

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

February 18, 2022

Approved February 25, 2022

1. Call to Order

Chair Williams called the meeting to order at 1:03pm

2. Roll Call

Present: Barrett, Boumenir, Branyon, Brandenburg, Brown, Carmack, Chambless, Cheng, Corley, DeWeese, Edelman, Elman, Erben, Evans (Davis sub.), Fuentes, Gault, Gordon, Graffius, Green (Wood sub.), Hadley, Hester, Ivory, Jara-Pazmino, Kellison, Khan, Kimbrel, Kniess, Kramer, Lee, Ly, MacKinnon, Mason, McClenny, McLean, Nickell, Olivieri (Sheppard sub.), Pazzani, Pencoe, Richter, Scullin, Self, Skott-Myhre, Shoemake, Snipes, Swift, Sykes, Talbot, Towhidi, Weber, Wei, Williams, Wofford, and Yoder

Absent: Barbour

3. Minutes

A) The January 22, 2022 Meeting Minutes were approved electronically on January 27, 2022.

4. Administrator Reports

A) Report from the President

- *The Board of Regents has named former Georgia Governor Sonny Purdue the sole finalist in their Chancellor search.*
- *UWG has entered into a partnership with the College Park Skyhawks, the official G League affiliate of the Atlanta Hawks, along with Hawks Talon Gaming, the NBA 2K League affiliate of the Hawks. The partnership also includes an internship for a UWG student to work within the organizations to gain valuable educational experiences in both sports and eSports. The Skyhawks will host a UWG Day on March 6 where UWG students can visit and learn more about the organization, and UWG will be featured on signage in Gateway Center Arena during the G League season.*
- *UWG is a stop on The Atlanta Braves World Champions Trophy Tour of the 2021 World Series Trophy. The Trophy will be at the Coliseum March 1 from 2pm-5pm.*

- An Employee Recognition Day Program will be held at the Football Stadium on May 12, 2022 at 11am, with lunch to follow.
- 72% of the local teachers of the year for Carrollton City Schools and Carroll County Schools are UWG Alumni, which is a testament to our university, programs, faculty, and students.
- Congratulations to Dr. Laura Smith, Interim Dean of the College of Education, who received the Thomas Upchurch Workforce Education Award by the Carroll County Chamber of Commerce this past week.
- Congratulations to Dr. Jeannie Pridmore, Richards College of Business MBA graduate program director and associate professor of Management Information Systems, who received the Felton Jenkins Jr. Hall of Fame Faculty Award.
- Congratulations to UWG's Department of Student Success, led by Executive Director Carrie Ziglar, who received the Regents' Momentum Year Award for Excellence in Advising and Student Success.
- Dr. Bridgette Stewart has been named UWG's Chief Wellness Officer. President Kelly recognized Dr. Stewart's leadership on the National Wellness Institute's Board of Directors, and noted that producing, evolving, and integrating a wellness framework for the university is part of our strategic plan.
- The President provided a brief update regarding the budget, discussing the progress of the Humanities budget to Stage 3 of the process, as well as the proposed \$5000 raise for all state employees. He noted that while the proposed \$5000 raise does not immediately apply to USG employees, the budget does include money for the USG to achieve the same outcome. This measure will need to go from the legislature to the BOR, who would designate those dollars according to their constitutional authority. He will keep us updated as more information becomes available.

B) Report from the Provost

- The Provost shared his good fortune in seeing recent UWG graduate Sarah Rogers's presentation at the Board of Regents meeting last week as part of their Academic Recognition Day Scholars program. Ms. Rogers graduated with honors from UWG with a 4.0 GPA from our Anthropology program, and her interdisciplinary project combined anthropology, biology, and music in an effort to examine the impact of

marching band on the human body. She plans to continue her graduate studies in Public History at UWG in the fall. The Provost extended his thanks to Honors College Dean Janet Donahoe, Dr. David Boldt, and Dr. Twyla Perryman, who reviewed those student applicants and nominees and participated in the selection process that led to Ms. Rogers's representation of UWG at this important event.

- *The Provost has spent the past few days in Albany, Georgia at the Regional Advisory Council for Academic Affairs meeting with his fellow USG Provosts as he does each semester, and he relayed the USG's appreciation for our hard work during these challenging times. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 22:55) The System Office is actively advocating for the \$5,000 raise for all State employees, among other things, and are doing what they can to make sure that this item moves forward during this legislative session. The USG is tracking 230 bills that have either a direct or indirect impact on the USG, our students, and our faculty and staff. The Provost specifically mentioned SB 509, which is focused on dual enrollment and the articulation agreements between the USG and the Technical College System of Georgia.*
- *The Provost briefly discussed SB377, emphasizing that the sponsors of these bills have made public statements on numerous occasions about ensuring the protection of academic freedom. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 25:06) He affirms the strength of the work that our faculty are doing within their various domains in Academic Affairs, and he wants people to have the same assurance that the bill sponsors have publicly stated the same.*
- *The Provost attended the Continuous Improvement Institute (CII) that morning, which was led by Studer Education founder Dr. Janet Pilcher, and he presented our work on the QEP as an effort towards retention, progression, and graduation. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 26:22) He also discussed UWG's focus on operationalizing the "Big 6 Elements" outlined by Purdue-Gallup as being integral college experiences linked to lifelong success through fostering experiential opportunities like internships, capstones, and practical undergraduate research. Dr. Preston noted that CII attendees discussed capturing faculty and staff superlatives as a*

means of affirming the work that we do and the ways in which our students and alumni connect with that work.

