

# Rules Committee Minutes

## 03/10/20 Meeting, 2pm, TLC 2-207

Approved 04/20/2020

**Attendants:** Anja Remshagen, Mikhail Beznosov, Angela Branyon, Brent Giles, Alison Hollingsworth, Denise Overfield, John Sewell, Charlie Sicignano

### 1. Minutes

Minutes from 02/10/20 were approved.

### 2. Regular Agenda Items

#### a. Membership of Faculty Senate & Faculty Senate Executive Committee

Heads-up provided by the committee chair: Request to add the UWG AAUP chapter president as member to Senate and Senate Executive Committee. See the [document](#) compiled by Matt Franks.

#### b. Annual Review

##### ■ Faculty Handbook Section 104.01

This section was updated to accommodate the request by the senate to clarify that the student evaluations are not the only possible source of evidence in the annual evaluation. The updated section as shown in [Appendix I](#) was approved.

#### c. Evaluation of Departmental Administrative Personnel

##### ■ UWG Procedure 2.4.4

The committee discussed whether Faculty Handbook Section 104.01 and UWG Procedure 2.4.4 should apply to department chairs only or in addition to different (departmental) administrative personnel in departments or possibly different units without a department chair. The work on the section and procedure were tabled to find out how units without department chairs handle the evaluation of administrative personnel.

#### d. Post-Tenure Review

##### ■ Faculty Handbook Section 104.02

##### ■ UWG Procedure 2.4.2

Changes to the Faculty Handbook Section 104.02 were approved as shown in [Appendix II](#).

## A. Membership

<b>Senate Members</b>		
Remshagen, Anja ( <b>Chair</b> )	anja@westga.edu	Senate – COSM (2020)
Angela Branyon	abranyon@westga.edu	Senate – COE (2021)
Beznosov, Mikhail	mbeznosov@westga.edu	Senate – COSS (2020)
Miller, Laura	lmiller@westga.edu	Senate – COAH (2020)
<b>Faculty Members</b>		
Bishop, Mary	mbishop@westga.edu	Faculty – THSSON (2021)
DeSilva, Landewatte	ldesilva@westga.edu	Faculty – COSM (2021)
Finck, Shannon	sfinck@westga.edu	Faculty COAH (2020)
Gilles, Brent	bgilles@westga.edu	Faculty – COE (2020)
Hollingsworth, Allison	alisonh@westga.edu	Faculty – RCOB (2020)
Sewell, John	johns@westga.edu	Faculty - COSS (2021)
Sicignano, Charlie	charlie@westga.edu	Faculty- Library (2020)
<b>Administrator</b>		
Overfield, Denise	doverfie@westga.edu	Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs appointee
Carman, Kristi	legal-list@westga.edu	University General Counsel
<b>Google Group</b>		
Faculty Senate Rules Committee, fs-rules-list@westga.edu		

## B. Meeting Schedule

<b>Rules Meetings</b>	<b>Rules Location/ Time</b>	<b>Senate Agenda Deadline</b>	<b>Senate &amp; Exec. Com. Meetings</b>	<b>Senate Meetings Location/Time</b>	<b>Executive Committee Location/Time</b>
<b>Dates (Mondays)</b>	<b>Location TLC 2-207</b>	<b>Dates (Fridays)</b>	<b>Dates (Fridays)</b>	<b>Location TSON 106</b>	<b>Location TSON 200</b>
08/26/2019	3pm-4:30pm	09/06/19	09/13/19	1pm	12pm
09/23/2019	3pm-4:30pm	10/04/19	10/11/19	1pm	12pm
10/21/2019	3pm-4:30pm	11/01/19	11/08/19	1pm	12pm
11/18/2019	3pm-4:30pm	11/29/19	12/06/19	1pm	12pm
01/13/2020	2pm-3:30pm	01/17/20	01/24/20	1pm	12pm
02/10/2020	2pm-3:30pm	02/14/20	02/21/20	1pm	12pm
03/10/2020	2pm-3:30pm	03/20/20	03/27/20	1pm	12pm
04/07/2020	2pm-3:30pm	04/10/20	04/17/20	1pm	12pm
06/16/2020*	2pm-3:30pm	06/05/20	06/12/20*	1pm	12pm
07/14/2020*	2pm-3:30pm	07/10/20	07/17/20*	1pm	12pm
* these meetings will be scheduled if there are pending agenda items					

