FAC Agenda, 1-3 p.m., Ed Policy Conference Rm, 4th floor, COE
Nov.11, 2009
Minutes

*Please print out all documents for each meeting.

**Members Present:** Peggy Albers, Chip Barksdale, Elizabeth Beck, Catherine Brack, Fred Brooks, Annette Butler, Dean Dabney, Cheryl Delk, John Duffield, Laura Fredrick, Shelby Frost, Peter Lindsay, Linda Nelson, Dave Pavesic, Jeff Rupp, Cherian Thachenkary, Kris Varjas, Marta White

**Members Absent:** David Cheshier, Conrad Ciccotello, Mary Jo DeJoice, Denise Donnelly, Don Edwards, Valerie Fennell, Mary Finn, MaryAnne Gaunt, Lynda Goodfellow, Hugh Hudson, Dick Miller, Risa Palm, Joe Perry, Jerry Rackliffe, Wayne Reed, Ruth Stanford, Corneill Stephens

**Call to Order**
The meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes**
Minutes were approved as written

**Information/Brief Action Items**

**SEIs, Policy 311.02.01**
Motion passed in the University Senate

John Duffield reported on the tuition exchange program. He noted that a number of faculty are interested in this program and briefly reported on the research that he had done regarding this issue, including talking with the Associate Provost for Academic Programs and the University Attorney. He outlined a potentially workable program for GSU modeled after the program used at the University of Florida, which uses a combination of out-of-state tuition waivers and participation fees. He proposed that FAC prepare a detailed proposal to be discussed with the Executive Committee prior to possible discussion with the administration. A discussion focused on several key points: 1) dependents of GSU faculty/staff cannot attend GSU for tuition-free; 2) The Hope Scholarship may factor into #1, however, FAC pointed out that, because of the Georgia laws (may be viewed as gratuity), children of GSU employees are then judged on their academic achievements, which if they do not meet the minimum “B” requirement, they could not attend GSU tuition-free; and 3) if GSU gave tuition waivers to children of faculty/staff from other institutions and not our own, this could bring about a huge PR issue for GSU. A subcommittee was formed to draft a detailed proposal for presentation to the Executive Committee. **FAC Subcommittee:** John Duffield, Linda Nelson

**Maternity/Paternal Leave**
John Duffield briefly presented this issue to the FAC. The discussion focused on faculty/staff taking sick leave if they need to attend to parental/maternity leave, however, it was noted that junior faculty/staff may
not have enough sick days banked. A subcommittee was formed to 1) to identify the precise issues to be addressed, such as length of leave, paid and partially paid leave, range of applicable circumstances, handling of teaching responsibilities, etc.; 2) to gather information on the leave policies of other institutions of higher education; and 3) to develop one or more alternative policies for consideration by the FAC. **FAC Subcommittee:** John Duffield, Annette Butler

**Phased Out Retirement**
Phased out retirement, a plan that some universities (UNC, UM, UWV) have adopted as part of their benefits and offers faculty interested in phasing out their retirement incrementally. Discussion focused on the basics of the plan presented by Dave Pavesic based upon materials that were distributed in the spring of 2009: 1) must be a win-win for faculty and dept.; 2) depts. must agree to whether this is a possible option; 3) enhanced recruitment and retention of faculty; 4) does it run in conflict with the BOR 49.9% retire-rehire policy. A subcommittee was formed to investigate and report on whether this would be an attractive benefit for faculty. Other names were suggested who might contribute as part of this subcommittee: Robert Elmore, Jerry Rackliffe, Hugh Hudson. **FAC Subcommittee:** Cherian Thachenkary, Dave Pavesic

**Wellness Benefits**
P. Albers briefly introduced the idea of wellness and insurance plans. Many faculty/staff may be unaware of the FLEX account. For example, if some expenses such as gym $ are medically necessary as certified by a doctor, one can use that as a possible deduction for your FLEX acct. The FAC suggested that faculty and staff always check the IRS guidelines on this and also to talk to the Benefits staff.) Linda Nelson and several others involved in HR will look into these benefits and determine how awareness of these benefits can be communicated to faculty/staff. **FAC Subcommittee:** Linda Nelson

