

# Faculty Affairs Policy Committee (FAPC) Report

## Given to the University Senate on 24 February 2012

### Submitted by Craig Turner

- A. A FACULTY CONCERN ABOUT COMMON MEETING TIME: Some committee members expressed concern that the change to the common meeting time that took effect in fall 2011 – a shift from Monday 12:20-1:50 and Friday 12:20-1:50 to Friday 2:00-5:00 – seems to make the scheduling of meetings for groups not designated in the governance calendar more challenging. Another committee member observed that most faculty spend more time in meetings each week than is set aside by the current three hour common meeting block. There was a reminder that recently a faculty member [Dee Sams] had filed a report with the Executive Committee prepared by some marketing majors that had articulated similar concerns with the current common meeting time for scheduling meetings of student groups. It was further noted that while the previous common meeting time of Monday and Friday 12:20-1:50 was in effect, many faculty and student groups would meet Wednesday 12:20-1:50 as virtually no classes were scheduled at this Wednesday time. Some suggestions were made about how to consider this issue (including looking at the current schedules, conducting a faculty survey, requesting the development of tools to assist in scheduling of meetings of faculty groups, etc.). There was also brief discussion about whether this item was within the scope of FAPC or APC. One committee member observed that while classes are important, faculty meetings are necessary to conduct institutional business and expressed the opinion that the aforementioned change to the common meeting time and class start times seems to underemphasize the necessity for having sufficient time to schedule meetings. Another committee member noted that presently very few classes are scheduled with a start time of 8:00 a.m. and thus scheduling meetings with 8:00 a.m. start times might be a feasible option for some faculty groups. Additionally, committee members suggested alternatives to face-to-face meetings including phone conferencing and Skype. The committee members charged the committee chair to bring this issue to the 10 February 2012 joint meeting of Standing Committee Chairs and Executive Committee to seek guidance and determine whether this concern resonates with other faculty.
- B. IFR FROM ACADEMIC YEAR TO CALENDAR YEAR: At the 13 January 2011 meeting, Mary Magoulick agreed to draft a position statement in consultation with Lee Gillis, University Chairs Council Chair, and circulate it by email to FAPC members. An email with the position statement was circulated by Mary for FAPC review prior to this meeting. In addition, supporting documents for the timeline offered in the position statement are linked to the meeting agenda at the FAPC web presence and indicate that the transition from calendar year to academic year occurred in two stages. The committee chair noted that the motion made by the committee at its 13 January meeting was provided on the agenda and read as *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.* There was some discussion among members about this issue. One committee member wondered why FAPC would solicit responses from faculty via the academic deans by providing its position statement. A concern was expressed that this approach appears to tell faculty what their opinion should be. There was discussion about the benefits of offering the Provost feedback from all concerned parties including department chairs, university faculty, and FAPC. Discussion ensued about the best way to solicit faculty feedback. Suggestions from FAPC members included sending faculty a survey asking for them to express a preference for academic year, a preference for calendar year, or to indicate ambivalence. Another suggestion was having FAPC members discuss the issue with their respective constituencies (colleges, departments). A point was made that another faculty survey may not be prudent in light of the anecdotal perception that many faculty already feel overloaded with surveys. A motion to amend the position statement by (1) removing the word “awkwardly” from the first bulleted item (2) changing the words “problems”, “current system”, “benefits”, and “switching” from upper case to lower case (3) eliminating the sentence “This survey is to solicit input from the faculty as a whole.”, to rescind the portion of the 13 January 2012 motion that read *to have academic deans solicit faculty feedback from the faculty members in their respective academic units (colleges and the library)*, and to endorse the draft position statement as

amended as the FAPC position statement was made, seconded, and approved. This position statement, as amended and endorsed, is provided on page three of this report.

