan 2012: During the deliberation of the tentative agenda, a motion to amend the agenda so that item 5.A., "Student Opinion Survey Work Group Recommendation," become item 6.C. and to limit deliberation of this item to at most ten minutes was made, seconded and approved. Ultimately, consideration of this matter was postponed to the 03 Feb 2012 FAPC meeting as its consideration on the agenda was not reached prior to the FAPC meeting time expiring.
- 03 Feb 2012: Consideration of the 02 Dec 2011 draft of the work group recommendation continued. A member asked for classification of the recommendation as policy, procedure, or practice. A member of the work group indicated the opinion that the recommendation is policy and noted that although it is currently practice to involve faculty members in decisions about faculty evaluation, there is concern that one day it may not be practice. This work group member went on to say that the recommendation was intended to advocate for faculty and articulate the role of faculty in the consideration of matters pertaining to faculty evaluation. There was an alternative opinion that the policy is "faculty shall be evaluated" and that the recommendation is a statement of best practice, and that developing policy to control a practice is beyond the charge of this committee or the university senate. There was some discussion about making a motion to amend the policy from "faculty shall be evaluated" to say something to the effect of "faculty shall be evaluated, having meaningful and substantive involvement in faculty evaluation." Another member suggested that if the work group recommendation is a policy proposal, it should include language detailing the role of academic administrators [provost, deans, chairs] in faculty evaluation. At this point, a member of the committee observed the proximity to time for adjournment and as an alternative to revising the language as a committee of the whole, offered a motion to *postpone consideration of this matter to the next meeting charging the student opinion survey work group to prepare at least one alternative version of the language for consideration by the committee*. This motion was seconded and approved.
- 02 Mar 2012: Karynne Kleine, Chair of the FAPC Student Opinion Survey Work Group, provided a summary of the revised work group recommendation indicating that the change was to label the statement from the last meeting as a best practice -- rather than a policy or procedure -- and to recommend its inclusion in the institutional policies, procedures and practices manual. That is, the recommendation of the work group for committee consideration has been formalized as a motion *To recommend that the following language be placed in the "Faculty Review Philosophy and General Procedures (Part One)" section of the GC Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual: Best Practice in Faculty Evaluation: Recognizing that faculty in the academy share responsibility for developing and upholding standards of professionalism in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, academic-year faculty shall actively participate in the determination and modification of policies governing faculty evaluation, and have meaningful and substantive involvement in reviewing and informing the development of procedures and practices appertaining. This includes but is not limited to the selection and/or creation of instruments used to assess or evaluate faculty performance.* The work group -- consisting of Karynne Kleine, Carrie Cook and Craig Turner -- clarified that they did not have a specific recommendation about where exactly the best practice language might be included

within Part One of the manual, only that it should be titled as a “Best Practice”, not as a policy or procedure. Associate Provost Tom Ormond provided a document from the Provost regarding this matter. This document included (1) a summary of the Provost’s objections to previous drafts of the recommendation and (2) a suggestion for an alternative approach for FAPC consideration. A lively discussion regarding the work group recommendation and the alternative recommendation from the Provost ensued. Discussion points included: (a) a recommendation for “shall” in place of “should” in the suggested alternative language from the Provost; (b) a concern about the implications of the work group recommendation, indicating uncertainty about its future impact including the possibility of creating an “us versus them” environment between faculty and administrators; (c) a concern that administrators have a role in the faculty evaluation process; and (d) time was needed for FAPC members to carefully review the document received from the Provost. As part of the discussion a motion was made and seconded *to call the question and vote on the work group recommendation*. Before this motion could be voted on, the time (4:45 pm) for adjournment was reached. The Chair reminded the committee that the committee operating procedures called for adjournment unless the committee votes to extend the meeting. In response, a motion was made and seconded *to extend the meeting for a vote on the motion to call the question and vote*. The motion to extend the meeting was approved by a 5-4 vote. The vote to call the question failed on a 5-4 vote not reaching the 2/3 majority approval necessary to pass. Discussion on the main motion (the work group motion) was halted as the superseding motion *to adjourn the meeting* was made, seconded and approved with a 5-4 vote. Following the meeting, the document from the Provost was scanned to produce a pdf file and linked to the 2 Mar 2012 meeting agenda at the FAPC web presence.as a supporting document for item 6.C. The work group recommendation is also a supporting document for item 6.C of the 2 Mar 2012 meeting agenda.

- 06 Apr 2012: Karynne Kleine, Chair of the FAPC Student Opinion Survey Work Group, provided a document entitled *Draft Resolution on Faculty Evaluation* that she alone had drafted. She indicated that she made the recommendation a resolution, as previously suggested, and that it provides rationalization about why faculty should be involved in evaluation. There was agreement that this draft resolution be included in the information forwarded to the 2012-2013 FAPC in the committee annual report. Subsequent to the meeting, Karynne provided an updated version of this draft resolution as a replacement. This updated version of the *Draft Resolution on Faculty Evaluation* is linked to the 06 April 2012 FAPC agenda at the FAPC web presence. The committee recommended this issue be forwarded to the 2012-2013 FAPC for its consideration.

2. Individual Faculty Report (Academic Year to Calendar Year).....Committee of the Whole

- **Issue:** The issue is to consider whether the individual faculty report (IFR) submitted for annual faculty evaluation should be based on a calendar year rather than an academic year.
- **Significance:** This issue resonated with the committee members present at the 07 Oct 2011 meeting when FAPC agreed to commit to consideration of this issue during 2011-2012.
- **Summary:** This issue was added to the committee tentative agenda list at the FAPC session of the 10 Aug 2011 governance retreat and endorsed for consideration by the committee at its 07 Oct 2011 meeting. At the 13 Jan 2012 meeting, the committee approved two motions: one to *charge the FAPC Chair to inform the University Chairs Council (UCC) Chair that the members of the 2011-2012 FAPC (and not necessarily their constituencies) favor basing the IFR on a calendar year instead of an academic year* and the other to draft a FAPC position statement for circulation to faculty via academic deans. Mary Magoulick drafted this position statement in consultation with Lee Gillis (UCC Chair). At the 03 Feb 2012 meeting, the committee endorsed the FAPC position statement as amended and rescinded the *circulation to faculty via academic deans* clause from the 13 Jan 2012 motion. At the 02 Mar 2012 meeting, **committee activity on this issue concluded** by noting that the Provost circulated an email to university faculty announcing that the IFR reporting cycle will be converted from academic year to calendar year effective 2012-2013 indicating that this conversion was a recommendation from both the UCC and FAPC.
- **Details:**
 - 10 Aug 2011: At the governance retreat, the issue of Individual Faculty Report (Academic Year to Calendar Year) was added to the committee tentative agenda list during the FAPC session.
 - 07 Oct 2011: The committee reviewed its list of tentative agenda items and committed to considering this issue during the 2011-2012 academic year.
 - 04 Nov 2011: After brief consideration of pros and cons, discussion of whether to form a work group for this item was interrupted by the time to adjourn, resulting in postponement to the next meeting.

- 02 Dec 2011: This item was postponed to the 13 Jan 2012 FAPC meeting as its consideration on the agenda was not reached prior to the FAPC meeting time expiring.
- 13 Jan 2012: It was noted that the University Chairs Council was engaged in discussion about this item, specifically in the context of their administrative duties and calendars. Committee members discussed some options for addressing this item. Suggestions included: surveying faculty to determine which reporting year (academic or calendar) they prefer and why, reporting to faculty the advantages and disadvantages of both reporting year (academic and calendar) options and soliciting feedback, etc. There was a suggestion that Tom Ormond may be able to provide some specific information to the committee as he has been working with department chairs on this matter. The committee members discussed the benefits of offering faculty voice to those who are currently considering the matter. There was some discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of both the academic year and calendar year IFR. Though some committee members have consulted with their respective constituencies, not all departments at the institution are represented by members of the committee. Some of these members reported that the faculty they talked to are in favor of revising the process to be based on the calendar year. A motion to *charge the FAPC Chair to inform the University Chairs Council Chair that the members of the 2011-2012 FAPC (and not necessarily their constituencies) favor basing the IFR on a calendar year instead of an academic year* was made, seconded and approved. A motion to *draft a statement of the FAPC position and to have academic deans solicit faculty feedback from the faculty members in their respective academic units (colleges and the library)* was made, seconded, and approved. Mary Magoulick agreed to prepare a draft of this position statement in consultation with Lee Gillis, University Chairs Council Chair, and circulate it by email to FAPC members prior to the next FAPC meeting.
- 03 Feb 2012: An email with the position statement was circulated by Mary Magoulick for FAPC review prior to this meeting. In addition, supporting documents for the timeline offered in the position statement are linked to the meeting agenda at the FAPC web presence and indicate that the transition from calendar year to academic year occurred in two stages. There was some discussion among members about this issue. One committee member wondered why FAPC would solicit responses from faculty via the academic deans by providing its position statement. A concern was expressed that this approach appears to tell faculty what their opinion should be. There was discussion about the benefits of offering the Provost feedback from all concerned parties including department chairs, university faculty, and FAPC. Discussion ensued about the best way to solicit faculty feedback. Suggestions from FAPC members included sending faculty a survey asking for them to express a preference for academic year, a preference for calendar year or to indicate ambivalence. Another suggestion was having FAPC members discuss the issue with their respective constituencies (colleges, departments). A point was made that another faculty survey may not be prudent in light of the anecdotal perception that many faculty already feel overloaded with surveys. A motion to *amend the position statement by (1) removing the word “awkwardly” from the first bulleted item (2) changing the words “problems”, “current system”, “benefits”, and “switching” from upper case to lower case (3) eliminating the sentence “This survey is to solicit input from the faculty as a whole.”, to rescind the portion of the 13 January 2012 motion that read “to have academic deans solicit faculty feedback from the faculty members in their respective academic units (colleges and the library)”, and to endorse the draft position statement as amended as the FAPC position statement* was made, seconded, and approved. This position statement, as amended and endorsed, is attached to the 03 Feb 2012 meeting minutes as a supporting document.
- 02 Mar 2012: The Provost recently circulated an email to announce the conversion of the IFR from academic year to calendar year effective 2012-2013 noting that this recommendation had come to her from the University Chairs Council (UCC) and that FAPC had shared its endorsement of the conversion to the calendar year to inform the UCC deliberation. There was some discussion about faculty concerns voiced to committee members about the process of this decision. **This completes committee activity on this issue.**

3. Post-Tenure Review (Post-TR) **Work Group**

- **Issue**: This issue arose from a concern about the post-tenure review appeal process and broadened to review the post-tenure review language in the institution’s policies, procedures, and practices manual (the language was in the former Academic Affairs Handbook that became part of this manual) and to prepare recommendations for committee consideration.
- **Significance**: This issue emerged as a follow-up from the 2010-2011 FAPC and resonated with the committee members present at the 29 Apr 2011 organizational meeting.

