

# Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) Report Given to the University Senate on 23 September 2011 Submitted by Craig Turner

## At its 2 Sep 2011 meeting, FAPC

### 1. REVIEWED AND APPROVED COMMITTEE OPERATING PROCEDURES

*These procedures are accessible from the FAPC web presence. On 2 Sep 2011, these operating procedures were filed with the Executive Committee as called for in Article III, Section 1 of the University Senate Bylaws.*

### 2. SELECTED A REPRESENTATIVE TO SERVE ON THE INSTITUTIONAL SACS STEERING COMMITTEE

*The Provost requested that each University Senate standing committee select a member to serve on the SACS steering committee during the 2011-12 academic year and Craig Turner was selected by FAPC to serve as its representative.*

### 3. CONSIDERED QUESTIONS ABOUT CONTRACTS OF ACADEMIC YEAR FACULTY

*The committee deliberation 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.*

### 4. CONSIDERED ACADEMIC YEAR FACULTY SUMMER COURSE PAY

*A faculty constituency expressed a concern 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.*

### 5. CONSIDERED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE DIGITAL MEASURES (FACULTY ACTIVITY DATABASE)

*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.*

**6. RECEIVED A REPORT FROM ITS STUDENT OPINION SURVEY WORK GROUP**

*At its 29 April 2011 organizational meeting, the 2011-2012 FAPC members formed a work group to meet with a representative of the University Council of Chairs 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 University Chairs Council and **suggested that a work group of 6-10 members, the majority faculty and the minority from University 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. The work group also 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 as concerns about the language of the proposed motion were expressed. These concerns are documented in the meeting minutes. 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.*

**7. RECEIVED A REPORT FROM ITS POST-TENURE REVIEW WORK GROUP**

*This issue arose in April 2010[at the final meeting of the 2009-10 FAPC] from a concern about the post-tenure review appeal process. This was passed from the 2009-10 FAPC to the 2010-2011 FAPC members who unanimously recommended that a post-tenure review work group include at least one representative from each academic unit (colleges and library) and that this work group review the post-tenure review language in the institutional Academic Affairs Handbook ensuring clarity and a careful review of the appeal process. At its 29 April 2011 organizational meeting, the 2011-12 FAPC members unanimously endorsed continuation of this work after hearing the report of the 2010-2011 FAPC Post-Tenure Review Work Group. At the 2 Sep 2011 FAPC meeting, this work group reported that a subset of its membership met once since the 29 Apr 2011 FAPC meeting and the work group is continuing its review of the post-tenure language (formerly in the academic affairs handbook) in the university policy manual. As part of its report, the work group noted that 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. Additionally, the work group will ensure that it has at least one active member representing each college and the library.*

**Tentative Agenda for the 7 Oct 2011 FAPC meeting** (3:30-4:45 in Arts & Sciences 1-16)

- tentative agenda items for the 2011-2012 FAPC considered at the 10 August 2011 governance retreat
- continue the deliberation on the recommendations of the student opinion survey work group.