## C. Rules Committee Purpose ([UWG Policies and Procedures](#))

**Purpose:** to review and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding the structures, composition and organizational aspects of the Faculty Senate and its committees

and the rules under which they operate; to resolve disputes between Senate committees, to recommend clear, transparent, efficient, and effective rules for faculty participation in shared university governance; to consider appeals for cases of alleged violations to the rules; to recommend and to coordinate revisions and updates to the [UWG Faculty Handbook](#), [Statutes](#), [Bylaws](#), [Policies and Procedures](#), and any operating protocols the Senate establishes.

**Membership:** four senators; seven faculty, one elected from each of the five colleges (COSM, COSS, COAH, RCOB, COE), the School of Nursing, and the Library; two administrators: the University General Counsel; and one appointed by the Provost.  
(Total: 13)

# Appendix I

## 104 Evaluation

### 104.01 Administrative Evaluation of Faculty

~~Section 8.3.51, Board of Regents Policy Manual, University System of Georgia, requires each institution to establish definite and stated criteria, consistent with Regents' POLICIES and the statutes of the institution, against which the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated. The evaluation shall occur at least annually and shall follow stated procedures as prescribed by each institution. Each institution, as part of its evaluative procedures, will utilize a written system of faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness as the main focus of these student evaluations. (BOR Minutes, 1979-80, p.50; 1983-84, p.36)~~

The performance of each faculty member shall be evaluated annually. The evaluation process shall utilize the Student Evaluations of Instruction among other sources of evidence as specified by the department or college. In those cases in which a faculty member's primary responsibilities do not include teaching, the evaluation should focus on performance of their professional duties. (See also Section 8.3.5.1, BoR Policy Manual.)

#### 104.0101 Procedure

The following steps should be made a part of all faculty evaluations systems:

- A. The immediate supervisor will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation.
- B. The faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that he or she has been apprised of the content of the annual written evaluation.
- C. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to respond in writing to the annual written evaluation; this response will be attached to the evaluation.
- D. The immediate supervisor will acknowledge in writing his or her receipt of this response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made as a result of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. This acknowledgment will also become a part of the records.

# Appendix II

## 104.02 Post-Tenure Review

### 104.0201

Beyond annual administrative review (see Section 104.01), Section 8.3.5.4, Board of Regents Policy Manual, University System of Georgia, requires that each institution establish procedures to formally evaluate tenured faculty every five years, to provide recommendations recognizing and supporting effective performance, and to provide development strategies for areas of inadequate performance. The purpose of the post-tenure review "will be to examine, recognize and enhance the performance of tenured faculty members. . . focus on identifying opportunities for faculty that will enable them to reach their full potential in service to their institutions. . . and to ensure that their performance meets the expectations and needs of the institution. . ." (BOR Minutes, April 10, 1996)

### 104.0202 General Policy Statement

The post-tenure review is not a reconsideration of tenure, but rather a constructive five-year performance review which serves to highlight contributions and future opportunities as well as identify any deficiencies in performance and, in those cases, provide a plan for addressing concerns.

~~The purpose of post-tenure review at the University of West Georgia is to review faculty every five years after the award of tenure and to yield accurate and useful information which will support high achievement among faculty and promote their continued professional development.~~ Directed toward career development, this review is designed to provide a longer term perspective than is usually provided by the annual review. Post-tenure review provides both retrospective and prospective reviews of performance, taking into account that a faculty member probably will have different emphases at different points in his or her career. It is to be directed toward career development and to provide the perspective of multiple years of accomplishments and plans for development.

Each unit shall ensure that the criteria governing this review do not infringe on the academic freedom of faculty, including the freedom to pursue novel, unpopular, or unfashionable lines of inquiry. The review shall be carried out free of bias or prejudice by factors such as race, religion, sex, color, national origin, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, disability, political affiliation, or veteran status.

