Franklin College Faculty Senate
Minutes of the meeting on Tuesday, March 1, 2022

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 PM via Zoom, Leslie Simons presiding.

Members Present: Toyin Alli, Michael Bachmann, Adam Barn, Benjamin Britton, Clifton Buck, Liming Cai, Joel Caughran, Pilar Chamorro Fernandez, Carmen Comeaux, Brian Condie, Inge DiBella, Vince Du, Le Guan, Timothy Gupton, DeLoris Hesse, Imi Hwangbo, Caner Kazanci, Joe Kellner, Emily Koh, Sidney Kushner, Kendall Marchman, Soroya McFarlane, Emily Mouilso, Vasant Muralidharan, Chris Peterson, Nancee Reeves, Laurie Reitsema, Amy Ross, Bala Sarasvati, Matthew Shipes, Rohan Sikri, Leslie Gordon Simons, Anne Summers, Cynthia Suveg, Alberto Villate-Isaza, Frans Weiser

Proxies: T.N Sriram for Gauri Datta, Bruce Railsback for Steve Holland, John Bray for Kristin Kundert

Members not present: Maduranga Dassanayake, Jordan Pickett, Hang Yin

Approval of the corrected minutes of the February 1, 2022. Corrected minutes were unanimously approved as distributed.

New Business

- **Nomination and election of Benjamin Britton as President-elect.** *A motion by Dr. Amy Ross and seconded by Dr. Caner Kazanci to approve Mr. Britton as president-elect passed unanimously*

Dean´s Office Remarks, presented by Associate Dean Thomas Mote:

- **State Budget**
    - There are two budgets under consideration in the Georgia General Assembly right now, the first is the amended FY2022 budget which is for the current fiscal year through June 30 and the second is the FY2023 budget, which will be for the fiscal year beginning on July 1. The information we have is largely from the same media reports that are available to all of you.
        - A cost-of-living adjustment of $5,000 this year as a bonus for State employees, including university system employees passed the House on February 10 and it was approved by a Senate Committee earlier this week and will be considered by the full Senate later.
        - The governor's recommendation is for the FY23 budget to make this salary bonus permanent, effectively making this a $5000 raise
- **Provost Hu has received and is reviewing feedback for the five candidates interviewed for the position of Dean of Franklin College.** Thank all of you who participated in that search process, who attended talks or watched online, and provided feedback on the candidates. I know that the Provost is taking that feedback very seriously.
- **We have a search underway in the Dean's Office and we are currently interviewing candidates for the Director of Human Resources and Workplace Diversity.**
    - This person will replace Nakia Wade who accepted the position of Senior Director of Diversity and Inclusion in the Central Human Resources Office.
- **Questions for Associate Dean Mote**

- Benjamin Britton (Art): The Franklin Senate *ad hoc* Committee on Hate Crimes report recommended the hiring of a new Associate Dean of Diversity. Is this in response to that recommendation?
    - Associate Dean Mote: No, this is to fill a current Director of Human Resources and Workplace Diversity position
- Leslie Simons (Sociology): Since you are hiring for a position that has the word diversity in the title it made me wonder if you can share what the College is discussing regarding the Georgia Senate Finance Committee's request to the interim Chancellor, and in turn her request to USG institutions, to provide an exhaustive list of every possible way that the institutions are focusing on anything related to diversity, equity, inclusion, anti-racism, and privilege.
    - Associate Dean Mote: There was an extensive legislative request that was made in February. You may have seen the media reports about that request being 11 pages long. That request was reconsidered based on questions from the Presidents and Chancellor and a new request was issued that was narrower in scope. The University is currently responding to that request. UGA often receives various kinds of legislative requests and as a public institution is obligated to respond. The President has made it very clear that he's very proud of the efforts that the University is making in terms of diversity, equity, and inclusion, as is Franklin College, and we report those activities in that spirit. I've not seen the final document, but I know that there is a document that's been prepared to be sent to the university system.

