

Memorandum

To: General Faculty

Date: September 9, 2020

Regarding: Faculty Senate Agenda for September 11, 2020 via Google Meet

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Minutes ([Addendum I](#))
4. Committee Reports

Committee X: Rules (Angela Branyon, Chair)

Action Items:

- A) *UWG Faculty Handbook*, Section 104.01
 - 1) Section 104.01 – 104.0101 Administrative Evaluation of Faculty ([Addendum II](#))
Request: Modify
- B) *UWG Academic Affairs Policies Index*, UWG Procedure 2.4.1
 - 1) UWG Procedure 2.4.1, Annual Evaluation ([Addendum III](#))
Request: Approve
- C) *UWG Faculty Handbook*, Section 104.02
 - 1) Section 104.02, Post-Tenure Review ([Addendum IV](#))
Request: Modify
- D) *UWG Academic Affairs Policies Index*, UWG Procedure 2.4.3
 - 1) UWG Procedure 2.4.3, Post-Tenure Review ([Addendum V](#))
Request: Approve
- E) *UWG Faculty Handbook*, Section 104.03
 - 1) Section 104.03 Faculty Evaluation of Departmental Administrative Personnel ([Addendum VI](#))
Request: Modify
- F) *UWG Academic Affairs Policies Index*, UWG Procedure 2.4.4
 - 1) UWG Procedure 2.4.4, Evaluation of Department Leaders ([Addendum VII](#))
Request: Approve

5. Old Business

A) Faculty Concerns ([Addendum VIII](#))

6. New Business

A) Spring 2021 Alternative Work Arrangements, Ms. J’Nee Dobson, Employee Relations
Manager, Human Resources

7. Announcements

A) Faculty Senate Chair Election Update ([Addendum IX](#))

B) Senate Liaison Reports

8. Adjournment

Addendum I

Faculty Senate
Draft Meeting Minutes
August 6, 2020

1. Call to Order

Chair Insenga called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present:

Barbour, Barrett, Boumenir, Branyon (sub. Willox), Corley, DeWeese, Erben, Fuentes, Gault, Geyer, Graffius, Gupta, Hadley, Hill, Hodges, Ivory, Kellison, Kimbrell, Kniess, Lew Yan Voon, Ly, MacKinnon, McKendry-Smith, McLean, Nickell, Pashia, Pazzani, Rees, Self, Snipes, Sterling, Swift, Towhidi, Van Valen, Wadlington, and Wang (sub. Jara-Pazmino)

Absent:

Banford, Cheng, Elman, Faucette, Gordon, Green, Hansen, Koczkas, Kramer, Mbaye, Ogletree, Richter, Scullin, Volkert, and Wofford

3. Minutes

A) The April 17, 2020 meeting minutes were approved electronically on April 21, 2020.

4. New Business

A) Shared Governance in Faculty Senate

Chair Insenga began the meeting by thanking everyone for attending. She then shared sections of the Faculty Senate By-Laws outlined in Article IV of the UWG Policies and Procedures Manual, specifically the descriptions of the role of Senate Chair and purpose of the Faculty Senate. She then made a motion to affirm the essential role played by Faculty Senate, either through the Executive Committee, Senate committees, or the entire body, in participating as a full partner in shared governance at UWG. The motion passed.

After the motion passed there was some discussion regarding the clarification of the term shared governance, and a link to the faculty handbook was provided in the Google Meet chat window. It was noted that the term “shared governance” appeared three times in the Faculty Handbook, always in the trifecta of “shared governance, impartiality, and transparency.” Several asked for an official definition of shared governance, but it was pointed out by others

that the motion that passed affirmed the principles of shared governance rather than any specific document or definition.

Chair Insenga clarified further that shared governance was a joint effort and that this is also stated in our by-laws. She stated that the Faculty Senate worked primarily as an advisory body, tasked with curriculum matters through UPC and GPC, as well as updating and revising the Faculty Handbook, Statutes, and the Policies and Procedures Manual through committees like APC and Rules.

Chair Insenga thanked everyone who wrote and signed the letter, as it created the opportunity to have this discussion and she was glad to have this meeting. She then opened the floor for questions and comments at 1:25 p.m. They were asked and answered as follows:

Q: The reorganization has caused considerable angst and trauma among faculty and staff. For example, six chair positions were eliminated from the College of Science and Mathematics and now there is only one Chair over what was once a college, all for savings. The commenter requested to see a spreadsheet detailing the savings and a cost benefit analysis so that we can reconsider whether this was worth it. Furthermore, they asked, what is the budget for this current academic year, and when will it be shared with faculty? Where is the transparency in the spirit of shared governance?

A: Chair Insenga stated that she too felt this angst and loss, and, while she anticipated the reorganization, she still found it upsetting. She stated that there was an Advisory Ad-Hoc Committee being formed, which would serve as an on-call group for budget issues needing immediate attention. The Faculty Senate Budget Standing Committee was charged with working alongside campus administration in this endeavor. Chair Insenga stated that she felt that perhaps faculty believed that advocacy was lacking because there were no Senate meetings this Summer. She noted that the Senate does not generally meet in the Summer as the Senate body is unavailable.

Q: With regards to the restructuring, the second commenter requested a clear written definition and description of the policies and procedures used regarding recent hires, the roles and duties of each position, and term lengths, as these are permanent positions rather than interim positions. Furthermore, there has been no transparency or sufficient conversation with faculty and staff regarding these new appointments.

A: Chair Insenga stated that the President had the right to appoint Deans, and that Deans appointed Associate Deans and Department Chairs.

Follow-Up to the Original Question: This is not what is stated in the COSS by-laws.

