Call to order

Dean Joyner called to order the regular faculty meeting of the College of Health and Human Sciences at 4:00 PM on November 30, 2015 in College of Education Room 1115.

Agenda Items

1. **External Letters for Promotion and/or Tenure**- Amy Jo Riggs, Faculty Affairs Committee Chair- ppt presentation - forms provided to attendees: draft of External Letters of Review Policy & draft of CHHS External Review Evidence Guidelines

Dr. Riggs reported that the purpose of the discussion was to provide the Faculty Affairs Committee with feedback and/or concerns regarding external letters for promotion and tenure. Dr. Riggs stated that the first area of discussion would be the process of contacting external reviewers. Dr. Riggs reported the process as follows:

- Faculty member will provide School Chair with 4 names for potential reviewers and up to three names of individuals who cannot be contacted. Both lists will be due to School Chair by April 1st.
- School Chair will contact and solicit letters from two individuals in faculty member’s list.
- If chair is not successful in securing reviewers from initial two individuals, the chair will contact remaining two.

Dr. Riggs requested feedback regarding process. Dr. Drew Zwald asked for clarification on who would be included in the three names of individuals who cannot be contacted. Dr. Riggs explained that this individuals may consist of individuals you have had bad experiences with. Dr. Joyner recommended the do not contact list be removed. A second area of concern discussed was what would happen if the chair received no response from any of the four external reviewers listed by faculty. Dr. Riggs stated that the chair would meet with the faculty member to discuss additional individuals that could be used as external reviewers. Clarification was requested on what makes an individual an external reviewer. Dr. Riggs stated that external reviewers must be an active faculty member that is equal or higher to what the faculty member is promoting to. Dr. Riggs stated that the institution that the external review is employed must be equal to Georgia Southern University and the reviewer must be of the same discipline. Dr. Riggs reported that the reviewer cannot have a relationship with the faculty. Attendees requested clarification on what is meant by relationship. Dr. Riggs stated that the faculty cannot contact the reviewer in advance or be a mentor to the faculty member. Dean Joyner stated that the external reviewer cannot be a close collaborator to the faculty. Dean Joyner noted that most colleges already have a
process of external reviews implemented. Dr. Gavin Colquitt asked about the chair of the P&T committee contacting external reviewers instead of the School Chair. Dr. Li Li stated from his understanding the School Chair represents the University externally and that is why the School Chair would be contacting externally reviewers.

Dr. Riggs reported that next area to address would be what material would be sent to the external reviewer. Dr. Riggs reported that committee had discussed the following material be sent:

- Cover letter from the chair: Dr. Riggs reported that this would be a uniformed letter that all school chairs would utilize. Dr. Riggs stated that the letter would include mission and vision of Georgia Southern University, teaching load, and state whether there is a graduate program in the school or not.
- Current CV of faculty member
- Narrative from the faculty member addressing teaching, scholarship, and service: Dr. Riggs reported the narrative would be limited to 6 pages.
- Copy of College Promotion and Tenure Guidelines
- Documents chosen by faculty member that represent teaching effectiveness, productive scholarship, and evidence of service

Dr. Trent Maurer recommended that instead of including whether there is a graduate program in the school or not to include whether the discipline/program had a graduate program. Recommendations were also made to include the faculty member’s start up package with the University. Dr. Alice Hall recommended including the length of time the faculty member had been with the University. Dr. Riggs noted that there was still discussion as to whether the schools guidelines from promotion and tenure as well as College would be included. Dr. Riggs reported that the faculty member would be responsibility for choosing what material best represents their evidence of service, teaching effectiveness and productive scholarship. Dr. Zwald ask about material be submitted electronically. Dr. Riggs stated that everything would be electronic. Dr. James Bigley made the comment that the process feels like the faculty are completing an entire portfolio. Dr. Riggs noted that it is different in that the faculty are given the opportunity to show what represents them best.