- *The Richards College of Business recently completed their AACSB reaffirmation process and received an extension on their business and accounting programs' accreditations.*
- *Oakridge Associated Universities recently recommended UWG as an associate member, making us the only comprehensive university within the USG to join.*
- *Ms. Ashlesha Pawar-Shirke will join UWG as the Executive Director for Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment on March 1, 2022. Dr. Kevin Gwaltney will join UWG as the Executive Director for Accreditation and Quality Enhancement on March 1 as well.*
- *Several faculty have already applied for an Innovations and Teaching Fellowship, and the selection process will be moving forward soon. The Provost stated that he is impressed with the work being done by our faculty both inside and outside of the classroom and he looks forward to seeing a discussion panel or talks later in the semester from our fellows highlighting the work they are doing.*
- *The Provost commended Dr. Camilla Gant, Chief Administrative Officer and Executive Director for Academic Affairs Douglasville, Ms. Rebecca Smith, Associate Director of UWG Newnan and UWG eCampus, and Vice Provost Ralitsa Aikens on their work organizing the five year plans of course offerings for our Douglasville and Newnan Campuses. This is the first time that we have undertaken such an endeavor and is integral to growing enrollment on these two campuses. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 32:43)*
- *Every institution is required to report on low enrollment and degrees, and each program is required to graduate 10 undergraduate degrees, 5 master's degrees, and/or 3 doctoral degrees a year. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 34:19) UWG has 15 programs that do not meet these requirements, some of which we are already in the process of or have put forward to the BOR to eliminate. The Provost will be addressing this with the deans who will be working with faculty on this front to do what we need to do to help revitalize programs and meet shifting needs.*

C) Report from the Vice-Provost

- Vice-Provost Akins began by thanking and commending the team of colleagues who participated in the review of the submitted proposals. They are Dr. Beth M. Sheppard, Ms. Bonnie Jett, Mr. Charles Sicignano, Ms. Holly Dever, Ms. Kimberly Scranage, Dr. Martin McPhail, Dr. Michael Hester, Dr. Nisha Gupta, Dr. Robert Morris, Dr. Stacey Britton, and Mr. Steve Hamby. Six proposals were submitted by our campus community in the following areas: Experiential Learning; News, Media & Information Literacies; The Language of Leadership; Level Up – Empowering Career and Curricular Confidence; Comprehensive Internationalization; and Career Connections. After careful review, they invited some of the proposal teams to combine their efforts. For example, the language of leadership proposal was aligned and combined with the proposal for news media and information literacies, and the original proposal for experiential learning now includes components from the proposal on career connections. Consequently, the following two QEP proposals were selected and will be forwarded to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate and the Executive Administrative Council for consideration: Experiential Learning, including Career Connections, and Rhetorical Competence & Information Literacy (combining News, Media & Information Literacies with the Language of Leadership). Dr. Akins asks that these proposals be shared with faculty for input, review, and feedback with that information to be returned to the Office of the Vice-Provost by April 1. Their goal is to identify the working proposal by April 15.

D) Q & A

- The first question concerned the recent UWG faculty/staff survey taken in October 2021 and when we may see the results. President Kelly stated that the survey was part of a discovery session for the new marketing firm that we were onboarding at that time. An integrated communications meeting is taking place soon with a broad range of leaders, and a high level summary of that survey will be shared there. He is happy to share that data once received, possibly at the March 18, 2022 Senate Meeting.
- Recently the Faculty Senate Budget Committee submitted an open records request for access to the budget narrative. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 50:52) When asked why the Budget Committee was denied access to the budget and budget narrative, President Kelly stated that he was unaware that this

narrative was made private until recently as we are a public university and these narratives are not protected, and this was likely a timing issue as we are between Chief Business Officers at the moment.

- *When asked to share the details about how programs may determine minimum enrollments necessary to run summer classes and whether specific programs or classes will be required to meet a certain threshold, the Provost responded that each class will be looked at individually to meet the required threshold and he discussed the various factors involved in making the decision to run, prorate, or cancel a class. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 52:03) He stated further that his first focus is on getting more students enrolled, utilizing waitlist, and driving towards a four-year graduation rate. His plan is to emulate last summer's strategies whereby if a course is under-enrolled, the deans will present their recommendations to him and each course will be taken on a case by case basis.*
- *When asked why afternoon classes were not cancelled for this Spring's Scholars Day Event, the Provost stated that he approached this from a Carnegie contact hours perspective. If we are not doing an activity related to a course, then that cuts down on the contact hours for that course and creates accreditation risks. Instead, he encouraged faculty who are interested in having their students attend Scholars Day to tie the event to their courses in some way. Dr. Preston stated that this empowers faculty to make that determination on a course by course basis, giving faculty flexibility in teaching that afternoon or not.*
- *When asked to reflect a year later on the decision to merge several colleges into the College of Arts, Culture, and Scientific Inquiry and whether that decision improved the university as planned, the Provost deferred to Dean Gagnon. Chair Williams stated that this anonymously submitted question was likely meant for President Kelly, as it is not up to the deans to decide who constitutes their college. That is instead a Presidential decision. President Kelly responded that Dean Gagnon has done a fantastic job creating interdisciplinarity throughout CACSI, and he gave several examples such as the recent regional science fair and the student-led visual art exhibition. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 57:03)*