- **Summary:** This issue was discussed at the 02 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. The 2010-2011 FAPC formed a work group to review the Post-TR language. At the 29 Apr 2011 organizational meeting, the 2011-2012 FAPC endorsed the continuation of the work group during the 2011-2012 academic year in consultation with the committee. The work group reported its progress at the Sep 2011, Oct 2011, Nov 2011, Jan 2012, and Mar 2012 meetings with its final recommendations provided 06 Apr 2012 at the final meeting of the academic year. At the 06 Apr 2012 FAPC meeting, the committee recommended this issue be forwarded to the 2012-2013 FAPC for its consideration.
- **Website:** The work group has a website, linked from the 2011-2012 FAPC website, at which supporting documents that informed its work and working drafts of the proposed revisions can be found. In short, this website documents the work group activity.
- **Details:**
 - 29 Apr 2011: Mike Rose, Chair of the 2010-2011 Post Tenure Review Work Group, provided a report to the 2011-2012 FAPC (supporting document linked to the meeting agenda) at this organizational FAPC meeting to indicate the status of the effort. In short, the work group had not completed its review but had made good progress. A lively discussion ensued regarding the supporting document and work group report and the discussion offered the work group feedback on its work to this point. Specific guidance included recommendations that the purpose of Post-TR be both formative and summative and from some committee members that upper academic administration, specifically the dean and provost, should receive detailed reports rather than just notification that the process has been completed. At the conclusion of this discussion, the 2011-2012 FAPC endorsed the formation of a 2011-2012 FAPC Post-TR work group and charged this group to continue the work from 2010-2011 and prepare recommendations for committee consideration. Mike Rose will continue to serve as work group chair and the work group is charged with ensuring that its membership remain in compliance with the membership requirements from 2010-2011 which were the inclusion of at least one member from each academic unit (colleges, library).
 - 02 Sep 2011: The committee received an oral report from the work group that
 - a subset of its membership met once since the 29 Apr 2011 FAPC meeting and continued its review of the post-tenure language in the university policy manual (formerly in the academic affairs handbook).
 - the University of West Georgia (UWG) recently revised its post-tenure review language and so the work group will inform its deliberation with the UWG language.
 - it will ensure that it has at least one active member representing each college and the library.
 - 07 Oct 2011: The committee received an oral report from the work group that it will
 - meet on 18 Oct 2011 to continue its deliberation,
 - inform its work with a review of the post-tenure review language recently adopted by the University of West Georgia.
 - 04 Nov 2011: While consideration of this item was postponed to the next FAPC meeting, a written update was provided by the work group chair (Mike Rose) to the committee prior to the meeting and is included here.
 - *The committee met last on October 18, 2011. A review of the University of West Georgia (UWG) post-tenure document was conducted, with inconclusive results. As the nature of UWG's procedures (as delineated in their official document) differed significantly from the current GC process for post-tenure review, a recommendation was made to expand the review to those in use at other USG institutions. The UWG post-tenure document was not a recent revision as was once believed.*
 - *An effort was made to repopulate several work group seats in an effort to provide adequate representation across the faculty, meaning to have at least one representative from each college and the library. Jeanne Sewell will represent the College of Health Sciences, while the identification of representatives from the College of Education and the Library are in progress. Active members of the committee include Ken Farr representing the College of Business and Mike Rose and Craig Turner representing the College of Arts & Sciences.*
 - 02 Dec 2011: The Post-TR work group update was postponed to the 13 Jan 2012 FAPC meeting as its consideration on the agenda was not reached prior to the FAPC meeting time expiring.
 - 13 Jan 2012: The work group chair (Mike Rose) provided a report to the committee that the Post-TR work group had to be reconstituted as they lost some members who had served during the 2010-2011

academic year. The work group is presently seeking and reviewing models for post-tenure review that are being used at other institutions in the University System of Georgia.

- 03 Feb 2012: The Post-TR work group update was postponed to the next FAPC meeting.
- 02 Mar 2012: The work group chair (Mike Rose) indicated that this work group had not met since the 03 Feb 2012 FAPC meeting so there was no new information to provide FAPC relative to the deliberations of this work group.
- 06 Apr 2012: There was no update given by the Post-TR work group at this meeting. The committee recommended this issue be forwarded to the 2012-2013 FAPC for its consideration.

4. Pre-Tenure Review (Pre-TR) *Work Group*

- **Issue**: The issue is to review the pre-tenure review language in the institution's policies, procedures, and practices manual (the language was in the former Academic Affairs Handbook that became part of this manual) and to prepare recommendations for committee consideration.
- **Significance**: This issue resonated with the committee members present at the 7 Oct 2011 meeting when FAPC agreed to commit to consideration of this issue during 2011-2012.
- **Summary**: This issue emerged at the 29 Apr 2011 organizational meeting as a tentative agenda item for 2011-2012. At the 13 Jan 2012 FAPC meeting, a FAPC Pre-Tenure Review work group was formed and charged to review the Pre-TR language and prepare recommendations for committee consideration. The work group reported its progress at the Feb 2012 and Mar 2012 meetings with its final recommendations provided 06 Apr 2012 at the final meeting of the academic year. At the 06 Apr 2012 FAPC meeting, the committee recommended this issue be forwarded to the 2012-2013 FAPC for its consideration.
- **Details**:
 - 29 Apr 2011: At this organizational meeting, the issue of review of the Pre-Tenure Review (Pre-TR) language in the Academic Affairs Handbook (subsequently moved to the University Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual) was proposed as a tentative agenda item for consideration by the 2011-2012 FAPC.
 - 07 Oct 2011: Committee members expressed the opinion that this is a worthwhile item to include on the FAPC agenda, but that it might be prudent to complete the review of the post-tenure review language, currently in-progress, before undertaking a review of the language of pre-tenure review.
 - 04 Nov 2011: Committee deliberation focused on the timing of this review and whether to wait for the current post-tenure language review to conclude, with no committee consensus emerging.
 - 02 Dec 2011: Consideration of Pre-TR was postponed to the 13 Jan 2012 FAPC meeting as its consideration on the agenda was not reached prior to the FAPC meeting time expiring.
 - 13 Jan 2012: Committee members discussed whether to form a work group to examine this agenda item. There was discussion about the purpose of pre-tenure review and distinguishing the process of pre-tenure review from the process of post-tenure review. A motion to *form a FAPC Pre-Tenure Review Work Group consisting of at least one faculty member of each academic college and the library and charged to review the pre-tenure language in the university policies, procedures, and practices manual and prepare recommendations on proposed revisions (if any) to the pre-tenure language for FAPC review* was made, seconded and approved. During the deliberation of this motion, some of the FAPC members volunteered to serve on this work group. Specifically, Victoria Deneroff (College of Education) volunteered to chair this work group while Leslie Moore (College of Health Sciences) and Mike Whitfield (College of Business) volunteered to serve as members. Victoria Deneroff will seek at least one representative from the College of Arts & Sciences faculty and at least one representative from the Library faculty to serve as members of this work group.
 - 03 Feb 2012: The work group chair (Victoria Deneroff) indicated that the work group had not yet met.
 - 02 Mar 2012: The work group chair (Victoria Deneroff) indicated that this work group is still being constituted and that she has made a request of academic deans to provide her a representative for their academic units.
 - 06 Apr 2012: There was no update given by the Pre-TR work group at this meeting. The committee recommended this issue be forwarded to the 2012-2013 FAPC for its consideration.

5. Student Opinion Survey Instrument Review *Work Group*

- **Issue**: A concern was expressed about the psychometrics of the questions in use on the current Student Opinion Survey (SOS) form.