A question was asked about if there was a limit to how much was submitted. Dr. Riggs stated that there was no limit but that faculty needed to mindful and remember what is really important and that is to demonstrate they are a productive faculty member. Attendees asked about a rubric being completed. Dr. Riggs stated yes but not a generic rubric. Dr. Riggs stated the rubric would not be a checklist but instead give an idea of what faculty should be including. Dr. Riggs stated that a generic rubric would not be feasible due to having faculty from different disciplines.
Attendees asked about what type of feedback the school chairs were expecting from the external reviewers. Dr. Riggs stated that the external reviewer’s feedback should be focused on whether they believe the faculty member is a productive faculty member and give reasons why. Dr. Riggs stated that they are not expecting the external reviewer to state whether the faculty member should be promoted or not. Dr. Kathy Anderson stated that she feels there should be a limit set to what can be submitted by the faculty. Dr. Anderson also noted that when she has been an external reviewer there is always a statement asking if the external reviewer supports or does not support the faculty member being promoted. Dr. Riggs stated that faculty members need to understand that the external reviewer’s feedback would not be the breaking reason for the faculty member being or not being promoted. Dr. Bigley suggest guidelines be given to the external reviewer to compare to the faculty member so that the external reviewer can suggest whether they support or do not support the promotion. Dr. Anderson stated that she has also seen verbiage like does meet or does not meet.

Dr. Li recommended the cover letter be simple and include the same set of questions for all disciplines that need to be answered by the external reviewer. Dr. Li stated the questions would be standard and uniform and this would give the external review a guideline as to what should be answered in their letter. Dr. Li used the question, would this person be promoted in your program, as a sample question for the cover letter. Dr. Maurer agreed that the external reviewer needed to receive guidelines. Many attendees in the meeting did not agree with asking an external reviewer if the faculty would or would not be promoted in the program where the external reviewer was currently employed since the faculty member did not work for that program. Dr. Anderson stated that the external reviewer should be from a university equivalent to Georgia Southern University so asking whether the faculty member would or would not be promoted should be relevant. Dr. Anderson stated that the external reviewer should have a consistent knowledge of the discipline. Dr. Anderson also recommended the external reviewer’s response be limited.

Concerns were addressed regarding the College guidelines and the difficulty of interpreting them. Dr. Riggs stated that this will be addressed.

Dr. Riggs reported that next area to address would be the timeline for external review material. Dr. Riggs reported that committee had discussed the following timeline:

- November: CHHS Promotion and Tenure Orientation Meeting
- April 1st: Names of four potential reviewers and list of three names not to be contacted would be due to the School Chair.
- May 15th: Deadline for faculty members to submit material to School Chair.
- June: School Chair will forward material to external reviewer
- August 1st: Reviews from external reviewer due back to the School Chair
Dr. Riggs reported that the timeline would be a little different this year as the CHHS Promotion and Tenure Orientation Meeting would be in February. A question was asked about how this timeline integrates with the timeline to submit portfolios. Dr. Riggs stated that portfolios are due August 1 and that the timeline for external review was just for material being sent to the reviewer. Dr. Anderson recommended moving the May 15th deadline back to June 1st due to graduation being the week prior and individuals would have only one weekend to between graduation and the May 15th deadline. Dr. Sharon Radzyminski reported that she feels the entire timeline needs to be backed up by several months. Dr. Riggs asked if Dr. Radzyminski thought orientation should be offered sooner. Dr. Radzyminski stated yes. Dr. Radzyminski stated that School Chairs should be contacting external reviewers in March with the material and letters from reviewers due back by April or May. Dr. Cynthia Johnson stated that she agreed with Dr. Radzyminski and stated that she had concerns regarding getting responses from external reviewers during the summer months. Dean Joyner stated that the committee had looked at other colleges’ timelines and they were very similar to what the committee was proposing. Dr. Maurer stated that he would like the date to be pushed to June 1st so that binders were not due at the same time. Dr. Riggs reported that once material was submitted to School Chairs, it would be the responsibility of the School Chairs to follow up with external reviewers. Dean Joyner stated that he believes the binder date could be pushed forward and he would check on that. Dr. Colquitt reported that he was concerned if the dates was pushed up to far then faculty members would be losing a whole semester of productivity. Dr. Riggs reported that due to time, the timeline would be revisited at a later date.

Dr. Riggs asked for feedback on how faculty felt about including the CHHS Promotion and Tenure Guidelines vs. the Individual School Promotion and Tenure Guidelines. Attendees agreed that faculty should be able to choose what guidelines to use. Attendees had concerns that the CHHS Promotion and Tenure Guidelines were more procedural. Dean Joyner reported that as of this year, new hires would be under the new guidelines and would not get a choice. Dean Joyner stated that the external reviewer’s letter will be most helpful to the President and Provost. Dean Joyner reported that this process will be evolving and that faculty members will not be held at fault if external reviewer letters were not received back.

