

**Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting
November 15, 2021**

Attendees

Chair Janette Hill
Kent Barnett
Shira Chess
Nancy Dellaria
Timothy Grey
Lindsey Harding
Mark Huber
David Okech

Andrew Park
Annette Poulsen
Esra Santesso
Ye Shen
Amanda Smith
Elizabeth St. Pierre
Richard Vining
George Zheng

Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs
Elizabeth Weeks (guest)

Meeting called to order at 10:04a

Review of minutes from last meeting. Elizabeth St. Pierre moved to approve with no changes, seconded by George Zheng. Approved unanimously.

Chair Hill asked for any announcements, updates or other information items.

Associate Provost Elizabeth Weeks provide an update on guidelines for non-tenure track lecturers (and similar faculty):

- Confirmation that the Deans of the various colleges are ready to incorporate the guidelines into existing review policies
- Full update from the administration will be distributed campus-wide soon.
- It was noted that there will be additional work to do to incorporate the lecturer guidelines into the existing By-Laws and Statutes and other University policies. Elizabeth St. Pierre, chair of the Committee on Statutes, Bylaws and Committees, noted that her committee will work with Associate Provost Weeks on this.
- Chair Hill noted that other policies for non-tenure track faculty will have to be evaluated to be consistent with the new Lecturer guidelines and also with the revised Faculty Evaluation Policies and Practices as mandated by the Board of Regents
 - Lindsey Harding volunteered to help with necessary revisions of non-tenure track guidelines and policies.

Chair Hill provided an update from the Working Group on Faculty Evaluation Policies and Practices:

- Working Group has met twice and expects to meet weekly as they develop policies and procedures consistent with the Board of Regents new requirements and expectations.

- The Board of Regents expects that we will have policies approved by end of spring semester 2022 and they will be in effect for the 2022-2023 academic year. The provost has requested a one-semester extension but there has been no decision on this.

Chair Hill open the floor for general discussion regarding the new policies. Issues raised included:

- Keep the process as open as possible – transparent and fair
- Concern about recruitment and retention. Faculty will have an incentive to look elsewhere
 - Can we quantify that in any way?
- How do the proposed changes affect the probability of becoming a member of the prestigious Association of American Universities? How are the accrediting agencies viewing the changes?
- Importance of speaking the truth to our faculty – do not exaggerate the impact of the changes
 - Is the end game to make it easier to take away tenure or to provide appropriate discipline for those not productive?
- How will appeals of annual reviews be handled?
 - The over-empowering of dept heads is very concerning
 - Really important to make sure an appeals committee is diverse (women, POC)
- What are meant by student success activities?
 - How will these be measured for current assistant professors who have been told to focus on research at the expense of teaching and service
 - What is included in student success??
 - The list seems very nebulous
 - Does it create more time-investment for faculty – what can they do less of?
 - Is PhD Placement part of this?? Careers? Getting a job? (The term “outcomes” was removed from the final BOR statement. The term now is “student success activities.”)
 - Most discussion has focused on undergraduates but what about graduate education. How will student success be measured for graduate students.
 - One thing to not include in measures of student success – grades in courses
 - Removing “outcomes” and replacing with “activities” is a very important distinction
- Non-tenure track faculty
 - Student success activities? NTT end up with lots of the student success responsibilities. Encourage NTT faculty to mentor assistant professors on student success activities
- How to keep transparent and get input....
 - Open-ended survey is available
 - Another kind of survey for additional input?
 - Increase prominence of the survey

- Regular report to Exec Committee and University Council
- Would it be helpful to have open forums / listening sessions?
 - Perhaps but also can become venting sessions
 - Perhaps more targeted to specific groups, if there were time
 - Focus groups rather than listening sessions

Chair Hill reminded the Committee that after the Working Group develops a set of guidelines, the guidelines will come to the Faculty Affairs Committee for approval before sending to the Executive Committee and University Council. She anticipates that the Guidelines will be on the FAC agenda by February to meet the deadline for the April University Council meeting.

Any new business?

A discussion of the federal mandate of vaccinations for those connected to federal contracts followed as part of new business. Associate Provost Weeks noted that the administration is working methodically to identify who is covered and not covered. Individuals are being notified as they are identified.

Motion to adjourn at 10:55a by Esra Santesso and seconded by David Okech. Approved unanimously.

8.3.5.4 Post Tenure Review (Emended Proposed Language)

~~Each institution shall conduct post-tenure reviews of all tenured faculty members five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action for the faculty member. Reviews shall continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review for promotion or personnel action. An administrator who has tenure will not be subject to post-tenure review, as long as a majority of the individual's duties are administrative in nature. If and when an administrator returns to the faculty full-time, the individual will be placed into the post-tenure review cycle described above. Institution presidents shall review and approve their institution's post-tenure review policies, as well as any subsequent revisions, both of which must conform to University System of Georgia procedures for post-tenure review and should address cases in which a tenured faculty member's performance is deemed unsatisfactory.~~

The post-tenure review process shall support the further career development of tenured faculty members as well as ensure accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure.

Each tenured faculty member shall participate in a post-tenure review within five years following the award of tenure and again at least once every five years thereafter. The first post-tenure review shall assess the tenured faculty member's performance since the award of tenure, and subsequent post-tenure reviews shall assess the performance since the most recent post-tenure review.

A tenured faculty member may voluntarily choose to participate in a post-tenure review sooner than five years. If this voluntary review is successful, then the faculty member's next scheduled post-tenure review will take place five years after this voluntary review.