- **Significance:** This matter has been a longstanding concern by various university faculty and was already under consideration by the University Chairs Council at the time it emerged as a concern and resonated with the committee members present at the 29 Apr 2011 organizational meeting of FAPC.
- **Summary:** The committee formed a work group (Karynne Kleine, Carrie Cook, and Craig Turner) to coordinate with the University Chairs Council (UCC) Chair (Lee Gillis) to determine the status of and advocate for faculty voice in their review of commercial student opinion surveys that are nationally normed with published measures of validity and reliability. This work group recommended the formation of a work group populated by UCC and FAPC members which was independently implemented by the UCC. The UCC work group (Chair Lee Gillis, Members: Indiren Pillay, Bill Fisher, Stephen Auerbach, Carrie Cook, Julia Metzker, and Craig Turner) recommendations were endorsed by the UCC on 17 Feb 2012 and recommended to Provost Jordan for consideration. At the 06 Apr 2012 FAPC meeting, Associate Provost Tom Ormond indicated that there was no update on this item.
- **Details:**
 - 29 Apr 2011: A concern about the psychometrics of the current questions on the SOS instrument was expressed. The Provost indicated that the University Chairs Council was asked to review the existing SOS instrument and consider the adoption of a new instrument for which the questions have documented reliability and validity. Some FAPC members expressed a desire that academic year faculty have a voice in this review and FAPC constituted a work group consisting of Carrie Cook, Karynne Kleine, Craig Turner and charged this work group to coordinate with Lee Gillis (Chair of the 2011-2012 University Chairs Council) regarding this matter and prepare recommendations for FAPC consideration.
 - 02 Sep 2011: There was an earlier recommendation by FAPC that representatives of FAPC meet with a representative of the University Council of Chairs (Chairs Council) to determine the status of and advocate for faculty voice in their review of commercial student opinion surveys that are nationally normed with published measures of validity and reliability. The members of this work group – Karynne Kleine, Craig Turner, and Carrie Cook – met with Lee Gillis from the Chairs Council and *suggested that a work group of 6-10 members, the majority faculty and the minority from Chairs Council, be formed to continue to work on this matter.* This recommendation was not formally acted upon (endorsed, not endorsed) by the full committee at this meeting.
 - 07 Oct 2011: A work group reporting to the University Chairs Council was formed and is gathering information about commercial student opinion survey instruments that are nationally-normed with published measures of validity and reliability. There are six options on which information is being gathered: CIEQ, SIRII (ETS), IDEA, CourseEval, eXplorance, Scantron. This work group is currently populated by members of the University Chairs Council (Lee Gillis (chair), Steve Auerbach, Bill Fisher, Indiren Pillay) and members of FAPC (Carrie Cook, Karynne Kleine, Craig Turner). Karynne Kleine has requested that another faculty member be considered in her place on this work group. Julia Metzker was nominated as Karynne Kleine's replacement. The committee members present at this meeting unanimously endorsed this nomination. A committee member requested that the work group consider whether questions added to any adopted instrument might be customizable by the department or if the university will have its own customized questions.
 - SOS Participation Rates: Prior to the 07 Oct 2011 FAPC meeting, the committee chair had emailed the committee with information, including supporting documents providing data and a narrative report on the data, about student opinion survey participation rates for spring 2009 through spring 2011. The data provide the student opinion survey participation rates at the university, college, and department levels and show a significant drop in participation rates in the first semester (fall 2009) of the on-line administration of the student opinion surveys followed by additional changes (mostly downward) in participation rates through the fall 2010 semester. A significant increase in participation rate occurred from fall 2010 to spring 2011 when several strategies to increase participation rates were implemented. As an illustration, the overall university participation rates for this period were **67.2%** (spring 2009, paper-n-pencil) **45.1%** (fall 2009-online) **34.6%** (spring 2010-online) **33.1%** (fall 2010-online) **49.3%** (spring 2011-online). The reports were prepared by Institutional Research for the Provost and shared by the Provost with FAPC to inform the FAPC (and ultimately UCC) student opinion survey work groups. These informational documents are linked to the agenda of the 7 Oct 2011 FAPC meeting and are accessible at the FAPC website.
 - 04 Nov 2011: The committee was informed that Julia Metzker accepted the nomination and was now serving as a member of the University Chairs Council Student Opinion Survey Work Group.

- 02 Dec 2011 The University Chairs Council Student Opinion Survey Work Group would meet again in Jan 2012 and was still in the process of gathering information about surveys from some of the companies [CIEQ, SIRII (ETS), IDEA, CourseEval, eXplorance, Scantron], including information on cost and survey questions. The Provost noted that the charge of this work group was to follow up on faculty concerns (originally reported to the University Chairs Council) that the current SOS was not reliable or adequate by comparing the currently used (locally produced) SOS to several nationally vetted surveys. The result of the review would be a report to the provost on the veracity of the concerns over the reliability of the current SOS. Additionally, while collecting and reviewing sample student surveys, the provost requested that the work group collect information on the cost of the professionally prepared instruments. Provost Jordan indicated that once the report is turned into her, there will be a need to determine what, if any, additional work is needed. If the report suggests the need for a change in the SOS, a larger, more representative group (with appropriate constituent representatives) will need to be formed to move the project to the next level. If the group indicates no significant difference exists between survey instruments, there may be no need for additional discussion or action.
- 13 Jan 2012: Consideration of work group update was postponed to the 03 Feb 2012 FAPC meeting as its consideration on the agenda was not reached prior to the FAPC meeting time expiring.
- 03 Feb 2012: Consideration of the work group update was not on the agenda of this meeting.
- 02 Mar 2012: This work group (Chair Lee Gillis, Members: Indiren Pillay, Bill Fisher, Stephen Auerbach, Carrie Cook, Julia Metzker, and Craig Turner) had finalized its report which was submitted to the University Chairs Council (UCC) for consideration at its 17 Feb 2012 meeting. The UCC endorsed this report including the recommendations and recommended the report for consideration by the Provost. This work group report is linked to the 02 Mar 2012 FAPC meeting agenda at the FAPC web presence. No one present at this meeting was aware of the Provost's actions (if any) on this report. Tom Ormond indicated that he would request an update on this matter from the Provost.
- 06 Apr 2012: Associate Provost Tom Ormond indicated that there was no update on this item.

6. Twelve-Month Pay Option for Academic Year Faculty*Committee of the Whole*

- **Issue:** The addition of an alternative (such as 12-month pay) option to the existing 10-month pay for academic year faculty with the understanding that each individual faculty member would be able to independently select the alternative option or continue under the current 10-month pay option.
- **Significance:** This matter has been a longstanding desire by some university faculty dating back to the time when ten equal monthly installments for academic year faculty was instituted as semester conversion was implemented in fall 1998.
- **Summary:** This issue emerged at the 29 Apr 2011 organizational meeting as a tentative agenda item for 2011-2012 and was confirmed as an agenda item on 07 Oct 2011. On 13 Jan 2012 a committee motion proposing the addition of 12-month pay as an option to 10-month pay was forwarded to Interim President Preczewski who responded orally at the 10 Feb 2012 joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and Executive Committee and in writing on 14 Feb 2012 via campus mail. On 25 Feb 2012, the University System of Georgia Faculty Council (USGFC) – a faculty advisory group to the USG Chancellor – endorsed a resolution advocating for 12-month pay as an option to 10-month pay for academic year faculty. At its 3 Mar 2012 meeting, the committee adopted a wait and see posture on this matter until more information about a response by the USG Chancellor to the USGFC resolution is available. A related matter – bimonthly pay for faculty – has been intermittently considered by centralized payroll (Shared Services) during the 2011-2012 academic year. At its 03 Feb 2012 meeting, a request from Susan Allen to express a faculty opinion on bimonthly pay to inform centralized payroll deliberation was considered and deferred until the response from Interim President Preczewski to the 13 Jan 2012 committee motion was received and deferred again at the 02 Mar 2012 meeting as more detail about the bimonthly pay proposal (e.g. 20 checks over 10 months or 24 checks over 12 months) was desired by some members of the committee. At the 06 Apr 2012 meeting, a motion was made, seconded, and approved to consider 12-month pay for academic year faculty closed.
- **Details**
 - 29 Apr 2011: The possibility of academic year faculty being given the option to have their compensation dispersed over the entire calendar year (twelve monthly paychecks) rather than the current system of ten monthly paychecks is an item that has been considered over many years. Given that a University System of Georgia committee is reviewing compensation of faculty and staff and

that the recently implemented ADP system is still in flux, it might be meaningful to continue the dialogue to explore the feasibility of introducing the “12-month pay” of faculty as an option to the “10-month pay” that is presently the ONLY option available to academic year faculty.

- 07 Oct 2011: The committee expressed interest in keeping this item on the agenda. There has been ongoing interest in this issue from faculty and several previous efforts to gather information and make recommendations about the issue. Information was provided that there is preliminary consideration by centralized payroll that all USG employees (faculty and staff) be paid twice a month. It is not clear how likely this is to actually be implemented but it is receiving consideration at this time.
- 04 Nov 2011: Consideration of this matter was postponed to the 02 Dec 2011 FAPC meeting as its consideration on the agenda was not reached prior to the FAPC meeting time expiring.
- 02 Dec 2011: Consideration of this matter was postponed to the 13 Jan 2012 FAPC meeting as its consideration on the agenda was not reached prior to the FAPC meeting time expiring.
- 13 Jan 2012: The committee was reminded that there is preliminary consideration by centralized payroll administrators that all USG employees (faculty and staff) be paid twice a month. There was some discussion about whether it would be productive for FAPC to take a position on this matter if it is being considered at the system level. There was a suggestion that FAPC request information from the institutional administration regarding this matter. A motion to *charge the FAPC Chair to send to Interim President Stas Preczewski a statement that the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee recommends that academic year faculty have the option of being paid according to a 10-month schedule or a 12-month schedule* was made, seconded and approved. Following the meeting, a 10-month faculty pay question and answer document prepared by President Leland in 2005 was linked to the meeting agenda at the FAPC web presence.
- 03 Feb 2012: The committee was awaiting a response from the interim president, Stas Preczewski, about the 13 Jan 2012 FAPC recommendation that *academic year faculty have the option of being paid according to a 10-month schedule or a 12-month schedule*. Interim President Preczewski had responded by email to acknowledge his receipt of the request and his intent to look into this matter. Craig Turner provided the committee a document that summarized an email conversation with Susan Allen on this matter in which she requested FAPC feedback on how faculty would feel about the bimonthly payment possibility as it’s back on the Shared Services Committee (SSC) agenda. After some discussion about bimonthly pay, several members of FAPC expressed their impression that faculty are most interested in the addition of the 12-month pay option to the current 10-month pay option. FAPC agreed to postpone a discussion about bimonthly pay until the aforementioned response from the interim president is received. The committee chair was charged to relay this information to Susan Allen on behalf of the committee. Following the meeting, the aforementioned document summarizing the email conversation with Susan Allen was linked to the meeting agenda.
- 02 Mar 2012: An oral response from Interim President Preczewski was received at the 10 Feb 2012 joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and Executive Committee. This response included the question *Why would faculty want the university to hold their money?* as well as an indication that the anticipated cost to introduce a 12-month pay option for academic year faculty into the ADP system could exceed \$100,000. This cost estimate was based on the fact that a much simpler change to ADP requested by Georgia State University cost in excess of \$60,000. Unless other institutions in the USG requested the modification, the full cost (possibly in excess of \$100,000) of the ADP modification to introduce a 12-month pay option for academic year faculty could be absorbed solely by Georgia College. It was also indicated that precise cost estimates for modifications to ADP are usually provided at a substantive cost. The 25 Feb 2012 University System of Georgia Faculty Council (USGFC) resolution on this matter was provided at this point and was to *allow 10-month-contract faculty and staff the option to be paid over a 12-month period and/or to be paid semimonthly*. When Craig Turner met with Susan Allen after the USGFC meeting, she indicated that if the USGFC is recommending this issue as a USG change, then perhaps Georgia College should adopt a wait-and-see posture on this matter until the response from the USG Chancellor to the USGFC resolution was known. It was noted that the aforementioned anticipated cost of \$100,000 would likely be spread across the USG institutions or absorbed by the USG if the USGFC resolution were to be accepted by the USG Chancellor and implemented. There was concern expressed by some FAPC members about the significant cost to Georgia College if the institution pursued this change on its own indicating that there are likely other initiatives that could be supported by these funds that would take priority over the implementation of the introduction of a 12-month pay option for academic year faculty. There was further discussion about whether the committee is ready to make a recommendation to Susan Allen regarding the bimonthly pay option under consideration by Shared Services without more information. There was further discussion about whether FAPC members should poll their constituents about the bimonthly option without more information (e.g., whether this is an optional or