Post-tenure review shall be faculty-driven and flexible enough to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities and professional interests that reflect the mission of the University of West Georgia. The essential elements of such a peer-review process are that it shall take into account one's past progress and anticipated future as scholar, teacher, and colleague; provide a measure of accountability with regard to the performance of tenured faculty which goes beyond the annual review; be developmental in nature; assist faculty to continue to grow professionally; provide a structure by which this periodic evaluation ~~it~~ **is** to take place; provide feedback and remediation recommendations for faculty found deficient in any area; allow faculty who were tenured prior to the institution of this review to select variable career paths or emphases under which they will be evaluated; provide faculty with timely and formal notification of any perceived deficiencies; and establish an appeal route for faculty who are aggrieved by either the substantive or procedural components of the review or the remediative process.

By thirty (30) days prior to the end of each Spring term, applicable departmental and/or college, **school**, or library policies and procedures must be submitted to, reviewed and approved by the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA) to assure compliance with university guidelines.

#### **104.0203 General Implementation Procedures**

All tenured faculty members **with the exception of tenured administrators whose majority of duties are administrative** for whom five or more years have passed since their last career review decision or personnel action took effect, must undergo post-tenure review. A faculty member ~~on a leave of absence any time during the five-year review period~~ may delay the post-tenure review ~~for up to one year.~~ **as specified in Section 103.0402.**

##### **A. Notification of faculty**

By 30 days prior to the end of each Spring term, the VPAA will provide to each college, **school**, and the library a list of faculty scheduled for post-tenure review during the subsequent academic year. ~~College deans and the Dean of Libraries Deans~~, or their designees, will be responsible for notifying faculty of pending review, as well as a schedule for completion of such reviews.

##### **B. Timetable for review.**

Each year the post-tenure reviews will be completed before the end of the Fall term.

#### **104.0204 Criteria for Post-Tenure Review**

Criteria to be utilized in conducting this review shall be fair and reasonable expectations consistent with the criteria and standards used in other reviews of faculty related to teaching, academic achievement, professional growth and development, and service ~~to the institution, which may be broadly defined~~. These will be considered in the context of stated expectations for performance developed by the department, college, and/or unit. These criteria shall also be consistent with the duties the faculty member was assigned through means customary for the unit for the period being reviewed and related to the mission of the institution. The weights or percentages given to different areas may differ according to the faculty member's professional role, rank and established goals, and any applicable college, ~~school~~, library or university-wide policies. The criteria must be sufficiently flexible to accommodate faculty with differing responsibilities, to recognize that faculty members may contribute in different ways to the institution's mission over time, and to consider the cumulative impact of the faculty member's career as well as his or her performance during the previous five years.

Each unit shall ensure that the criteria governing post-tenure review do not infringe on the accepted standards of academic freedom of faculty.

In the case of tenured faculty serving in administrative capacities, allowances must be made for the responsibilities these individuals carry in the area of service to the institution.

#### **104.0205 Documentation Required**

Faculty undergoing post-tenure review must submit the ~~following documentation~~ **post-tenure dossier** to the Post Tenure Advisory Committee, **which includes the following documentation**:

1. Current curriculum vitae with accomplishments of the years under consideration highlighted.
2. Copies of annual performance reviews of the faculty member by his or her department chair or unit supervisor for the years under consideration.
3. Copies of the documentation prepared and submitted for consideration by the faculty member at the time of each of these annual reviews.
4. A statement prepared by the faculty member, not to exceed two pages in length, detailing his or her accomplishments and goals for the period under review and projected goals for the next five-year period.
5. Measures of teaching effectiveness including, but not limited, to a combination of written student evaluations and peer evaluations.
6. Any additional documentation specified by unit, departmental or institutional policy.

7. ~~Effective Fall 2018~~; Dossiers must be submitted electronically in a format approved by the Provost.

Consistent with library, ~~school~~, or college and university policies, review policies must specify the nature of and the evaluative standards for evidence which will be used to support claims about faculty activities.

Once submitted for consideration, the faculty member shall have supervised access at any time to his or her review file. The faculty member shall also have the right to add material to this file, including statements and additional documents, at any time during the review process.

