

**IFR statement composed by Lee Gillis & Mary Magoulick
as amended and endorsed by FAPC as a committee position statement
at its 03 Feb 2012 meeting**

The Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) recently voted in favor of basing the Individual Faculty Report (IFR) on a calendar year rather than the current method of a split academic year. The university chairs have also been discussing such a change.

The reasons for supporting this change are based largely on these problems with the current system:

- The awkwardness of the current system (March 16th of previous year through March 15th of current year), which makes the reports due in the middle of a semester, when some faculty work may be counted in the following year's reports, or both year's reports (for instance if a conference paper is given in mid-March).
- Thus the current system may not accurately account for the entire academic year nor allow for student opinions to be counted in the half semester.

By contrast, we see these as benefits of switching to a calendar year system:

- The calendar year system would allow chairs to complete their reports by the required deadline, while also allowing faculty to fully account for an entire year's worth of work in one document - in short it would be simpler for faculty and chairs to know what belongs in the report - if it occurred within the calendar year, count it.
- Typically, the calendar year IFRs (a system previously used at GCSU) [*transition from calendar year to academic year effective 09/01/2004 as University Senate motion 0405.AG.001.P; academic year IFR due date standardized to March 15 via a Nov 2007 advisory motion to VP Gormly by 2007-08 FAPC and confirmed by 07 March 2008 email to faculty from VP Gormly*] are due in early March, giving the faculty member ample time to account for all work from the previous calendar year and chairs enough time to complete faculty evaluations, return them to/meet with faculty for feedback prior to any "merit" decisions being made.
- In addition, chairs are often asked to report scholarly activity or "service learning"/engaged learning on a calendar year and, though Digital Measures may allow for accurate reporting, having all reports on the same calendar allows for increased accuracy.