

Faculty Affairs Policy Committee

Annual Report 2024-2025

Committee Name: Faculty Affairs Policy Committee

Academic Year: 2024-2025

Committee Charge:

- **V.Section2.C.3.a Membership.** The Faculty Affairs Policy Committee shall have no fewer than eleven (11) and no more than thirteen (13) members distributed as follows: no fewer than nine (9) and no more than 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 a designee in compliance with V.Section2.C, and one (1) member appointed by the University President in compliance with II.Section1.A.5.
- **V.Section2.C.3.b Scope.** The Faculty Affairs Policy Committee shall review and recommend for or against 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: 9/6/24, 10/4/24, 11/1/24, 1/10/25, 2/7/25, 3/7/25, 4/4/25

Executive Summary:

This narrative abstract offers an overview of the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee's key deliberations and initiatives from September 2024 through March 2025. The committee's work coalesced around data-driven policy reviews, enhanced evaluation practices, transparent leave processes, and improved faculty well-being at university events.

Compensation & Workload Policy Data Gathering: FAPC launched a multi-phase study to **benchmark and refine faculty compensation and workload structures**. In September, Jennifer Flory secured Provost-level approval to request detailed data on part-time faculty salaries, Program Coordinator stipends, and overload pay. By November, Academic Affairs had supplied preliminary figures, prompting follow-up queries to clarify salary bands and eligibility criteria. In February, the committee expanded its request to include summer-salary provisions and granular breakdowns of coordinator duties, administrative support, and service-counting policies. This study will continue into the 2024-2025 AY.

Teaching & Course Evaluation Policies: In response to unintended consequences of the updated Student Opinion Survey (SRIS) policy, FAPC worked to **ensure fair evaluations** for co-taught, lab-supervised, and cross-listed courses. Committee members endorsed David Smith's recommendation to flag such courses in Banner and advised faculty to collaborate with departmental administrators for accurate survey assignments. Concurrently, FAPC explored the **integration of a CTL-hosted resource link into SRIS and Annual Evaluation policies** through the **Teaching Effectiveness Ad Hoc Committee**. When the committee's focus began to stray, FAPC stepped in to realign its charge and refocus its objectives. This [list](#) is slated for publication in the CTL Faculty course on GaView in Fall 2025. Amid these efforts, the committee also discussed **realigning tenure-evaluation criteria** with the Board of Regents' five-category model, responding to USG Academic Affairs' call for "norming" of tenure scores.

Professional Leave Policy & Rubric Development: FAPC engaged in a **layered review of the university's professional leave program to bolster transparency and consistency**. Initial discussions highlighted discrepancies between legacy and current application forms and a review rubric used by the A&S panel. After soliciting clarification from Academic Affairs, FAPC recommended that university-level standards be articulated first, then that the college rubric be realigned accordingly and shared with applicants. To institutionalize these improvements, the committee will convene an **ad hoc faculty panel in Fall 2025**—representing all colleges and Academic Affairs—to define key terms, establish award quotas or balanced allocations, and **craft a unified rubric for FY 2026 proposals**.

Faculty Attendance & Regalia Policy: FAPC addressed **health and safety concerns** surrounding **mandatory university events**—Graduation, Convocation, Academic Expo, etc. Faculty recounted stifling line-ups, prolonged exposure to heat, and inadequate seating. To mitigate these risks, the committee recommended shortening ceremonies, increasing chair spacing, providing climate-controlled waiting areas, and offering hybrid or rescheduled formats. FAPC recommended the University offer accommodations and/or alternative arrangements for University events for those with medical concerns and issues. The issue was raised again in July and the Provost said that the Convocation planning committee would discuss the concerns and provide information on how faculty can request accommodations and what resources will be available to make the events of the day as accessible as possible.

Modified Operations & Committee Processes: FAPC reviewed the draft of the Modified Operations Policy with Nicholas Creel and Cara Smith. The goal is to distill procedural details into a succinct HR policy while retaining essential governance provisions in the committee handbook. Proposed changes were tracked in the Faculty Evaluation Policy and circulated to Academic Affairs and ECUS members for review. The committee will review and vote on the revised policy at the earliest opportunity in Fall 2025.

