

# Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) Report Given to the University Senate on 27 January 2012 Submitted by Craig Turner

This report summarizes committee deliberations for the 3 Dec 2011 and 13 Jan 2012 meetings.  
*Items A and B were considered at the 3 Dec 2011 FAPC meeting while item C was considered at the 13 Jan 2012 FAPC meeting.*

## A. REPORT ON THE WORK OF THE UNIVERSITY CHAIRS COUNCIL STUDENT OPINION SURVEY (SOS) WORK GROUP:

- i. Members of this work group:  
Lee Gillis (chair), Indiren Pillay, Stephen Auerbach, Bill Fisher, Carrie Cook, Julia Metzker, Craig Turner.
- ii. There are six options on which information is being gathered:  
CIEQ, SIRII (ETS), IDEA, CourseEval, eXplorance, Scantron.
- iii. Carrie Cook provided information about the progress of the work group. She reported that the work group would meet again in January 2012 and was still in the process of gathering information about surveys from some of the companies, including information on cost and survey questions. The Provost noted that the charge of this work group was to follow up on faculty concerns (originally reported by the Chairs' Council) that the current SOS was not reliable or adequate by comparing the currently used (locally produced) SOS to several nationally vetted surveys. The result of the review would be a report to the provost on the veracity of the concerns over the reliability of the current SOS. Additionally, while collecting and reviewing sample student surveys, the provost requested that the work group collect information on the cost of the professionally prepared instruments. Provost Jordan indicated that once the report is turned in to her, there will be a need to determine what, if any, additional work is needed. If the report suggests the need for a change in the SOS, a larger, more representative group (with appropriate constituent representatives) will need to be formed to move the project to the next level. If the group indicates no significant difference exists between survey instruments, there may be no need for additional discussion or action.

## B. FAPC STUDENT OPINION SURVEY WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:

- i. Members of this work group: Karynne Kleine (chair), Carrie Cook, Craig Turner.
- ii. During the 04 November 2011 FAPC meeting a motion was made charging the FAPC Student Opinion Survey Work Group to prepare, for committee deliberation, a revision of the language in their recommendation. Carrie Cook reported that the work group revised the language in the original recommendation and asked the committee to consider the revised language for deliberation. The original recommendation given at the 02 September 2011 FAPC meeting was "*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 revised recommendation for committee consideration was "*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 Provost asked Carrie to identify the underlying issue this recommendation is addressing. Carrie responded that the work group sees this recommendation as a form of faculty advocacy. Provost Jordan indicated her view is that the University Senate (faculty) recommends policy but does not develop procedure. Some committee members expressed a concern that the proposed language "*reviewing and informing the development of procedures and practices appertaining*" seems to extend the role of faculty into the administrative role of developing the procedures that implement policy. The FAPC Student Opinion Survey Work Group members present (Carrie Cook, Craig Turner) indicated that the work group's intent was to formalize the role of faculty in decision-making and

acknowledged there can be a disconnect between intent and reception. A lively discussion ensued where FAPC members expressed varying opinions about the recommendation, including: agreement that the recommendation formalizes appropriate involvement by faculty, concern that it will create an unnecessary divide between faculty and administrators, concern about the wording of the language being too broad or too narrow, a desire to abandon the recommendation altogether given that its adoption would not significantly affect the existing university culture, concern that the recommendation is redundant given the formal mechanisms for faculty voice that currently exist, and identification of relevant language from the American Association of University Professors (section 5 of the AAUP *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*) and BOR policy (3.2.4 Faculty Rules and Regulations). There was discussion about how the recommendation, if adopted, would be put forward. The FAPC Student Opinion Survey Work Group members present (Carrie Cook, Craig Turner) indicated that the work group's deliberation focused its efforts on the development of the language rather than its final destination. Upon request, the committee chair offered possibilities for the committee's consideration (a motion to the University Senate or publication in the policy manual etc.). During discussion of this item, 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 to postpone further discussion of this item and postpone discussion of the remaining items on the agenda to the next meeting and to adjourn this meeting. This motion was seconded and approved.