A: Chair Insenga promised to look into it, and stated that she would check the Board of Regents Rules regarding the process for appointing Deans and those who followed. She noted that she thought that this would be a question for Dean Gagnon.

Statement: Dr. Franks clarified that the letter was not written by the AAUP. Instead, faculty came to the AAUP for support. Also, the letter was addressed to the Faculty Senate and not to the Senate Chair specifically.

Q: There are questions and concerns regarding what seems to be a breakdown of shared governance on campus. Still, it was noted, this meeting met many of the points that were requested in the letter. A meeting was requested and was being held with shared governance as the main agenda item, and substantive discussion occurred. Chair Insenga's first order of business was to call for approval of a motion that affirmed the essential role played by Faculty Senate in shared governance. It was then stated that, while authors and signers of the letter understood that certain decisions are in the hands of administrators, many felt that there were breakdowns in policies and procedures at UWG and that the Faculty Senate could have taken a role in advocating for faculty at UWG this summer. That said, the letter was not an attempt to claim more power for the Faculty Senate.

A: Chair Insenga disagreed that there was a void in advocacy, and noted the ways in which she has worked and advocated for faculty over the summer from weekly meetings held with campus administrators and the President himself to organizing and facilitating three Senate Forums on Dual Modality, Reopening Campus, and Budget and Restructuring. Furthermore, she created the Teacher's Academy as a means of aiding faculty in the implementation of dual modalities this fall. She then reiterated that the Senate body was unavailable this summer.

Statement: Several attendees requested an official definition of shared governance in Google Meet Chat and in the virtual discussion, and stated that the Faculty Senate needs to provide one according to Robert's Rules of Order.

A: Chair Insenga responded that it would take a large, broad conversation to consolidate the definitions of shared governance held by various campus entities and that Faculty Senate would work on creating an official definition this year. She added that this would start within one of the Faculty Senate's Standing Committees.

Q: With regards to the reorganization, it should be noted that the students are also affected and traumatized by the transition and restructuring of the colleges. Where was faculty governance during this reorganization? A lot of this reorganization affects curriculum, policy, etc. and it should have gone through Senate committees.

A: Chair Insenga stated that while she agreed that faculty should have been consulted, the President can reorganize how he sees fit according to the by-laws. Chair Insenga then noted that the reorganization may not be permanent, and she stated that she was told this by Front Campus.

Statement: In looking at shared governance within the UWG Policies and Procedures Manual, we should compare where shared governance has been upheld. For example, many processes were skipped during the reorganization with regards to creating new academic programs. All of these changes should have come through Senate as action items, and we need to create an itemized list of what has happened, what should have happened, and what will happen moving forward.

A: Chair Insenga responded that this is coming and that Senate has a lot to do this year.

Statement: Dr. Finck shared the following information in the Google Meet chat window:

First, our university has a chapter of United Campus Workers of Georgia, a statewide union, which offers campus workers (faculty & staff) another opportunity for advocacy. If you're interested in joining, please reach out to me at shannon.finck@gmail.com. There are several local petitions circulating, but I'd like to direct everyone's attention to the statewide petition regarding campus reopening: <https://www.change.org/p/the-georgia-board-of-regents-safer-and-more-equitable-higher-education-upon-return-to-campus>. We're a growing union chapter, and I hope you will consider joining. Those of you seeking more info about the union, the website is <http://www.ucwga.com>. (Contrary to popular belief, you cannot be fired for joining a union or union organizing, even in a R2W state, so if anyone is hesitating for that reason, please know that retaliation for union membership is not legal.)

Statement: Dr. Hodges felt that a correction was needed regarding some miss-shared information, and he spoke to this in the Google Meet Chat as well as in the virtual discussion. He stated that the Faculty Senate Budget Committee was on-call during the last budget crisis, and they held multiple meetings with less than 24-hour notice. As such, the Budget Committee had shared governance with the Administration on Budget Issues. Since re-organizations affect budgets, re-organization was discussed in advance. During Dr. Marrero's term as President, UWG increased staff and salary with almost no increase in students. He argued that shared governance is more than a discussion, and it involves listening to resolutions and recommendations; we need to be worthy of shared governance. Cuts are coming and we will

have to cut faculty and staff. If we are not willing to discuss that then we cannot say that we were ignored.

Statement: It was noted that Dr. Insenga ran for Senate Chair unopposed, as did Dr. Butler before her. She stepped up when no one else would take on this work, and this makes it look like we as a collective do not care. The by-laws state that there must be two nominees for Senate Chair, and we violated our own by-laws. More faculty need to run and participate in Faculty Senate.

Q: Can we request how it was that the School of Mass Communications came to be, and also how people were appointed in an official communication from Front Campus? Also, there has been no information sent regarding Senator responsibilities and roles, and it would be helpful to send that out.

A: Chair Insenga stated that there was a Handbook for Faculty Senate Standing Committee Chairs, and that she would share that upon request. She also stated that she would begin work on creating a handbook for faculty Senators as well.

Statement: Dr. Sethna spoke at length about the budget adjustments and cuts during his tenure as President. He stated that while it may not have been perfect and he could have done more, there was faculty input. He then spoke about the policies and procedures used during the reorganization of the College of Arts and Sciences into three separate colleges, noting that the process was done entirely by committee with representatives from all of the colleges involved with Dr. Lloyd serving as Chair of that committee. According to Dr. Sethna, the COAS ran that reorganization, and he stated that it was delayed for six months so that faculty would have more time for input. He noted that the years between 2009-2012 experienced the worst budget cuts.