Committee Membership and Record of Attendance:

Members	9/6	10/4	11/1	1/10	2/7	3/7	4/4
Jennifer Flory (chair)	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Amy Sumpter (vice-chair)	P	P	P	P	P	R	P
Benjamin "Chad" Whittle (secretary)	P	P	P	P	P	P	R
Christopher Clark	P	P	P	P	R	P	P
Helen DuPree	P	R	P	P	P	P	P
Sabrina Hom	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
Frank A. Richardson	A	R	P	A	A	A	A
Suzanna Roman-Oliver	P	P	P	P	P	P	P
John Marshall Smith	P	P	P	R	P	R	P
Winston Tripp	P	P	P	P	R	P	P
David Weese	P	P	P	P	P	R	P

Motions brought to the Senate floor:

<u>Motion</u>	<u>Type</u>	<u>Author</u>	<u>Committee</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Update</u>
[2425.FAPC.001.P] Emeritus Title Policy Revision	Policy Recommendation	jennifer.flory@gcsu.edu	FAPC	Awaiting Action by Implementor	06/18/2025

Motion Text: To approve the proposed revisions to the Emeritus Title Policy as outlined in the supporting documents. Faculty will have 1 year prior to retirement and up to 3 years after to file for this recognition.



Emeritus Title Policy Revision
Emeritus Policy as of 10.28.24 with trac
Emeritus Policy as of 10.28.24 clean dr

The primary contention in revising the Faculty Emeritus Policy centered on the eligible application window. Below is a streamlined chronology of actions and decisions:

- 2021 Policy: The original policy allowed emerita/emeritus applications from 30 days before retirement through 30 days into the following semester. It also included a transitional clause permitting pre-policy retirees to petition their vice president for status.
- September 6, 2024: FAPC unanimously voted to remove the transitional clause and eliminate all time limits. At the subsequent ECUS–SCC meeting, the Provost raised concerns about an open-ended window. After discussion, chairs agreed on a one-year-before to one-year-after retirement timeframe. An electronic FAPC vote (9/12–9/13) on that revision failed for lack of quorum.
- October 4, 2024: FAPC explored extending the post-retirement window to five years. Rather than vote immediately, FAPC deferred to a follow-up ECUS–SCC discussion, which reinstated the one-year-before/one-year-after proposal. An electronic vote (10/7–10/9) narrowly approved that timeframe.
- October 18, 2024: After robust debate at the University Senate meeting, senators amended the policy to span one year prior through three years after retirement. The amendment passed with three dissenting faculty votes; the final, amended policy then received unanimous voice-vote approval by eligible faculty senators.

Other Significant Deliberation (Non-Motions):

The Faculty Affairs Policy Committee advanced from data collection to policy drafting across five core areas: compensation and workload, teaching evaluations, professional leave, emeritus status, and faculty well-being. Their work emphasized transparency, consistency, and data-driven decision-making, setting the stage for substantive updates in the next academic year.

Compensation & Workload Data Gathering

- Launched a multi-phase benchmarking study covering part-time salaries, coordinator stipends, overload pay, and summer-salary provisions.
- Secured Provost approval for detailed data requests in September; received preliminary figures by November and refined inquiries through February.
- Expanded scope to include breakdowns of administrative support, service counts, and coordinator duties.

Teaching & Course Evaluation

- Addressed unintended gaps in the updated SRIS policy for co-taught, lab-supervised, and cross-listed courses.
- Recommended Banner flags for special course types and collaboration with administrators to ensure proper survey assignments.
- Explored embedding CTL resource links into evaluation policies and realigning tenure-evaluation criteria with the Board of Regents' five-category model.

Professional Leave Policy & Rubric Development

- Identified discrepancies between legacy and current application forms and the A&S review rubric.

- Advised articulating university-level standards first, then realigning college rubrics and sharing them with applicants.
- Will convene a cross-college ad hoc panel in Fall 2025 to define terms, set quotas or balanced allocations, and craft a unified rubric for FY 2026 proposals.

Faculty Emeritus Status Policy

- Debated eligibility windows ranging from one to five years post-retirement and compared peer-institution benchmarks.
- Recommended a one-year-before to three-years-after retirement window, which the University Senate amended and approved in November.
- Policy now awaits implementor action.

Faculty Attendance & Regalia at University Events

- Reviewed health and safety concerns at mandatory events (e.g., graduation, convocation).
- Proposed shorter ceremonies, increased chair spacing, climate-controlled waiting areas, and hybrid or rescheduled formats.
- Encouraged formal accommodations for medical concerns; Provost tasked the Convocation planning committee with detailing accommodation procedures.

Modified Operations & Committee Processes

- Collaborated with HR representatives to distill procedural details into a concise policy and retain governance provisions in the committee handbook.
- Tracked proposed changes in the Faculty Evaluation Policy and circulated drafts to Academic Affairs and ECUS.
- Plans to review and vote on the revised policy in Fall 2025.