mandatory change, etc.). Members recommended asking Susan Allen to attend the 06 Apr 2012 FAPC meeting only if she has specific details about the proposed bimonthly pay option for academic year faculty being considered by Shared Services including if this would mean 20 paychecks over 10 months or 24 paychecks over 12 months. The committee agreed to adopt a wait-and-see posture on the further pursuit of the 12-month pay option for academic year faculty until more information was available about the USG Chancellor response to the aforementioned USGFC resolution. The committee further agreed to defer a position statement on the bimonthly pay until more details about the Shared Services bimonthly proposal were available.

- 07 Mar 2012: The committee chair (Craig Turner) sent the committee an email to indicate that a response memo from Interim President Preczewski dated 14 Feb 2012 was delivered via campus mail to his department inbox and that he did not see this memo until this morning. This response memo is linked to the agenda of the 06 Apr 2012 FAPC meeting.
- 06 Apr 2012: A motion was made, seconded, and approved to consider 12-month pay for academic year faculty closed.

Issues Considered Briefly or Committed to ECUS

This section of the report documents the ten issues that were considered briefly or committed to the Executive Committee for steering. Six of these issues are listed in alphabetical order by name, while the remaining four are bundled together in item six below. Each of these items includes an italicized annotation of *Considered Briefly* [an issue that did not consume much committee deliberation time] or *Committed to ECUS* [sent to the Executive Committee for steering or clarification]. For each issue, the information provided here includes fields for the **Issue** (a description of the issue), **Summary** (a summary of the committee deliberation), and **Details** (deliberation details as a timeline). In some cases, additional details are available in the committee minutes. The supporting documents associated with these topics that were distributed to the committee members are linked to the committee meeting agendas at the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee web presence.

1. Academic Year Faculty Contract Questions..... *Committed to ECUS*

- **Issue**: The issue posed questions pertaining to the duration (9-month, 10-month) and the process that determines the start and end dates of contracts for academic year faculty.
- **Summary**: This issue was added to the tentative agenda list for FAPC during the committee session of the 10 Aug 2011 governance retreat. At the 02 Sep 2011 meeting, a committee member posed questions on academic year contracts. The questions were
 - How are the start date and end date on academic year faculty contracts determined/selected?
 - Do academic year faculty have 9-month or 10-month contracts?

On 05 Oct 2011, committee members were copied on an informational email from the Provost to Presiding Officer Jan Clark answering questions about contracts including the two questions posed by the committee. This email is linked to the agenda of the 07 Oct 2011 meeting at the FAPC web presence. At the 07 Oct 2011 meeting, the committee agreed to curtail its deliberation on this matter and routed the matter to ECUS for steering as it was also being considered by the Academic Policy Committee (APC). In Nov 2011 and Dec 2011, the committee received informational updates from David de Posada who consulted with ECUS on the matter at the October and Nov 2011 joint meetings of Standing Committee Chairs and ECUS. The update from the October joint meeting was that ECUS would gather information to inform its steering of this issue while the update of the Nov 2011 joint meeting was that ECUS had steered this matter to itself and historical data of start and end dates from semester conversion (Aug 1998) to the present was provided. This historical data is linked to the agenda of the 02 Dec 2011 meeting at the FAPC website. **The update received at the 02 Dec 2011 meeting completed committee activity on this issue.**

- **Details**:
 - 10 Aug 2011: At the governance retreat, the issue of start/end dates for faculty contracts was added to the committee tentative agenda list during the FAPC session.
 - 02 Sep 2011: The committee considered academic year faculty contracts including interest in the process by which the start date and end date are determined and whether academic year faculty have 9-month or 10-month contracts. Anecdotal information is that since semester conversion (Fall 1998)

the start date has been consistently August 1 while the end date has varied from May 4 to May 14 and in recent years the end date has been in close proximity to the date that spring grades are due. The Provost indicated that according to the information she has, if the start date was adjusted from August 1 to a later date in August, a proration for the August paycheck would be necessary. There are references in University System of Georgia policy and procedure manuals of such contracts as 9-month, 10-month and academic year contracts. The current institutional policy manual indicates that conversion from academic year to fiscal year contracts for faculty is accomplished by multiplying the base salary by 1.2. This practice supports the position that academic year faculty have 10-month contracts as the conversion factor of 1.2 is the ratio of twelve months to ten months. The Provost indicated her perception that the University System of Georgia centralized payroll systems consider academic year faculty as 10-month employees and that faculty have been 10-month employees since the institution shifted from the quarter system to the semester system.

- 05 Oct 2011: The committee was copied on an email with subject “questions about contracts” from the Provost to Jan Clark, Presiding Officer of the University Senate. In this email, the Provost addressed questions about academic year faculty contracts that had come to her attention including the two questions posed at the 02 Sep 2011 FAPC meeting. This email is linked to the meeting agenda of the 07 Oct 2011 FAPC meeting at the FAPC web presence.
- 07 Oct 2011: The Academic Policy Committee (APC) is also discussing academic year faculty contract start dates. The committee asked David de Posada to submit this item to Executive Committee for steering at the 14 Oct 2011 meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and Executive Committee as presently it is being considered by both APC and FAPC. There was also some discussion that the nature of the original FAPC inquiry was a curiosity question seeking information on the process by which the start/end dates for academic year contracts are determined and an opinion expressed that the Provost’s 05 Oct 2011 email response was informative and comprehensive in answering the questions from the previous committee deliberation on this matter. Some committee members expressed the opinion that consideration of this item should no longer be on the FAPC agenda for 2011-2012. The committee decided to conclude its consideration of this item until the committee is asked to further consider the item by either one of its members or by the Executive Committee.
- 04 Nov 2011: In his update on the 14 Oct 2011 joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and Executive Committee. David de Posada reported that no representative of the APC was present at the joint meeting and that there was some discussion about whether APC had ever had this item on their agenda. Members of the University Senate who were present at this FAPC meeting recalled that during the 23 Sep 2011 University Senate meeting, the APC Chair indicated that the issue had been discussed by APC. In fact, the APC report in the 23 Sep 2011 University Senate minutes documents that the APC Chair did report confusion over the return to work date for faculty and that the item was being added to the ECUS agenda in two weeks (7 Oct 2011). As the 14 Oct 2011 joint meeting ended before this issue was definitively steered to APC or FAPC, David indicated, at the request of members of FAPC, that he would seek clarification of the steering of this item during the next joint meeting scheduled for 11 Nov 2011.
- 02 Dec 2011: In his update on the 11 Nov 2011 joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and Executive Committee. David de Posada reported the faculty contract issue would be considered by ECUS. David also reported that at this meeting, historical data was provided giving academic year faculty contract start/end dates from the years 1998-2012. For each of these years, the contract start date for academic year faculty has always been August 1 while end dates have varied between May 4 and May 14 and in recent years are set in close proximity to the due date for spring semester grades. This historical data linked to the meeting agenda of the 02 Dec 2011 FAPC meeting at the FAPC web presence David also stated that ECUS will review standing committee charges in the University Senate bylaws. **This 02 Dec 2011 update completed committee activity on this issue.**

2. Academic Year Faculty Summer Course Pay*Considered Briefly*

- **Issue:** The issue was a concern about the pay rate for summer teaching, specifically noting that while not meeting an enrollment threshold resulted in a proration, exceeding this threshold did not result in a bonus.
- **Summary:** At the 02 Sep 2011 meeting, a committee member expressed a constituency concern regarding summer pay rates. After some deliberation, the committee observed that colleges have flexibility in summer course pay. The committee member was encouraged to recommend that the constituency explore making modifications at the college level noting that FAPC could consider this

matter further should there be a proposed revision that would apply to all university faculty. **This conversation at the 02 Sep 2011 meeting completed committee activity on this issue.**

○ **Details:**

- 02 Sep 2011: A committee member expressed a concern from constituents regarding the way that faculty who have an academic year contract and teach at least one summer course are compensated. The standard pay rate is 9% of base pay for a three-hour course taught in the summer. While faculty can be prorated and receive less than this if a certain threshold of students is not achieved (this threshold is a function of the base pay of the individual faculty member), there is no bonus for teaching a course when the number of students exceeds this threshold. It was noted that during the 2010-2011 academic year, the College of Arts & Sciences developed a summer teaching compensation system that included offering a bonus for exceeding the enrollment threshold and that this system was implemented for summer 2011 courses. This illustrated that modifying the summer teaching compensation system at the college level was one way to address the concern and this approach was recommended for consideration by the faculty constituency. It was noted that this matter could be revisited by FAPC at a future meeting if there were recommendations for proposing revisions to summer pay that would apply to all university faculty. **This completed committee activity on this issue.**

3. Common Meeting Time (Concern) Committed to ECUS

- **Issue:** The issue was a concern that the change to the common meeting time that took effect in fall 2011 – a shift from Monday 12:20-1:50 and Friday 12:20-1:50 to Friday 2:00-5:00 – seems to make scheduling meetings for groups not designated in the governance calendar more challenging.