Committee Reports:

- **Executive Committee:** (Benjamin Britton, Art): There are suggestions regarding changes to the Curriculum Committee including expanding the number of members sitting on that committee. Updates will be presented in a future meeting.
- **Academic Standards:** (Tharuvai Sriram, statistics, proxy for Gauri Datta)**:** One appeal, approved
- **Curriculum Committee** (Sherry Gray, read from the report provided by Dr. Bala Sarasvati):
    - 3 new courses
    - 10 course changes
    - 25 Bulletin Changes: Various Departments
    - 2 Experiential Learning Proposals: MATH 4801; STAT(CSI) 4990
    - 2 Double Dawgs: Communication Studies; Music
    - 2 Multicultural Proposals: ANTH(NAMS) 4310/6310; FILM 4100/6100
- **Planning and Evaluation**: No new business reported
- **Faculty Affairs:** (Amy Ross, Geography): The Faculty Affairs Committee is evaluating legislative activity that could have an impact on our academic freedom, specifically concerning divisive content in our courses. The committee is drafting a response to these ongoing activities.
- **Planning and Evaluation:** No new business reported

New Business: Update from Provost's Working Group on Faculty Policies and Practices by committee co-chairs Janette Hill, Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee of the University Council and Professor in the Department of Career and Information Studies in the Mary Frances Early College of Education, and, Elizabeth Weeks, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and Charles H. Kirbo Chair in the School of Law

- General information about working group: https://provost.uga.edu/faculty_working_group/

- Update on faculty evaluation policies and practices: https://provost.uga.edu/faculty_working_group/february_23_2022_memo/
- Pdf of presentation slides: https://provost.uga.edu/faculty_working_group/USGAEPTRGuidelines_Spring2022.pdf.
- Jeanette Hill:
    - In September, the Board of Regents had their meeting and by October these policies were approved and in place. In November, the Provost charged the working group to implement those policies into the current UGA policies.
    - Guidelines from the University System of Georgia were circulated and those guidelines which put the policies into practice were finalized on the eighth of February.
    - After looking at those updated guidelines and then considering the original charge of the working group, the Provost recharged and expanded the working group to include members from across various areas of campus. We were able to expand to now represent the five schools and colleges that were not represented previously as well as members from non-tenure track faculty.
    - Another change is that the Provost charged five subgroups to work on continued updates to the UGA policies, including annual evaluations, post tenure review, review of administrators, P and T guidelines, and due process policies.
        - The annual evaluation subgroup has focused on the student success activities within the existing areas of effort and how we will evaluate those incorporating a five-point evaluation scale.
        - Another consideration for this subgroup has been incorporation of a one-year performance remediation plan as a part of what happens after you get a score of one or two from an annual evaluation. If you have two consecutive years of a one or two on your annual evaluation overall that leads to a corrective post tenure review.
        - Another component to the annual evaluation update is that currently rebuttal is allowed, though no response is now required to that faculty member's rebuttal. Now a response is required from the unit that performed the annual evaluation.
    - Elizabeth Weeks: It bears emphasis that, the annual evaluation draft policy, which is already on the FTP website, was passed unanimously and uses language and elements of the annual evaluation process that is prescriptive by USG. The document that now is on the FTP website is color coded in red to indicate language that is hardwired by USG, black shows what is in our existing UGA policy, and blue where we had an opportunity to amend and iterate some of the language in the policy. The annual evaluation language that was given by USG was finalized on February 8 and is quite detailed and prescriptive around annual evaluations and post tenure review. The timeline for this is not effective right now, and not effective for annual evaluations that will be performed a year from now, but would be an effective for annual evaluations, the following year.
- **Discussion and Questions**
    - Clifton Buck (Marine Sciences): I recognize that these aspects came from USG but I was wondering if they provided any guidance on this five-point scale because it seems inconsistent.
        - Elizabeth Weeks: Whether there's a distinction that makes a difference between a one and a two and a five is unclear. I think it leaves open some questions about a faculty member who does receive a one but improves to a two in the second year, and it doesn't seem to provide a lot of incentive for that modest improvement.

