FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 02, 2002

Members present: Glenn Abney, Gayle Christian, Pauline Clance, Bonnie Fritz, Gerald Gay, Hugh Hudson, Linda McGehee, Jean Miller, Jim Senn, Cherian Thachenkary, and Marta White


Guest: Connie Rifkind, College Administrative Officer in College of Arts and Sciences.

Report on FASA

Bonnie Fritz introduced Connie Rifkind, a guest at this afternoon’s meeting. Mrs. Rifkind gave a report regarding Faculty and Staff Assistance (FASA). FASA is a confidential service for Georgia State University faculty and staff that offers short term counseling and referral for problems ranging from work-related concerns to personal difficulties. This service has been in existence for over 10 years. The office is located on the 3rd floor of Sparks Hall, the former Legal Affairs office. This service is being evaluated by Human Resources and the VP for Finance and Administration for a decision to be kept as an internal employee assistance program or outsourced to an outside agency. Mrs. Rifkind was invited to this meeting to bring to faculty’s attention that this decision process was going on and get feedback if the faculty were interested in being involved in the decision process.

Ms. Rifkind indicated the decision is budget driven and the ultimate decision would be made by Katharine Johnston, VP for Finance and Administration. The interim head of FASA is a temporary employee whose contract was extended an additional three months. The support staff position is expected to be eliminated at the end of the year.

Jean Miller asked if raw numbers on the numbers of faculty and staff using this service were available. Mrs. Rifkind stated she would send the FASA’s Annual Report which has the number of faculty and staff utilizing the service.

Bonnie Fritz clarified the Counseling Center worked closely and with a lot of collaboration with FASA, but was mainly for students. FASA was the only on-campus service of this type available to faculty and staff.

Faculty Affairs committee members indicated they were concerned about this issue and Cherian Thachenkary stated the Benefits Subcommittee would discuss at their meeting tomorrow.

Subcommittee Report-Evaluation of Administrators

Hugh Hudson reported when the subcommittee held conversations regarding the evaluation process, the President had asked that they have conversations with the person going through the evaluation. During their evaluation with the Vice President for Research, the subcommittee agreed to a request from the VP for Research that his external constituencies be included in the evaluation process. The subcommittee believed it was a reasonable request and agreed to include a comments section to deal with external constituents. The comment section was left out of the report approved by Faculty Affairs at its last meeting and is being brought back for approval to be included in the report as follows:

Section B of the staff instrument will also be provided to the Vice Presidents for Research of the member institutions of the Georgia Research Alliance with a request that they contribute their written comments.
Fritz stated she did not bring extra copies of the Evaluation of Administrations and of Intellectual Properties, but if Committee members would like, she would send copies electronically, including the agenda items.

**Subcommittee Report: On-line Faculty Evaluations**

Glenn Abney stated the responsibility given to the committee is to evaluate the use of on-line evaluations and make recommendations to what happens in 2003. He stated one thing the Subcommittee needs to do is meet and decide how to evaluate the online evaluation process and thought it would be nice to have input from the whole committee. Abney expressed his concerns he has with the process.

The response rate for minim esters, early returns were frightening and he is very concerned with the response rate. Despite promises made to deal with the return rate, he anticipates the response rate being quite low. Two things he suggested that can help increase the response rate is one, faculty members have to support it (on line evaluations) and have to push it. The second suggestion is to use, peer pressure, but he admitted he was not sure how to utilize. During a meeting with Georgia Tech, he was told individual rewards did not work, but giving the whole class a reward as an incentive worked better. He also reported that surveys of people using online evaluations revealed a positive aspect in that the comments were more qualitative and the responses were longer and more thoughtful.

The online evaluations will have a comment section and another block below that will allow students to evaluate the evaluation process. A real danger of the on line evaluation process is it is being built around email to students. The problem is that emails are going out to the GSU email address.

Jane Miller stated she thought part of the explanation for the poor response rate is it started on September 24 and she was not sure if any faculty member, beside those on the Faculty Affairs Committee were aware or knew the online evaluation process was coming down the pipe. There is a real concern that faculty members are not getting the message. Faculty are supposed to be given running totals of their enrollment and how many student are completing the evaluations.

Cherian Thachenkary reported his experience with one of his classes regarding communications. He indicated he got on GoSolar and sent email to his class of 30 and only two students responded to his email and only one student indicated he had heard of GoSolar. All of his students had a non GSU email account. All official communications should go through the GSU email account. In response to a question if technology would be able to handle the GSU email system, Jim Penn stated he had been to ISAT meetings and the people who are responsible say they are in good shape.