- **Summary:** This concern emerged at the 03 Feb 2012 meeting. The committee chair was asked to consult with the Executive Committee at its 10 Feb 2012 joint meeting with standing committee chairs to see if this concern resonated with other faculty. At its 02 Mar 2012 meeting, the committee received an update that RPIPC was forming a task force to consider this matter. At the 06 Apr 2012 meeting, Craig Turner provided a written update on the work of the RPIPC task force and this update is linked to the 06 Apr 2012 FAPC meeting agenda at the FAPC web presence.

○ **Details:**

- 03 Feb 2012: Some committee members expressed concern that the change to the common meeting time that took effect in fall 2011 – a shift from Monday 12:20-1:50 and Friday 12:20-1:50 to Friday 2:00-5:00 – seems to make the scheduling of meetings for groups not designated in the governance calendar more challenging. Another committee member observed that most faculty spend more time in meetings each week than is set aside by the current three hour common meeting block. There was a reminder that recently a faculty member [Dee Sams] had filed a report with the Executive Committee prepared by some marketing majors that had articulated similar concerns with the current common meeting time for scheduling meetings of student groups. It was further noted that while the previous common meeting time of Monday and Friday 12:20-1:50 was in effect, many faculty and student groups would meet Wednesday 12:20-1:50 as virtually no classes were scheduled at this Wednesday time. Some suggestions were made about how to consider this issue (including looking at the current schedules, conducting a faculty survey, requesting the development of tools to assist in scheduling of meetings of faculty groups, etc.). There was also brief discussion about whether this item was within the scope of FAPC or APC. One committee member observed that while classes are important, faculty meetings are necessary to conduct institutional business and expressed the opinion that the aforementioned change to the common meeting time and class start times seems to underemphasize the necessity for having sufficient time to schedule meetings. Another committee member noted that presently very few classes are scheduled with a start time of 8:00 a.m. and thus scheduling meetings with 8:00 a.m. start times might be a feasible option for some faculty groups. Additionally, committee members suggested alternatives to face-to-face meetings including phone conferencing and Skype. The committee members charged the committee chair to bring this issue to the 10 Feb 2012 joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and Executive Committee to seek guidance and determine whether this concern resonates with other faculty.

- 02 Mar 2012: In his update on the 10 Feb 2012 joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and Executive Committee. Craig Turner indicated there is a common meeting time task force reporting to RPIPC currently being formed in response to this concern. This task force will be chaired by Sally Humphries and include as members Dr. Paul Jones, University Registrar Kay Anderson, a representative from the Student Government Association, a representative of the Staff Council, a representative of SAPC, a representative from FAPC, and possibly others if necessary. The purpose of the task force is to design a survey instrument to collect information from students, staff, faculty and

administrators to inform the reconsideration of the common meeting time during the 2012-2013 academic year. This survey instrument will not be implemented prior to the fall 2012 semester and will attempt to determine whether affected parties (students, faculty, staff, administration, etc.) have problems or concerns with the common meeting time as well as the nature of those concerns. Prior to the meeting, Craig had circulated an email from Sally Humphries calling for volunteers from FAPC to serve on this task force. It was determined that Craig may have been the only member of FAPC to volunteer to serve on the task force. Craig reminded the members of the committee that at its 03 Feb 2012 meeting, FAPC charged him to bring the issue of faculty concern about common meeting time to the joint meeting to seek guidance and determine whether this concern resonates with other faculty. There was general consensus among FAPC members that the RPIPC task force met the FAPC charge in bringing the faculty concern on the common meeting time to the attention of ECUS. Craig's joint meeting notes are linked to the 02 Mar 2012 FAPC meeting agenda at the FAPC web presence.

- 06 Apr 2012: Craig Turner, member of the RPIPC task force, provided a brief update, indicating that the task force was considering survey implementation to explore this issue for fall 2012. His update was provided in writing and is linked to the 06 Apr 2012 FAPC meeting agenda at the FAPC web presence.

4. Digital Measures Questions*Considered Briefly*

- **Issue**: The issue posed questions regarding the faculty activity database called Digital Measures, specifically access to faculty records and notification of faculty members when an administrator (chair, dean, provost) access their records or when modifications to their records are made by another.
- **Summary**: At the 02 Sep 2011 meeting, questions regarding Digital Measures on access, notification, and revisions were discussed. The specific questions were
 - Is there a firewall between the department and the dean/provost?
 - Will faculty be notified when his or her IFR is looked at?
 - Would it be possible for the dean's/provost's office to have access to only aggregated data?
 - Can a notification be sent to the faculty when his or her account is being viewed?
 - May faculty look at the IFR of people "above" them?
 - Will faculty be notified if something is changed within their IFR?

This conversation at the 02 Sep 2011 meeting completed committee activity on this issue.

- **Details**:
 - 02 Sep 2011: A committee member posed questions from constituents regarding the faculty activity database called Digital Measures, specifically regarding access to faculty records and notification of faculty members when an administrator (chair, dean, provost) accesses their records or when modifications to their records are made by another.
 - **Access**: The Provost indicated that access to a faculty member's activity records within Digital Measures is available only to the faculty member, administrators in the supervisory chain of the faculty member (chair, dean, provost), and the office of institutional research (for the purpose of preparing reports). To be specific, chairs can access activities of the faculty in their department, deans can access activities of faculty in their college, and the provost and institutional research can access activities of all university faculty. The Provost stated that this administrative access [available to chairs, deans, provost, and institutional research] allows an administrator to **indirectly view** faculty activities by making a query of the system and receiving aggregate data [e.g. a count of the number of faculty who engage in activity X] as well as **directly view** the specific activities of an individual faculty member who reports to her/him. She went on to indicate that in practice, this administrative access is typically used to perform queries for aggregate data [indirectly viewing faculty activities].
 - **Notification**: The constituency being represented advocated for a faculty member to receive a courtesy notification when an administrator **directly views** that faculty member's activity records within the digital measures environment, likening this access to viewing the faculty member's personnel file in the department. However, an individual faculty member is not presently notified when her/his activity information is directly viewed by a person with administrative access (chair, dean, provost, institutional research). The Provost indicated that it may not be possible to alter Digital Measures to support this type of notification because it is a purchased program and not programmed by university employees. Additionally, the Provost noted that the information available in Digital Measures is the same performance-related information that faculty have historically provided as an electronic resume, and there has been no practice of notifying faculty when their resumes are used to obtain information.

- **Revisions:** The Provost indicated that each faculty member has control over her/his own information and that the ability to revise information depends on whether that information is in a “locked” field or not. If a “locked” field (such as gender, employment start date, etc.) is incorrect, then a faculty member can use an electronic notification to contact the system administrator and request a correction. Fields that are not “locked” can be revised only by the faculty member to whom they apply. The Digital Measures environment allows a collaborative effort to be documented by a single faculty member and applied to all individuals participating in the collaboration. For example, if an activity is entered by one member of a collaborative group and that member designates other participating members, then each of the other designated faculty members in the collaborative group receives a “copy” of that documentation and is notified of that addition. The individual can then modify her/his “copy” of the documentation.
- **This 02 Sep 2011 conversation completed committee activity on this issue.**

5. SACS Review Representative*Briefly Considered*

- **Issue:** The naming of a representative of FAPC for participation on the SACS steering committee during the 2011-2012 academic year.
- **Summary:** At the 29 Apr 2011 organizational FAPC meeting, the Provost indicated that each university senate committee will be asked to provide nominations from its membership to serve on the committee(s) on SACS re-accreditation issues. At the 03 Sep 2011 meeting, the Provost expressed interest in having a member of FAPC serve on the SACS steering committee. Craig Turner was named to serve as this representative. At the 06 Apr 2012 meeting, Craig Turner indicated that he had not yet been called on to represent FAPC as its *SACS Review Representative*.
- **Details:**
 - 29 Apr 2011: The Provost indicated that SACS work will be gearing up in the summer of 2011 by twelve-month employees and continuing into the 2011-2012 academic year. Each university senate committee will be asked to provide nominations from its membership to serve on the committee(s) working on SACS re-accreditation issues.
 - 02 Sep 2011: The Provost expressed interest in having a member of FAPC serve on the SACS steering committee during the 2011-2012 academic year. The floor was opened for nominations and self-nominations. Craig Turner volunteered to represent FAPC on the SACS steering committee. This self-nomination was the only nomination coming forward and Craig Turner was selected by the committee to serve in this capacity by acclamation.
 - 06 Apr 2012: Craig Turner provided an update on the “SACS Review Representative” topic indicating that while he had been elected by the committee at its 03 Sep 2011 meeting to represent FAPC on the SACS steering committee, he had not yet been called on to represent FAPC as its “SACS Review Representative.”

