FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
MINUTES
THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 2002

Members present: Glenn Abney, Gayle Christian, Pauline Clance, Nancy Floyd, Bonnie Fritz, Hugh Hudson, Charles Marvin, Linda McGehee, H. Richard Miller, John Peterson, Cherian Thachenkary, and Marta White


Guests: Crawford Elliott, Rebecca Harrison, and Patti Karst

Bonnie Fritz, chair, called the meeting to order at 10:03.

Approval of minutes
Minutes for the April 17, 2002 meeting were approved.

Review of Committee and Subcommittees 2002-2003
Bonnie Fritz asked the group to review the documents detailing the committee membership roster and the subcommittee membership lists for accuracy. Members who wished to add or delete membership on a particular committee were asked to email byergens@gsu.edu with this information. Gayle Christian volunteered to join the Evaluation of Administrators subcommittee. Fritz requested volunteers for the Bookstore subcommittee, the post office subcommittee, and the parking appeals board, which will meet once per month. H. Richard Miller volunteered for the Benefits subcommittee. This subcommittee needs to meet to elect a chair, and to meet with Auxiliary Services to get its schedules. The group approved a motion to merge the Academic Support Services subcommittee with the Benefits subcommittee.

On-line Faculty Evaluation by Students
Go-SOLAR representatives Rebecca Harrison and Patti Karst were present to discuss the issue of faculty evaluation under Banner. Rebecca reported that both Business and Arts and Sciences use scanning equipment to read their customized evaluations of faculty. The rest of the colleges process their evaluations through the Testing Center. The programs that read the evaluations can’t scan Banner code. This means that all of the scanning programs would have to be reconfigured to read the evaluations, a time-consuming and expensive task. Recognizing that the current system of recording faculty evaluations is subject to error through lost forms, forms being completed in pen, and illegibility of forms, the GoSOLAR team is proposing that students complete faculty evaluations on-line. In addition to providing increased accuracy, the timeline for receiving the data back would be shortened, and greater reporting flexibility, through Crystal reporting, could be achieved. In fact, at the end of the period for completion, summary totals could be received in less than one day. In response to a question from Marta White, Karst stated that faculty could know the number of students who did not complete the evaluation, but furnishing names would be an ethical problem.

Karst distributed a prototype of the form that a student would complete on the web, using his/her normal user id and pin. The Banner main menu would have a heading for faculty evaluations, which the student would click. The student would then be taken to a screen detailing all of the evaluations that need to be completed. The evaluations could be completed all at once, or the student could come back and complete them one by one. The evaluation form presented to students retains the same language of the questions used previously, including a comment area. Once a student completes an evaluation and submits it, s/he cannot go back and change the evaluation. Students would receive an email during the last two weeks of class urging them to complete their evaluations. Every 48 to 72 hours an email reminder would be sent to those who had not complied. A prototype summary report was included in the materials distributed. In light of this information, the group was asked to consider the following resolution:

The Senate Faculty Affairs Committee considered the resolution to endorse the implementation of on-line course evaluation with the following stipulations:

1. The endorsement will cover only Fall 2002 semester, after which directors of the Go-SOLAR team will report back to Faculty Affairs at its January 9, 2002 meeting for evaluation.

2. Access to data will be the prerogative of the college deans.

The Committee had many concerns about this proposed resolution. Marta White, Cherian Thachenkary, and Pauline Clance all voiced serious concerns about the response rate of students, as these evaluations affect tenure and promotion. According to Harrison, a committee has been formed to develop a marketing campaign for students to
possibly include incentives.
It was acknowledged that a drop in response rate would occur in the first semester of implementation of this new system.

Harrison responded to a question from Thachenkary that the data would be archived for permanent retention. She also reported that the college schedulers could modify the evaluation, a concern since Business is re-designing its evaluation now. SGA would still have on-line immediate access as now. It is not likely that SGA would have increased access, such as access to the comments area.

The group felt strongly that a shadow system to process faculty evaluations should be implemented immediately. It was suggested that perhaps on-line evaluation system could be tried for the mini-mester only, using only professors who volunteer. Glenn Abney suggested adopting different strategies and testing these with respect to response rate. Pauline Clance supported Abney’s suggestion.

Fritz suggested that a subcommittee be formed to develop a strategy for implementing on-line evaluations. Glenn Abney volunteered to chair the committee comprised of Bonnie Fritz, Cherian Thachenkary, and Hugh Hudson. The subcommittee will meet before August 12th. On August 12th, the subcommittee will attend the Banner meeting on this subject. The group agreed on this course of action, with Marta White suggesting that work on the shadow system should begin immediately.

**Intellectual Property**
Crawford Elliott, chair of the Intellectual Properties Subcommittee, discussed the new Intellectual Property Policy, which he believes to be faculty-friendly. Cherian Thachenkary went over the document and gave some background on its creation. The document went through extensive revisions before its routing through the Senate Research Committee. The Policy will now go to the Executive Committee and a final vote. This policy will fill in a void, since no such policy existed previously. Thachenkary pointed out that sections IV, VI, IX, and X were the major sticking points. According to Elliott, the main section of the policy is in section I., stating “The circumstances under which intellectual property is created determines ownership rights to such intellectual property.”