- *The next two questions related to discontent over the perception that certain departments were artificially split, specifically the department that includes Criminology and Political Science now housed in the UC and the social sciences that are housed in CACSI. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 1:01:25) President Kelly stated that part of the philosophy behind putting Criminology and Political Science together was to create unique opportunities inside of the context of the University College and to create balance across Academic Affairs. In addition, Dr. Kelly argued that it created an opportunity to connect public service and engagement philosophically by bringing these two disciplines together and providing greater ability for experimentation and innovation.*
- *Along those lines, the second question related to the math department being split between general education in the UC and the CACSI Mathematics program. The specific question asked how faculty teaching in the CACSI math program should handle students who pass the UC-taught pre-Calculus sections but fail the CACSI-taught calculus sections. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 1:05:12) The Provost responded by saying that there could be any number of reasons why that occurs, some beyond our control as faculty, and mapped his answer more broadly to a discussion of student success. [After the Senate meeting concluded, Chair Williams expressed regret that this pre-submitted question from another faculty member unfairly denigrated faculty in the Department of General Education, and he apologized to the faculty in that program for failing to realize this when he read the question. He affirmed his strong belief in the professional competence of faculty in the Department of General Education, none of whom were responsible for the organization of their program that was mentioned in this question].*
- *The next question focused on the status of the applications for professional and research leave that were submitted in November 2021, when faculty might hear whether their requests for leave have been approved, and what options are available for appeal if denied. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 1:09:06 and again at 1:39:41) The Provost stated that the decision rests within the Office of the Provost, and while he is happy to hear any motions for appeal, there is no formal appeal process beyond the local institution. He added that his goal was to*

coordinate with the deans within the next two weeks and have decisions made by March 1. He also stated that in the event that a request for leave is denied, there is flexibility in workloads through options like buyout and reassigned time.

- *The next pre-submitted question focused on the concerns that many faculty have expressed regarding the stability of academic advising, the shifting of students to different advisors without PCs being notified, and the confusion expressed by some students regarding changes in the advising process. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 1:10:17) This question then asked what are the advantages to UWG students switching to fully professional advising in the current circumstances and whether anyone is studying the negative student perceptions that may be emerging as a result of this new system. The Provost stated that this is a best practice that has been widely adopted throughout the Academy and within the USG, and he pointed to the success that Georgia State has had with this system. He stated further that if there is an opportunity to improve the transition between professional advising in early years into faculty focused advising and mentorship in the latter years of study then we should solve that locally where it's occurring.*
- *When asked why the student credit hours generated for an XIDS class did not go to the professor of record's home program, the Provost agreed that faculty should be getting credit for the XIDS course and the workload involved in creating and teaching that class. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 1:13:03)*
- *When asked how this year's enrollment data compared to last year's data and that of the year before, President Kelly provided a detailed summary for the body. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 1:16:57) He stated that we are taking a very different enrollment approach with Vice President Scranage compared to previous years in that we are running a multi-dimensional strategic enrollment plan that takes into account the ever-evolving changes in student needs and demands, as well as economic and demographic changes. There is a 9.2% overall decrease in national undergraduate enrollment. Compared to all sectors for the USG, comprehensive universities are down 10% while we are down about 7%. Across the comprehensive sector, dual enrollment is up 14% overall and 1% for the USG, while new and transfer applications are up 9% from last year. President Kelly also*

commended Dr. Ryan Bronkema, Director of Academic Transition Programs, Ms. Cassidy Nelson, Interim Director of Housing and Residence Life, and Dr. Morris Council for their work in growing living learning communities on campus. As a result, we have half of the current housing contracts in renewal for next year.

- *When asked the deadline for the Innovations Grants, Vice President for Innovation and Research Daryush Ila stated that there was no specific deadline. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 1:31:58) When asked if the criteria for these grant applications could be more specific and if Dr. Ila could share more about the evaluation team for these grants, Dr. Ila stated that there was not a team in place as yet, because the evaluation team needed to correlate with the background of the proposals. Follow-up questions for Dr. Ila focused on when the call for faculty research grant proposals will be circulated, when the winners of the teaching innovations grants will be named, and what steps have been taken to ensure that the selection process is both rigorous and free from bias and/or discrimination. Dr. Ila stated that the announcements for these awards are forthcoming, but he did not have a specific date. They have received 14 proposals thus far for the Innovation in Teaching Fellowships, and the team should complete the evaluation process in the next week. He also noted that it was difficult to find reviewers on such short notice. It was noted by faculty in attendance that it would be helpful if multiple disciplines were a part of the review process, and if the entire process could be improved and clarified more for applicants who may be unsure of the specific criteria needed for their applications.*
- *The next question focused on the current applications for graduate assistantship monies that were submitted by December 31, and when programs might receive a decision. VP Ila stated that the applications were currently under review within the Graduate School, and he hoped to have a decision by the end of February.*
- *Recently, Republican State Senator David Knight sent a letter to the USG requesting information about courses and curriculum that focuses on efforts represented as increasing institutional diversity, equity, inclusion, advocacy, and activism. Several in attendance shared their concerns regarding that request and how it may be answered by UWG administrators. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 1:44:14 and again at 1:54:29) President Kelly stated that the USG*

regularly receives requests from legislators, and when they do we try to satisfy a request without raising more questions than we answer, while at the same time we deliver what the Chancellor has directed us to deliver. He stated further that the Chancellor has asked USG schools to pause work on fulfilling this request. Faculty in attendance shared their concerns that listing specific courses may put the faculty who teach those courses as well as specific programs at risk, especially since there are many courses and faculty on campus that deal with these concepts despite certain keywords not appearing in course titles and/or descriptions. Faculty also expressed their concerns at how this may relate to SB377 and the resulting laws that would ban discussion of certain topics in our courses. President Kelly stated that the previous request from legislators regarding courses on gender was a very specific request with a single topic, and courses are approved by the general faculty thereby associating the course with the core of the faculty. He added that responding to requests such as these helps people who are not part of universities make sense of them and they are working with the USG to protect people in ways to allow them to do their work without getting caught up in the politics of the day. Faculty in attendance asked for solidarity from administrators in not only defending our academic freedom, but speaking to the importance of teaching facts in a university setting. President Kelly stated that because the USG and BOR have full authority over the 26 institutions in the USG system, legislative advocacy and response doesn't work in same way here as it does in other states. He asked the body to trust the process, and that they are trying to make certain that conversations that might occur somewhere else are not turning into action and affecting the work that we do here at UWG.