Q: Will faculty have a say in the Strategic Plan unveiled by Dr. Kelly, and will there be shared governance in this process?

A: Chair Insenga stated that the Faculty Senate Institutional Planning Committee will respond.

After a final call for questions and comments, Chair Insenga expressed her thanks for this conversation and stated that she had taken notes throughout. She affirmed her hope that the university would be able to keep all of its programs and appreciated everyone's comments and questions.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by

Colleen Vasconcellos

Executive Secretary, Faculty Senate

Addendum II

UWG Faculty Handbook
Modification of 104.01 – 104.0101 Administrative Evaluation of Faculty

Rationale: The proposed changes had been submitted at a senate meeting in Spring 2020 with the following rationale: Instead of citing the section of the BoR Policy Manual, which requires the establishment of criteria and procedures for the evaluation of faculty, the introductory section states criteria and procedures practiced at UWG.

At the senate meeting in Spring 2020, some faculty members raised the concern that the sentence “The evaluation process shall utilize the Student Evaluations of Instruction” may be misinterpreted such that the SEI may be used as the only means of evaluating teaching. The Rules committee added the part “... among other sources of evidence as specified by the faculty member’s academic unit” to address the concern.

PROPOSED MODIFIED VERSION

104 Evaluation

104.01 Administrative Evaluation of Faculty

~~Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 803.07 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. (BR 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 faculty member’s academic unit. 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.

PROPOSED REVISED VERSION

104 Evaluation

104.01 Administrative Evaluation of Faculty

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 faculty member's academic unit. 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:

- 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.

Addendum III

UWG Academic Affairs Policies Index

Approval of UWG Procedure 2.4.1, Annual Evaluation

Rationale: Currently no university procedure exists for the annual evaluation. The proposed procedure has the same content as Section 104.0101 of the Faculty Handbook as proposed in the preceding appendix.

PROPOSED PROCEDURE



UWG PROCEDURE NUMBER: 2.4.1, Annual Evaluation

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 annual faculty evaluation procedure.

A. Annual Evaluation Procedure

1. The immediate supervisor will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.

B. 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](#), 4.7 Evaluation of Faculty 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

Addendum IV

UWG Faculty Handbook
Modification of 104.02, Post-Tenure Review

Rationale:

- When the post-tenure review was implemented 1996/1997, some safeguards were put into place that require reviews of this policy. These requirements have been removed since the required reviews are no longer practiced and the post-tenure policies do seem to require a regular review any more than other faculty evaluation policies.
- Most changes concern update of the wording to match changes in other sections of the faculty handbook (e.g., “working days” has been replaced by “University Business Day”, “service to the institution” is now “service”).
- Updates reflect that the School of Nursing is now an academic unit, not only colleges and the library.

PROPOSED MODIFIED VERSION

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 ~~is~~ **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 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 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 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 **L**ibrary, 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.

- i. 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.
- 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.

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.~~

PROPOSED REVISED VERSION

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.

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 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.

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 may delay the post-tenure review 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. 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. 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 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.

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. 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 paragraph 104.0208, 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.

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 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) 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.

104.0209 Right to Redress

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

Addendum V

UWG Academic Affairs Policies Index

Approval of UWG Procedure 2.4.3, Post-Tenure Review

Rationale: Currently no university procedure exists for the post-tenure review. The content of the procedure corresponds to Section 104.02 of the Faculty Handbook as proposed in the preceding appendix where some general and explanatory statements have been removed.

PROPOSED PROCEDURE



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

Addendum VI

Rationale:

- This evaluation procedure applies to department chairs (in case of departments of colleges) and department heads (in case of departments of the library). In the current version, the first part of Section 104.03 refers to “departmental administrative personnel” and the second part refers to department chairs. The proposed version uses consistently the term “department leader” and makes some improvements to the language.
- Section 104.0302 contains an evaluation form, presumably a sample form for the evaluation of department chairs and heads. Since the form is not referenced anywhere in the Faculty Handbook and since it contains formatting and wording issues, the section with the evaluation form has been removed from the proposed version of Section 104.03. Departments that are currently using the evaluation form may still use the form.

PROPOSED MODIFIED VERSION

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 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~~ **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**.

104.0302

Personnel Evaluation Questionnaire
University of West Georgia

Individual Under Review _____ Date _____

Position _____

On the average I have contact with this person: Daily Weekly Bimonthly Occasionally

I am: A Student A Faculty Member An Administrator A Staff Member Other

Return this completed form to: _____

Instructions:

Listed below are a number of statements which describe the behavior of administrators and professional personnel. Rate this person on each of these items by marking the appropriate response. In making your rating, compare the person with other administrators you have known. There is, of course, a great diversity among the types of professional positions, and some of the statements below may be more fitting for some positions than others. If you feel that an item is not applicable (N.A.) in describing the person's behavior or position, place a mark in the blank to its left. If you do not have sufficient information to evaluate the person, please mark the 'O' response of 'Do Not Know'. Please respond to all of the items.

