

The Faculty Affairs Committee has recommendations on the following four items:

1. Recommended changes to the Faculty Handbook

Dr. Vaughn is in the process of submitting an application to have CSU designated as a Carnegie Engaged University. One area of the application addresses community engagement in the promotion and tenure processes. The Faculty Handbook does not clearly emphasize/address community engagement, so Dr. Vaughn has proposed some changes to the wording in the Handbook. The proposed revisions do not change the P&T process or requirements. The FAC discussed the proposed changes, unanimously approved the changes, and recommends the changes to the Faculty Senate. The specific changes are attached to this email.

2. Annual reviews for all faculty

- a. In December the Faculty Senate asked the FAC to consider possible changes to the annual review weighting for all faculty (specifically decreasing the weight factor for teaching and increasing the weight factor for scholarship/professional development. The committee discussed this option, and feels that such a change might not reflect the mission of the University, and that the larger issue to be considered is faculty workload and the percentage of faculty time that is currently devoted to teaching, service, and scholarship/professional development. The FAC feels that a discussion about faculty workload would be valuable, but is too large an issue for the FAC to consider this year. The FAC recommends the formation of an ad hoc committee to look at faculty workload. This committee should consist of Deans/Associate Deans and faculty.
- b. The FAC was also asked to consider recommending changes to the percentage of "Service to the larger community" in the faculty evaluation form. Currently, the weight factor for this area is 0-15, but some faculty feel that service to the community should be required (the minimum for this area should be raised). While the FAC agrees that service outside the institution should be strongly encouraged, such service should not be required. The FAC does not recommend any changes to this area.

3. Annual reviews for administrative faculty

- a. In November the FAC made the recommendation to the Faculty Senate to adjust the weighting of the Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Form for faculty with administrative responsibilities (department chairs, program coordinators, etc.). The Senate asked us to survey the administrative faculty to gather their input. The survey presenting the proposal and soliciting feedback and other suggestions was conducted in December and January. The survey responses indicated those administrative faculty are in support of the FAC proposal. That proposal is:

Category	Current Weighting	Proposed Weighting
I. Teaching	60 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25-40 Instruction of students</li> <li>• 20-35 Planning, Development, and Evaluation of Programs, Courses, and Materials</li> </ul>	15-60 (based on teaching load) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5-55 Instruction of students</li> <li>• 5-55 Planning, Development, and Evaluation of Programs, Courses, and Materials</li> </ul>
II. Service to the Institution	15-30 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15-30 Committee and Other Service Within the University Community</li> <li>• 0-15 Service to the Larger Community</li> </ul>	15-75 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15-75 Committee and Other Service Within the University Community</li> <li>• 0-60 Service to the Larger Community</li> </ul>
III. Professional Development and Scholarship	10-25	10-25

Since teaching and service responsibilities vary greatly for different administrative faculty, the exact weighting for each area of this sliding scale can be determined each year by the faculty being evaluated.

- b. In addition, the survey results indicated that not all Colleges are using the Annual Faculty Evaluation Summary Form to evaluate administrative faculty. The FAC believes it is important for all faculty to be evaluated using this form for promotion and tenure purposes, as described in the Faculty Handbook. We recommend that the Faculty Senate stress this importance to the Provost's office and the Deans of each College.

4. Resolution on same-sex partner benefits:

The FAC proposes the following resolution, to show appreciation for the recent progress made in this area.

Whereas

For several years, members of the Faculty Affairs Committee have encouraged the university to provide health care benefits for same-sex or domestic partners;

Whereas

Members of the committee felt that such benefits were an issue of equity and basic human rights;

Whereas

Such benefits would make it easier to recruit and retain faculty and staff;

Whereas

Such benefits would align Clayton State with other leading universities and corporations;

And whereas

Clayton State University was able to begin offering vision and dental benefits to same-sex partners starting in January 2014;

Be it resolved

That members of the faculty wish to express their appreciation for this first step towards full parity for the diverse members of the university community.