

**Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting  
March 4, 2022**

**Attendees:**

Janette Hill, Chair  
Kent Barnett  
Shira Chess  
Lindsey Harding  
Mark Huber  
Artur Muszynski  
Andrew Park  
Annette Poulsen  
Amber Prentiss  
Esra Santesso  
Yoo-Kyoung Seock

Ye Shen  
Amanda Smith  
John Peroni  
Elizabeth St. Pierre  
Thiab Taha  
Brock Woodson  
George Zheng

**Guests:**

Provost Jack Hu  
Associate Provost Elizabeth Weeks  
Barb Biesecker  
Mike Fulford  
Paul Matthews  
Usha Rodrigues

Meeting called to order at 2:30.

Review of minutes from the meetings of Feb 4 and Feb 18. After discussion and correction, Annette Poulsen moved to approve the minutes and Artur Muszynski seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Janette Hill briefly updated the FAC on the work of the Faculty Evaluation Policies and Practices (FEPP) Working Group and provided a description of the work of FAC over the next several months to update the evaluation, tenure and promotion, and post-tenure review policies. She then invited Provost Hu to expand on the upcoming work.

Provost Hu described the process of USG and the Board of Regents in developing the new guidelines and noted that the FEPP has been expanded to 25 members. The increased size allows five subgroups to work in parallel on different aspects of the changes and then to bring their work back to the full committee. The additional members broadened the representation on the Working Group to include all UGA Colleges and Schools, various career tracks, and administrators. He also detailed the implementation timeline, including the establishment of rubrics for evaluation by January 2023, to be used in Annual Evaluations in January 2024. He hopes that the Annual Evaluation Guidelines can be approved by USG and University Council before summer 2022 so that PTUs can begin to develop evaluation standards.

Additional Information provided to the FAC:

- The guidelines are now published on the USG website in the Academic and Student Affairs Handbook.
  - [https://www.usg.edu/academic\\_affairs\\_handbook/section4/C2845/#p4.4\\_faculty\\_evaluation\\_systems](https://www.usg.edu/academic_affairs_handbook/section4/C2845/#p4.4_faculty_evaluation_systems)

- [https://www.usg.edu/academic\\_affairs\\_handbook/section4/C690](https://www.usg.edu/academic_affairs_handbook/section4/C690)
- [https://www.usg.edu/academic\\_affairs\\_handbook/section4/C691/](https://www.usg.edu/academic_affairs_handbook/section4/C691/)

Dr. Hill introduced the Action Item on the agenda, to consider the Draft of the Annual Evaluation Policy, as developed by the Working Group, for approval to forward to USG and Executive Committee for presentation to University Council.

Considerable discussion ensued regarding whether a grievance policy could be added to the annual evaluation policy, especially related to the Performance Remediation Plans or Performance Improvement Plans envisioned for corrective action after two negative annual reviews or a negative post-tenure review. Guest Barb Biesecker indicated that she would identify the grievance policies being used at other USG schools, prepare a new draft of the Annual Evaluation Policy developed by the Working Group and share with the FAC the week of March 7.

After clarifying discussion of Dr. Biesecker's proposal, Elizabeth St. Pierre moved to table the action item, which was seconded by Esra Santesso. The vote was 13 yes to 4 no to table. Dr. Hill indicated that she would reach out to FAC to set up another meeting early in the week of March 14 to consider the new draft.

The Committee then turned to discussion of Old Business, the Academic Professional Guidelines as developed by FAC but not approved by EC to move forward to the full University Council.

Considerable discussion ensued regarding why EC did not forward the document, what changes were envisioned by that discussion, and the possible need for a more formal process for review of significant changes to faculty evaluation and promotion guidelines.

Lindsey Harding made a motion to table the discussion of the AP Guidelines, noting that would give the FAC an opportunity to develop a process for reviewing significant changes. Annette Poulsen seconded the motion to table the discussion. The vote was 13 yes to 5 no.

Dr. Harding made a motion that the FAC should develop a formal process that would codify the approach of FAC to its work. It was seconded by Dr. Poulsen. After discussion, Dr. Poulsen made a motion to call the question and Artur Muszynski seconded the motion. That motion passed. The Committee then proceeded to vote on the proposal. The proposal did not pass with 5 yes votes, 10 no, and 1 abstain vote.

Dr. St. Pierre asked Usha Rodrigues, University Council Parliamentarian, to clarify the procedure for setting the agenda for Council Committee meetings. Professor Rodrigues suggested that agendas are generally set by the chair and that any member can suggest additions to the agenda during a meeting. She said that she would further analyze Robert's Rules of Order with respect to this question and would get back to the FAC with the results of her research.

Dr. Poulsen made a motion that the FAC should form a subcommittee to review the Academic Practitioner Guidelines. The purpose would be to determine what to do next with guidelines – revisions or retraction or some other outcome. Guest Dr. Biesecker noted that 63% of the FAC would be new next year and that it might be better to leave the work to that new Committee. Dr. Poulsen withdrew her motion.

Dr. St. Pierre made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Santesso. The motion passed unanimously and the meeting was adjourned at 4:45.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Annette Poulsen". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent initial 'A'.

Annette Poulsen