

Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) Report Given to the University Senate on 18 November 2011 Submitted by Craig Turner

At its 4 Nov 2011 meeting, FAPC

1. RECOMMENDATION ADVOCATING FOR FACULTY VOICE IN ASSESSING FACULTY PERFORMANCE

Deliberation continued on the FAPC Student Opinion Survey Work Group recommendation that reads as follows: *“FAPC work group members agreed to recommend 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.”* The work group members offered rationale to the committee for this recommendation as a form of advocating for faculty voice in such matters and affording the faculty formal documentation in the institutional policy manual of the right to have this voice. As at previous FAPC meetings, committee members expressed concern about the wording of the recommendation and suggested avoiding language that was too broad or too specific. There was discussion about whether FAPC should forward this recommendation as presently worded in the form of a motion to the University Senate or if alternate language should be developed prior to being considered for submission as a motion to the University Senate. The work group members advocated for the development of alternate language indicating the current language had not been drafted with publication in the policy manual in mind. There were several suggestions made for revisions, including the inclusion of specific examples to illustrate the context in which faculty should have meaningful involvement, and wording revisions [revisions indicated in bold] such as *“**Academic year** faculty should have meaningful and substantive involvement in **all** issues related to faculty evaluation.”* A motion charging the FAPC Student Opinion Survey Work Group (Karynne Kleine, Carrie Cook, Craig Turner) to prepare a revision of the language in this recommendation informed by the committee deliberation for FAPC consideration.

2. REVIEW PRE-TENURE LANGUAGE, IFR CALENDAR, ALTERNATIVES TO TEN MONTHLY CHECKS

Review of Pre-Tenure Review Policy Manual Language: The discussion focused on the timing of this review and whether to wait for the current post-tenure language review to conclude, with no committee consensus emerging.

IFR Report from Academic Year to Calendar Year: After brief consideration of pros and cons, discussion of whether to form a work group for this item was interrupted by the time to adjourn, resulting in postponement to the next meeting.

Faculty Pay (12-month pay for Academic Year Faculty, Alternatives to Ten Monthly Checks): The 4 Nov 2011 FAPC meeting time expired before this item could be discussed.

3. RECEIVED AN UPDATE FROM THE FAPC 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 Apr 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, procedures, and practices manual. At the 7 Oct 2011 meeting, this work group noted that it will review the post-tenure review procedure in use at University of West Georgia (UWG) and ensure that it has at least one active member representing each college and the library. At the 4 Nov 2011 meeting, this work group noted that the UWG's procedures differed significantly from the current institutional procedures resulting in a recommendation to review post-tenure review procedures at other USG institutions. Mike Rose (College of Arts & Sciences) chairs the work group with active members Ken Farr (College of Business) and Craig Turner (College of Arts & Sciences) while the identification of representatives for the College of Education, College of Health Sciences and the Library are in progress.

Tentative Agenda for the 2 Dec 2011 FAPC meeting (3:30-4:45 in Arts & Sciences 1-16)

- continue consideration of the recommendations of the FAPC student opinion survey work group.
- receive updates from the FAPC workgroups (Student Opinion Survey, Post-Tenure Review)
- consider matters surviving tentative agenda review: Review of Pre-tenure review Policy Language, IFR from academic year to calendar year, Faculty Pay (12-month pay for Academic Year Faculty, Alternatives to Ten Monthly Checks)