- *With regards to efforts made by UWG to secure extra monies from the USG and whether we had a plan in place to operate without that additional funding, President Kelly stated that we are in the midst of negotiating through that process and we will know more once we are a bit farther through the budget process with the system and the BOR. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 1:52:08)*

5. Committee Reports

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

Action Items:

A) College of Arts, Culture, and Scientific Inquiry

- 1) Department of Computing and Mathematics
 - a) [COMP 3310 – Mobile Development](#)
Request: Modify
 - b) [COMP 3400 – System and Network Admin I](#)
Request: Modify
 - c) [COMP 3600 – User-Centric Computing I](#)
Request: Modify
 - d) [COMP 4200 – Advanced Database Systems](#)
Request: Modify
 - e) [COMP 4420 – DevOps](#)
Request: Modify
 - f) [COMP 4500 – Computer Forensics](#)
Request: Modify

Items a-f were taken as a block and approved with 43 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

- g) [CS 1300 – Introduction to Computing](#)
Request: Modify

Item approved with 44 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

- h) [Computer Science, B.S.](#)
Request: Modify

Item approved with 43 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

- 2) Department of Anthropology, Psychology, and Sociology
 - a) [SABH 4000 – Research Methodology](#)
Request: Add
 - b) [SABH 4003 – Applied Statistics for Sociology](#)
Request: Add

Items a-b were taken as a block and approved with 44 in favor, 1 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

Committee II: Graduate Programs Committee (Dena Kniess, Chair)

Action Items:

A) College of Arts, Culture, and Scientific Inquiry

- 1) Department of Anthropology, Psychology, and Sociology

a) [Psychology, MA](#)

Request: Modify

Item approved with 41 in favor, 3 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

b) [Sociology, MA](#)

Request: Modify

Item approved with 42 in favor, 1 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

B) Graduate Catalog Changes 2022-2023 – International Admissions ([**Figure 1**](#))

Item approved with 44 in favor, 0 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

Committee III: Academic Policies Committee (Jennifer Edelman, Chair)

Information Items:

A) High Impact Practices (HIPs) Committee: Service-Learning Designation for Courses ([**Figure 2**](#))

*Service-Learning (SL) is the second of the High Impact Practices (HIPs) drafted by the campus HIPs (LEAP West) Steering Committee and approved by the APC. The criteria in [**Figure 2**](#) will be used to assign a service learning attribute to courses in Banner. Courses that meet the criteria will be sent to the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Programs Committee for review and approval. The campus HIPs Steering Committee will communicate to faculty and departments, beginning in the spring 2022 semester, the process for submitting courses to receive an SL attribute. A website housed in Academic Affairs is currently in development to provide information on HIPs criteria and processes. Chair Edelman also recognized the work of the previous service learning committee and noted that there will be an option to list a previously approved course as an SL course.*

B) The Undergraduate Research Committee invites you to submit Fall 2022 and later courses to receive the Undergraduate Research High Impact Practice attribute in Banner. View [this link](#) using your UWG credential for info about the designation process. Submit your courses using [this survey](#) by Feb. 25.

C) Calendar Committee Update

Summer Session II, which is taught over 8 weeks from June through July will now be a 7 week session beginning Summer 2023. Graduation will still take place on the date scheduled and grades will still be due the Monday after Graduation.

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

Information Item:

- A) FDC Update on UWG Implementation of BOR-mandated Post-Tenure Review and Annual Evaluation Policy Changes ([Figure 3](#))

Chair Erben provided the body with an update on the finalized Academic Affairs Handbook language that has been issued by the USG, as is outlined in [Figure 3](#). (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 2:15:05) The FDC will work on incorporating the guiding document and policies in [Figure 3](#) moving forward. Chair Erben expressed his thanks to all of the faculty from the FDC and the faculty liaisons who have worked so diligently across units to collect feedback over the past few months. Please contact your FDC representative for a copy of that feedback if interested. The FDC has begun the process workshopping all of the changes to the UWG Faculty Handbook, and they plan to have a completed draft completed in the coming weeks. They hope to share that draft with faculty at the March 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Meeting as an information item. There will be additional opportunities for feedback before the draft becomes available for a vote at the April 15, 2022 Faculty Senate meeting. Chair Erben stated that he has received numerous questions regarding the timeline for unit-specific changes, in particular the creation of criteria for each unit that govern annual evaluations as well as PTR. He stated that units should begin to create their own criteria and rubrics if they have not already done so, especially for annual evaluations which will have much more impact on faculty lives. However, the Provost has confirmed that department and/or program-specific criteria and policies do not have to be finalized until fall 2022. Chair Erben added that the Provost has also confirmed that the annual evaluations submitted in January of 2023 will still be governed by the previous guidelines and processes, so the new guidelines still to be finalized and approved will not go into effect until January 2024's annual evaluations review cycle. Chair Erben also stated that the Provost has clarified that a two-year grace period will be put in place during the transition to the new guidelines, so faculty in the middle of the review cycle will not be adversely impacted.