Nancy Floyd stated she has a concern with Abney's suggestions on dealing with the low response rate. She felt that continuing to remind students over and over to complete the online evaluations puts her in a bad position and felt it was the University's responsibility to offer incentives. Abney indicated he thought the University will offer incentives, but explained the worst thing would be if faculty blows the evaluation process off, and believed that reminders are appropriate.

In response to a questions regarding if there would be any problems for tenured faculty, it was answered that evaluations were considered in post tenure review.

Jean Miller expressed her concern with some faculty being given the choice to chose to do the evaluations on paper or doing them online. She thought it would be comparing apples and oranges, not to mention the administrative nightmare of doing that way. She felt it would be difficult for chairs to know what they're dealing with and thought that would be an incentive for everyone to do the evaluations on line.

Miller also expressed her concern that communications to the student is breaking down because students are not reading their GSU email and equating that to say that the online evaluation process does not have integrity and isn’t going to work because students are not reading their email. The problem is students are not reading their email.
She expressed her surprise that students have not realized how important the GSU email account, especially now that professors can email their whole class through the student's GSU email account.

Abney responded there were so many different dimensions to make the online evaluation process work including student’s not getting email, glitches in the system, process of communications or lack thereof between administrators, implementors, Deans and faculty members. He reiterated it is not the subcommittee’s responsibility to fix, but just to provide feedback. Bonnie Fritz suggested this was a good opportunity to establish a faculty feedback line where faculty can pose questions and answers can be presented in a timely way.

Thachenkary asked for clarification on how the Chairs got access to the faculty’s evaluation and wondered if copies of the summaries along with comments for each course were copied to the Chairs GoSolar account. Fritz suggested this might be a question for the Deans.

Miller inquired if other colleges been asked whether they wanted to do evaluations on paper or online. Hudson indicated the Provost’s statement had gone to all the colleges, but some Deans were going to make the choice.

Fritz suggested the subcommittee should start prioritizing issues with the online evaluation process. How to contact the Dean’s and faculty might be something the subcommittee should focus on to make sure everybody gets the word out and the next thing is how to boost the responses.

Hudson called for a motion to request from the Provost verification that faculty in all of the colleges have been informed of the student evaluation on-line process ensuring that the Provost would have to ask the Deans. Abney will send email to the Provost of this request.

The Implementation Team needs to be more active in communicating to Faculty and doing some major works with the different colleges, faculty and staff. The Implementation Team is assuming the college schedulers are going back to the colleges with information and this is not happening. The Committee asked Abney to give feedback that whatever the intention was with communicating with faculty is not happening, in terms of educating faculty about the online evaluation process.

Fritz stated the subcommittee would meet and make some decisions about what kinds of information it will need to get through the first round of the process. It was suggested to ask someone from the Implementation Team sit in on the subcommittee meetings. Abney replied he would ask Patti Karst if she could.

In response to a question if students could enter their preferred email address in the system when they registered, the answer was they could log on their GSU email account and forward their mail to their regular internet email account. Faculty are encouraged to educate and talk to students at the beginning of the term on the first day to get their students to forward their emails. Fritz stated faculty could email their concerns to the Associate Provost or powers that be and will get a response either directly or indirectly.

Hudson contended that the Faculty Affairs Committee charge is to make policy and its responsibility is to give a reasonable analysis of the system. Going to the online process is not a given. The President would have to veto a Senate decision. Hudson expressed it is a critical concern to get a statement about the viability of going to an online system or staying with the current system. One thing that would be very helpful, is information about costs, how much will it cost the University to continue with online evaluations.

Fritz suggested when the subcommittee meets, a list be made of all the things that have been expressed as concerns. This list will either be brought back to next month’s meeting or will be sent out for amendments and additions. This list will be kept as a checklist to not lose track of these concerns.

---

**Subcommittee Report: Bookstore**
Jim Senn reported the Bookstore Subcommittee had not met yet this year, but is still addressing concerns from last year including the fact that Banner does not have an interface to order books.  Follett has its own system, but the issue is with competing bookstores.  ISAT created a system and the initial review of that system revealed a few essential features were not included.  An updated version has been implemented and Senn is anxious to see from the Bookstore side how it is working.

Senn also indicated the Subcommittee had instituted some quality indicators for the Bookstore.  Somehow, through the University, a formal assessment of what faculty and staff thinks is and not working well with the Bookstore is needed.  Some colleges think the Bookstore is working pretty well some say nothing has changed.  Hudson indicated he had collected from faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences their concerns with the Bookstore and most were the Bookstore lack of ordering sufficient copies and the difficulty in ordering additional copies.  Hugh will send this information to Senn.