CODE

0-Do Not Know 1-Low 2-Below Average 3-Average 4-Above Average 5-High

Evaluate the person named above in terms of the degree to which he or she:

SCALE I. COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION

____ N.A. ____

- | | | |
|---------|---|-------------|
| ____ 1. | Communicates with you in a timely and responsive manner. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 |
| ____ 2. | Has sufficient contact with you. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 |
| ____ 3. | Is duly sensitive to your needs for information. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 |
| ____ 4. | Writes letters and makes statements that seldom need clarification. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 |
| ____ 5. | Conveys a sense of caring and concern for the needs and problems of students, faculty and associates. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 |
| ____ 6. | Displays a sensitivity to the feelings of students, faculty and associates. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 |
| ____ 7. | Conducts effective conferences and interviews. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 |
| ____ 8. | Displays the ability to give constructive criticism in a positive manner. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 |
| ____ 9. | Has good rapport with students, faculty and associates. | 0 1 2 3 4 5 |

- ___ 10. Works well with students, faculty and associates to achieve common goals. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 11. Needs to improve communication skills. Yes ___ No ___

If yes, explain in what way(s) _____

CODE

0-Do Not Know 1-Low 2-Below Average 3-Average 4-Above Average 5-High

SCALE II. PLANNING, OPERATIONS, AND ACTION

___ N.A. ___

- ___ 12. Plans ahead for those activities under his or her jurisdiction. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 13. Keeps goals up to date and clearly stated. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 14. Makes time for planning by delegating routine work. 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 15. Initiates action towards defined goals 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 16. Perseveres in the face of frustrations and obstacles to accomplish difficult goals 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 17. Completes detailed and routine tasks effectively 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 18. Establishes uniform procedures where appropriate 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 19. Encourages initiative and performance by delegating tasks effectively to others 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 20. Can anticipate potential problems which may develop when plans do not work out in practice 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 21. Shows resourcefulness and imagination in finding answers to problems 0 1 2 3 4 5
- Other: _____
- ___ 22. Needs to improve in planning, operations and action Yes ___ No ___

If yes, explain in what way(s) _____

SCALE III. DECISION MAKING AND PROBLEM SOLVING

___ N.A. ___

- ___ 23. Makes sound and timely decisions 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 24. Gathers pertinent facts before acting 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 25. Applies policy consistently and fairly 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 26. Consults with others on important decisions 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 27. Is skilled in participatory decision making 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 28. Approaches problem solving on systematic basis 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 29. Is able to cope with unanticipated events 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 30. Recognizes and utilizes the special talents of others as an aid to solving problems 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 31. Understands the college well enough to refer matters to the proper offices for effective action 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ___ 32. Acts with deliberateness and common sense under stress 0 1 2 3 4 5
- Other: _____
- ___ 33. Needs to improve decision making and problem solving skills 0 1 2 3 4 5

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, explain in what way(s) _____

CODE

0-Do Not Know 1-Low 2-Below Average 3-Average 4-Above Average 5-High
SCALE IV. PLANNING, OPERATIONS, AND ACTION

____ N.A. _____

- ____ 34. Establishes rapport easily and is approachable for counsel 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ____ 35. Is receptive to constructive suggestions for changes 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ____ 36. Gives credit to others for their contributions 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ____ 37. Fosters morale and instills co-workers with a sense of enthusiasm, purpose and direction 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ____ 38. Works well with committees 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ____ 39. Inspires confidence in his or her personal integrity and professionalism 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ____ 40. Is fair and impartial in rendering decisions affecting students, faculty and associates 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ____ 41. Is skilled in those specialties demanded by his or her assignment 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ____ 42. Demonstrates a clear understanding of the role and scope of his or her assignments and authority 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ____ 43. Compared with other administrators and professional at UWG, is (1) one of the worst, (2) below average, (3) average, (4) above average, (5) one of the best
Other: _____ 0 1 2 3 4 5
- ____ 44. Needs to improve personal and human relations skills Yes _____ No _____

If yes, explain in what way(s) _____

PROPOSED REVISED VERSION

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

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

104.0301 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 departmental members,

reviewed by the department leader, 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.

Addendum VII

UWG Academic Affairs Policies Index

Approval of UWG Procedure 2.4.4, Evaluation of Department Leaders

Rationale: Currently no university procedure exists for the evaluation of department leaders. The proposed procedure has the same content as Section 104.0301 of the Faculty Handbook with the proposed modifications from the preceding appendix.

PROPOSED PROCEDURE



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 leader, 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*

Addendum VIII

Addendum VIII: Faculty Concerns

Thank you for your request for agenda items. These are my suggestions:

- Request for descriptions of the process used over summer by VPAA for administrative appointment of Deans and Chairs
 - Rationale for why these appointments were permanent rather than interim
 - Information for length of term and evaluation of appointed deans and chairs.
 - Rationale for development of new strategic initiatives.
 - Discussion of how the work we've done to align course, etc. to the past strategic initiatives can be mapped on to the current ones so our time is not wasted.
-

Regarding the "All Faculty" email list and who is able to use it...is there any type of protocol in place (or some type of guidelines?) about what groups have permission (maybe that's not the right word) to use it?

I brought up the Faculty Handbook and tried some search terms within it but I couldn't locate anything regarding all-faculty email.

I have included a link here to an article about the University of Alabama, because it feels so similar to what UWG is asking of us as faculty indirectly:

<https://www.ajc.com/news/university-of-alabama-orders-faculty-to-keep-quiet-about-outbreak/7ZAHSQPNDRBRINBEF3A6YAVMPRE/>

I feel the University does not want me to inform students about possible exposure and that makes me feel that my safety and the safety of my students is not a priority.

I am concerned that the health and exposure page is showing data only one week at a time.

While I have concerns about how Covid is being addressed on this campus, University re-organization that occurred without faculty input, weak/failed shared governance, a Strategic Planning Committee that does not see the average faculty member as a stakeholder at this university, and the one-man University campaign "On Becoming UWG," there are even more alarming things I am experiencing with several of my colleagues. Many of us feel intentionally threatened at the (new) Department level and (new) College level. This sense of alarm, fear, and threat is something I've not experienced previously at UWG. I am concerned that we are rapidly developing into a culture of fear and silence on campus where dialogue does not occur and it not being valued at all by the upper administration. This will ultimately impact our students, as they are encouraged and motivated by seeing faculty who love scholasticism and remain committed to UWG literally over generations. We are the front-line workers of UWG.