Committee V: Institutional Planning Committee (Cale Self, Chair)

Information Item:

- A) Discussion of Variation in Academic Units' Implementation of the Strategic Plan

Chair Self shared some concerns regarding the varied nature of communications between administration and faculty regarding the strategic plan. We have finished the first two 90-Day Sprint, and Chair Self became concerned that he had not seen an update on the data from that 90-day period. In a recent meeting with the Vice-Provost and Incoming IPC Chair Jonathan Corley, Chair Self learned that each unit is going through their own process of discussing their long term goals and strategic priorities to meet each of those goals within these 90-Day periods. While the heads of those units are in charge of communicating that to their faculty, people in each unit are getting vastly different amounts of information concerning how the strategic plan is going and how we are performing. While some are receiving detailed information, others are in the dark, and Chair Self felt that there was a need for more consistent communication from the heads of each academic unit in order to get more prolific buy-in from faculty. After opening the floor for discussion and seeing none, Chair Williams invited the IPC to use their college reps to survey faculty to get a sense of their feelings on the subject and perhaps bring a formal recommendation to the Faculty Senate for a vote in March or April. Chair Self appreciated the opportunity to provide an update on their progress and agreed to take up this measure within the IPC.

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

- A) Joint Parking Subcommittee Report by Heather A. D. Mbaye, Chair, and Mark Reeves, Interim Chief Business Officer ([Figure 4](#) and [Figure 5](#))

Interim Vice President for Business and Financial Services Mark Reeves shared a PowerPoint presentation (see [Figure 5](#)) that summarized the proposed parking fee increase first proposed in Spring 2021 as well as the recommendations for AY23 and beyond made by the joint Parking and Transportation Subcommittee with members from the Faculty Senate Facilities and Information Technologies Committee and the Faculty Senate Budget Committee (see [Figure 4](#)). (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 2:27:22) Mr. Reeves stated that the fleet of busses is aging and diesel fuel costs are increasing, so costs are constantly on the rise. The bottom line

recommendation is \$73,000 in faculty/staff parking fees per year without escalation. He has shared both models on Slide 6 in [Figure 5](#) with President Kelly, but he is unsure which will be approved. The joint Parking and Transportation Subcommittee Chair Dr. Heather Mbaye added that the subcommittee took this work very seriously and tried to work as openly and with the best intentions possible. She noted that their recommendation isn't just for an increase in parking fees as outlined in [Figure 4](#) but also a more systematic study that includes a ridership survey and a gradual discontinuation of the apartment shuttle. Dr. Mbaye thanked everyone for their hard work, specifically Dr. Gavin Lee, Dr. David Nickell, Dr. Phillip Grant, Interim VP Reeves, and former VP John Haven.

When asked if it were possible to subcontract or lease busses rather than buy new or rehabilitate our existing fleet, Mr. Reeves replied that this was always a possibility, but we have had plenty of studies done on this front and our fleet is extremely efficient and cost effective. Another question posed to Mr. Reeves asked about alternative fuel transportation vehicles. He responded that they have looked into it twice, but there were challenges in getting the charging stations added for the busses and he welcomed any suggestions and help with this. Faculty Development Committee Chair Dr. Patrick Erben stated that Georgia Power is currently advertising the installation of electric charging stations around the state. Mr. Reeves stated that Georgia Power was not interested in this in the past, but things have clearly changed and he would look into it.

Faculty Senate Budget Committee Chair Dr. Laurie Kimbrel wanted to provide the body with the perspective of Budget Committee. She noted that the Budget Committee unanimously recommended that this be tabled until the new Vice President for Business and Financial Services is in place, as they hope that this individual will have a different perspective and more creative way to solve the problem than to lay the burden on the backs of the faculty. Dr. Kimbrel added that this is not a problem that faculty created for themselves, nor were faculty asked when parking lots were financed. Therefore, faculty should not be expected to solve this problem.

Dr. David Nickell noted that the surplus by itself covers the fee increase, maintaining a balanced budget. He noted further that the apartment shuttle, which costs over \$100,000 per year to run, was created to help alleviate the parking issues on

campus that have been alleviated by the addition of new lots. Dr. Nickell stated that we could cut that service or ask apartments to pay for a service that they use as a selling point for students. He echoed Dr. Kimbrel's sentiments that the burden should not be on the faculty, and that we should wait until the new VP is hired.

When asked to discuss the proposed \$5000 pay increase, Mr. Reeves confirmed that the state will not fund the Auxiliary and a \$5000 pay increase for Auxiliary employees would have to come from other revenue streams.

Other members of the body shared their appreciation for the time the subcommittee spent on this, while several expressed their frustration that the proposed fee schedule seemed to place the financial burden on the faculty and staff with lower annual incomes.

At 4:15pm, Chair Williams called for a vote for an endorsement of the Joint Parking Subcommittee Report. The resulting vote did not pass with 19 in favor, 20 opposed, and 9 abstentions.

Information Item:

A) Update on WorkWest navigation issues and Web Editors ([Figure 6](#))

After concerns were raised by a number of faculty about the difficulties navigating WorkWest and the UWG Website, FITC reached out to a number of people on campus to find out more information which led to the list of contacts in [Figure 6](#). Please contact the corresponding person on that list in the event of any issue with data content and/or quality. Chair Fuentes stated that our websites are maintained by UCM Web Services, adding that they are working towards creating a smaller and more manageable web presence. Please report any broken links [here](#).