In addition, a tenured faculty member whose performance is evaluated as unsatisfactory or not meeting expectations – whether overall or in any particular area – in an annual review process will be provided with a remediation plan. If the faculty member's performance is evaluated as unsatisfactory or not meeting expectations – overall or in a particular area – again the next year, the faculty member shall then undergo a corrective post-tenure review. That review will not alter the timing of the faculty member's regularly scheduled five-year post-tenure review thereafter.

Each tenure-granting institution must create its own specific policies for implementing this post-tenure review policy. Each institution's policies shall be developed in consultation with the institution's faculty and should include appropriate due-process mechanisms. Institutions will have flexibility in their implementation to create a process appropriate to the campus context. Prior to implementation, institutions must submit policies and evaluation criteria to the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee(s) for approval. The Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee(s) will provide institutions with more specific guidelines for their post-tenure review policies and procedures.

Consistent with those guidelines and institutional policies, post-tenure review shall include evaluation of instruction, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service as is appropriate to the faculty member's institution, school or college, and department. The post-tenure review will also incorporate findings from the faculty member's annual reviews from the years since the last post-tenure review. The faculty member shall provide review materials and additional information, as provided for in the institution's guidelines, to aid the review process. The post-tenure review will include, at a minimum, feedback from the faculty member's department chair

and an appropriate committee of faculty colleagues. The results of the post-tenure review shall be conveyed to the faculty member. The results of the post-tenure review shall be considered in subsequent decisions on promotion, merit pay, and other rewards.

If the results of the post-tenure review are unfavorable, then a performance improvement plan shall be created by the applicable department chair and dean in consultation with the faculty member. The necessary elements of such performance improvement plans will be described in the guidelines provided by the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee(s) as well as in each institution's post-tenure review policies.

If the faculty member successfully completes the performance improvement plan, then the faculty member's next post-tenure review will take place on the regular five-year schedule.

If the faculty member fails to make sufficient progress in performance as outlined in the performance improvement plan (or refuses to engage reasonably in the process) as determined by the department chair and dean after considering feedback from the appropriate committee of faculty colleagues, then the institution shall take appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies. The President will make the final determination on behalf of the institution regarding appropriate remedial action. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to the Board Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review.

Remedial actions may include, but are not necessarily limited to, suspension of pay, salary reduction, revocation of tenure, and separation from employment. The institution must give the faculty member notice of the possibility of such remedial actions when the performance improvement plan begins. The determined remedial action will be imposed in accordance with the guidelines provided by the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee(s) as well as the institution's post-tenure review policies. The institution's imposition of such remedial action will not be governed by or subject to the Board Policy on Grounds for Removal or Procedures for Dismissal.

Each institution shall also develop and implement procedures to conduct post-tenure reviews with tenured faculty members who hold administrative positions. These procedures shall address the distinctive nature of administrators' work and leadership roles, include constituent feedback, and reflect that tenure is held in faculty positions not in administrative positions.

Each institution shall compile and submit an annual report on post-tenure review activity to the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee(s).

8.3.7.1 Faculty (Current Proposed Language)

Each University System of Georgia (USG) institution, with the exception of GGC, shall establish clearly-stated tenure criteria and procedures that emphasize excellence in teaching and involvement in student success activities for all teaching faculty, conform to the requirements listed below, and are approved by the USG Chief Academic Officer. The requirements listed below are the minimum standard for award of tenure, but shall be sufficiently flexible to permit an institution to make individual adjustments appropriate to its mission. **While the Board of Regents has delegated authority for tenure decisions to institution presidents, if an institution is adjudged to be insufficiently rigorous in its enactment of faculty review processes the Board of Regents may move the authority to award tenure to the Board level until institutional processes have been remediated.**

8.3.7.1 Faculty (Emended Proposed Language)

Each University System of Georgia (USG) institution, with the exception of GGC, shall establish clearly-stated tenure criteria and procedures that emphasize excellence in teaching **and involvement in student success activities** for all teaching faculty, conform to the requirements listed below, **and** are approved by the USG Chief Academic Officer. The requirements listed below are the minimum standard for award of tenure, but shall be sufficiently flexible to permit an institution to make individual adjustments appropriate to its mission. **While the Board of Regents has delegated authority for tenure decisions to institution presidents, if an institution is not carrying out its faculty review process in a sufficiently rigorous manner the Board of Regents may move the authority to award tenure to the Board level until institutional processes have been remediated.**

8.3.7.2 Tenure Requirements (Emended Proposed Language)

Tenure resides at the institutional level. Institutional responsibility for employment of a tenured individual is to the extent of continued employment on a 100 percent workload basis for two out of every three consecutive academic terms until retirement, **resignation, separation as remedial action related to post-tenure review**, dismissal for cause, or release because of financial exigency or program modification as determined by the Board of Regents.

Only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors are eligible for tenure. Normally, only faculty who are employed full-time, defined as service on a 100 percent workload basis for at least two out of three consecutive academic terms, by an institution are eligible for tenure. Faculty members holding these professorial ranks who are employed by a USG institution on less than a full-time basis and who are assigned by the USG institution to or hold an appointment at a non-USG corporate or governmental entity shall, subject to the approval of the Chancellor, be eligible for promotion and the award of tenure by the institution President.

The award of tenure is limited to the above academic ranks and shall not be construed to include honorific appointments such as adjunct appointments. Faculty with non-tenure track appointments shall not acquire tenure.