In many clear ways, including through direct response, President Kelley has communicated that, for him, UWG has been a failed enterprise waiting for him to arrive. Everything we have done in the past, everything that we have achieved through hard work, sacrifice, and collective success, is now reduced to the requirement that we be thankful that Dr. Kelley has now arrived to save us. It is disheartening. This attitude is now permeating throughout the structure that he set up without faculty input – through Chairs and Deans.

I am concerned about the quality of the data reporting we are getting. I would like to see cumulative numbers presented in a way that gives us a bigger, fuller picture of what is going. Other schools in the USG are doing this better, such as GCSU: <https://www.gcsu.edu/coronavirus/managing-covid>

Fear of bad publicity must not guide us in our campus response to COVID.

In addition, professors should be allowed to choose whether they go online or not. Minimally, AWA requests for protection for family members must be considered. It is the moral and ethical decision.

—Anonymous

I am concerned about the lack of shared governance and the total silencing of faculty voices and concerns in the decision-making processes that occurred between Spring and Summer, when many faculty were not on contract. Administration has completely focused on a business-oriented model that does not work for educational institutions because it detracts from the educational product of the institution in favor of providing student amenities to “compete” with other universities simply on amenities (it is a completely unsustainable model, hence the budget crisis we experienced). Faculty have been voicing concern over this issue at many institutions across the country, so UWG is not alone in this, but this university exhibits the worst symptoms of this model, which came to the fore with the sweeping non-renewals in Fall 2019; the complete lack of shared governance in the decision-making processes that led to the reorganization of multiple departments and colleges across campus as a cost-saving measure (when administration did not contribute to cost-saving measures, instead continuing to have multiple administrative positions that can be done by a single position); the withholding of information regarding a global pandemic on campus (creating an unsafe work environment and unsafe learning environment by increasing the risk posed to faculty, staff, and students) until one hour after the fee deadline and full refund deadline had passed (effectively exhibiting collusion among administrators to ensure students do not decide to drop their courses and return to a safe position); the inaccurate and ineffective reporting of COVID numbers on campus to create a false sense of security even though faculty have been requesting different reporting measures; the implementation of classroom policies and procedures that do not provide accurate measures of safety given recent studies coming from University of Florida and

Shands Hospital; the reprimanding of faculty and/or the implementation of disciplinary measures on faculty for making an announcement about exposure to COVID; and more...

Strategic Focus for the Future of UWG

The Principles of Accreditation of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) <https://sacscoc.org/pdf/2018PrinciplesOfAccreditation.pdf> (p.19) includes the following quote (emphasis added):

“SECTION 7: Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Effective institutions demonstrate a commitment to principles of continuous improvement, **based on a systematic and documented process** of assessing institutional performance with respect to mission in all aspects of the institution. An institutional planning and effectiveness process **involves all programs, services, and constituencies**; is linked to the decision-making process at all levels; and provides a sound basis for budgetary decisions and resource allocations.”

On 8/5/20, the Office of the President sent an email to all employees and to other constituencies announcing that, “**three pillars – relevance, competitiveness, and placemaking – will serve as the institution’s focus** to imagine the future. These pillars will frame “Becoming UWG,” the overarching strategic planning process that will lead our institution into the next chapter.” Thus, the entire **strategic focus for the future of UWG** was developed, not through any published or known process, not through consultation with any committee which included faculty and others, but simply emerged fully grown from the mind of one person.

This plan was presented as a *fait accompli* with the name of the plan and the three key elements (“pillars”) of the plan, which were fully described by the president to the public in an hour-long televised program on 8/11.

Up to that point, there had been no information disseminated about even the development or process of a strategic plan, and with absolutely no discussion (or even opportunity for discussion) among faculty.

Fully two weeks *after* that public announcement, a committee was announced. That committee of almost 20 people has one full-time faculty member on it.

No nominations from the grass roots were invited or sought for membership of that committee. It was simply announced again as a *fait accompli*, and again apparently based on one person’s personal preferences, which adds to the perception that they were chosen just as convenient instruments for the president’s plan (as opposed to a university plan). Note that the vast majority of the committee consists of administrators who serve at the pleasure of the president.

Any further developments in the strategic planning process are, in fact or in perception, simply perfunctory, just for the pretense of endorsing the one-man pronouncements of early August. These actions are not only in apparent violation of SACS standards but also all norms of shared governance and commonly held principles of academic institutions.

Three faculty concerns are described below:

