Committee on Faculty Affairs
Minutes of Meeting - September 14, 2005

Members present: Peggy Albers, Pam Barr, Cathy Brack, Fred Brooks, Joan Carson, Julie Dangel, Cheryl Delk, Nancy Floyd, Shelby Frost, Gerald Gay, Lynda Thomas Goodfellow, Cecelia Grindel, Hugh Hudson, Rick Lakes, Ralph LaRossa, Charles Marvin, Dick Miller, Linda Nelson, Dave Pavesic, Charlotte Petrek, Jerry Rackliffe, James Senn, Tammy Sugarman, Leonard Teel, Cherian Thachenkary, and Marta White

The meeting began with introductions and status reports by the Faculty Affairs subcommittees:

Non-tenure Track Governance
Shelby reported that the roles of non-tenure track faculty are still being defined.

Ombuds, Legal Affairs and ODDEP
This subcommittee has deferred to the Grievance Group, chaired by Joan Carson. This group does have representation from Faculty Affairs.

Joan Carson reported that the Classified Staff Grievance Policy has been finished and approved by the Staff Advisory Council. The Grievance Group has now shifted its attention to the performance evaluation process and form. The Grievance Group, which meets bi-weekly, has been in existence for about two years. It was created to organize all faculty, staff, and student grievance procedures into one location. Thus far, it has been working on staff grievances, and the group has noted that grievance policies and procedures are not standard across campus. The group has on its agenda to organize all student policies and procedures for non-academic issues, as policies and procedures for grieving academic polices and procedures seem to be well defined. Faculty grievance policies and procedures are rightly administered within the colleges, but they need to be examined for cohesiveness.

Hugh Hudson asked if the Grievance Group had been looking into allegations that investigations have been conducted, and that the person being investigated was not made aware of the investigation until near the end of the process. Linda Nelson was called upon to discuss this issue.

Linda pointed out that ODDEP handles only complaints of discrimination and sexual harassment. ODDEP gives an aggrieved person all of the options for resolution, such as going through the departmental chain of command or filing a formal complaint. Prior to a formal charge being fired, Linda stated that an informal investigation may be conducted, but that this informal investigation is only to determine if ODDEP has jurisdiction in the matter.

If ODDEP determines that it has jurisdiction, the individual being charged and the leadership is advised of the claim, and immediate contact is made with Legal Affairs. According to Linda, there is no investigation of a formal claim without input from all sides. Valerie Fennel mentioned that a grievance brought to the Office of the Ombudsperson is always treated informally and is always voluntary. This office conducts no investigations of any kind, but gives the person options for filing a formal complaint.

Cherian asked if ODDEP’s records were covered under Open Records legislation. Linda said that they are, but that records may not be made available until ODDEP has made a determination. Cherian also asked how long the Grievance Group will remain active. Joan responded that the group will continue until we have a single streamlined process defined for filing a complaint for each of the three groups, faculty, staff and students.

Joan noted that a representative from Faculty Affairs is needed to serve on the Performance Evaluation and Processes Subcommittee that is looking at the grievance procedures. Hugh Hudson volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.
Benefits Committee
Cherian reported that there had been a Senate Resolution that Human Resources look into the possibility of providing long-term care insurance benefits for employees. Unfortunately, this benefit will not be available for this open enrollment period. The request for proposal was incomplete, and the services requested in the document would not yield the best plan. Larry McCallop is researching how to set up a request for proposal that would meet the needs of employees.

Evaluation of Administrators
Mary Nell has requested some information from this committee for this year’s evaluations.

Discussions
Faculty Annual Report Template: The template, presented by Gary Henry, was the next item of discussion. Several years ago, the Senate voted that all faculty reports would use the same template, but this was never done. There is no Faculty Information System at GSU, and faculty data is located in many different areas such as Human Resources, Banner and Research. The problem is that all of these separate data elements cannot be aggregated for reporting.

The proposal is to establish a Faculty Information System which would pull data elements from the various on campus sources. The data would then be available to individual faculty members, their chairs and their deans. Gary pointed out that we are grossly underreporting faculty productivity, and it is difficult to fill out different reports spanning different time periods. With the Faculty Annual Report Template, a faculty member could print out a current cv on demand, and information would be available for reporting and aggregating.

Cherian suggested that centralizing records makes the data easier to hack into. Jim Senn felt strongly that a policy was needed. He believes that the policies reside in the colleges, which should be charged with developing a template. Gary disagreed, feeling that faculty should approve a template first, and then submit it to the administration. Marta White also felt strongly that a policy and a procedure for access to the data was needed.

Ralph LaRossa could not see the value in protecting data which is freely available on one’s cv. His point is that the data elements represent the information on the cv, and the Template is nothing more than the cv for the particular year.

Marta moved that the group table the motion to approve the Template until a policy is defined, a procedure for access to the data is completed, and qualitative and quantitative effectiveness are spelled out. The motion carried. Cathy Brack noticed that the committee which developed the Template lacked input from the Counseling Center.

Joan Carson volunteered to head a subcommittee to provide the required information on the proposed Template. Other subcommittee members are Cathy Brack and Marta White.

Non-Tenure Track Governance: The group then discussed whether or not NTT faculty can apply for graduate faculty. Yes, they can if they have published in the past five years. It was also decided that NTT faculty may not chair either Master’s thesis or dissertation committees. 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. There was also a question as to which rights and privileges should be decided at the college level. A subcommittee was formed to look into this further. The committee consists of Tammy Sugarman, Marta White, Shelby Frost (chair), Cheryl Delk and Charlotte Petrek.

Resolution Regarding Pay Raises: The Resolution presented by Cherian passed (11 in favor; 5 opposed) with the addition of the following language:

- To attempt to hold employee increases in fringe benefits costs to be commensurate with pay raises.
Faculty Affairs will submit the Resolution to the Executive Committee as a joint resolution from Faculty Affairs and Budget Committees.