6. Old Business
7. New Business

A) Discussion of SB 377 ([Figure 7](#) and [Figure 8](#))

Chair Williams began by stating that he hoped that everyone had a chance to read the text of SB377 included in [Figure 7](#), and noted that he originally intended to invite Senator Mike Dugan to this meeting. However, after receiving some communication from the administration regarding that invitation, Chair Williams stated that Faculty Senate Diversity and Internationalization Chair Dr. Mike Hester was taking notes during this

discussion and would be crafting a letter for President Kelly. He then opened the floor for the continued discussion of this bill that began earlier in the meeting, as well as what faculty in attendance thought should be included in that letter to President Kelly. (See [February 18, 2022 Faculty Senate Zoom Meeting](#), starting at 3:16:33)

While many reiterated the apprehensions previously shared during Q&A, others added their concerns on how this would affect accreditation, recruitment, course offerings, and both the quality and stability of our programs, as well as whether sanctions could be issued against a faculty member who was found to be in violation of any ban put into place. While some questioned the constitutionality of this bill, others feared that SB377 would be tied to recent BOR revisions to the annual review process. Others expressed concerns over what they saw as a lack of repudiation by administration of an assault on academic freedom, while others noted that this would infringe upon and suppress our students' academic freedom as well. Many in attendance agreed that this would only succeed in alienating vulnerable and often marginalized students. There was considerable discussion about the problematic and often repeated language first noted in line 39 of the bill stating if "an individual should feel discomfort, guilt, anguish, or any other form of psychological distress because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity," as well as the language in the bill that prohibited an educator from teaching students the history and existence of systematic racism in the United States.

It was pointed out that, while we cannot speak to our students and Faculty Senate cannot invite Senator Dugan to a Senate meeting, we could write a personal letter from our own private email addresses. The Provost noted that if an individual employee wishes to share their own views on political issues externally, he affirms and supports their right to do so. Within the guidelines of the USG, however, it must be made clear that they are expressing a personal view and do not represent the views of the USG or the institution, without using UWG resources (including work email account).

Dr. Sethna noted that UWG used to invite legislators to campus and they were pleased to come, and he felt that it would be ideal to pose the questions raised in this discussion directly to Senator Dugan. He asked for administration to give faculty some guidance as to what would be considered protected speech within the classroom. The Provost stated that he affirmed the diversity of thought and academic freedom within the

disciplines across campus. He asked that faculty interested in inviting a legislator to campus coordinate their efforts with Dr. Russell Crutchfield's Office.

Dr. Hester stated that he has organized his notes for the letter to President Kelly into three categories: (1) communication on campus and specifically how the administration communicates with employees on campus and how employees on campus might communicate with the appropriate authorities on campus with regards to this issue, (2) the protection of faculty and academic freedom, and how the administration advocates on our behalf, and (3) the content of the bill and what it does to academic freedom and higher education generally. He invited faculty to email him to send more information and/or examples, and stated that he would begin drafting the letter this weekend.

[After the Senate meeting concluded, Dr. Hester drafted the letter found in [Figure 8](#) and it was taken to the Faculty Senate for an electronic vote on Wednesday, February 23, 2022. The Faculty Senate approved the letter with 26 in favor, 0 opposed, and 6 abstentions.]

- B) Resolution on the Administration's Communication with the Faculty Senate about Government Activities ([Figure 9](#))

Chair Williams stated that this resolution originated through the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in response to the discussion that the Executive Committee had with the Provost about SB377. Many felt that there needed to be a statement made by the faculty to the President and the administration on the way in which the administration communicates with the faculty regarding pending legislation. There was further concern that if the Senate had not taken up the issue of SB377 that the faculty potentially would never have heard from the administration on this issue. After seeing no questions or comment on this resolution from the body, Chair Williams called for a vote. This resolution passed with 34 in favor, 1 opposed, and 5 abstentions.

- 8. Announcements
- 9. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:59pm.

Respectfully submitted by Colleen Vasconcellos, Executive Secretary

Figure 1

Modifications to the 2022-2023 Graduate Catalog
International Admissions (p. 27)

APPROVED MODIFIED VERSION

International Admissions

International students must submit a complete application packet to the office of International Student Admissions and Programs (ISAP) prior to the deadline of the desired program*. If the application is incomplete after the deadline has passed for the semester in which admission is sought, the application may be considered for the following semester pending receipt of all necessary materials to complete the application packet.

*Applicants are strongly encouraged to apply four (4) to six (6) months prior to program deadline. Due to the need to complete the application for a student visa, programs that have a late deadline may not allow for sufficient time to obtain the necessary travel authorizations.

Admission Requirements

Admission of international students is based on academic admissibility, and English proficiency. International students must also provide proof of financial means to study in the United States, as per the requirements for a U.S. student visa. Applicants wanting to apply for admission to the Graduate School at the University of West Georgia must comply with all requirements listed by the program, as well as the below general requirements that apply to all international applicants:

1. Previous Education: Submit official transcripts from each college or university you have attended. If this institution is based internationally and does not currently hold United States regional accreditation, an internal academic credential evaluation will be performed to determine the American equivalent of the courses/degrees earned. The University of West Georgia reserves the right to request a formal Academic Credential Evaluation of transcripts/documents submitted to the University as part of the student's application. If requested, the student must provide a course-by-course evaluation, with a GPA conversion, of all post-secondary coursework from a service belonging to either the National Association of Credential Evaluation Services (NACES), or the Association of International Credential Evaluators (AICE).