C. FACULTY PAY (12 MONTH PAY FOR ACADEMIC YEAR FACULTY/ ALTERNATIVES TO 10 MONTHLY CHECKS):

FAPC is currently awaiting a response from Interim President Stas Preczewski, to the 13 January 2012 FAPC recommendation that *academic year faculty have the option of being paid according to a 10-month schedule or a 12-month schedule*. Interim President Preczewski has responded by email to acknowledge his receipt of the recommendation and his intent to look into this matter. Craig Turner provided the committee a document that summarized an email conversation with Susan Allen on this matter in which she requested FAPC feedback on how faculty would feel about the bi-monthly payment possibility as it's back on the Shared Services Committee (SSC) agenda. After some discussion about bi-monthly pay, several members of FAPC expressed their impression that faculty are most interested in the addition of the 12-month pay option to the current 10-month pay option. FAPC agreed to postpone a discussion about bi-monthly pay until it receives the aforementioned response from the interim president. The committee chair was charged to relay this information to Susan Allen on behalf of the committee. The aforementioned document summarizing the email conversation with Susan Allen is available on page four of this report as well as linked to the agenda.

D. FAPC STUDENT OPINION SURVEY WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS:

- i. Members of this work group: Karynne Kleine (chair), Carrie Cook, Craig Turner.
- ii. The current draft of the work group recommendation under consideration states *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.* A member asked for classification of the recommendation as policy, procedure, or practice. A member of the work group indicated the opinion that the recommendation is policy and noted that although it is currently practice to involve faculty members in decisions about faculty evaluation, there is concern that one day it may not be practice. This work group member went on to say that the recommendation was intended to advocate for faculty and articulate the role of faculty in the consideration of matters pertaining to faculty evaluation. There was an alternative opinion that the policy is "faculty shall be evaluated" and that the recommendation is a statement of best practice, and that developing policy to control a practice is beyond the charge of this committee or the university senate. There was some discussion about making a motion to amend the policy from "faculty shall be evaluated" to say something to the effect of "faculty shall be evaluated, having meaningful and substantive involvement in faculty evaluation." Another member suggested that if the work group recommendation is a policy proposal, it should include language detailing the role of academic administrators [provost, deans, chairs] in faculty evaluation. At this point, a member of the committee observed the proximity to time for adjournment and as an alternative to revising the language as a committee of the whole, offered a motion to postpone consideration of this matter to the next meeting charging the student opinion survey work group to prepare at least one alternative version of the language for consideration by the committee. This motion was seconded and approved.

E. TENTATIVE AGENDA ITEMS FOR 2 MARCH 2012 FAPC MEETING:

- i. FACULTY PAY: 12 month pay for academic year faculty/ alternatives to 10 monthly checks
- ii. FAPC Work Group Updates
  1. PRE-TENURE REVIEW LANGUAGE
    - Review the language in the *University Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual*.
  2. POST-TENURE REVIEW LANGUAGE
    - Review the language in the *University Policies, Procedures, and Practices Manual*.
  3. CONTINUE DELIBERATION OF FAPC SOS WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATION

**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.

**A Q&A on Academic Year Faculty Pay**  
**Distributed to FAPC at its 3 February 2012 meeting**

*Based on email between Craig Turner and Susan Allen spanning the dates Feb 1, 2012 through Feb 3, 2012*

**February 1, 2012**

Susan: At the next FAPC meeting, would you please get feedback on how faculty would feel about the bi-monthly payment possibility? It's back on the SSC agenda.

Craig: I'll be happy to. A few questions.

**February 2, 2012**

Craig: Does SSC mean Shared Services Committee?

Susan: Yes.

Craig: When does SSC next meet?

Susan: I don't think they have "set" meeting times, this isn't time sensitive.

Craig: How soon do we need to have faculty feedback to inform the SSC deliberation?

Susan: This could possibly go on for another year...there are so many people that have to get involved and so many hurdles to jump.

Craig: How would biweekly pay for academic year faculty work: twenty times (twice a month for ten months) or twenty-four times (twice a month for twelve months) or some other scheme?

Susan: This part hasn't been fully thought through. I think they're just trying to find out how faculty feel about this possibility.

Craig: USG Faculty Council meets Feb 25 - is it meaningful to seek input at that time?

Susan: That will work...we're just gathering feedback at this point.

**February 3, 2012**

Craig: May I share your responses with FAPC?

Susan: Certainly, and please tell them it is and has been on the radar it's just going to be a long drawn-out process with so many "players/approvers" involved.