Ad hoc committees and other groups: Teaching Effectiveness Ad Hoc Committee (see above)

Committee Reflections:

This reflection evaluates what went well, what encountered challenges, and how the committee's activities aligned with its charge to review and recommend policies affecting faculty welfare.

What Worked Well

- Cross-Unit Collaboration: Partnered effectively with Academic Affairs, CTL, the Registrar, and ECUS to refine teaching-evaluation resources, flag complex course types in Banner, and coordinate policy revisions.
- Targeted Policy Win: Guided the University Senate to amend and approve the Emeritus status timeline (one year prior through three years after retirement), fulfilling a major committee objective.

What Did Not Work So Well

- Data-collection: Unable to secure data from Academic Affairs for multi-phase study to benchmark and refine faculty compensation and workload structures.
- Quorum & Voting Delays: Electronic votes on the Emeritus policy and other motions fell short of quorum, prolonging decision cycles.
- Scope Creep in Ad Hoc Committee: The Teaching Effectiveness Ad Hoc Committee initially diverged from its charge, requiring FAPC intervention to realign objectives and deadlines.
- Deferred PPPM Audit: The comprehensive audit of the PPPM was postponed to address higher-priority issues and remains outstanding.
- Protracted Professional Leave Rubric Finalization: Long discussions about and research into Professional Leave did not lead to a solution by year's end, delaying clarity for prospective applicants.

Time Spent

- Workload & Compensation: approximately 30 %
- Teaching Evaluation & Academic Freedom: 25%
- Recognition & Development (Professional Leave): 20%
- Rights & Recognitions (Emeritus Status): 15%
- Procedural Advice & Committee Operations: 10%

This distribution reflects FAPC's commitment to data-driven policy reviews, enhanced evaluation practices, transparent leave processes, and bolstered faculty welfare—fully aligned with its charge for 2024–25.

Committee Recommendations:

Work Carried Forward

- Continue discussions to realign tenure and promotion criteria with the Board of Regents' five-category model by reviewing GCSU's more stringent requirements—matched by only one other USG campus. Half of USG institutions (including Georgia Tech) omit any "noteworthiness" standard, and two (including UGA) apply it in only two of the five areas. Draft and recommend to the University Senate updated evaluation criteria that fully integrate USG expectations and guard against inflationary pressures on faculty assessments.
- Continue and finalize multi-phase benchmarking study covering part-time salaries, coordinator stipends, overload pay, summer-salary provisions, breakdowns of administrative support, service counts, and coordinator duties.

- Finalize and approve the university-level Professional Leave rubric, send to colleges for alignment, and publicize clear guidelines for applicants.
- Complete the comprehensive audit of the PPPM, identify redundancies, and propose streamlined governance revisions.

Issues to Consider

- To align with the USG policy statement below, initiate exploratory discussions aimed at creating a transparent framework for recognizing and rewarding faculty with positive post-tenure review outcomes—whether through formal recognition, merit pay, promotion, educational leave, or other incentives.
 - “The results of a positive post-tenure review should be linked to recognition or reward. Faculty members who are performing at noteworthy levels should receive recognition for their achievements. Each institution will prescribe how the review results will be related to possible rewards such as formal recognition, merit pay, promotion, educational leave, etc.” “The results of a positive post-tenure review should be linked to recognition or reward. Faculty members who are performing at noteworthy levels should receive recognition for their achievements. Each institution will prescribe how the review results will be related to possible rewards such as formal recognition, merit pay, promotion, educational leave, etc.”
- Draft a policy for department chairs to get training on how to evaluate colleagues in their department on their teaching, what that looks like, how it can be accomplished, what tools are available, etc.
- Commission a detailed retention analysis for contingent faculty to address gaps in contract renewal and support.
- Launch a Provost-led retention study for limited-term lecturers to inform recruitment and support strategies.

Recommend items for consideration at the governance retreat:

- Introduce chair Jennifer Flory and vice-chair Sabrina Hom.
- Review office of secretary (secretary will take notes that can later be archived).
- Evaluate and Prioritize Committee Recommendations.
 - Review all 2024–2025 committee recommendations.
 - Prioritize top three initiatives for the 2025–2026 term.
- Identify Emerging Oversight and Policy Needs: Brainstorm new issues or review challenges that surfaced during 2024–2025 term.
- Establish Committee Operating Procedures for 2025–2026 term.
 - Review last year’s operating procedures document (see below).
 - Discuss and vote on meeting location.

Appendix: Committee Operating Procedures



FAPC Operating
Procedures 2024-2025