

**Middle Georgia State University**  
**Faculty Affairs Committee**  
**November 18, 2022**

---

**(1) Call to Order**

The Faculty Affairs Committee (“the Committee”) was called to order at 9:00am on Friday, November 18, 2022 on Microsoft Teams.

---

**(2) Roll Call**

**Present**

- Ashford, Tina
- Buffenmyer, Luke
- Cole, Gary (Chair)
- Frazier, Javan
- Fuller, Dawn
- Hagler, James
- Hornung, Chris
- Lanning, Rebecca
- Matson, Charles
- McRae, Rod
- Wallace, Steve
- Watson, Annie (Recorder)
- Whiddon, Kelly

**Not Present**

- Briones, Ervin
  - Funches, Amanda
- 

**(3) Approval of the Agenda**

**Charles Matson** moFunches/Pa (rl)-6 329.4 441(a)4 (n0-C /C2\_0 1 Tf1 /P u)nMoa10 (al)c190.92 280.44 T





- **Wallace** responded that a statement of nomination would be required (either self-nomination or nomination of a third party), and optional letters of recommendation would be allowed.

**Rebecca Lanning** inquired who would make the nominations for all of the awards.

- **Hagler** responded that it could be faculty member themselves (through self-nomination), chairs, deans, or others.

**Wallace** highlighted that naming the new award should be done very carefully, noting that the new general award should not be presented as superseding the three existing awards.

**Cole** inquired about the logistics of implementing the ad hoc committee's recommendations. The Committee is charged with handling faculty awards. Does that mean that in the fall, the chair of the Committee will send a message to all schools encouraging that they select their nominees, the schools will select their nominees, the nominees will be provided to the Committee, and the Committee will select the winners in the spring? Or will the Committee select the nominee from each school?

- **Hagler** responded that the Committee should not be selecting the school nominees, only strongly encouraging nominees from each school.

**Lanning** remarked that the only way to avoid making the fourth award seem as though it supersedes the exm (o)2 (mmitoc 0.004 Tw2 (e)4 (r)Tw -21.55 -1..004 Tc 0.e18.002 Tc -0.002 (e n)-4 (o)2 (ha)4

- **Wallace** highlighted the role of the nomination letter, which can include these details, as well as the faculty member's self-evaluation. (In the past, letters of recommendation often regurgitated the information from the self-evaluations.) Faculty members would also be allowed to submit additional materials highlighting or expanding on their self-evaluations.

**Tina Ashford** suggested that a problem with using annual self-evaluations for the process is that the Committee would have access to information beyond the scope of an individual award, which could influence the selection process for winners.

- **Buffenmyer** suggested that using self-evaluations in the nominating process for these awards could change the way faculty members complete their self-evaluations for the better.
- **Wallace** added that the Faculty Recognition Committee should be trusted to concentrate on the content from the self-evaluations that is relevant to the award being considered.

**Cole** suggested that it seems potentially problematic to have no student voices directly contributing to the selection of the teaching award but that addressing this concern would likely require the continued use of student letters of recommendation (which remain problematic, themselves).

He also emphasized that these proposed changes to awards will take effect in the fall of 2023.

**Cole** requested that the ad hoc committee prepare a statement to be presented in the Committee's January meeting for discussion, amendment, and approval.

- **Buffenmyer** volunteered to draft the statement for the ad hoc committee.

#### *(B) Report from the Chair on Part-Time Faculty in the Handbook*

**Gary Cole** noted that in the Committee's previous meeting, **Rod McRae** had asked if the Faculty Handbook was intended to apply to part-time faculty members (as well as full-time faculty members). The review of sections 4 and 5 of the handbook made it clear that it is intended to apply. No further action is required.

#### *(C) Faculty Handbook Review: Sections 4-5*

**Gary Cole** reviewed the collaborative document used by the Committee to make comments on Sections 4-5 of the faculty handbook.

Some points of discussion:

From **Steve Wallace**: "Should we suggest a maximum amount of time that a faculty member can be expected to work without a contract?" *This is related to 4.02.02.1.H in the handbook.*

- **Tina Ashford** asked if it is possible for the Committee to take this step, given the role of the President in carrying out this action.



Human Resources Department of the institution, and the campus liaisons for conflict resolution.’ Does this happen?” *This is associated with section 5.06.01 of the handbook (pg. 78, second paragraph).*

- **Frazier** suggested that since this is an ad hoc committee, it may occur infrequently. Human Resources could be a useful resource for this question.
- **Cole** offered to follow up with Human Resources.

From **Matson**: Is the Chair of the Executive Committee a 12-month employee? *This is associated with section 5.06.03 of the handbook (pg. 80, third paragraph).*

- **Whiddon** answered that the Chair of the Executive Committee is not a 12-month, contracted employee. The individual in question receives a course release, instead.

From **Chris Hornung**: “Are we going to discuss changing the workload policy from being degree-based to being rank-based?” He added that it seems unfair that faculty members are required to teaching more or fewer courses purely based on degree. He also inquired what the best process for initiating this conversation with the institution would be. *This is associated with section 5.03.07 of the handbook.*

- **Cole** suggested that the Senate may be the best place for this conversation.
- **Whiddon** added that in her experience on the Senate, workload is a commonly discussed topic.
- **Cole** suggested that this matter is often left to individual departments but that it seems fairest to make sure that faculty members at the same rank should have the same workload.
- **Hornung** added that since the Committee has control over the faculty handbook, it should have some say over how this policy is phrased—but that ultimate authority likely falls to the Provost.
- **Whiddon** concurred that the Provost likely has the final authority on this policy. When the Senate has discussed workload previously, they have focused on who could achieve full professor (by degree earned). However, she noted, if someone has the credentials to make rank, that also (ed)T 1003 Te (d) 2 (4 (d) b) 4 (h) 1 (s) 2 (h) 1 (T) 32 (o) n) e) d) h) a) d) i) e) 2 (h) o) u) b) o) o) k) (e)

**(7) Next Meeting**

The Committee's next meeting will be Friday, January 20, 2023 at 9:00am on Microsoft Teams.

---

**(8) Adjourning**

**Javan Frazier** moved to adjourn the meeting.

---