1. Reorganization of many of the Arts and Sciences disciplines:
 - a. The inaccurate or misleading claims of consultation or reasons for lack of consultation. *Who*, specifically, were the faculty members (not including administrators) who were consulted as to organizational sub-units, names, chair structure, selection of specific chairs, etc.
 - i) The elimination of departments serves no purpose. Had faculty been consulted, innovative and inexpensive solutions might have been found, even within the constraints of the budget.
 - ii) It was disrespectful to the faculty to claim, *without evidence, that they could not have contributed anything of value because it was the summertime.*
 - b. The dual claims of the “unprecedented” budget cut plans (\$7 million) and that 13 days was insufficient to consult anyone but for the chosen few administrators. Discussion during the last faculty senate online meeting revealed that these claims were inaccurate or misleading.
 - i) In 2010, UWG was given 48 hours (Thursday noon to Saturday noon) to submit a plan to cut \$8 million which was a significantly higher budget cut in terms of dollars and a much higher budget cut plan in percentage terms, and further, with far less time than the budget cut plan of 2020.
 - ii) In 2009, the cuts were 11.5% for the year.
 - iii) There were other years with cuts of the order of 10%.
 - iv) In all of these cases, *including the 48-hour, \$8 million cut planning*, there were meetings with faculty representatives to work through the details of cuts. The faculty senate budget committee representative from that period (2009-11) so stated during the senate meeting.
2. The Strategic Plan:
 - a. On August 5, 2020, the number, names, descriptions of the “three pillars” of the strategic plan were announced.
 - i) Publicly,
 - ii) To the entire Carrollton community,
 - iii) Without any prior faculty consultation.
 - b. No strategic plan at UWG has been done in such a dictatorial way. To the best of our knowledge, no strategic plan is done like this at any respectable not-for-profit institution. Committees have been charged, extensive deliberations have been done largely without administration even in the room, drafts have been put out on the web for faculty / staff / student / public comment, revisions have been made, and only after several iterations, has a formal announcement been made. This current plan is not a UWG strategic plan; it is one person’s strategic plan. There cannot be buy-in to such a product, except through pressure.

The process was tainted the moment multiple public announcements were made without any substantive faculty input.

- c. The message of August 21, 2020 (**16** days after the entire plan was publicly announced), states: “The *first stage* (emphasis added; how can this be the first stage when the plan was announced more than two weeks prior to this?) in the planning process, **Stakeholder Engagement**, will focus on engaging internal and external university stakeholders. Our **Strategic Planning Steering Team**, supported by Dr. Janet Pilcher of Studer Education, will lead this stage of the process. This group of thought-leaders and advocates, who represent a diverse cross-section of forward-thinking professionals from throughout the institution, will work to gather, analyze, and organize data throughout the process, using diverse perspectives to identify recurring themes and push the institution toward next-level priorities. The members of this esteemed steering team are (in alphabetical order) ...”
 - i. Apparently, there is one, and only one “thought leader” at UWG who is a (non-administrative) faculty member, out of a committee size of 19. Apparently, there are no faculty at UWG other than that one who are “forward-thinking professionals.” The structure of the committee is very disrespectful to the faculty. It sends a message that, if you are looking for thought leaders and forward-thinking professionals at UWG, look to administrators, *not* to the faculty.
 - ii. There has been no faculty consultation or nomination process or election as to who would serve on this committee. The committee gives the impression that it was likely selected by the same person or persons who designed the entire plan.
 - iii. There is no indication of what role anyone or any such committee would play, because the names and details of the pillars of the plan have already been publicly announced. The Committee appears to be in place just to fill in a few blanks and give the appearance of consultation.
 - iv. The very name of the strategic plan, “Becoming UWG,” is offensive and disrespectful to anyone who was at UWG in 2019, 2018, or prior to that. What *were* we in January of 2020 – if not UWG? Again, the disrespectful name of the plan is the creation of people who believe that the clock of UWG started ticking in March of 2020, that it did not fully exist, and that nothing that we did prior to the arrival of this top administrative team matters one iota.

3. The Reopening Plans:

- a. While it is recognized the USG (and the State) plays the major role, the mandatory mask protests started by Georgia Tech and echoed at UWG prove that those minds *can* be changed. UWG administration is so enamored with reopening, that it comes across as being cavalier and totally dismissive of concerns of our health, our safety, and our lives. As the Notre Dame student paper editorial <https://ndsmcobserver.com/2020/08/observer-editorial-dont-make-us-write-obituaries/> says: “...***Don’t make us write a professor’s obituary. Don’t make us write a classmate’s obituary. Don’t make us write a friend’s obituary...***”
Deaths in Georgia are on the rise as of the start of the third week of classes. Are we waiting for the death of one, two, 10 of us at UWG to wake up?
- b. Where is the *evidence* that the vast majority of students want the campus in the face-to-face mode in fall, 2020? Either the evidence by way of a representative survey exists and is being hidden from the faculty, or the evidence does not exist and that claim is about as strong the other claims made by administration listed earlier in this document.

- c. Here is some evidence that not all students are as enamored of a face-to-face reopening as the administration is. See WakeUpBrendan: <https://twitter.com/UpBrendan>
- d. Even given the regrettable decision to start face-to-face classes, the faculty were *not* consulted as to how best to meet the needs of instruction. *Who*, specifically (non-administrative faculty) participated in the construction of the reopening plans? Dr. Kelly's description of the learning styles of his three children seems to be the rationale for reopening plans. He said in one of the discussion forums that knowing that his kids prefer three different modes, why would we not want to meet those needs? That may be a reasonable point, but not necessarily all in the same course. And, again, the point is not whether he is right or wrong, but that *no* faculty discussion or deliberation is invited or tolerated. Faculty were simply *told* that they were to teach in dual modality for every class session.

There are other examples perhaps, but these three different and distinct concerns show common, recurring, and disturbing themes:

- an autocratic, if not dictatorial, style,
- with no substantive faculty consultation, and indeed disrespect for the faculty,
- with a pretense of coopting a couple of faculty to go along with the myth of consultation, and
- with complete disregard and disrespect for the past.

What is the state of the sabbaticals for FALL 21? We are not sure where we stand.

Faculty want the ability to change the modality of Spring 21 courses. We're being told no, probably by the USG, but it's an issue of equity. Those who are shouldering the face-to-face/dual modality this semester will have to do it again next, if there's no vaccine. I hope that the Deans will discuss this with the Provost as well, fyi.

- According to SACS modality is a faculty determination, not USG or upper administration.
- Students were requesting more online course this fall, so there's a demand.

