

Rules Committee Minutes

04/20/20 Meeting, 10am, Google Meet

Approved 04/20/2020 by electronic vote

Attendants: Anja Remshagen, Mikhail Beznosov, Mary Bishop, Angela Branyon, Kristi Carman, Landewatte DeSilva, Shannon Finck, Brent Giles, Alison Hollingsworth, Laura Miller, John Sewell, Charlie Sicignano

1. Minutes

Minutes from 03/10/20 were approved.

2. Regular Agenda Items

a. Annual Review (Faculty Handbook Section 104.01)

The correction of wording in Faculty Handbook Section 104.01 as shown below was approved:

“The evaluation process shall utilize the Student Evaluations of Instruction among other sources of evidence as specified by the ~~department or~~ college faculty member’s academic unit.”

b. Evaluation of Departmental Administrative Personnel (Faculty Handbook Sections 104.03 & 104.0301)

Changes to the Faculty Handbook Section 104.03 & 104.0301 were approved as shown in [Appendix I](#).

c. Evaluation of Departmental Administrative Personnel (UWG Procedure 2.4.4)

UWG Procedure 2.4.4 was approved as shown in [Appendix II](#).

d. Post-Tenure Review (Faculty Handbook 104.0202)

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs do not review the post-tenure policies and procedures annually, and an annual review is not required by the BoR. Therefore, the committee approved the removal of the following paragraph from the Faculty Handbook Section 104.0202:

“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.”

e. Post-Tenure Review, UWG Procedure 2.4.2

UWG Procedure 2.4.4 was approved as shown in [Appendix III](#).

A. Membership

	Senate Members	
Remshagen, Anja (Chair)	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)
	Faculty Members	
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)
	Administrator	
Overfield, Denise	doverfie@westga.edu	Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs appointee
Carman, Kristi	legal-list@westga.edu	University General Counsel
	Google Group	
Faculty Senate Rules Committee, fs-rules-list@westga.edu		

B. Meeting Schedule

Rules Meetings	Rules Location/ Time	Senate Agenda Deadline	Senate & Exec. Com. Meetings	Senate Meetings Location/Time	Executive Committee Location/Time
Dates (Mondays)	Location TLC 2-207	Dates (Fridays)	Dates (Fridays)	Location TSON 106	Location TSON 200
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

104.03 Faculty Evaluation of Departmental ~~Administrative Personnel~~ Leadership

To provide the faculty and administration with information on the performance of departmental ~~administrative personnel~~ **leadership as defined by each academic unit**, a periodic evaluation is established.

104.0301 Procedure.

An evaluation of the ~~department chair~~ **each department leader as defined by each academic unit** shall be conducted by the department at least once every three years (~~except that new department chairs~~ **with the exception of new department leaders, who** shall not be evaluated **during** their first year in office). The form of evaluation (written, oral, group, etc.) and the procedure to be used shall be determined by the departmental members, reviewed by the ~~department chair~~ **department leader**, and approved by the dean. The ~~form and~~ procedure shall meet the following guidelines:

1. All evaluators will feel free to be candid without fear of repercussion.
2. The faculty of that department, ~~the department chair~~ **administrative personnel the department leader**, and the dean will be made privy to the information, and these parties will not divulge the contents except at the discretion of the dean.
3. The dean will keep the results of the last three evaluations of ~~a particular department chair~~ **each department leader**.

Appendix II

UWG PROCEDURE NUMBER: 2.4.4, Evaluation of Department Leaders

Authority: UWG POLICY 2.4, (Recurring Faculty Evaluations)

The University of West Georgia (UWG) faculty, pursuant to the authority of UWG Policy 2.4, establishes the following procedures for compliance with UWG Policy 2.4 on Recurring Faculty Evaluations:

The purpose of the procedure is to clearly communicate to the University of West Georgia faculty information on the periodic performance evaluation of department leaders.

A. Definitions

1. Department leader - department chair or head of academic units.

B. Procedure

An evaluation of each department leader as defined by each academic unit shall be conducted by the department at least once every three years (with the exception of new department leaders, who shall not be evaluated during their first year in office). The form of evaluation (written, oral, group, etc.) and the procedure to be used shall be determined by the department members, reviewed by the department leaders, and approved by the dean. The procedure shall meet the following guidelines:

1. All evaluators will feel free to be candid without fear of repercussion.
2. The faculty of that department, the department leader, and the dean will be made privy to the information, and these parties will not divulge the contents except at the discretion of the dean.
3. The dean will keep the results of the last three evaluations of each department leader.

C. Compliance

UWG follows the Board of Regents policies on this matter, and to the extent the language conflicts, the Board of Regents language prevails. (BOR Policy Manual, 8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel)

Issued by the [title of person charged with writing procedure], **the** ____ **day of** _____, **2020.**

Signature, [title of person charged with writing procedure]

Reviewed by President [or VP]: _____

Previous version dated: N/A

Appendix III

UWG PROCEDURE NUMBER: 2.4.3, Post-Tenure Review

Authority: UWG POLICY 2.4, (Recurring Faculty Evaluations)

The University of West Georgia (UWG) faculty, pursuant to the authority of UWG Policy 2.4, establishes the following procedures for compliance with UWG Policy 2.4 on Recurring Faculty Evaluations:

The purpose of the procedure is to clearly communicate to the University of West Georgia faculty the post-tenure review procedure.

A. Definitions

1. Post-tenure review - Post-tenure review is one of several types of faculty performance reviews (e.g., annual, promotion, and tenure reviews) and is intended to provide a longer term perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. BoR Policy 8.3.7

B. Timeline

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 may delay the post-tenure review as specified in UWG Procedure 2.3.1.

1. 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. Deans, or their designees, will be responsible for notifying faculty of pending review, as well as a schedule for completion of such reviews.
2. Timetable for review
Each year the post-tenure reviews will be completed before the end of the Fall term.

C. Required Documentation

Faculty undergoing post-tenure review must submit the 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. Dossiers must be submitted electronically in a format approved by the Provost.

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.

D. 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. A Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee or Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committees consisting-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.
- c. 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.
- d. 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.

- e. Each committee shall meet at the call of its committee chair. At the initial meeting the committee chair shall review the applicable unit, and university policies and procedures governing post-tenure review so that committee members will be aware of these before any review process begins.
- f. The documentation submitted by each faculty member shall be reviewed by committee members prior to committee meetings.
- g. 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.
- h. 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).
- i. 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) 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) University Business Days to prepare an appeal for reconsideration by the committee (see Section G, below).

- j. 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) 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 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 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 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.

- i. The faculty member's department chair or unit supervisor is responsible for monitoring the progress of faculty members engaging in a 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 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.
- ii. 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.

E. 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 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, UWG Procedure 2.4.4 and 2.4.5).

F. 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) 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) 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 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) 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.

G. Compliance

UWG follows the Board of Regents policies on this matter, and to the extent the language conflicts, the Board of Regents language prevails. ([BOR Academic and Student Affairs Handbook](#), 4.6 Post-Tenure Review and [BOR Policy Manual](#), 8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel)

Issued by the [title of person charged with writing procedure], ***the*** ____ ***day of*** _____, ***2020.***

Signature, [title of person charged with writing procedure]

Reviewed by President [or VP]: _____

Previous version dated: N/A