

Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) Minutes - 02 Mar 2012

Next meeting: Friday, 6 April 2012, from 3:30 p.m. to 4:45 p.m. in Arts & Sciences 1-16

Attendance

Present: Dean Baker, Carrie Cook, Victoria Deneroff, Karynne Kleine, Mary Magoulick, Leslie Moore, Holley Roberts, Mike Rose, Craig Turner, Mike Whitfield.

Absent: David Connolly.

Regrets: David de Posada, Provost Sandra Jordan.

Guests: Tom Ormond.

Activity and Agreements

1. **Call to Order:** Craig Turner, committee chair, called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.
2. **Agenda:** A motion to approve the 02 March 2012 agenda, as circulated, was made, seconded, and approved.
3. **Minutes:** A motion to approve the 03 February 2012 FAPC meeting minutes, as circulated, was made, seconded, and approved.
4. **Informational Items:**

A. **REPORT ON THE 10 FEBRUARY 2012 JOINT MEETING OF STANDING COMMITTEE CHAIRS (SCC) AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (ECUS):** Craig Turner, FAPC Chair, attended this meeting and provided an update to the committee. Craig's joint meeting notes had been circulated with the tentative agenda to the committee members prior to the meeting and Craig offered to supply clarifications of his notes. A few clarifications of the notes were requested by members of the committee. Craig provided more information about the common meeting time concern brought forth by RPIPC and the 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 February 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 the SCCs and ECUS. Craig's joint meeting notes are linked to the 02 March 2012 FAPC meeting agenda at the FAPC web presence.

Committee Annual Report: The template and due date for committee annual reports were discussed at the 10 February 2012 joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and Executive Committee. The template used for 2010-2011 academic year was adopted for use for the 2011-2012 academic year and these annual reports are due no later than 3:30 pm on Friday, 27 April 2012. Craig asked members of the committee for feedback on the process for completing the annual report indicating the process used by the 2010-2011 FAPC was to have the committee chair prepare a draft for committee review with the committee providing feedback on the committee reflections, committee recommendations and recommended items for consideration at the governance retreat sections at its April 2011 meeting. A motion was made and seconded to adopt this same process for 2011-2012, specifically to have Craig prepare a draft of the committee annual report for committee review at its 06 April 2012 meeting; noting that this draft shall defer the following sections to the committee for completion: committee reflections, committee recommendations, and recommended items for consideration at the governance retreat. After some discussion about whether the best approach was to have the chair complete a draft for committee review or if members of the committee should be more involved in the preparation of the draft report, this motion was approved.

- B. UPDATES ON ITEMS IN THE "COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION" SECTION OF THE 2010-2011 FAPC ANNUAL REPORT: No update was available. Associate Provost Tom Ormond indicated that he would check with the Provost on this item.
- C. IFR FROM ACADEMIC YEAR TO CALENDAR YEAR: 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.
- D. UPDATE ON UNIVERSITY CHAIRS COUNCIL STUDENT OPINION SURVEY WORK GROUP: 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 February 2012 meeting. The UCC endorsed this report including the recommendations and recommended the report for consideration by the Provost. The work group report is linked to the 02 March 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.
- E. UPDATE ON UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA FACULTY COUNCIL (USGFC): The current Georgia College voting representative to the USGFC, Catherine Whelan, in consultation with the Executive Committee, named Craig Turner as her designee to attend the 25 February 2012 USGFC meeting as she was unable to

attend. The six resolutions made by the USGFC at this meeting were circulated as a supporting document for the 02 March 2012 FAPC meeting. One of the specific USGFC resolutions was related to recent FAPC activity 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*. All six USGFC resolutions were shared and are available in a supporting document linked to the 02 March 2012 FAPC meeting agenda at the FAPC web presence.

5. **ACTION ITEMS:**

A. TENTATIVE AGENDA ITEMS FOR FAPC FOR THE 2011-2012 ACADEMIC YEAR THAT REMAINED AFTER THE 07 OCTOBER 2011 MEETING:

- i. FACULTY PAY (12 MONTH PAY FOR ACADEMIC YEAR FACULTY/ ALTERNATIVES TO 10 MONTHLY CHECKS): At its 03 February 2012 meeting, FAPC agreed to postpone a committee response to Susan Allen on bimonthly pay until a response was received from the interim president, Stas Preczewski, regarding the 13 January 2012 FAPC recommendation that *academic year faculty have the option of being paid according to a 10-month schedule or a 12-month schedule*. Craig Turner indicated that he received an oral response from Interim President Preczewski at the 10 February 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 aforementioned USGFC resolution on this matter was mentioned again 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 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 April 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.

6. **UPDATES FROM FAPC WORK GROUPS:**

- A. **PRE-TENURE REVIEW WORK GROUP:** Victoria Deneroff, Chair of the Pre-Tenure Work Group, 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 respective academic units. As a reminder, the 13 Jan 2012 FAPC minutes indicate that *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 and that 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.*
- B. **POST-TENURE REVIEW WORK GROUP:** Mike Rose, Chair of the Post-Tenure Review Work Group, indicated that this work group had not met since the 03 February 2012 FAPC meeting so there was no new information to provide FAPC relative to the deliberations of this work group.
- C. **FAPC STUDENT OPINION SURVEY WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATION:** 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 02 March 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 02 March 2012 meeting agenda.

7. **Tentative Agenda for the next FAPC meeting:** The tentative agenda for the next meeting includes the updates (if any) on agenda items 4.B, 4.D, and 5.A., further consideration of 6.C, a review of the draft of the committee annual report, and updates from the work groups listed in 6.A and 6.B.
8. **Adjourn:** As indicated in 6.C above, a motion to adjourn was made, seconded and approved. The meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.

Actions *Some activities lead to actions to implement the committee agreements.*

- 4.A. Represent FAPC on RPIPC’s common meeting time task force. (Craig Turner)
- 4.A. Prepare a draft of the committee annual report for committee review as indicated in the motion in the “Committee Annual Report” section of item 4.A. (Craig Turner)
- 5.A. Update Susan Allen on the postponement of bimonthly pay discussion. (Craig Turner)
7. Set the tentative agenda for the next FAPC meeting in consultation with the committee. (Craig Turner)