Meeting
Faculty Affairs Committee of the Senate
October 13, 2005

Members present: Peggy Albers, Pam Barr, Cathy Brack, Joan Carson, Harry Dangel, Cheryl Delk, Valerie Fennell, Shelby Frost, Gerald Gay, Lynda Goodfellow, Cecelia Grindel, Hugh Hudson, Ralph LaRossa, Charles Marvin, Dick Miller, Dave Pavesic, Jerry Rackliffe, Leonard Teel, Cherian Thachenkary, Duane Truex, Marta White, and Wayne Reed

Guests: Carolyn Alexander and George Rainbolt

Cherian Thachenkary made a correction to the minutes of the last meeting. The following sentence in the September minutes was changed: “NTT may participate in the hiring of TT faculty, but it was not clear whether or not they may participate in the annual evaluation of TT faculty.” In fact, there is NO faculty evaluation in which NTT faculty may participate. Only tenured faculty are involved in faculty evaluation. The sentence will now read: “NTT may participate in the hiring of TT faculty.” The minutes were approved as amended.

Faculty Annual Report Template
Joan Carson met with Cathy Brack and Marta White, and she made the changes to the template suggested in this meeting. Joan then brought the revised template to the Deans’ Group at their retreat. The Deans were in favor of adopting an automated system.

Harry made two suggestions for template revisions:
1. We need to have an emphasis on teaching effectiveness. He would add a section to the template for supporting information, such as evidence of student learning.
2. Pedagogical research needs to be considered. The scholarship of teaching and learning need to be encouraged. Harry would add a section to highlight published work for student use.

Charles suggested that the professional schools might have a different audience. He wondered where to put publications designed to educate other professionals - under teaching?

Joan suggested that the colleges could make the decision as to which items should be suppressed if not needed.

Hugh Hudson wondered what was evidence of student learning, since the faculty do not want their evaluations based exclusively on the student evaluations. Suggestions for evidence of student learning were: scores on departmental exams, improvements over time, and feedback from employers.

George Rainbolt suggested that rather than add the two sections proposed by Harry, it might be more useful to allow adding a file of additional information to put the teaching in context.

Dave Pavesic agreed, as this file could be added depending on the purpose for which the report is being used, e.g. promotion, tenure, etc. Joan pointed out that this would not be a static document, and that it could be modified. Hugh suggested that changes would need to be approved by the Senate. Cece suggested a period of evaluation of the template, such as one year after implementation. Dave Truex thought that the period of evaluation should be longer than one year. After evaluation, the template would come back to Faculty Affairs for consideration. Gerald Gay brought up Jim Senn’s opinion that a policy statement on how the template can and cannot be used is necessary. Dave agreed that the policy should detail why the template was created and how it will be used is needed, and all other use of the template would have to be approved by Faculty Affairs.

Cherian proposed that the template stay tabled until the policy document is prepared. Joan, Harry and Dave volunteered to work on the policy statement to include the reason for the template’s creation, how the data will be used, and how the usage might be amended.
Class Scheduling
Carolyn Alexander from the Registrar’s Office was present to answer questions about class scheduling. Dave asked how classrooms are assigned. According to Carolyn, the primary driver is the room’s limit (the capacity of the room). Capacity rules over technology. Cherian suggested that more flexibility is needed. If an instructor cannot teach in a particular room, he or she should be given credence. Schedule 25 is the program which schedules rooms and events (non academic room usage). The Office of the Registrar does not have any control over the repair of rooms. Ralph LaRossa suggested inviting someone from Classroom Facilities to discuss the condition of rooms. Dave asked if Schedule can be modified, and Carolyn responded that it could. It was felt that faculty should be consulted regarding the scheduling needs of the faculty. There are no rooms “owned” by a particular college. When cancellations occur, a waiting list is not maintained, but the college schedulers watch for such changes. No, there is not a default location for a particular class. Cherian suggested that using a swipe card system using the Panthercard would be more efficient than generating keys for each room. This has been discussed, but the cost of installing a card swipe system was prohibitive. Hugh made a motion that CBSAC re-look at the swipe card system for classrooms versus the cost of issuing keys. The group agreed. Dave felt that Faculty Affairs needs to look into the criteria driving Schedule 25, and he volunteered to head a committee of one to do so.

Evaluation of Administrators
Charles Marvin brought the group up to date on this issue. At the February, 2005 meeting, the Faculty Affairs Committee voted to approve:

1. Recommendations on the logistics of launching administrator surveys, and on certain changes to the survey instrument; and
2. The adding of the following question to the Provost’s and Deans’ evaluations:
   “Within budgetary constraints, the (Provost) (Dean) has been responsive to departmental and unit action plan commitments”.

Unfortunately, these recommendations were not passed on to the Senate for consideration. In response to this issue of self evaluation raised by Mary Nell, Hugh made a motion that no administrator be allowed to review him or herself. The group voted to approve this motion. Cece will pass the all three items on to the Executive Committee.

Faculty Salary Study
Cherian reviewed the Report of the Joint Sub-Committee of the Senate Budget and Faculty Affairs Committees on Salary Compression and Inversion of Sept. 26, 2005. In Appendix C, Resolution, Cherian will add recognition of the efforts made by the University administration.

In the second bullet regarding the cost of living increase, the estimate of inflation of 2.3 to 3.1% will be added, and specific cases will be added for clarification. Instituting step increases or cost of living allowances would require BOR action, and this bullet point will be modified to seek change in BOR policy.

Appendix B, which compares GSU faculty salaries to peer and aspirational schools, showed no consistent pattern across the board. In RCB, Law and Policy Studies, the associate professors showed significant inversion to the assistant professors. Also in these areas, the lowest paid full professors earned less than the median of the associate professors. Both Hugh and Dick suggested that such a comparison was flawed, in that time in rank also needed to be considered.

Appendix A showed that GSU ranked #2 in average salary for professors, #11 in average salary for associate professors, #9 in average salary for assistant professors and #10 in average salary for instructors as compared with peer institutions. GSU was on target with average professor salaries with the aspirational group, but not so for other titles.

After considerable discussion, it was agreed to table the Report for further discussion.
**Dependent Tuition Waivers**
Offering tuition waivers to dependents of faculty/staff is against BOR policy, and further discussion was tabled. Hugh suggested the issue could be brought to the Provost for discussion with Dr. Patton.

**Benefits Changes**
Dick suggested that faculty and staff should be notified when a reduction in benefits is made.