2. Focus Group Results-Dan Czech-ppt presentation

Results of Focus group was presented by Dr. Czech. Dr. Czech reported that one of the major themes reported throughout the focus groups was the need for faculty and staff to get together more often to discuss how life is going, professionally and personally. Dr. Czech reported that faculty and staff discussed how therapeutic social events were. Dr. Czech reported that the focus groups were asked the following questions:

- What does the College do well?
What does the College not do well?
What should the College be doing?
What is the future painting of what you would like CHHS to look like?

Dr. Czech reported that when asking about what the College does well, the following responses were reported:
- Quality, collegial, caring faculty
- Professor autonomy to achieve goals
- Optimal collaboration between schools
- Strong, visible academic programs
- Financial, personal and professions support from Dean
- Open door policy from all administrators
- Beginning of the year socials
- Community service
- Research production from faculty

Dr. Czech reported that when asking about what the College does not do well, the following responses were reported:
- No faculty mentor program
- Limited turn out for College Meetings
- College facilities are far apart from each other
- Limited communication in the following areas
  - Strategic Plan for Research University
  - Changing expectations
  - Faculty research lines
  - Dean to Chair to faculty
  - Increasing mass enrollments
- Inequity in salary packages and with salary compression

Dr. Czech reported that when asking about what the College should be doing, the following responses were reported:
- Formal mentoring program
- Organized volunteering in local/community programs
- More organized interschool research programs
- Equality in resources between schools
- Developing a 5 year and 10 year plan for each School within the College
- Better Marketing in the areas of social media, faculty accomplishments, current school events, College Development Office

Dr. Czech reported that when asking about what the future of CHHS should look like, the following responses were reported:
- Salary compression for faculty
- Completed strategic plan for College and University
- Smaller administrator to faculty ratios
- Unified academic building that houses all schools and all classes
• Annual faculty retreat
• Premier labs for all programs
• Free parking and RAC passes for faculty and staff
• More diverse faculty from an age, gender, and ethnic background perspective.

3. Presidential Search-Melissa Garno

Dr. Garno reported that the Presidential Search Committee has received 42 nominations for the President’s position and 9 candidates have submitted their material for consideration for the position. Dr. Garno provided the following upcoming dates in regarding to the next steps for the Presidential Search:

- January 22, 2016-final application deadline
- February 9, 2016-screening process of candidates begins
- February 17-18, 2016-airport interviews
- February 29, 2016 and March 7, 2016-Candidates visit campus

4. QEP-Ellen Hamilton

Ellen Hamilton reported that CHHS was leading the way for QEP. Dr. Hamilton reported that the next course into the QEP would be in the fall not spring.

5. Internal Research Funding from Faculty Research Committee

Dean Joyner noted the deadline for Internal Research Funding would be in January.

6. Upcoming Events

Dean Joyner reported the following upcoming events:
- SGA Breakfast -December 1, 2015 from 8-11 A.M. in the Williams Center Multipurpose Room
- Recreation Poster Session -December 2, 2015 at 10 A.M in the SHE Building. Dr. Wolfe corrected location of event. Event will be located in Engineering Building Room 2117.
- Experimental Food Show-December 3, 2015 at 11:30 A.M. in the SHE Building
- FMAD Fashion Show-December 4, 2015 at 6:00 P.M. in the Union Ballroom
- Holiday Luncheon-December 9, 2015 at 11:30 A.M. in Nesmith-Lane Ballroom
- Nursing Graduation Ceremony-December 10, 2015 at 5:00 P.M. in the Union Ballroom
- Nursing Undergraduate Pinning Ceremony-December 10, 2015 at 7:00 P.M. in the Performing Arts Center)
• Fall Commencement-December 11, 2015 at 11 A.M. in Hanner

7. Questions/Announcements

Dean Joyner reported that a preliminary meeting about the new building was held and he and Dr. Johnson, SHE Chair, attended the meeting. Dr. Joyner reported that a list of must haves and love to haves were provided to the architects and the next meeting is scheduled for next week.

Next meeting: April 2016

Adjournment

Dean Joyner adjourned the meeting at 5:10 PM
Minutes submitted by: Kim Harp
Minutes approved by: [Name]