Charles Marvin expressed concern over the statement in the policy that BOR policy will prevail Section X11, lines 441-443. Elliott assured Marvin that this means that the money stays with GSU. Marvin suggested that we might want to amend the language of this, so that University money could not go to the System for re-allocation. Elliott said that the intent is for the BOR to mediate, not to profit from intellectual policy disputes. Elliott believes that the assignee is GSURF, and that the BOR cannot simply come in and take what it wants. Nancy Floyd asked about the ownership of works of art, if GSU has paid for the materials to create the work. Crawford referred again to the section I as in the first paragraph, the situation of the creation determines the ownership.

Hugh Hudson moved to approve the motion, Pauline Clance seconded the motion, and the group supported the adoption of the Intellectual Property Policy.

**Evaluation of Administrators**
Hugh Hudson asked the group to look over the Evaluation of Administrators materials presented in the packet of materials distributed at the meeting. The subcommittee made changes, based upon input from the VP of Research. There were staff component changes, names were corrected, and attorneys were added. In addition, staff appointed by the VP of Research was added. The rating scale was changed to the scale agreed upon last year of A-F. C, neither agree nor disagree, means that the evaluator has an opinion. F, don’t know or have no opinion, means that the evaluator doesn’t care. Hudson referred to a red line version of the draft, showing changes that had been made. This red line draft will be distributed before the next meeting. According to Hudson, it is important for the administrator being evaluated to give input. It is desirable to throw as large a net as possible to get as much information as possible to assist the person being evaluated in their performance. Please email comments on the draft to Hugh Hudson, and the subcommittee will pull the comments together for the next meeting.

**Advancement of Women**
Chair Mary Ann Romski met with Bonnie Fritz to complete a new draft to present at the next meeting of the subcommittee. Although improvements have been achieved, this is still an issue that needs to be stressed in order to keep the tide from turning. A formalized policy needs to be built to ensure future advancement of women to the position of full professor, which is the first step in the pipeline to upper administration, and to address other areas of under-representation.

**Benefits**
Participation in the OHS dental program is voluntary, and there have been complaints of problems with the size of the
network and customer service. Employees pay for dental care, with no funding by the University. If an employee declines to participate in the BOR dental plan at the point of hire, s/he may not elect the BOR plan in the future. The BOR plan, which costs twice as much as OHS, allows employees to select any dentist the employee chooses. Human Resources put out bids for a new voluntary dental plan, and is considering MetLife. The premium structure is comparable to that of OHS, but there is a wider network of dentists offering covered services (service outside the network is reimbursed at lower rates than if a participating dentist had been selected). The deductibles and co-pays are also comparable with OHS. The downside is that OHS premiums have been stable for the past four years, but we don’t know what will happen with MetLife’s premiums in the future. Both Tech and the Fulton County School Board are considering MetLife also. Glenn Abney moved that GSU consider funding dental for faculty. Cherian Thachenkary seconded the motion, which the group approved.

Faculty Development
The committee was asked to approve the motion to revise the faculty handbook regarding learning outcomes. The motion had been approved by Admissions and Standards and IS&T. The group changed the wording regarding the class syllabus as follows:

Section 401.08 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes: (A proposed new section)

Faculty Affairs Friendly Amendment (in red) to proposed insertion 401.01 of learning outcomes text in the Faculty Handbook

Section 401.01 Course Syllabus

4. objectives of the course objectives that specify measurable and/or observable student learning outcomes. These learning outcomes should state course objectives in language that makes explicit the knowledge and skills students should have after completing the course. Consequently, these objectives may be quantitative or qualitative, as appropriate for the learning outcomes. The learning outcomes for general education courses are available at http://www.gsu.edu/~wwwapa/goalsassessmentofgeneraleducation.html, as approved by the GSU Senate 3/22/01.

Section 401.08 Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes: (A proposed new section)

Assessment should be conducted to determine the extent of student achievement of the stated learning outcomes and to inform the subsequent improvement of learning experiences.

Approved by the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee 8-1-2002

Pauline Clance asked at what point do you need to change the catalog when outcomes/objectives change. Bonnie Fritz volunteered to ask the opinion of Admissions and Standards.

Valerie Miller heads up Learning Outcomes. Fritz volunteered to find out from Miller what training would be offered to the faculty. There was concern that academic freedom could be compromised if outcomes are measured/measurable. The RCB is using exit interviews with students to see what they learned. The fact that arts are not measurable was mentioned. More information is needed to determine the impact of learning outcomes on the various disciplines.

Admissions and Standards is proposing a change to the policy on finals. Students have been complaining that faculty are giving finals during the last class meeting, and that such finals are too brief to cover material from the complete semester and student preparation time is shortened. Current policy allows this practice. After reviewing the proposed policy change, the group amended the change as follows:

Faculty Affairs Friendly Amendment (in red) to proposed policy change #2 of final exam text in the Faculty Handbook

402.01 Final Examinations
It is understood that because the evaluation model varies by discipline, not all areas can comply with the final exam schedule as described. When appropriate, faculty are strongly encouraged to only give end of the term exams during the final examination period and not during the last two weeks of class. At the end of the term, students may well need the extra study time which an examination during the final examination period gives them. If a faculty member decides to give an examination during the last two weeks of a term, that examination may not test the students on material covered before the mid-point of the term. In other words, cumulative final examinations must be given during the final examination period.

Approved by the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee 8-1-2002

On a motion by John Peterson and a second by Nancy Floyd, the group moved to approve the policy as amended.

The meeting adjourned at 12:11