Promotion and Tenure expectations: Folks are relieved by the optional extension for this academic year. However, because of the re-org and loss of faculty and staff to VSP and the reduction in force, AND the loss of stipends, course releases, etc. for folks who were coordinating areas within programs, more service is being expected of faculty than ever before. The faculty wonder if the Handbook should be revised in terms of P & T to reflect this. To be clear: should P & T expectations change with the heavier service expectations the institution is now demanding? Dual modality also affects professional development, as does the loss of travel support.

I send a list of concerns from colleagues and faculty:

COVID:

- My concern is about having a Covid testing plan and reporting numbers. There are many rumors going around that I hear from students about outbreaks on campus. Information is

critical. I read that GCSU is reporting daily numbers: <https://www.gcsu.edu/coronavirus/managing-covid> So they can't look to the USG to say their hands are tied....

- I am very concerned with the late announcement of Covid numbers on campus and the way it came about. First, the fact that they announced this information *not an hour after the fee deadline passed for our students is very disconcerting*. It gives the impression that their plan was to withhold information just long enough to get past the full refund deadline.

Second, the issue about the phrasing "not required to be notified" is problematic as there seems to be a culture in place already of backlash against that do notify their students of exposure. There is a Twitter thread making the rounds on social media right now that includes a faculty member's CourseDen announcement to their class about being notified of exposure, and then an email response stating from administration that the faculty member is being dealt with

(<https://m.facebook.com/groups/381022648941666?view=permalink&id=1210799435963979&sfnsn=mo>). So, what happens if we are exposed and have to quarantine? Are we not allowed to inform our classes that we have to quarantine due to exposure? We just disappear from the classroom for a couple weeks?

Third, I already have several students that were notified by UWG that they need to quarantine due to exposure. Is this something we should also be using UWG Cares for an additional reporting metric? Or are we just supposed to rely on the students to self report?

Fourth, do we know what the threshold will be to cause another shutdown? It's the first week, we already have 57 total cases, and they are only reporting things on a weekly basis. As we all know this virus is capable of exponential growth and infection at a very fast rate. What is the magic number administration will use to draw the line in the sand and say enough people are infected to warrant a shutdown? My students are already scared (as am I!), and if administration allows that line to be too high then I fear we will lose more students altogether due to mishandling of the situation in general. I already have students that have made the decision to opt out of the f2f portion of my courses because of their safety concerns (and I don't blame them!). What is going to happen when the number of cases reaches well into the hundreds? Will they trust the university enough to return in future semesters?

I would also have concerns about student employees since so many are employed across campus. Many departments don't have enough remote work to go around and keep student employees busy enough, if at all, if they are required to quarantine. So, if a student employee has to quarantine due to exposure, they are unable to work at all. Likewise, if they become infected they obviously can't work.

Many of our students rely on the paychecks they receive from campus work. So, if they have to quarantine from exposure or infection, it will affect them financially. To my knowledge, student employees do not accrue sick days like faculty and staff (please correct me if I'm

wrong here). So, how do we deal with that side of things? Do we still give them hours even though they can't work or do we do what the university system seems to be doing and turn a blind eye to their needs? And if we do give them hours and pay to help ensure their wellbeing while they are out, will there be repercussions from the administration? Is there something we can do to ensure student employees are given paid sick days, too?

- My questions are specific to how to respond to the class given certain covid risks/testing positive etc...

Much of the issue surrounds our roles as mandatory reporters and is complexified by the nature of personal medical information and our desires to protect one another, our students, and the community.

If a faculty member teaching f2f **tests positive**, after they self-report as the policy requires, are they permitted to 1) immediately discontinue f2f meetings (until advised to continue), and/or 2) inform their students that they, themselves have tested positive? The answer should keep in mind that a faculty member may find out with very little to no lead-time before the next in-class session. An explicit statement forbidding this type of information sharing should be made if "violating it" will result in disciplinary action.

If a faculty member **self-identifies** as having been in "close contact" are BOTH above actions permitted? Or must they wait on "being identified" as "close contact" by GDPH? Or are in either case these actions not up to the Faculty member?

What do we do if a student reveals they've tested positive but continues to attend f2f and voices their refusal to self-report to the University?

What do we do if to our knowledge, despite a student testing positive and self-reporting, no contact tracing is being performed?

- At what point is it counterproductive to run class f2f with low attendance?
When specifically do we personally have the responsibility to cancel classes for safety concerns? If the answer is "never", then that needs to be in writing, otherwise I know I'd exercise my best judgment ethically in several situations with or without guidance.
When and how will testing on campus be available? (that we haven't heard more on this is completely not ok)
- 1) Why is there no free and readily available testing available to faculty teaching f2f and staff in f2f settings?
2) What is the nature of student housing, and the administration's partnership with housing companies in relation to the COVID outbreak? I ask because I recently had to write to housing on behalf of a student who made the decision to move back home after a week on campus, seeing that things were not so safe as promised. I had to tell housing that she was permitted to complete all of the course work online before they would let her out of her contract.

3) Contact tracing only works if everyone knows about it and all potential close contacts also quarantine. Why is there such an emphasis on being under-cautious? What end will that serve? It will only accelerate our campus pandemic and cause deeper impacts.

4) We need to see cumulative, longer term data statistics that will enable us to gauge as a community how much worse the local outbreak has gotten on campus and in Carrollton since reopening. The administration is accountable to all of us, and we need that information.