6. Updates on Four FAPC Agenda Items*Briefly Considered, One Committed to ECUS*

- **Issue:** This issue provides details on the disposition of four items that were on the tentative FAPC agenda: Mission/Vision of CETL, Faculty Voice on Presidential Search Committee, Standing Committee Officer Mentoring (Guidance on Operating Procedures), Syllabus (Required Statements).
- **Summary:** These four issues were placed on the tentative agenda for FAPC during the committee session at the 10 Aug 2011 governance retreat. When this list of tentative agenda items was reviewed by the committee at the 07 Oct 2011 meeting, the committee determined that three [Mission/Vision of CETL, Faculty Voice on Presidential Search Committee, Syllabi (Required Statements)] were resolved while the remaining one [Standing Committee Officer Mentoring (Guidance on Operating Procedures)] was steered to ECUS. Upon receiving the 04 Nov 2011 update indicating that ECUS will look into the mentoring matter, **committee activity reached conclusion on these issues.** At the 06 Apr 2012 meeting, an informational update on the topic of CETL Vision/Mission was requested. For details, see the 06 Apr 2012 entry below.
- **Details:**
 - 29 Apr 2011: The 2010-2011 FAPC recommended to the Provost that all course syllabi require the inclusion of a standardized statement regarding the administration of Student Opinion Surveys. The Provost indicated that this proposal was accepted and that this statement has been added to a recently collected archive of all required statements for course syllabi, indicating that a link to this archive will be distributed to faculty during the time that course syllabi are in preparation.

- 10 Aug 2011: At the governance retreat, these four issues were added to the committee tentative agenda list during the FAPC session.
- 07 Oct 2011: As the list of tentative FAPC agenda items was reviewed, each of the following items was resolved almost immediately and thus they are bundled into one issue for the purposes of this report.
 - (1) MISSION/VISION OF CETL: The committee agreed to defer committee consideration of this tentative agenda item in light of the efforts currently in progress to rethink the mission of CETL. Specifically, the interim CETL director distributed an email survey to the entire faculty inviting feedback on how CETL can best serve faculty needs. Associate Provost Ormond indicated that Provost Jordan is inviting Dr. Linda Noble, Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs in the University System of Georgia, as a consultant to review CETL and offer advice for campus consideration. David de Posada also mentioned that the CETL committee (on which he sits) welcomes more volunteers to join the committee and that the next meeting of this CETL committee will be held in Nov 2011.
 - (2) FACULTY VOICE: PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE: The committee agreed that this issue has been addressed as there are four faculty members [Ken McGill (Chair), Jan Clark, Carlos Herrera, Kendra Russell] on the Presidential search committee. Therefore, this item can be taken off of the 2011-2012 agenda.
 - (3) STANDING COMMITTEE OFFICER MENTORING (GUIDANCE ON OPERATING PROCEDURES): The committee chair indicated that he had forwarded this item to the presiding officer of the university senate via email for possible consideration by Executive Committee. The committee expressed the belief that this item should be forwarded to Executive Committee for steering as this item is outside the scope of FAPC. David de Posada was asked to share this belief with Executive Committee at the next joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and Executive Committee scheduled for 14 Oct 2011.
 - (4) SYLLABUS (REQUIRED STATEMENTS) AND WHETHER ONE COULD LINK TO THE CENTRAL WEBSITE IN PLACE OF HAVING STANDARDIZED STATEMENTS ON SYLLABI: The committee expressed interest in removing this item from the agenda in light of (a) the update received from the Provost at the 29 Apr 2011 FAPC meeting indicating there is a centralized archive of required statements for syllabi in existence (see item 7.c.i. on 29 Apr 2011 FAPC minutes) and (b) the fact that Academic Policy Committee (APC) is presently considering the matter of the inclusion of a link to the central website in place of the actual appearance of standardized statements on the syllabus.
- 04 Nov 2011: In his update on the 14 Oct 2011 joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and Executive Committee. David de Posada reported that he communicated to Executive Committee the FAPC belief that “standing committee officer mentoring (guidance on operating procedures),” an item from the tentative FAPC agenda list from the 10 Aug 2011 governance retreat, is outside the scope of FAPC and is directed to Executive Committee for steering. David indicated that the ECUS response was that they will look into it. **This update completed committee activity on this issue.**
- 06 Apr 2012: An information update on the CETL Mission/Vision item was requested. Specific queries were: What analysis was done with the survey data? How was the feedback from the Dr. Linda Noble consultation used? What sort of job description was written as a result? Associate Provost Tom Ormond briefly discussed the new director position [describing it as a combined director of CETL and IDEAS] search as announced within the Provost’s Report at the 23 Mar 2012 University Senate meeting. Associate Provost Tom Ormond indicated that he could provide no update on the analysis of survey data to direct the rethinking of the CETL mission or on the use of the feedback of the consultation with Dr. Linda Noble.

7. Years of Service Recognition Lag Committed to ECUS

- **Issue**: The issue was a concern about the lag in years of service recognition for academic year faculty noting that for example the recognition for 10 years of service occurred during the 11th year of service.
- **Summary**: This issue was added to the tentative agenda list for FAPC during the committee session of the 10 Aug 2011 governance retreat and was discussed at the 07 Oct 2011 meeting. As these service recognitions are extended to all employees (faculty and staff), this matter was committed to Executive Committee for steering. On 04 Nov 2011, an update indicated that ECUS steered this item to the Resources, Planning, and Institutional Policy Committee (RPIPC) for consideration. **This update at the 04 Nov 2011 meeting completed committee activity on this issue.**
- **Details**:

- 07 Oct 2011: Some faculty expressed a concern regarding the lag present in years of service recognition. For example, the recognition for 10 years of service to GC is made during the 11th year of service. The committee chair noted that the Academic Policy Committee (APC) report given at the 23 Sep 2011 University Senate meeting included a statement that the issue of years of service recognition lag had been routed to FAPC. To inform the drafting of the tentative agenda of the 07 Oct 2011 FAPC meeting, the committee chair consulted with the presiding officer of the university senate to clarify whether this item (recognition lag) was to be considered by FAPC. As part of this conversation, it was noted that the service recognition was for all employees (faculty and staff) and thus might more appropriately be considered by the Resources, Planning, and Institutional Policy Committee (RPIPC) as that committee has both faculty and staff among its membership while FAPC is populated exclusively by faculty. The presiding officer agreed to consult with the members of Executive Committee at their next meeting regarding the steering of this item. David de Posada was asked to follow-up on this matter at the 14 Oct 2011 meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and ECUS.
- 04 Nov 2011: In his update on the 14 Oct 2011 joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and Executive Committee. David de Posada reported that he shared this item with ECUS and it was steered to RPIPC for consideration. **This completed committee activity on this issue.**

Ad hoc committees and other groups:

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

- The Student Opinion Survey work group was formed at the 29 Apr 2010 organizational meeting and consisted of Karynne Kleine (CoE) [Chair], Carrie Cook (CoAS), and Craig Turner [CoAS] This work group
 - *Charge: To coordinate with Lee Gillis (Chair of the 2011-2012 University Chairs Council) regarding Student Opinion Survey Instrument Review and prepare recommendations for FAPC consideration*
 - met with University Chairs Council (UCC) Chair, Lee Gillis, to discuss the Student Opinion Survey Instrument Review [August 2011]
 - made a pair of recommendations [Form a Student Opinion Survey Instrument Review Work Group with University Chairs Council, Prepare Faculty Evaluation Language Advocating for Significant Faculty Involvement] to FAPC at its 2 Sep 2011 meeting
 - split consideration of the two issues into two separate work groups
 - UCC Student Opinion Survey work group
 - *Chair: Lee Gillis*
 - *Members: Stephen Auerbach, Carrie Cook, Bill Fisher, Julia Metzker (replacing Karynne Kleine), Indiren Pillay, Craig Turner*
 - *Charge: To follow up on faculty concerns (originally reported to the University Chairs Council) that the current SOS was not reliable or adequate by comparing the currently used (locally produced) SOS instrument to several nationally-normed survey instruments with published measures of validity and reliability, collect information on the cost of the professionally prepared instruments, report to the provost on the veracity of the concerns over the reliability of the current (locally produced) SOS instrument.*
 - *The six instruments on which information was gathered: CIEQ, SIRII (ETS), IDEA, CourseEval, eXplorance, Scantron.*
 - provided informational updates on its activity to FAPC at its 07 Oct 2011, 04 Nov 2011, 02 Dec 2011, and 02 Mar 2012 meetings
 - **completed its work** with recommendations to the University Chairs Council at the 17 Feb 2012 UCC meeting.
 - FAPC Student Opinion Survey work group
 - *Chair: Karynne Kleine*
 - *Members: Carrie Cook, Craig Turner*
 - *Charge: To prepare recommendations and drafts as requested by the committee to inform committee deliberation on this issue (faculty evaluation).*
 - consistently advocated for the development of faculty evaluation language detailing the role of faculty in faculty evaluation policy and procedure, ultimately recommending the inclusion of the language in the institutional policies, procedures, and practices manual
 - prepared drafts (as requested by FAPC) for the 2 Dec 2011 and 2 Mar 2012 FAPC meetings
- The Post-Tenure Review (Post-TR) work group was formed at the 29 Apr 2011 organizational meeting. This work group
 - *Composition: Chair: Mike Rose (CoAS), Continuing Members: Ken Farr (CoB), Craig Turner (CoAS).*

- Charge: To continue the work of the 2010-2011 Post-TR work group [review the post-tenure review language in the institution's policies, procedures, and practices manual and prepare recommendations for committee consideration] and ensure that its membership remain in compliance with the membership requirements from 2010-2011 [the inclusion of at least one member from each academic unit (colleges, library)].
- gave progress reports Sep 2011, Oct 2011, Nov 2011 [Jeanne Sewell (CoHS) to work group], Jan 2012, and Mar 2012 meetings.
- The **Pre-Tenure Review (Pre-TR) work group** was formed at the 13 Jan 2012 meeting. This work group
 - Composition: Chair: Victoria Deneroff (CoE) Members: Leslie Moore (CoHS), Mike Whitfield (CoB)
 - Charge: To form a FAPC Pre-Tenure Review Work Group consisting of at least one faculty member of each academic college and the library and charged to review the pre-tenure language in the university policies, procedures, and practices manual and prepare recommendations on proposed revisions (if any) to the pre-tenure language for FAPC review.
 - was formed with the aforementioned charge at the 13 Jan 2012 meeting
 - reported its progress at the Feb 2012 [not yet met] and Mar 2012 [deans consulted to populate work group] meetings.