**Action Items**

**Permanenent Tenure Clock Stoppage and Leave**
The subcommittee presented five versions of the Tenure Clock Stoppage and Leave policy to FAC. John Duffield walked FAC through the various versions. FAC members were largely in agreement that domestic partners be written into the policy. A discussion ensued and focused on several key points: 1) UGA’s present policy; 2) whether GSU’s policy with domestic partners included in the wording was against BOR policy and Georgia state law; and 3) the importance of ensuring no discrimination of faculty/staff on this issue. A motion from the floor was made to pass the policy with domestic partners in the wording. The motion passed. **FAC Subcommittee:** P. Albers, J. Duffield, M. Finn, M. White, D. Donnelly

**Administrators Evaluations**
The revised procedures and response items for administration evaluations was vigorously discussed. Administrators up for evaluation in 2009-2010 include the following: Fenwick Huss, Dean, J. Mack Robinson College of Business; Randy Kamphaus, Dean, College of Education; Steve Kaminshine, Dean, College of Law; Susan Kelley, Dean, College of Health and Human Services; Mary Finn, AP for Institutional Effectiveness, John Hicks, AP for International Affairs, and Robin Morris, VP for Research. In general, the FAC approved of the revised procedures and response items as the
subcommittees had generated them. FAC members suggested that the revised procedures were much better than the current procedures. FAC noted mechanical/editing errors. The bulk of the discussion centered on three key points: 1) Implementation of new procedures; 2) Administrators up for evaluation in 2009-2010 with revised procedures in place; and 3) The staff component of evaluations. At the Oct. meeting of the FAC, the majority of the members agreed that implementation of these new procedures would start in fall 2010. However, in today’s meeting, FAC were not in consensus on the first two points.

1) *Implementation:* In terms of implementation, several issues were at play: a) when the revised procedures would be implemented; b) whether the process of notification of the administrators had already begun and should current procedures remain in place; c) politics of evaluations. First (a), it was argued by several FAC members that all facets of the procedures must be passed and implemented, not part of them. That is, if the FAC agreed to pass the revised procedures, administrators in their second review cycle would be reviewed in two years, not in the 2009-2010 academic year. Further, the idea of workload for the Executive Committee in completing these evaluations was raised. A total of seven administrators were notified that they would be evaluated; this is substantial work for the Executive Committee who must review all evaluations, and who must write up the administrator’s evaluation within a short period of time. Further, the added component of outside evaluators will add to the review process of the Executive Committee. If the revised procedures were passed, only four would be evaluated, and the number of administrators evaluated more equitably staggered. Second (b), since administrators had been notified by email that they were under review in 2009-2010, members raised the point that the process had been started, and administrators who were contacted would be evaluated. However, another FAC member stated that this would move the revised procedures back to the fall 2010 implementation. The purpose of completing these evaluations in the fall was to have a revised set of procedures in place for administrators. FAC members discussed the politics that surround such work.

2) *Who would be evaluated.* Central to this discussion was who would be evaluated. This led to further discussion of keeping the current procedures and implementing the revised procedures in the fall of 2010. However, again, the point that all of the revised procedures must be implemented, not just part of them. With the revised procedures, Kamphaus, Hicks, Finn, and Morris would be evaluated as they are in their first review cycle while Deans Kelley, Kaminshire, and Huss would be evaluated in two years as they are in their second review cycle.

3) *Staff component:* In the subcommittee’s work, staff members noted suggested that a number of the administrators more closely work with staff than faculty. The current and revised procedures, staff are asked to comment on lists of areas rather than specific response questions,
as faculty are asked to do. One FAC member suggested that this part of the evaluation resembles a “report” rather than an evaluation. This FAC member suggested that response items be constructed that more closely resemble those that faculty complete. Further, discussion on whether staff should evaluate the University President, Academic Deans, and the Provost.

At the end of the discussion, a motion was made from the floor that the revised procedures would be implemented with this group of administrators. The motion passed.

**Unfinished Business**

**Faculty Workload**

This issue was tabled until the next meeting.

**Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

**Meeting Dates 2009-2010:** Dean’s Conference Room, COE, 10th floor, 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. Please note: Nov. meeting will be held in the Educational Policy Studies' (EPS) conference room on the fourth floor, COE.

|------|--------------|-------|---------------|------|----------------|

**Senate meetings, Veteran’s Memorial Hall: Thursdays, from 3-5:** *October 15, December 10, March 18; April 15 (organizational mtg)*

**Website for Senate information:** [http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwsen/index.html](http://www2.gsu.edu/~wwsen/index.html)