REORGANIZATION/SHARED GOVERNANCE

- Dear Chairs of the Standing Committees of the Academic Senate, this communication is a follow up to the Faculty Senate meeting of August 6. I believe a central issue we need to address is the process used by the President and VPAA during the recent appointment of Deans and Chairs. COSS Bylaws and Procedures (<https://www.westga.edu/academics/coss/assets-coss/docs/COSSBylawsandPoliciesProceduresAugust2018.pdf>) outline a careful collaborative process for the selection and evaluation of Deans and Chairs (see Article II Sections A and B). In reference to the appointment of a Dean the bylaws state “The Search Committee shall consult with the Administrative Council and the Faculty Council of the College prior to making its recommendation to the Vice President of Academic Affairs.” Associate and Assistant Deans are appointed “In consultation with the Faculty Council and the Administrative Council.” In reference to the appointment of a Department Chair the bylaws state: “Recommendation for appointment shall be made only after consultation with all members of the department concerned or with an elected committee of that department.” I do not believe these procedures were followed in the recent appointments of CACSI Dean and Chairs.

It is possible that the President and VPAA believed COSS bylaws were irrelevant given the dissolution of the College. If this was indeed the case, what was the stated rationale for the appointment of permanent rather than interim positions? Appointing an Interim Dean and Interim Chairs would have provided CACSI the time needed to develop new bylaws and procedures.

Please provide a written description of the procedures the President and VPAA used in these recent appointments. Please also provide information on the length of appointment for these positions as well as procedures for Dean and Chair evaluations.

Will new policies and procedures adopted by CACSI supersede the processes used in these recent academic appointments? If so, what might such bylaws mean for these Dean and Chair appointments, particularly if the bylaws outline procedures markedly different from those used by the President and VPAA? Will newly developed bylaws and procedures be enacted ex post facto? Be ignored?

Bylaws and procedures are a central way for the University to ensure procedural justice. Given the importance of these documents and decisions it is imperative we move

forward with clarity regarding what took place over summer and with full faculty input as we move forward. It is in this spirit of collaborative governance that I offer these observations and questions. I want to clearly state that my concerns do not reflect any concerns regarding the competence of the current Deans or Chairs; indeed it is quite possible these same appointments would have resulted from a process in keeping with COSS bylaws.

Thank you in advance for your careful attention to these issues.

- need for substantial acknowledgement of the faculty-excluded process they used to reorganize the campus: there is no excuse for that; they could have found ways to be more inclusive, even if all the business needed to be done late Spring and into the summer. And some things, like choosing leadership (chairs and assist/assoc deans) could have waited until this Fall. In addition to acknowledgement, there is the question about reparations for that AND demonstrated commitment to a new model moving forward.

What would faculty engagement/governance look like to us? Not sure, and that needs to be a topic of discussion at Senate: what would make faculty feel involved. Maybe we need another campus climate survey?! I feel like our leadership has a lot of explaining to do, and a lot of effort will need to be made to make us trust them. The re-org + the lack of transparency and clarity about the COVID response (seems like they are replicating the model of deciding everything themselves and then communicating it inadequately--is Senate involved at all? Any faculty at all?) together are problematic and don't seem to suggest a future of faculty inclusivity. What role does President WANT faculty to play? Individual feedback isn't enough: we need robust dialog and engagement - through Senate.

Also, what's this commitment to diversity and what does it look like? Before he announced that at the Gen Fac meeting (or wherever he made that public announcement), he hadn't even mentioned it to anyone on campus whose service or job descriptions include working toward diversity. With whom is he talking? what's the plan? So far he's only talking to himself and his cronies in his office, it seems. When I asked, he blew off the re-org changes as 'oh that was so last month', but we are seeing the pattern continuing.

- I am deeply concerned about the lack of shared governance and the total erasure of faculty voices in the decision making processes that have shaped UWG over the last two years in particular. Our autonomy as educators and our investment in the institution has been eroded further and further to the point that we feel decisions are announced to us that we have no say in or knowledge of until it is released by the administration. The non renewals last year are a clear example of this, as is the way restructuring was carried out and the dismissal of staff etc.

Addendum IX

Election Procedure for Faculty Senate Chair, Fall 2020

Given that the Faculty Senate by-laws authorize elections of the Faculty Senate Chair only in the spring, and that the by-laws do not describe a particular method of voting except to specify that “the University faculty will vote in such a fashion that the winner of the election will have received a majority of votes cast,” the Executive Committee voted on August 14, 2020 to authorize deviation from the by-laws to allow for an election in the fall and voted on September 6, 2020 to authorize the use of preferential voting to enable the election of a Chair by majority vote.

In cases where continuous re-balloting without removing any candidates is not feasible, Robert’s Rules of Order Newly Revised (45:62) identifies preferential voting as the preferred election method (in contrast to runoff elections in which some candidates would be removed from subsequent ballots). We will use the method of preferential voting (also known as ranked-choice voting or instant-runoff voting) described in Robert’s Rules 45:63–66; more information on this method of voting can also be found [here](#).

While more details can be found in those sources, briefly, this method works as follows:

1. Each voter will cast a ballot ranking the candidates from first preference to last preference. Should a candidate receive the majority of the first-preference votes, that candidate will win the election.
2. In the case that no candidate receives a majority of the first-preference votes, the ballots cast for the candidate who received the fewest first-preference votes will be reassigned to the second-preference candidate indicated on each of those ballots.
 - a. A new count will be conducted. If at that point, a candidate has received a majority of votes, that candidate will win the election.
 - b. If there is still no candidate with a majority of votes, the procedure will repeat, with the ballots for the candidate with the fewest votes being reassigned to their most preferred candidate still in the running.
 - c. This process will continue until one candidate has received a majority of the votes cast.