#### **104.0206 Formation and Operation of Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee**

- A. This review shall be conducted by faculty peers with tenure who are able to render a fair and objective assessment of the person being reviewed. If a significant conflict of interest exists, no person with such a conflict may participate in post-tenure review recommendations, advisement of candidates, and/or preparation of materials. All personal and professional conflicts of interest must be revealed and reviewed. Such conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to, personal and professional interactions and relationships that would preclude dispassionate and disinterested recommendations and correct, complete, and unbiased participation in these matters. Spouses, immediate family members, and colleagues with an intimate personal relationship with the candidate are explicitly prohibited from participation. Each college, ~~school~~, and/or the library, as well as the University-wide Appeals Committee for Post-Tenure Review, shall establish a process for removing a faculty member from the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee(s) and shall establish criteria for assessing the credibility of claims of bias if a person being reviewed has reason to believe that another individual could not judge his or her case fairly.
- ~~B. When post-tenure review was first initiated in 1997, the College of Arts and Sciences elected to carry out this review at the department level, while the Colleges of Business and Education 32 Revised August 7, 2019 and the Library elected for a college review. This determination may be amended by a secret ballot vote of the respective faculties.~~
- C. A Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee or Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committees consisting of at least three tenured faculty colleagues, selected by whatever means the faculty members so determine, **exclusively of tenured faculty members (no fewer than three) selected by the faculty of the department, school, or library by whatever means the aforementioned determines**, shall be established annually ~~at the department, unit school and/or college level(s) in accordance with these votes.~~

- D. ~~Even if the faculty of a given unit (college, school, or library) decides that department chairs or unit supervisors can serve on Post-Tenure Review Advisory committees (for example, at the University-wide Appeals Committee advisory level);~~ Under no circumstances shall anyone who serves in a supervisory role to the individual being reviewed be permitted to serve on a Post-Tenure Review Advisory committee reviewing that individual.
- E. In each college, school, and in the library, the dean will be responsible for convening the initial meeting of the elected committee or committees. At the initial meeting, the members of the committee shall select one of its faculty members as chair. The chair will be a voting member of the committee.
- F. Each committee shall meet at the call of its committee chair. At the initial meeting the committee chair shall review the applicable ~~departmental, college,~~ unit, and university policies and procedures governing post-tenure review so that committee members will be aware of these before any review process begins.
- G. The documentation submitted by each faculty member shall be reviewed by committee members prior to committee meetings.
- H. The merits of each faculty member undergoing post-tenure review will be discussed to the extent desired by a simple majority of committee members. In the event of disagreement about the value of scholarly performance, job performance, or service, the review may include the evaluations of external reviewers to provide a due process protection that ensures an unbiased appraisal. This panel of external reviewers will be generated by the faculty member under review and appropriate department chair or unit supervisor and include a minimum of three professors knowledgeable of the faculty member's field of expertise from both on and off campus. The panel will serve to ensure that scholarly written work or job performance is being fairly and accurately interpreted. Any department chair or unit supervisor may be called to discuss with the committee the qualifications of a person under review who holds rank in his or her department.
- I. Voting on a colleague's status with regard to the post-tenure review shall be by secret ballot. Each faculty member being reviewed shall be evaluated as either Does Not Meet, Meets, or Exceeds Expectations with regard to his or her overall accomplishments; to be adjudged as Does Not Meet Expectations faculty under review must receive votes of Does Not Meet Expectations from at least sixty percent (60%) of the voting members of the committee. Any person with an evaluation of Does Not Meet Expectations performance will be required to develop a three-year plan to address deficiencies (see section K,2 below).
- J. The committee chair, in consultation with members of the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee, shall prepare a written evaluation for each candidate reviewed during post-tenure review. This evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee and must provide specific reasons for conclusions contained within it. It will report the

consensus arrived at by the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee with regard to a faculty member's performance; address the faculty member's record of accomplishments and quality of contributions with regard to teaching, academic achievement, service, professional growth and development; clarify any areas needing improvement; and, where applicable, offer specific suggestions on what will be needed to improve performance. This evaluation must be written as clearly and collegially as possible. In the event that this evaluation differs from annual reviews, this evaluation shall state the exact reason(s) for this judgment. The chair of the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee shall give each faculty member being reviewed a copy of the committee's evaluation ten (10) ~~working days~~ **University Business Days** prior to the deadline for submitting the committee recommendation to the appropriate department chair or unit supervisor; therefore, the person being reviewed has five (5) ~~working days~~ **University Business Days** to prepare an appeal for reconsideration by the committee (see paragraph 104.0208, below).