Students applying to the College of Education must have their evaluation completed by Josef Silny & Associates, Inc. or Educational Credential Evaluators, Inc. Failing to have an evaluation from one of these two agencies will result in the applicant being denied admission to the College of Education.

2. Proof of English: All students must prove their English language proficiency. Waivers for formal ESL examination are available to those who have completed an approved educational program from one of the following countries: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Canada (except Quebec), Ireland, Jamaica, New Zealand, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, United Kingdom, and the

United States. Exemptions from other countries are possible and will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. These requests will be reviewed and approved by the office of International Student Admissions and Programs (ISAP).

For students who require external verification of their English proficiency, one of the below must be submitted in support of their application:

Official Scores from an approved test of English:

Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), International English Language Testing Systems (IELTS) "Academic," Pearson Test of English (PTE) "Academic," Cambridge tests of Advanced English (CAE) or Proficiency in English (CPE), or the EIKAN Test in Practical English Proficiency (EIKAN).

Please see the policy at

https://www.usg.edu/international_education/international_students/general_admission_requirements for the minimum score requirements for these exams.

3. Financial Certification: All international applicants, which require sponsorship for an F-1 or J-1 visa, must submit financial documentation indicating evidence of sufficient funds available for study at UWG. These documents are not required to receive a decision on an application but are required prior to the release of any documents needed for the visa application process.

In order to attract international students, the University may waive all or a part of the nonresident portion of tuition for select graduate international applicants who meet certain academic criteria. Upon acceptance, an international student may apply for this waiver with the office of International Student Admissions and Programs (ISAP).

A limited number of waivers are available, and not all eligible international applicants will receive a waiver. Students awarded a waiver must maintain minimum requirements, including GPA, and apply for a renewal of the waiver for each academic year of their study. These awards can be included in the Financial Certification as part of the I-20 creation process. Receipt of all official documents and confirmed offer of admission is required for the release of the I-20.

Figure 2

Course Attributes for High Impact Practices (HIPs)

Service-Learning Attributes

November 2021

HIPs Attributes Process

The University System of Georgia has requested that all institutions develop criteria and a process for assigning attributes for High Impact Practices (HIPs) in Banner. Information on the USG criteria and definitions for all eleven HIPs can be found [HERE](#).

[The LEAP West Committee](#) is charged by the Provost with guiding the successful design and implementation of High Impact Practices (HIPs) at the University of West Georgia. Campus work to develop and expand HIPs and other experiential learning opportunities for students is known at UWG as *LEAP West!* In 2015, the Faculty Senate endorsed a [resolution](#) to support The University of West Georgia's inclusion in Georgia's petition to become a LEAP State. The petition was formally approved by the University System of Georgia and the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) in 2016. The University of West Georgia is a member of the [LEAP State Georgia Consortium](#), which is affiliated with the [University System of Georgia's](#) initiatives to expand student access to HIPs. Additional information about AAC&U's LEAP initiatives can be found [HERE](#).

In Fall 2021, the LEAP West Committee submitted a [proposal](#) to the Academic Programs Committee of the Faculty Senate that outlined the campus process for assigning attributes to courses in Banner. The proposal was approved by the Faculty Senate in September 2021. The proposal outlines two stages in the HIPs implementation process:

- 1) The LEAP West Committee will develop in consultation with faculty representatives from each of the academic colleges and schools criteria for assigning HIPs attributes in Banner to courses. These criteria will be submitted to the Academic Programs Committee for review, revision, and approval before being sent forward to the Faculty Senate for final approval.
- 2) Once criteria have been approved, the LEAP West Committee will communicate and coordinate with faculty and academic programs on submitting course materials (typically, a syllabus) for the assignment of HIPs attributes. Courses will then be submitted to the Undergraduate Programs Committee for approval. Once final approval by the Faculty Senate has been received, the LEAP West Committee will coordinate with the Office of the Registrar to have attributes assigned.

How Course Attributes Benefit Students, Faculty, and Academic Programs

Service-Learning (SL) is an important High Impact Practice that the USG has identified for inclusion in Banner. The University of West Georgia aspires for every student to have the opportunity to engage in service-learning. The SL course designation would allow students to

identify courses in the schedule of classes in Banweb that include an undergraduate research component. The attributes would also enable faculty to list courses that have received a SL or other HIPs designation as an evidentiary source in their teaching portfolios. Once attributes are assigned to courses, academic units could also establish program or degree requirements aligned to Service-Learning or other HIPs that meet their specific educational goals. Assigning attributes to courses in Banner does not capture all HIPs occurring on campus, since some student involvement in HIPs takes place in co-curricular or extra-curricular settings. How UWG captures these experiences will be addressed in the next stages of this work.

Institutional History of Service-Learning at the University of West Georgia

Service-Learning was the first High Impact Practice to be officially recognized by the University of West Georgia and the first to have attributes assigned to courses in Banner. The Service-Learning Campus Committee, chaired by Dr. Tami Ogletree, drafted a formal definition and criteria for Service-Learning that was submitted to the Strategic Planning Committee and approved by the [Faculty Senate](#) on 12/4/2015 (See Appendix C). The definition and criteria approved by the Faculty Senate in 2015 are included below:

Service Learning is a structured teaching and learning strategy within a course that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and address community priorities.

The Instructor is equipped with knowledge and resources to ensure that:

The need is identified by the community being served.

Students engage in critical reflection.

The service is aligned with student learning outcomes for which the student receives academic credit.

It is a mutually beneficial partnership that balances student learning with service to the community.

