



MEMORANDUM

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Dr. Brendan B. Kelly, President
RE: President's Response to Senate Actions
DATE: August 16, 2022

Following is my response to the actions of the Faculty Senate as represented in the minutes of the meeting on June 10, 2022, which were approved electronically on June 17, 2022. All program approvals are made contingent upon the department's commitment to staff the changes out of existing internal funds. Note that Section 3.6.2 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual states, inter alia: "The termination of educational programs, degrees, or majors shall be submitted to the Chancellor for review and recommendation for action by the Board of Regents." So, all program, degree, and major terminations (as well as additions) need to be approved by the Board. Our requests should include the rationale and the plan for addressing the needs of existing students.

Committee I: Undergraduate Programs Committee (Karen Graffius, Chair)

Information Item:

- A) Kim Green will serve as Chair of the Undergraduate Programs Committee for the 2022-2023 Academic Year.

I thank Dr. Green for serving as Chair of the Undergraduate Programs Committee for the 2022-2023 Academic Year.

Committee IV: Faculty Development Committee (Patrick Erben, Chair)

Action Item:

- A) Changes of UWG Handbook following BOR-mandated Post-Tenure Review and Annual Evaluation Policy Changes (Figure 2)

Chair Erben expressed his thanks to all of the faculty serving on the Faculty Development Committee for their hard work in completing these most recent revisions,

especially over the summer. Chair Erben then provided the body with a detailed overview of the revisions made to the UWG Handbook since the FDC received feedback from Dr. Rayfield and the USG. (See Figure 2 and the June 10, 2022 Faculty Senate Meeting Zoom Recording beginning at 19:29) Chair Erben also noted that this is essentially the same document that was presented to the Faculty Senate on April 15, 2022, with the main revisions concerning annual evaluations (see paragraph 4 of this item's summary below). To provide a general review of the handbook changes, Chair Erben first explained that student success will be defined and measured within the areas of service, academic achievement, and professional growth. The revisions also emphasize that all faculty activities benefit student success, whether directly or indirectly, and faculty will have opportunity to offer specifics within their professional activity report narratives. Chair Erben added that while the revisions provide a representative list of student success activities as they are tied to curricular and co-curricular activities, professional achievement of students, mentoring and advising, and the like, this list is meant to offer examples for faculty rather an exclusive list of requirements for faculty to complete. Chair Erben stated that there will be opportunity for faculty to indicate which activities within their reports contribute to student success.

The USG has mandated that evaluations must now follow a five-point scale and a basic rubric is included within the handbook revisions. The new evaluation process, especially the fact that low evaluations now take on a much higher level of significance for Post Tenure Review, make it paramount for all units to develop their own discipline-specific criteria and rubrics. The revisions also recognize that substantive work takes time, often compounded by delays and publishing processes, and evaluation criteria should therefore value and reward evidence of individual stages in a faculty member's work and development as distinct markers of achievement.

In response to a Senator's question regarding the late receipt of annual evaluations from their Chairs now that so many Department Chairs manage much larger departments after the reorganization of the colleges, Chair Erben stated that the handbook revisions require the Provost to establish an annual evaluation timeline each October, which must include specific deadlines for faculty reports and chair evaluations. Furthermore, the deadline for chair evaluations must allow sufficient time for an appeals process (as defined in the handbook revisions) to play out completely by the end of the academic year. When asked if individual rubrics require Faculty Senate approval, both Chair Williams and Chair Erben stated that it was their understanding that these approvals reside at the department level.

Chair Erben also provided the body with a detailed summary of the revisions to the modifications to the annual evaluation appeals process. (See the June 10, 2022 Faculty Senate Meeting Zoom Recording beginning at 43:36) In the event that a faculty member elected to appeal their annual evaluation with their Dean, they would also have the option to solicit further testimony from their peers inside and outside the university to further contextualize how their achievements stand up to the rubrics, disciplinary expectations, and so on. The faculty member's Dean will then include that documentation as part of their determination, and can request additional context and/or supporting materials if needed. The mutually agreed upon revised evaluation becomes the evaluation of record. This ensures that the additional testimony provided by the faculty member initiating the appeal would not just be considered but the Dean would also explain how it entered into their final decision.

After reminding the body that only Senators in service during the 2021-2022 Academic Year were eligible to vote on action items presented during this meeting, Chair Williams called for a vote on the changes to the Faculty Handbook following the BOR-mandated Post-Tenure Review and Annual Evaluation policy changes. The resulting vote passed with 35 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

I accept this motion.

