Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2001

Members Present: Glenn Abney, Bonnie Fritz, Gerald Gay, Hugh Hudson, Katherine Johnston, Astrid Lipp, Charles
Marvin, Ramona Matthews, Linda McGehee, Marian Meyers, Richard Miller, Dave Pavesic, Charlotte Petrek, Ted
Poister, Jim Senn, Cherian Thachenkary, Lyn Thaxton, Roger Weed, Diane Willen

Members Absent: Pauline Clance, Nancy Floyd, Dan Franklin, Martin Grace, Ronald Henry, Kathryn Kozaitis, Siva
Nathan, Linda Nelson, Steve Rapp, Leonard Teel

Guest: Valerie Fennel, George Rainbolt

Diane Willen, chair, called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes for the August 27, 2001 meeting were approved.

E-Courses

George Rainbolt distributed revisions of sections 401.01, 401.03, 401.04, 401.06, 401.08, 402.01, and 408.01 to the
Faculty Handbook that the E-Course Joint-Subcommittee drafted in response to the introduction of e-courses at the
university. According to Rainbolt, the changes are technical. He cited as an example language such as “in the
classroom,” which had to be modified to the more general “designated communication channels” in order to anticipate
the variety of ways students could be present or participate in an e-course. The Committee approved the revision.

Rainbolt also distributed a Motion on Approval of New Instructional Methods, which was rejected by the Joint Ad & St,
APACE, IS&T, and Faculty Affairs Subcommittee. The Motion addresses the issue of when and if a change in the
teaching method used for a course should trigger a course review by a curriculum committee. Hugh Hudson argued
that method does affect learning as much as course content, and he made a motion to send the Motion to a Faculty
Affairs Subcommittee. Jim Senn argued that this is a college level issue that should not concern Faculty Affairs.
Hudson’s motion was defeated.

Non-Tenure Track

A motion was made to endorse the Plan to Reduce Reliance on Non-Tenure Track Faculty. Linda McGehee
questioned whether this was a university-wide plan or a plan just for the Business School. She also expressed
concern over item number three (“As university funding becomes available, open non-tenure track lines will be
converted to tenure-track lines.”) and asked how this would affect clinical faculty who also teach. Hugh Hudson said
that the plan was for the university and not just the business school. A motion to amend item three failed, and
Committee members agreed that the wording of the document clearly excluded clinical faculty. The Committee
considered further clarifying the seven-year time frame stipulated in the document, but then decided that such
restrictions could have unforeseen repercussions. The Plan was endorsed by a majority vote of 13; two members
abstained.

Evaluation of Administrators

The Committee voted to change the current procedures for the Evaluation of the Vice President of Student Services by
relieving the Dean of Students of his responsibilities of convening and serving on that evaluation committee and re-
assigning those responsibilities to the chair of the Committee on Student Discipline. There were two abstentions to
this vote, which passed with a majority of 13.

The Committee passed a new five-point evaluation scale with the change that the sixth option, formerly “Don’t Know or
No Opinion,” be changed to “Inadequate information to have an opinion.” The Committee agreed that this revised
language differentiated it more clearly from the third option, “Neither agree nor disagree.”

Both the revised evaluation instrument for the University Librarian and the new evaluation instrument for the Associate
Provost of IS&T were passed.

Policy on Sick Leave

Provost Ron Henry asked for the Committee’s advice on a draft of a Board of Regents sick leave policy. He added
that he needed this advice in time for an October 16 meeting. In response to the BOR draft, the Benefits
Subcommittee drafted its own policy on sick leave. The Subcommittee reported that faculty who had read the BOR
draft thought it reflected a misunderstanding of the work week structure of faculty. Committee members said that the
BOR draft was aimed to limit the amount of sick leave that faculty could accrue and apply toward retirement. Richard Miller presented the Benefits Subcommittee’s draft of a sick leave policy that takes into consideration the schedule of faculty at a research university such as Georgia State. Committee members made several suggestions for the draft, but only a few could be incorporated in time for the October 16 meeting: The first paragraph will become a preamble, and the title “Policy on Sick Leave” will be placed just above the four numbered points. The last sentence, with the removal of the first word “Consequently,” will become the first sentence. The phrase “the faculty are not hourly employees” and “Faculty work and faculty work load is not based upon the eight hour day nor upon the five-day work week” will be removed so that the language does not seem reactive to the BOR draft. Jim Senn recommended pasting the second paragraph of the BOR draft onto the Subcommittee draft as a 5th point.

Katherine Johnston suggested writing a position paper addressing all points that the Committee members raised, but instead the Committee decided to draft a policy and seek support from UGA and Georgia Tech. For the time being, the Committee will report to Ron Henry that there were objections to the BOR draft and that Faculty Affairs has begun work on a new policy for sick leave. The draft distributed by Richard Miller will be submitted to Ron Henry (as amended) as a working draft.

Dr. Willen adjourned the meeting at approximately 1:05 p.m.