

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

Committee Reflections:

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

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

Committee Recommendations:

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

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

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

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

Pre-processing of Concerns Received by Committee:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

→ 1. Academic Year Faculty Availability in the Summer

- **Review of Letters:** Closing the loop on the review of letters at the department and academic unit level by department chairs and deans respectively for the presence of language communicating faculty expectations [such as advising, availability at orientations, summer accessibility of faculty to students, etc.] to the students. While there is a clear indication that the Provost requested deans to ensure these reviews were done within their unit, there was no closure to indicate that this review was completed [nor is there information to suggest this review is incomplete].
- ◎ **Motion 1 (14 Jan 2011 FAPC Meeting):** *To recommend that the Provost instruct all academic administrators that no faculty member be required to perform duties while not under contract. Further, that refusal by a faculty member to perform tasks while not under contract shall not be considered during the tenure application process, annual evaluations or merit increase decisions.*
 - Consideration by the Provost in consultation with the Academic Deans of this motion is still in progress.

→ 2. Desk Copies

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

3. Faculty Awards

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

4. Faculty Evaluation, Triggering Review of Department Chairs

- As of 1 Apr 2011, consideration of part (2) of the following motion by the Provost was in progress.
FAPC Motion 1 (4 Mar 2010): To recommend that
 - (1) *each member of the 2010-2011 Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) educate her/his constituency (faculty colleagues) that faculty have an opportunity to inform the evaluation of an academic administrator [see Section 3.07.01 of the Georgia College Academic Affairs Handbook].*
 - (2) *the Provost ensure that the administrative evaluation process include a mechanism by which the appropriate personnel solicit developmental feedback, on an annual basis, from the faculty to inform an administrative evaluation. In particular, a recommendation that each Academic Dean actively solicit developmental feedback, on an annual basis, from faculty to inform the administrative evaluation of the department chair or unit supervisor of the faculty. Care should be taken to ensure confidentiality in the collection of this developmental feedback from the faculty. The “Faculty Recommendations for Administrative Development” form (modified version of the existing Part IV) is provided as a sample form that could be used to collect this feedback.*

5. Post-Tenure Review

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

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

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

7. Student Opinion Surveys: Participation Rate (Concern)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. Summer Pay: Academic Year Faculty / Extra Compensation

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

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

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

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

Recommend items for consideration at the governance retreat: None.

APPENDIX: Recognitions and Appreciation

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

Appreciation: The committee chair expresses his appreciation to

- a. **each of the committee members** for their service and contributions to the work of the committee over the 2010-2011 academic year;
- b. **each of the committee work groups** for the time they spent between committee meetings to prepare drafts and recommendations for committee consideration;
- c. **the Secretary, Mike Rose**, for the care, diligence, and timely manner in which he prepared and posted the minutes of each meeting of the committee;
- d. **the Vice Chair, Lee Digiovanni**, for her guidance on continuing issues as she had chaired FAPC during the 2008-9 and 2009-10 academic years **and** for representing the committee at the 18 Feb 2011 joint meeting of standing committee chairs with the Executive Committee;
- e. **Associate Provost Ormond** for his increasingly active participation on the committee during the Spring 2011 semester as designee for Provost Jordan when she had a conflict with the meeting time culminating with him obtaining and providing the committee updates from the Provost for nearly every matter under committee consideration at the 1 Apr 2011 meeting;
- f. **Provost Jordan** for her gracious reception of each advisory motion from the committee and her timely responses and informational updates regarding progress on each of these motions to include the topics of
 - o **Academic Year Faculty: Summer Availability**
 - o reviews of letters to students at university, academic unit and department levels
 - o ensuring that faculty (1) are aware of expectations placed on them AND (2) have a voice (the right to accept or decline, the right to negotiate compensation) with respect to work, particularly in the area of service (advising, orientations, availability to students, etc.) that is desirable or necessary during the time when faculty are not formally under contract (most prominently summer)
 - o **Desk Copies: Alternatives to Reselling**
 - o **Faculty Awards:** follow-up from and closure on the 2009-10 FAPC proposed revisions to language in the Academic Affairs Handbook
 - o **Faculty Evaluation / Triggered Department Chair Reviews:**, mechanism for faculty-informed academic administrative reviews
 - o **SOS: Average Ratings Discrepancy Concern:** communication with Institutional Research to facilitate a timely resolution
 - o **SOS: Participation Rate** update to faculty on actions to increase participation rate, language proposed for inclusion on all syllabi, all courses with ten or more surveyed, dissemination of student narratives (student responses),
 - o **Summer Pay / Extra Compensation:** informational updates and recommendation for consulting Ms. Susan Allen
- g. **Director of Payroll Services, Susan Allen**, for her diligence, persistence and ultimate success in finding a way to shift the Maymester pay date closer to the end of the Maymester [from July 1 to early June].