Follow-up on Recommendations Received from the 2010-2011 FAPC

Are there any issues that the 2010-2011 FAPC believes should be considered by the 2011-2012 FAPC?

1. **Required Language for Syllabi:**

- **Statement from the 2010-2011 FAPC Annual Report:** 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.
- **2011-2012 FAPC Responses to the Questions from the 2010-2011 FAPC Annual Report:**
 - *If the language of these statements is standardized for all course syllabi, what is the most efficient way of handling this language?*
 - ✓ **2011-2012 FAPC Response:** This was implicitly deferred to APC at the 07 Oct 2011 meeting.
 - **Item 5.A.(11) from the 07 Oct 2011 meeting minutes:**
 - **THE SYLLABUS (REQUIRED STATEMENTS) AND WHETHER ONE COULD LINK TO THE CENTRAL WEBSITE IN PLACE OF HAVING STANDARDIZED STATEMENTS ON SYLLABI:** The committee expressed interest in removing this item from the agenda in light of (a) the update received from the Provost at the 29 April 2011 FAPC meeting indicating there is a centralized archive of required statements for syllabi in existence (see item 7.c.i. on 29 April 2011 FAPC minutes) and (b) the fact that Academic Policy Committee (APC) is presently considering the matter of the inclusion of a link to the central website in place of the actual appearance of standardized statements on the syllabus.
 - *Is there a centralized location where this “required” language is stored and accessible to faculty members?*
 - ✓ **2011-2012 FAPC Response:** This was considered done given this update at the 29 Apr 2011 meeting.
 - **Item 7.c.i. from the 29 Apr 2011 meeting minutes:**
 - The 2010-2011 FAPC recommended to the Provost that all course syllabi require the inclusion of a standardized statement regarding the administration of Student Opinion Surveys. The Provost indicated that this proposal was accepted and that this statement has been added to a recently collected archive of all required statements for course syllabi, indicating that a link to this archive will be distributed to faculty during the time that course syllabi are in preparation.

Do any of the 2010-11 FAPC actions require follow-up by the 2011-2012 FAPC?

Provost. While each of these “open questions” are addressed in the Significant Deliberations section of the 2010-2011 report, a summary annotated list of these “open questions” was provided in the 2010-2011 FAPC annual report along with the suggestion that the 2011-2012 FAPC consider continuing these conversations with the Provost.

Note for 2011-2012 FAPC Review: The five topics for which the 2010-2011 FAPC provided an “open question” are listed here.

2010-2011 FAPC TOPIC 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.*
- **2010-2011 FAPC “open question”:** Consideration by the Provost in consultation with the Academic Deans of this motion is still in progress.
- ✓ **2011-2012 FAPC “answer to open question”:** At the 06 Apr 2012 meeting, **committee activity on this issue concluded** in light of the 03 Apr 2012 informational update on this matter that the committee received from Provost Jordan which is provided here.
 - 03 Apr 2012 email update from Provost Jordan regarding “Review of Letters”:
 - *Last spring the deans completed a review of the letters sent to students that were submitted by Admissions, departments, and colleges and found no specific reference to the availability of faculty in the summer. In a few examples, deans reported that some departments made reference to the availability of advisors. However, the reference was not specific to the faculty. As far as the deans could report, the department chairs, graduate coordinators, or faculty who are teaching summer courses were serving as advisors to students enrolled in summer courses. The deans were asked to make certain that messages regarding references to advisors be written carefully to avoid any misunderstanding about general faculty availability. As we looked into this issue, I noted that those programs with cohorts beginning in the summer were most at risk for potential problems related to “pressing” faculty who are off contract into service. Those departments that designed, approved, and implemented a summer cohort program might not have taken into consideration the need for and impact on faculty time. Those programs will need to be particularly attentive to potential problems. The deans council discussed the fact that there are occasional needs for faculty to assist in the summer, but all agreed to be vigilant about protecting faculty time. Many reported that it is common practice for chairs to ask faculty to volunteer to assist occasionally in the summer. Upon the recommendation of President Leland and the advice of Legal Counsel, it was decided that we should avoid “spelling out in written guidelines” restrictions about faculty availability when they are “off contract.” The concern was that this might draw unwelcome attention to the fact that the institution continues to provide “off contract” faculty with various benefits (such as travel reimbursements, research grants, benefits, office space, computers and lab equipment, networking capabilities, and so forth). In lieu of written guidelines, it will fall to the provost and deans to remain vigilant and mindful of faculty time. Additionally, the deans discussed the feasibility of providing compensation to “off contract” faculty whose assistance to the department in summer stretched beyond a few hours. Deans were instructed to make certain that no faculty member be required to perform duties while not under contract. Furthermore, all agreed that any form of retaliation toward those “off contract” individuals who refused to perform tasks during the summer would be unacceptable. Faculty should make the dean and/or provost aware of any violation of this practice. Please do not hesitate to contact me if clarity is needed.*

2010-2011 FAPC TOPIC 2: DESK COPIES

- **2010-2011 FAPC “open question”:** 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.
- ✓ **2011-2012 FAPC “answer to open question”:** At the 06 Apr 2012 meeting, **committee activity on this issue concluded** in light of the 03 Apr 2012 informational update on this matter that the committee received from Provost Jordan which is provided here.
 - 03 Apr 2012 email update from Provost Jordan regarding “Desk Copies”:
 - *FAPC recommended that the feasibility of the institution’s library as a clearinghouse for unwanted desk copies be explored. The Provost discussed this initiative with the Director, Nancy Davis Bray, who agreed*

that the library could serve the institution in this manner. This decision was shared at the Academic Leadership Team meeting. Communication was to take place in the college. A follow-up communication will be sent “campus wide” to campus toward the end of the academic year. The practice will be added to the university’s Policy Manual in the appropriate location. Please do not hesitate to contact me if clarity is needed.

2010-2011 FAPC TOPIC 3: FACULTY EVALUATION, TRIGGERING REVIEW OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

- *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.*
- **2010-2011 FAPC “open question”**: As of 1 Apr 2011, consideration of part (2) of **this** motion by the Provost was in progress.
- ✓ **2011-2012 FAPC “answer to open question”**: At the 06 Apr 2012 meeting, **committee activity on this issue concluded** in light of the 03 Apr 2012 informational update on this matter that the committee received from Provost Jordan which is provided here.
 - 03 Apr 2012 email update from Provost Jordan regarding “Faculty Evaluation of Collegiate Administrators”:
 - *FAPC recommended that the Provost ensure that the administrative evaluation process include a mechanism by which the appropriate personnel are reminded to provide feedback on administrative performance. This was accomplished through discussion with the deans and a request that they send an email to the faculty and staff soliciting feedback on chair evaluations. Most deans chose to send this reminder to their collegiate constituents through an email. A line was placed in the appropriate processes section of the university Policy Manual spelling out the need to for the provost to ensure that constituents are reminded annually of the evaluation process. Care is taken to ensure confidentiality in all personnel matters, including evaluations. Please do not hesitate to contact me if clarity is needed.*

2010-2011 FAPC TOPIC 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.
- **2010-2011 FAPC “open question”**: Receive progress report of 2010-2011 Post-TR Work Group at 29 Apr 2011 organizational and consider whether the work group should continue its work.
- ✓ **2011-2012 FAPC “answer to open question”**: Formed work group to continue the work during 2011-2012.
 - Item 7.c.ii of the 29 Apr 2011 FAPC minutes: The 2010-2011 FAPC had formed a work group to review the language in the institutional academic affairs handbook on post-tenure review. Mike Rose, chair of this Post Tenure Review Work Group, provided a report to the committee (supporting document to the meeting agenda) of the status of the effort. In short, the work group had not completed its review but had made good progress. A lively discussion ensued regarding the supporting document and report and the discussion offered the work group feedback on its work to this point. Specific guidance included that its purpose be both formative and summative and that upper academic administration, specifically the dean and provost, should receive detailed reports rather than just notification that the process has been completed. At the conclusion of this discussion, the committee endorsed the work group continue its work during the 2011-2012 academic year in consultation with the committee and ensuring that its membership remain in compliance with the membership requirements from 2010-2011 which were the inclusion of at least one member from each academic unit (colleges, library).

2010-2011 FAPC TOPIC 7: STUDENT OPINION SURVEYS: PARTICIPATION RATE (CONCERN)

- **2010-2011 FAPC “open question”**: 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.*

➤ **2011-2012 FAPC “answer to open question”:** At the 06 Apr 2012 FAPC meeting, Craig Turner provided information that the *Georgia College Policies, Procedures and Practices Manual* has two versions of SOS language in sections entitled “Student Opinion Surveys” and “Student Opinion Forms” and that these sections are not completely consistent. Associate Provost Ormond volunteered to follow up on this item. In light of this information, the 2011-2012 FAPC recommends that this matter be forwarded to the 2012-2013 FAPC for its consideration.