- Amy Ross (Geography): When you see key policy changes here (evaluation of student success, etc.), these are all mandated by the USG, is that correct? If it's just about accepting that there's no room to make changes to the most egregious aspects of this, then I'm unclear as to what your committee is going to accomplish.
    - Jeanette Hill: There are some areas in which we have been able to insert some language and hopefully when you look at that color coded document that might help with clarifying that.
    - AR: Can you tell us what you cannot change?
        - JH: One of the things that we can't change is this five-point evaluation scale.
        - EW: There is language in the framework about how the standards and criteria and processes for annual evaluation needs to be transparent and clearly articulated and available in advance of the time period in which a faculty member will be reviewed under them. A notice of the standards to which we hold ourselves have to be clear and agreed upon by the unit and available to the unit, and that's not the work of the ftp working group. A number of units have annual evaluation documents that draw on their PTU criteria that are tailored to the annual evaluation. This USG process very much encourages that sort of annual evaluation document so that faculty know the mark that they are shooting for on an annual basis, not just on a promotion and tenure cycle.
- Adam Barb (BMB): I look at the updated version and a lot of this is red and I certainly understand that a lot of this is being forced upon the university and we have to do the best we can. One of the biggest issues that I have is with respect to what that five-point scale is. These are subjective terms, so can there be guidance to aspects that need to be met?
    - EW: I think that's a great suggestion. I this is another piece where we have more work to do around how we train someone to write a performance remediation plan that's appropriate for the discipline and realistic. I think those training opportunities are really critical as part of the implementation.
- Anne Summers (Microbiology): A question that I had from the beginning is what problem we're trying to fix by adding this? Nationally, many campuses suddenly have something called student success as part of their characterization of their programs and I thought, maybe somebody has some measurements about the kinds of activities that would be most appropriate for achieving student success. By and large, it seems to be a kind of a branding, which is fine. What are we going to be looking at to see that this is working?
    - JH: I do think that's a fair question and in terms of how will we know that it's working. One of the things in an initial draft is that there would be a measurement related to student success. We would somehow collect data to measure student success activities and what that means for students. That's something that would be really challenging and difficult to measure and we pushed back on that. USG then asked that we think about student success activities that faculty engage in all the time.
- Alberto Villate, Senator: I have a question regarding the role of the supervisor or department head in the assessment and implementation of the performance Improvement Plan.
    - JH: An unsuccessful post tenure review requires a one-year Performance Improvement Plan developed by the faculty member who is undergoing the post

tenure review, the department head, a faculty committee, and then that PIP is approved by the Dean and filed with the office of faculty affairs. There is an opportunity for the Faculty Member to appeal to the university level post tenure review appeals committee.

- AV: Who determines that the Improvement Plan was in fact successful or unsuccessful? Initial consideration of the faculty member seems to rely heavily on the department head.
  - JH: There's actually three elements are involved in that assessment of whether the PIP was successful or unsuccessful: the department head, input from the Dean, and the post tenure review committee.

- Benjamin Britton (Art): Assuming that student success activities will be added to our evaluations, are we going to see new categories in Elements and requirements to documents such as activities, for example, will we need to do an Elements entry for every letter of recommendation that we write? I appreciate being recognized for things we do already but documentation sounds extremely tedious and time consuming.
  - EW: In terms of elements, this is done by the Elements team. Faculty affairs is working on creating a tag or a checkbox so those things that we already enter in Elements can just be tagged as a student success activity. At the Unit level, we can think about how to properly capture both a more tailored definition of what student success activities means within a discipline and also some appropriate and reasonable ways of documenting those activities.
- EW: We do have a slide on explicit language in the USG framework on review of administrators. We have a subgroup working on that particular topic, and it very explicitly requires that administrators be reviewed, both in their administrative or leadership capacity, as well as within I think that uses the language their traditional faculty roles in teaching, research and service.
- Leslie Simons (Sociology): What are examples of remedial actions that follow an unsuccessful PIP, other than termination?
  - JH: A couple of examples that were included in the list were reduction in pay, or perhaps removal of tenure or reallocation of effort.
- Benjamin Britton: Does the FTP vote?
  - JH: we do vote as a full committee after the subgroups bring the working documents to the committee. The full committee votes on whether it is ready to move forward to the Faculty Affairs Committee for consideration.
- Georgios Petridis: My specific question has to do with what happens if the Provost makes a recommendation that is the opposite of what the committee recommends or makes the opposite recommendation of a university wide post tenure review committee. Have you considered what might happen in this case? EW: I don't know either.
- Tharuvai Sriram: I'm the head of the Department of Statistics. This gives the heads a lot of power. When a poor annual evaluation is given and there is a rebuttal, I think that response should go to the Dean's office for review. I think there should be some oversight from the Dean's office.
  - JH: just to clarify, I think you were talking about the annual evaluation rebuttal. In some units there may have been a faculty evaluation committee for annual evaluation that gave input to the department head, but I know in a lot of units that

doesn't exist. in units where they don't have faculty input from the beginning, then they may consider changing those evaluation processes to include some of that.

- Benjamin Britton: Thank you. I'm so sorry we have to cut off this discussion there, I think we probably have a lot more to ask them to talk about because we only got halfway through the presentation. Thank you so much for coming,

Old Business: None

Meeting was adjourned at 4:45pm

Respectfully submitted,
DeLoris Hesse
Franklin College Senate Secretary and Senator for Cellular Biology