Committee VI: Facilities and Information Technology Committee (Yvonne Fuentes, Chair)

Information Item:

- A) Gavin Lee will serve as Chair of the Facilities and Information Technology Committee for the 2022-2023 Academic Year.

I thank Dr. Lee for serving as Chair of the Facilities and Information Technology Committee for the 2022-2023 Academic Year.

Committee VIII: Budget Committee (David Nickell, Incoming Chair)

Action Item:

- A) Recommendations for Budget Committee's Role in the Budget Cut Process (Figure 3)
- When the USG Faculty Council met with Dr. Stuart Rayfield on April 30, 2022, she told them that if an institution's provost agrees, a faculty observer will be allowed to be part of a university or college's team attending the USG training session on the new proposed process for a "strategic alignment of resources" on May 23, 2022. The Provost approved Dr. Rick Sigman and Dr. Rob Kilpatrick's attendance at that training session as faculty observers. Dr. Kilpatrick provided a summary of that session for the body, describing the format and substance of the meeting, as well as some of their key takeaways. (See the June 10, 2022 Faculty Senate Meeting Zoom Recording beginning at 1:08:11) He stated that the meeting was largely meant for administrators, and Dr. Sigman and he were the only two faculty observers at the meeting. The morning session was largely an introduction by Dr. Rayfield designed to contextualize the budget exercises many USG institutions will participate in this summer, followed by a presentation by an administrator at Kennesaw State University who offered up their metrics for budget allocations. The message from the USG was that this should be a starting point for institutions about strategic budget reallocation informed by a clear set of metrics. The afternoon sessions split attendees into two groups: institutions that were growing and institutions in decline. 21 of the 26 institutions in the USG are in a period of enrollment decline. While growing institutions discussed strategies for how to allocate resources in a climate of growth, institutions in decline discussed the submission process and forms for non-renewals.*

Dr. Kilpatrick stated that what he viewed as a positive first step was the rhetorical commitment on the part of the administration and the USG that metrics and data should be shared in a transparent way with each institution, that each institution's Faculty Senate should be involved in that process, and that employees should be informed of the budget

metrics that are most important to a university in determining how funds and resources are allocated. He also shared the Provost's belief in a strong Dean Model, where the Deans will have the opportunity to provide greater contextualization to data as well as advocate for certain positions or content as we navigate budget reductions.

With regards to the non-renewal process, Dr. Kilpatrick stated that it was reiterated at the meeting that it was unlikely that tenure track faculty would receive non-renewals in this initiative. UWG administrators in attendance also stated that we are ahead of the curve compared to other institutions, having already planned for enrollment decline. Our goal would be to minimize non-renewals. That said, no other specifics were given beyond that. When asked about a possible timeline for non-renewals, Dr. Kilpatrick stated that every indication they were given was that faculty would be informed by August in the event that they would receive a non-renewal notice.

After the meeting, Drs. Sigman and Kilpatrick provided a summary to the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, who then discussed and made the various recommendations listed in Figure 3. The philosophy behind these recommendations is to continue building a platform upon which a collaborative relationship can be built and nurtured between the Faculty Senate Budget Committee and UWG administration as we face these challenges together. They feel that the information sharing outlined in these recommendations is a positive step in that process. The Budget Committee requested that the Faculty Senate vote to affirm these recommendations as a framework that will guide the Budget Committee's discussions with the administration about potential faculty non-renewals, budget cuts, and/or significant reallocations during the coming academic year.

After a brief discussion of the timeline for non-renewals as well as the recommendations themselves, Chair Williams called for a vote. The recommendations passed with 36 in favor, 2 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Thank you for these recommendations.

Committee IX: Rules Committee (Jamie Brandenburg, Incoming Chair)

Action Item:

- A) *UWG Policies and Procedures Manual*
 - 1) Article IV, Section 2.J.8: Budget Committee (Figure 4)
Request: Modify

These modifications update the Budget Committee's membership to reflect the split of the Office of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management into two offices to include the Vice President for Enrollment Management as one of its members.

This item was approved unanimously, and will be brought to the General Faculty for a vote in August 2022 according to Article IV, Section 3 of the UWG Policies and Procedures Manual.

I accept this motion.

- B) UWG Shared Governance Procedures for Modifications to Academic Degrees and Programs (Figure 5)
Request: Modify

The Faculty Senate reviews and updates the shared governance procedures for modifications to academic degrees and programs every few years. The current modifications include procedures for adding or removing program electives and tracks, as well as modified minors and/or certificates and the designation of new course topics for XIDS 1101, 2001, or 2002 or courses receiving HIP attribute designations.

These modifications were approved unanimously.

I accept this motion.