▪ **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*

➤ **2011-2012 FAPC “answer to open question”:** In light of the committee deliberation on FAPC Motion 1 (1 Apr 2011) above, the 2011-2012 FAPC recommends that FAPC Motion 2 (1 Apr 2011) be forwarded to the 2012-2013 FAPC for its consideration.

▪ **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.*

✓ **2011-2012 FAPC “answer to open question”:** Considered done given this update at the 29 Apr 2011 meeting.

▪ **Item 7.c.i. from the 29 Apr 2011 meeting minutes:** The 2010-2011 FAPC recommended to the Provost that all course syllabi require the inclusion of a standardized statement regarding the administration of Student Opinion Surveys. The Provost indicated that this proposal was accepted and that this statement has been added to a recently collected archive of all required statements for course syllabi, indicating that a link to this archive will be distributed to faculty during the time that course syllabi are in preparation

2010-2011 FAPC TOPIC 8: SUMMER PAY: ACADEMIC YEAR FACULTY / EXTRA COMPENSATION

○ **2010-2011 FAPC “open question: 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

➤ **2011-2012 FAPC “answer to open question”:** Given that no new information on the status of this item was received by the committee during the 2011-2012 academic year, the 2011-2012 FAPC recommends that this matter be forwarded to the 2012-2013 FAPC for its consideration.

▪ **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.

○ **2010-2011 FAPC “open question”:** 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.

○ **2010-2011 FAPC Partial Answer to “Tax Liability” (partial in that it handles the summer pay not extra compensation) as taken from the FAPC report at the 18 Apr 2011 University Senate meeting:** Ms. Susan Allen attended the 1 Apr 2011 FAPC meeting to provide information on the Maymester paydate. She provided 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 asked 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]. Errant or incomplete information may result in delaying disbursement to the July payroll date.
- Ms. Allen was 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 expressed 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].
- Pay Dates: As a reminder, the pay dates presently scheduled for Summer 2011 are as follows.
 - Maymester 2011 July 1, 2011 (earliest allowed by USG financial policy) [as of 16 Mar 2011, 3 June 2011]
 - Summer I 2011 July 8, 2011 (normal ADP run July 15 or with Maymester)
 - Summer II 2011 August 5, 2011 (normal ADP run August 15)
 - Each date corresponds with the grades requested date for the stated term with the exception of Maymester which is subject to USG financial policy guidelines from which July 1 is the earliest allowable date. Subsequent to the 4 Mar 2011 FAPC meeting, Dr. Paul Jones sent an email 16 Mar 2011 to the faculty email list crediting the diligence of Ms. Susan Allen for finding a viable way to shift the Maymester pay date to a date closer to the end of Maymester. **The result: Maymester pay date 1 July 2011 is now 3 June 2011.**

- **2011-2012 FAPC “answer to open question”:** Given that no new information on the status of this item was received by the committee during the 2011-2012 academic year, the 2011-2012 FAPC recommends that this matter be forwarded to the 2012-2013 FAPC for its consideration.

Committee Reflections: *What worked well, what did not work so well. Given your charge, how did you spend your time?*

Eliciting Candor: A member of the committee suggested that there was a committee challenge to elicit candor in committee deliberation. There was further discussion about possible suggestions to the 2012-2013 FAPC to elicit candor, including laying ground rules for discussion and clarification of roles of committee members. Members further discussed both the function of voting as an opportunity to voice opinion, and the importance of candid discussion for understanding of the background of the issues as well as committee member perspectives.

Clarifying Roles of Committee Members: Clarifying this role is perhaps most challenging in the context of the Chief Academic Officer designee. Opinions expressed included acknowledgment of (1) the difficulty broaching the conversation about clarification of this role, (2) the variety of roles this individual could play such as consultant, fixer, listener, authority, etc. (3) the difficulty of balancing the power differential external to the committee within the administrative structure and the status as a voting member within the committee.

Focus: An additional reflection recommendation was that FAPC continue to focus on and be deliberate in selecting “important” faculty issues and recognize the sensitivity of these faculty issues and not get caught up in administrative or minutia items.

Committee Recommendations:

Advice to the membership of the 2012-2013 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.*”

Assigning members to work groups: Make an effort to ensure that work group membership is divided more equitably among members. Try to ensure that each member of the committee has the opportunity to serve on a work group before members are assigned to a second work group.

Constituency Consultation: To encourage the continuation of the practice that members seek constituency input to inform committee deliberation on issues considered by FAPC.

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

2010-2011 FAPC Issues: At its 06 Apr 2012 meeting, the 2011-2012 FAPC reviewed the items recommended for its consideration by the 2010-2011 FAPC and recommended the following items be forwarded to the 2012-2013 FAPC for its consideration. Refer to the section of this report entitled *Follow-up on Recommendations Received from the 2010-2011 FAPC* for details.

- 2010-2011 FAPC TOPIC 7: STUDENT OPINION SURVEYS: PARTICIPATION RATE (CONCERN)
- 2010-2011 FAPC TOPIC 8: SUMMER PAY: ACADEMIC YEAR FACULTY / EXTRA COMPENSATION

Are there issues on which the 2011-12 FAPC was unable to complete its work?

2011-2012 FAPC Issues: At its 06 Apr 2012 meeting, the 2011-2012 FAPC recommended the following items be forwarded to the 2012-2013 FAPC for its consideration. Refer to the section of this report entitled *Other Significant Deliberation (Non-Motions)* for details.

- 2011-2012 FAPC TOPIC 1: Faculty Evaluation
 - At the close of the 2011-2012 academic year, there were three versions available to the committee, all of which are linked to the agenda of the 06 Apr 2012 meeting of the 2011-2012 FAPC. To be specific:
 1. *Work Group Recommendation (Draft 3)* received by the committee at its 02 Mar 2012 meeting
 2. *Memo from Provost to FAPC* received by the committee at its 02 Mar 2012 meeting
 3. *Draft Resolution on Faculty Evaluation* received by the committee at its 06 Apr 2012 meeting
- 2011-2012 FAPC TOPIC 3: Post-Tenure Review (Post-TR)
- 2011-2012 FAPC TOPIC 4: Pre-Tenure Review (Pre-TR)

Do any of the 2011-12 FAPC actions require follow-up?

The items listed above as *2010-2011 FAPC Issues as issues that should be considered* and *2011-2012 FAPC Issues as issues on which the 2011-12 FAPC was unable to complete its work* are the items for which follow-up may be required at the discretion of the 2012-13 FAPC.

Recommendations on calendar (meeting times, outline items that you expect would be considered annually)

No additional items were identified for inclusion in this section.

Recommend items for consideration at the governance retreat:

A recommendation was made that the standing committees establish as a priority at the first meetings of the academic year the development of operating procedures to provide mechanisms to establish ground rules and rules of engagement to facilitate meaningful discussion of standing committee issues throughout the academic year. In particular, standing committees are discouraged from simply adopting the operating procedures of the previous year’s committee and to be thoughtful and intentional in developing and maintaining operating procedures.

APPENDIX: Recognitions and Appreciation

Recognitions: Each faculty member who served as a “volunteer” on the committee (faculty serving on the committee who did not serve as university senators during the 2011-2012 academic year) were awarded a certificate of recognition, complete with an impressive gold seal, signed by Interim President Stas Preczewski for their service on FAPC during the 2011-2012 academic year. Those volunteers recognized at the 06 Apr 2012 FAPC meeting were David Connolly (CoAS) and Karynne Kleine (CoE). Victoria Deneroff (CoE) was recognized in absentia at the 06 Apr 2012 FAPC meeting 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 2011-2012 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 FAPC Secretary, Carrie Cook**, for the
 - diligence, care, passion, and commitment she applied when drafting, reviewing, and editing meeting minutes,
 - timely manner in which she prepared, circulated, and posted the minutes of each meeting of the committee, and
 - careful review of drafts of the annual report and meeting agendas preceding circulation to the committee;
- d. **the FAPC Vice Chair, David de Posada**, for
 - representing the committee at the fall 2011 joint meetings of standing committee chairs with the Executive Committee that took place from 8am to 9am on 16 Sep 2011, 14 Oct 2011, 11 Nov 2011, and 2 Dec 2011,
 - carefully reviewing drafts of the annual report and meeting agendas preceding circulation to the committee;
- e. **Dr. Jason Huffman** for his active participation at the 4 Nov 2011 FAPC meeting as designee for Provost Jordan;
- f. **Associate Provost Ormond** for his active participation at the 7 Oct 2011, 2 Mar 2012, 6 Apr 2012 FAPC meetings as designee for Provost Jordan and for obtaining and providing updates from the Provost for matters under committee consideration at these meetings;
- g. **Provost Jordan** for her
 - accessibility to the committee at each meeting either in person or via her designee when other commitments prevented her from attending,
 - responses and informational updates regarding matters under committee consideration;
- h. **Interim University President “Stas” Preczewski** for his timely and comprehensive response to the committee resolution advocating for the addition of the option of 12-month pay for academic year faculty;
- i. **Director of Payroll Services, Susan Allen**, for her accessibility, assistance and counsel throughout the spring 2012 semester that informed committee deliberation on the 12 month pay option for academic year faculty; and
- j. **the Presiding Officer of the University Senate, Jan Clark**, for the
 - gracious and creative introductions at each University Senate meeting,
 - cheerful reception of each matter routed from FAPC to the Executive Committee for steering including the timely response to indicate the disposition of these matters [Academic Year Faculty Contract Questions, Common Meeting Time Concern, Years of Service Recognition Lag, Standing Committee Officer Mentoring], and
 - informational updates, guidance and encouragement she provided to standing committee chairs throughout the academic year.