- K. Once any appeals to the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee(s) have been heard and acted upon, the committee chair will provide a copy of the committee's final evaluation to the faculty member being reviewed and to the appropriate department chair or unit supervisor. The faculty member, if he or she desires, will have an opportunity to prepare a written response to the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee's evaluation. Such a response shall be received by the chair of the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee within five (5) ~~working days~~ **University Business Days** after the date the committee's final evaluation is received by the faculty member under review. It will be the responsibility of the appropriate dean to preserve the ~~original~~ ballots of rankings and to keep these on file for a period of six (6) years.

A copy of the post-tenure review advisory committee's evaluation and any written response to it by the evaluated faculty member shall then be sent to the administrative office at least one level above the faculty member's administrative unit. The same material shall also be placed in the faculty member's personnel file at the departmental level. The department shall also preserve in the faculty member's personnel file all documents, other than documents like publications that are readily available elsewhere, that played a substantive part in the review.

1. If the review reveals Exceeds Expectations performance, a faculty member shall receive recognition for his or her achievements through institutional policies and procedures already in place for acknowledging and rewarding meritorious achievement (e.g. merit pay, study and research leave opportunities, other opportunities consistent with his or her career goals and objectives and Board of Regents policy).

2. If areas needing improvement have been identified, the department chair **or unit supervisor**, and faculty member shall jointly develop a formal plan for ~~faculty~~ **professional** development that includes clearly defined and specific goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a timetable within which goals or outcomes should be accomplished, and an agreed-upon strategy and criteria for monitoring progress. The faculty member's department chair **or unit supervisor**, and the appropriate dean are jointly responsible for arranging for appropriate funding for the development plan, if required. The department chair or unit supervisor is responsible for forwarding a copy of the ~~faculty~~ **professional** development plan resulting from a post-tenure review to the appropriate dean by the end of the academic year in which the review was conducted.
  - a. The faculty member's department chair or unit supervisor is responsible for monitoring the progress of faculty members engaging in a ~~faculty~~ **professional** development plan to remedy deficiencies identified in a post-tenure review. A progress report, which will be included in the annual review, will be forwarded each year to the appropriate dean. When the objectives of the ~~faculty~~ **professional** development plan designed to deal with specified deficiencies have been met as determined by the department chair or unit supervisor, the department chair or unit supervisor shall make a final report to the appropriate dean.
  - b. It is the responsibility of the department chair or unit supervisor to determine, after a period of three years from the academic term in which the development plan is agreed upon, whether or not a faculty member whose performance was deemed as Does Not Meet Expectations in the post-tenure review has been successful in remedying deficiencies identified in the review. He or she will report that finding to the appropriate dean. The university will then proceed in accordance with options available as specified by University and Board of Regents policy and procedures.

#### **104.0207 Review of Chair or Supervisor**

When a department chair or unit supervisor is under consideration for post-tenure review, the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee shall review the faculty member's file and make, in writing, a Does Not Meet, Meets, or Exceeds Expectations evaluation to the appropriate dean. In the event deficiencies are noted which require the development of a three-year plan, the appropriate dean will be responsible for developing the plan for ~~faculty~~ **professional** development and monitoring the progress of the faculty member engaged in this plan with the assistance of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Administrators other than department chairs or unit supervisors who are tenured will not undergo post-tenure review

unless or until they return to a faculty role with little or no administrative responsibilities. Any administrator returning to a faculty role with little or no administrative responsibilities is to be reviewed five years after returning and reviews shall continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review for promotion. In the post-tenure review of a department chair or other faculty member with an administrative assignment, provision must be made for his or her activities in that area. Those with administrative responsibilities will still be subject to policy and procedures regarding administrative evaluation (see, for example, Sections 104.03 and 104.04).

