



Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS)
College Faculty Council (CFC)

HSS CFC MINUTES
SO 3020
February 4, 2009

Attending: Bowers, Fein, Firment, Hedeem, Kelley, Voogt, Wachniak, Womack

Excused: Trendell, Vengroff

1. Report from CFC/DFC meeting, Jan 26

On Monday January 26, approximately thirty members of college and department faculty councils (CFCs and DFCs) convened to share experiences and insights related to shared governance. The meeting was organized by AAUP@KSU.

The Provost, Dr. Black, joined us for a very useful portion of the meeting and stressed his support for the faculty councils and their work. Below are a few notes we promised to share with all our faculty colleagues:

- 1. Academic Affairs website update:** The chairs of the DFCs and CFCs across campus are now listed on the Academic affairs website. They are the third and fourth items under "Resources" on that page. These lists are important for efficient communication. Updates or corrections to the lists should be sent to Val Whittlesley <vwhittle@kennesaw.edu>
- 2. A resource bank for FCs:** A colleague suggested a resource bank to support the work of FCs, noting that much information is hard to track down. The provost seeks suggestions for which types of information would be useful; this resource could be part of the re-designed Academic Affairs website.
- 3. FCs as part of administrative review:** While the processes for conducting annual reviews of chair and dean performance are under development with a group representing faculty senate, chairs, deans, and the provost, the nature and principles of shared governance would indicate that FCs will have a role. The provost noted that we don't yet know what that will be, but he concurred that faculty would have a definite role.
- 4. A note on serving in an "advisory" capacity:** While the FCs are "advisory" in many ways, they are also the legitimate representatives of the faculty. Thus chairs and deans are invited to seek advice from FCs and are also required to be responsive to FC requests and suggestions.
- 5. Elect committees in January, not April:** Electing or otherwise selecting faculty committee assignments (not just to FCs) by January allows for more accurate FPA plans, better succession, and preparation for responding to quick-turnaround items--such as budgeting, which occurs in a tight window between August and October.



Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) College Faculty Council (CFC)

6. **Preview (not just review) budget requests:** FCs should probably review budget priorities and requests with chairs and deans before departments and colleges send this requests to the PPBAC. Once requests have reached that level, changes aren't easily made.

7. **Make it easy and safe for faculty to communicate with the FCs:** FCs should develop appropriate opportunities for colleagues to raise concerns or topics. FCs would do well to employ a range of methods to learn of faculty concerns--email blasts, one-to-one conversations, department meetings. Be sensitive to the fact that some concerns and some colleagues might require confidentiality.

8. **Faculty development possibilities:** Some faculty would be interested in training in how to be a good colleague and/or how to conduct an FC efficiently and effectively--this speaks to the ever-present difficulty of keeping a group focused (on task and on time) and the sometimes-seen inattention to collegial relations. If you're interested in such a training, please reply to me; with sufficient interest we can develop a short training.

9. **FCs can work with the chair or dean to set agendas:** One DFC chair mentioned that the DFC and department chair meet to develop the agenda for upcoming faculty meetings.

10. **FCs as awards committees:** One DFC has taken on the role of department committee on faculty awards nominations-review body; selects dept nominee in each award area.

11. **Trouble getting information?** FCs will get some support through the resource bank mentioned above; it's also useful to remember there are other bodies to consult, as appropriate--faculty senate, AAUP@KSU, higher-level administrators, and more. The provost is designated as a resource to FCs, should difficulties arise in the conduct of their work.

2. *HSS CFC representation at HSS Chairs meetings;
CFC representation at Deans Council meetings*

The dates of upcoming HSS Chairs meetings, as well as the CFC volunteer representatives to attend each:

March 6: Firment
March 20: Voogt
April 3: Bowers
April 17: Fein (9am-9:45am)
May 1: Hedeem
May 15: TBD
May 29: TBD

The meeting dates of upcoming Deans Council meetings, and the CFC representatives available—
Hedeem will contact Angie Conti at the Provost's office to check for available space for one of these:



Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) College Faculty Council (CFC)

March 5: Hedeem

April 2: Hedeem

April 30: Bowers

3. Faculty annual reviews

A. Annual reviews

The CFC will request the Dean to seek consistency across HSS departments regarding the content and length of annual reviews for tenured faculty performance, *excepting* the formal Post Tenure Review detailed in the Faculty Handbook. Most departments in HSS presently require the past and coming years' FPAs, an Annual Report on performance on the past year's FPA; others require narratives and still others the provision of documents and other materials. The annual review processes are detailed in each department's guidelines, which are developed by the chair and faculty. The CFC requests the Dean recommend a format for departments to consider.

B. Expectations

The CFC discussed the continuing issue of recognizing service in faculty performance and T&P procedures. No consensus was reached.

4. Administrative review

Wachniak requested the CFC offer feedback on the upcoming review process for HSS deans and chairs; all present affirmed they seek a process that allows full and frank review of all administrators, in line with the HSS Chairs discussion below:

Report of discussion among the HSS Chairs regarding the "Academic Administrators Review Process" 1/9/09

The HSS Chairs unanimously subscribe to three principles that should guide all reviews:

1. The review process and the results of the review should be fully transparent.
2. The results of the review process should be shared publicly (via paper, oral presentation, email, or electronic posting).
3. The review should include a structure to assure open communication/dialog among the participants about the process and the results.

The CHSS Chairs unanimously affirm their satisfaction with the review process currently in place in the CHSS and request of the Provost that this process be continued within the CHSS. The CHSS Chairs suggest that the CHSS review process might be considered for adoption within other Colleges, where appropriate.



Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) College Faculty Council (CFC)

Among the positive qualities of the CHSS Academic Administrator Review Process are the following. It is easily administrated. Results can be quickly analyzed. The data provided are easily understood, meaningful, and easy to disseminate.

The process is as follows:

1. All faculty evaluate chairs, deans (associate, assistant) using a 14 question instrument (attached) that permits both quantitative and qualitative responses.
2. Responses are submitted electronically to assure confidentiality.
3. Results are submitted to the Dean who sends the data to the Chairs (associate, assistant deans). Chairs must distribute the results to their department faculty via paper, email, or electronic posting. Qualitative responses are not shared.
4. Chairs invited faculty to respond to the results, either to the Chair or to the Dean.
5. The Dean provides a written review of yearly performance to the Chairs at the time of the annual review interview. The written review includes the Dean's interpretation and review of the aforementioned 14 item faculty review of the Chair.

Updated 1/12/2009

Hedeen related faculty concerns about the past practice of (and HSS Chairs' request for university-wide consideration of) keeping qualitative feedback confidential. Wachniak illustrated the functionality of this policy, Hedeen noted drawbacks; all agreed to seek a method to meet the participants' expectations of anonymity and transparency. A specific method was not proposed.

Models presently under consideration at a Provost's committee (with representatives from Deans Council, Chairs Council, Faculty Senate) include various roles for faculty; the CFC discussed the values of DFCs reviewing Chair evaluations and CFCs reviewing Dean evaluations, while considering the possibility of CFCs reviewing evaluations of Deans and Chairs.