Miller indicated she went through the training for the online book order and she was impressed with the system.  The Bookstore has a policy that students can give the Bookstore $5 to order out of stock books and within a couple of days can pick up the book ordered.  Miller stated the problem with the system this semester was there was no communication with the other two bookstores, and they did not order books and the GSU Bookstore ran out of copies.  It is Auxiliary Services responsibility to notify all of the competing bookstores of books needed for courses.  Miller indicated there was training on the new book ordering system on Friday and interested faculty could contact Wade Douglass at the Bookstore for more information.

**Subcommittee Report: Benefits/Auxiliary Services**
Cherian Thachenkary reported the first subcommittee meeting will be held tomorrow and they would set the agenda.  If Committee members have additional benefits related items they want placed on the subcommittee’s agenda, they should send them to him via email.  One issue coming up on the pension side is TRS and OSP.  Floyd asked that the new recreation center and the issue of lost benefits be brought back up.  It was also requested that the subcommittee revisit the parking fee issue and have Auxiliary Services justify the continuing issue of increased fees.  Miller indicated the Staff Advisory Council was also considering the Parking fees issue.

**Subcommittee Report: Intellectual Properties**
The Senate Executive Committee is recommending that that current paragraph which reads . . . “if there is an appeal, the VP for Research “may” refer that appeals to the IP Committee . . .” be amended to change the “may refer” to “will refer”.  The VP for Research is making an argument that there may well be some cases because of the immediacy of exposure and the University to seek IP protection, the possible delay that may come about as a result of having to refer the appeals, could compromise the University’s position.  Due to this debate, the policy will not make the deadline to be included on the next Senate agenda for discussion and approval.
Subcommittee Report-Advancement of Women

Pauline Clance reported the subcommittee is waiting on data from Institutional Research before completing its report. The subcommittee hopes to get the data next week and is moving forward for getting the report through the next Senate meeting.

Subcommittee Report-Faculty Development

Fritz reported the subcommittee’s Disruptive Students policy has come back with some suggestions which she feels are minor clarifications. The Subcommittee will meet and make the changes and bring back to the full committee next month for approval.

Final Exams Committee is sitting on a joint subcommittee to look at changes in policy and this topic will be brought back at the next meeting.

Childcare & Children in Class

The issue of children in class will be folded in with other childcare issues and was sent to Marilyn Meyers for discussion. If Faculty has any concerns regarding this issue, please email Marilyn Meyers.

Subcommittee Evaluations: New committee, charges, memberships

The remainder of the meeting focused on looking at the current structure of the subcommittees and their membership. Fritz asked that committee members think about the subcommittees and check with the chairs to see if they want more input or more members. Some subcommittees are very active and will need more memberships. Some are inactive and may need to be retired for a year or more and some subcommittees will need to be created. Bonnie urged Committee members not hesitate to bring up any issues for discussion.

Currently active Faculty Affairs Subcommittees:

Evaluation of Administrators: Gayle Christian will be added to the membership.

On-line Evaluation: Linda McGehee and Harry Dangel will be added. Fritz suggested adding more members or breaking the subcommittee into additional subcommittees.

Faculty Development: Harvey Brightman should be deleted. Fritz will verify with Pauline Clance that she wants to be added. Fritz will send a solicitation for additional members.

Intellectual Property: This subcommittee will soon be going inactive.

Less Active Subcommittees:

Harassment and Appeals: Hugh Hudson will discuss with Marian Meyers if this subcommittee is still active and plans to revisit the Sexual Harassment Policy.

NTTrack: Hudson reported the subcommittee is waiting on a report from the Provost’s office. Hudson will contact the Provost regarding the status of the report.

Alternative Dispute Resolution: The Committee will review each meeting to see if there are any issues.

Salary Equity: Nancy Floyd will ask each college what their policy and procedures are for guaranteeing salary equity in their respective colleges.
Graduate Education: Is on the back burner, but will be coming forward this semester.

Possible New Subcommittees:

Student Discipline Committee: Nancy Floyd reported her concerns with serving on the Student Discipline Committee. Floyd indicated she felt uncomfortable” as a faculty member passing judgments on students without legal representation. Fritz stated she would talk to the Chair of the Committee and bring up the issues.

Senate Research Committee: The Subcommittee is looking at the research infrastructure. Fritz will circulate report of college issues and concerns via email.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.