

Franklin College Faculty Senate
Minutes of the meeting on Tuesday, February 16, 2016

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 PM in room 104 of Conner Hall, Dan Nakano presiding.

Members Present: John Achee, Christine Albright, Analisa Arroyo, Maor Bar-Peled, Mary Bedell, Renato Castelao, Tom Cerbu, Shanta Dhar, Inge DiBella, Husseina Dinani, Diana Downs, Ray Freeman-Lynde, Lisa Fusilla, Kim Gilbert, Adam Goodie, Richard Gordon, Jaelyn Hartenberger, Chad Howe, Richard Hubbard, Maria Hybinette, Kevin Jones, Jain Kwon, Tricia Lootens, Reid Messich, Lan Mu, Dan Nakano, Rielle Navitski, Lakshmish Ramaswamy, Jeremy Reynolds, Jennifer Rice, Inseok Song, T.N. Sriram, Phillip Stancil, Rick Tarleton, Sarah Wright

Proxies: Ibigbolade Aderibigbe for Derrick Lemons, Huabei Guo for Lianchun Wang

Guest:

Members not present: Fred Dolezal, Takahiro Ito, Don Nelson, Mitch Rothstein

Approval of the minutes of the January 19 meeting: Approved without corrections.

President Dan Nakano's Remarks

- President Nakano expressed his thanks to Christine Albright for preparing the January minutes. The last meeting was featured in the *Athens Banner Herald* on 1/20/16, which served as a positive reflection on the work of the Faculty Affairs Committee, the thorough discussions, and the consensus that was reached. We can be an effective body to reflect faculty concerns. It's President Nakano's hope that this episode can serve as a positive example in future deliberations.

Dean Dorsey's Remarks

- Dean Dorsey discussed the business from last month. There was discussion of the letter from the Faculty Affairs Committee to Dean Dorsey. Discussion was cordial and productive. He received the letter the following day, and had a chance to reflect on the content and recommendations. There has been a lot of communication with Heads and Center/Institute Directors, which should have been disseminated to faculty members. Dean Dorsey had prepared a letter in response, which he read to the Senate, and which is attached as an Appendix.
- Questions were invited. The role of a "service" component in faculty evaluations was discussed.

Committee Reports:

- Executive Committee: No new business reported.

- Curriculum Committee: Approved 25 new courses, approved 61 course changes, and various other proposals.
- Academic Standards Committee: Received 5 petitions, of which 3 were approved and 2 were denied.
- Committee on Faculty Affairs: No new business reported.
- Committee on Planning & Evaluation: No new business reported.

New Business:

- Termination of Ph.D. in Life-Span Developmental Psychology. Passed unanimously.
- Nomination of Adam Goodie as President-elect to replace Lisa Fusillo. Passed unanimously.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Adam Goodie
Franklin College Senate Secretary and Senator for Psychology

Appendix: Dean Dorsey's letter to the Faculty Affairs Committee



The University of Georgia

Franklin College of Arts and Sciences
Office of the Dean

February 17, 2016

To: Committee on Faculty Affairs, Franklin College of Arts and Sciences
From: Alan T. Dorsey, Dean
Re: Response to your memo dated 19 January 2016

Dear Colleagues:

At last month's Faculty Senate meeting, the Senate ratified a letter to me that outlined general principles for fair, clear and constructive annual letters of evaluation for all faculty. I appreciate your articulation of these principles, with which I agree, and I hope that our academic units will find them helpful as they develop their own unit-specific guidelines for annual performance evaluations.

Over the past month I have collected and reviewed existing annual evaluation and merit raise guidelines from our departments, centers, and institutes. Many of our units have robust and clear guidelines, consistent with the principles you have stated; other units still need to develop or clarify their guidelines. For the evaluations of 2015 annual activities, the Heads and Directors may use their previously established methods of conducting annual evaluations. During the spring 2016 term, I have asked the Heads and Directors to work with their faculties to develop evaluation standards that are consistent with their unit's discipline-specific criteria for meritorious work in the areas of research and scholarship, teaching, and service.

Finally, I would like to address the two specific recommendations in your letter:

1. *That the departments of the college be allowed to formulate and carry out their faculty evaluations in whatever manner best suits them, consistent with the principles stated in part I.*

Response: As noted above, this process is already in progress.

2. *That a grading system or scorecard, such as 'does not meet/meets/exceeds expectations', not be required.*

Response: To quote from Principle I.A in your letter, "to serve as a useful tool, the annual review must therefore be more than a summary of activity. It must contain an evaluative component." Also, to quote from Principle I.B, "Whatever the format for communicating information, the annual review must conclude with a clear statement that indicates how well the faculty member is performing." I agree with both points. Therefore, unit heads may use alternative language or methods to communicate their performance evaluations, but should do so in a fashion that is clear and consistent.

Sincerely,

Alan T. Dorsey
Dean