#### **104.0208 Appeal for Reconsideration**

The first appeal shall be directed to the committee(s), which originally conducted the faculty member's post-tenure review. Within fifteen (15) ~~working days~~ **University Business Days** of receipt of an appeal, the committee(s) shall carefully re-evaluate the faculty member's file in light of the written appeal. This evaluation shall be made in accordance with the procedure established for initial consideration and shall replace this party's previous evaluation of the faculty member. If, upon re-examination of the case, the original review committee(s) see(s) no reason to alter its/their recommendation(s), the faculty member may appeal within thirty (30) ~~working days~~ **University Business Days** to the University-wide Appeals Committee for Post-Tenure Review. By March 1 of each year, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will notify in writing the deans ~~of the College of Arts & Sciences, the College of Business, and the College of Education, and the Dean of Libraries~~ that nominees must be solicited from among the tenured faculty in each of these units and that a university-wide election must take place by the end of the Spring term to select tenured faculty from each unit to constitute a University-wide Appeals Committee for Post-Tenure Review to hear any post-tenure review appeals. Seven duly elected tenured faculty members, apportioned as follows, will constitute the University-wide Appeals Committee for Post-Tenure Review:

College of Science and Mathematics: 1

College of Social Science: 1

College of Arts and Humanities: 1

Richards College of Business: 1

College of Education: 1

School of Nursing: 1

The Ingram Library: 1

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall be responsible for calling the initial meeting of this committee. At the initial meeting, the members of the committee shall elect one of its faculty members as chair, who will be a voting member of the committee.

The committee shall meet at the call of its committee chair. The committee chair shall review the applicable departmental, college, **school**, library and university policies and procedures governing post-tenure review so that committee members will be aware of these before any review process begins.

Any faculty member appealing for reconsideration shall state in writing the grounds for his or her request and shall include in this appeal such additional material as is pertinent.

The documentation submitted by each faculty member, including that regarding the grounds for his or her appeal, shall be reviewed by committee members prior to committee meetings.

Within fifteen (15) ~~working days~~ **University Business Days** of receipt of an appeal, the University-wide Appeals Committee for Post-Tenure Review shall carefully evaluate the faculty member's file in light of the written appeal. This evaluation shall be made in accordance with the procedure established for initial consideration (e.g., voting on a colleague's status with regard to the post-tenure review shall be by secret ballot; each faculty member being reviewed shall be evaluated as either Does Not Meet, Meets, or Exceeds Expectations with regard to his or her overall accomplishments; to be adjudged as Does Not Meet Expectations, faculty under review must receive votes of Does Not Meet Expectations from at least sixty percent (60%) of the voting members of the committee). The committee chair, in consultation with the other members of the University-wide Appeals Committee for Post-Tenure Review shall prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member reviewed on appeal during post-tenure review. This evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee and must provide specific reasons for conclusions contained within it. It should report the recommendation arrived at by the University-wide Appeals Committee for Post-Tenure Review with regard to a faculty member's performance; address the faculty member's record of accomplishments and quality of contributions with regard to teaching, academic achievement, service and professional growth and development; clarify any areas needing improvement; and, where applicable, offer specific suggestions on what will be needed to improve performance. This evaluation must be written as clearly and collegially as possible. This evaluation shall take precedence over the previous evaluation of the faculty member. The evaluation of this committee shall be forwarded to the faculty member under review, the appropriate department chair or unit supervisor, the appropriate dean, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

#### **104.0209 Right to Redress**

(See Policies and Procedures Manual, Article V, Section 3)

**~~104.0210 Reconsideration Clause~~**

~~At the end of the three-year phase-in period, this policy and these procedures must be reviewed and reconsidered by the Faculty and Administrative Staff Personnel Committee and the Faculty Senate to determine its effectiveness. Modifications will be considered prior to the implementation of post-tenure reviews in Academic Year 1998-1999.~~