C. SUMMARY OF THE 13 JANUARY 2012 FAPC MEETING:

- i. CONTINUE DELIBERATION OF FAPC SOS WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATION
- ii. PRE-TENURE REVIEW LANGUAGE

Review the language in the *University Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual*.

Committee members discussed whether to form a work group to examine this agenda item. There was discussion about the purpose of pre-tenure review and distinguishing the process of pre-tenure review from the process of post-tenure review. A motion to form a FAPC Pre-Tenure Review Work Group consisting of at least one faculty member of each academic college and the library and charged to review the pre-tenure language in the university policies, procedures, and practices manual and prepare recommendations on proposed revisions (if any) to the pre-tenure language for FAPC review was made, seconded and approved. During the deliberation of this motion, some of the FAPC members volunteered to serve on this work group. Specifically, 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. 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.

- iii. INDIVIDUAL FACULTY REPORT (IFR) FROM ACADEMIC YEAR TO CALENDAR YEAR

Consideration of modifying the IFR reporting calendar from academic year to calendar year

It was noted that the University Chairs Council is engaged in discussion about this item, specifically in the context of their administrative duties and calendars. Committee members discussed some options for addressing this item. Some suggestions included: surveying faculty to determine which reporting year (academic or calendar) they prefer and why, reporting to faculty the advantages and disadvantages of both reporting year (academic and calendar) options and soliciting feedback, etc. There was a suggestion that Tom Ormond may be able to provide some specific information to the committee as he has been working with department chairs on this matter. The committee members discussed the benefits of offering faculty voice to those who are currently considering the matter. There was some discussion about the advantages and disadvantages of both the academic year and calendar year IFR. Though some committee members have consulted with their respective constituencies, not all departments at the institution are represented by members of the committee. Some of these members reported that the faculty they talked to are in favor of revising the process to be based on the calendar year. A motion to charge the FAPC Chair to inform the University

Chairs Council Chair that the members of the 2011-2012 FAPC (and not necessarily their constituencies) favor basing the IFR on a calendar year instead of an academic year was made, seconded and approved. A motion to draft a statement of the FAPC position and to have academic deans solicit faculty feedback from the faculty members in their respective academic units (colleges and the library) was made, seconded, and approved. Mary Magoulick agreed to prepare a draft of this position statement in consultation with Lee Gillis, University Chairs Council Chair, and circulate it by email to FAPC members prior to the next FAPC meeting.

iv. FACULTY PAY

12-month pay for academic year faculty/ alternatives to 10 monthly checks

The committee was reminded that there is preliminary consideration by centralized payroll administrators that all USG employees (faculty and staff) be paid twice a month. There was some discussion about whether it would be productive for FAPC to take a position on this matter if it is being considered at the system level. There was a suggestion that FAPC request information from the institutional administration regarding this matter. A motion to charge the FAPC Chair to send to Interim President Stas Preczewski a statement that the Faculty Affairs Policy Committee recommends that academic year faculty have the option of being paid according to a 10-month schedule or a 12- month schedule was made, seconded and approved. Following the meeting, a 10-month faculty pay question and answer document prepared by President Leland in 2005 was linked to the meeting agenda at the FAPC web presence.

D. TENTATIVE AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE NEXT MEETING [3:30-4:45 ON FRI 3 FEB 2012 IN ARTS & SCIENCES 1-16]:

- i. INDIVIDUAL FACULTY REPORT (IFR) FROM ACADEMIC YEAR TO CALENDAR YEAR
- ii. FACULTY PAY (12-MONTH PAY FOR ACADEMIC YEAR FACULTY, ALTERNATIVES TO 10 MONTHLY CHECKS)
- iii. REPORTS FROM FAPC WORK GROUPS
  - (a) PRE-TENURE REVIEW
  - (b) POST-TENURE REVIEW
  - (c) STUDENT OPINION SURVEY