With this approved definition and criteria in place, UWG implemented a process (beginning in 2016) through which faculty could submit a course to receive a Service-Learning attribute in Banner.

In meeting the new USG guidelines for assigning HIPs attributes in Banner, UWG retains and affirms the essential elements of the original definition and criteria approved in 2015. The only significant difference involves a secondary attribute which will be assigned to all approved SL courses to identify the range of contact hours that students will be engaged in Service-Learning (see Appendix B). UWG will require all courses that receive the SL attribute to engage students in a minimum of eleven (11) service-learning contact hours.

Courses that already have been through the approval process and that have received the SL attribute will not have to go through the approval process again. However, they will be asked to

submit an updated syllabus and indicate the number or range of required service-learning so that the appropriate USG SL attribute can be assigned.

Service-Learning Definition

Service-learning can be defined as “a course-based, credit-bearing educational experience in which students (a) participate in an organized service activity that meets identified community needs and (b) reflect on the service activity in such a way as to gain further understanding of course content, a broader appreciation of the discipline, and an enhanced sense of personal values and civic responsibility” (Bringle, Hatcher, & McIntosh, 2006, p.12). The University of West Georgia defines service-learning as a structured teaching and learning strategy within a course that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and address community priorities. In addition, the Instructor is equipped with knowledge and resources to ensure the following:

- The need is identified by the community being served.
- Students engage in critical reflection.
- The service is aligned with student learning outcomes for which the student receives academic credit.
- It is a mutually beneficial partnership that balances student learning with service to the community, with community partners and faculty collaboratively planning service-learning projects.

Criteria for Service-Learning

The University System of Georgia has established codes in Banner for institutions to assign to courses that meet the institution’s criteria for Service-Learning and has provided guidelines for institutions in designating a course as a High-Impact Practice (See Appendix B).

1. Identification of service-learning site(s) for student participation that aligns with course content, learning outcomes, and material in a co-curricular fashion, intentionally designed by the faculty.
2. A minimum of 10 hours of service-learning participation required in community required by the course, at the sponsored site, outside of the classroom. These hours of service completed by students qualify as the “contact hours” identified by USG.
3. An integration of student service-learning experiences within course content (i.e., students share experiences and/or progress within service-learning sites as the semester progresses).
4. A culminating course-required activity (e.g., paper, presentation) whereby students are expected to combine course content and material with their service-learning experience in a critically reflective manner.

Process for Having a Course Designated as a SL Level course

The campus LEAP West Faculty Committee will periodically throughout the year issue invitations for faculty to submit courses to receive the SL designation. As part of this process, faculty would submit an application form (see appendix B) along with the course syllabus to the faculty committee. The committee would then evaluate the syllabus according to the SL criteria (see appendix B), recommend changes to the syllabus to fully meet the criteria, and recommend a SL level designation. All courses submitted and the committee's recommendations would be sent to the Undergraduate or Graduate Programs Committee of the Faculty Senate for approval. Once a course has been approved, the Office of the Registrar would assign the attribute.

Examples of Learning Outcomes for Courses Designated as Service-Learning Courses

To receive the SL attribute, a course must include at least one learning outcome that defines how SL is incorporated into the course. This can be an approved course learning outcome or a learning outcome that the instructor specifically designs to meet the SL objective. Below are examples of learning outcomes in order to meet SL criteria for a course:

SL Learning Outcome Example 1: Students will engage in at least 10-15 hours of co-curricular service-learning within their instructor-approved service-learning site related to child and adolescent development.

SL Learning Outcome Example 2: Students will engage in dialogue with faculty and peers evidencing an integration of course content with their service-learning experiences.

Appendix A

Course Approval for Service-Learning Designation

Name of person responsible for this submission:

Program (e.g. Chemistry):

Program Director:

Department:

Department Chair:

Course Number (e.g. ENGL 1101):

Course Title:

Brief Course Description:

Learning Outcomes for the Course:

Will multiple sections of this course be taught in any given semester: Yes No

Community Partner:

Is approval being sought for all sections or specific sections?

For the following categories, please select the activity that most closely aligns with what will be expected in this course:

Investment of Time in the Field: Fewer than 10 hours 11-20 hours 21-50 hours 51 or more hours

(Investment of time refers to the amount of time the student is expected to put into the service-learning component of this course. This does not include in-class time, but includes time the student might spend outside of class participating in service-learning).

Dissemination of resulting reflection project: shared with a small group

Shared in class

Publicly shared (outside of class, e.g. conference presentation)

Publicly shared (publication)

Is student reflection upon the project required? Yes No

- Faculty Feedback:
- None
 - General and Limited
 - Specific to course project but not iterative
 - Specific to course project and iterative
 - Extensive, specific, and iterative

The student is required to engage in a literature review and/or combine course material with their service-learning project:

Not at all

limitedly

moderately

extensively

The student will provide written evidence of understanding of disciplinary method:

Not at all

Limitedly

Moderately

Extensively

The student will provide explanation of service-learning experience and integration of course content:

Not at all

Limitedly

Moderately

Extensively

What is the service-learning outcome associated with the course?

Appendix B

University System of Georgia

Service-Learning Criteria and Coding Guidelines

Identifying Service-Learning Courses as a High Impact Practice for Inclusion in Banner

What is a High Impact Practice?

The American Association of Colleges & Universities has established a set of High Impact Practices that encourage postsecondary institutions to adopt and scale. High Impact Practices are teaching and learning practices that have been widely tested and have been shown to be beneficial for college students from many backgrounds. These practices take many different forms, depending on learner characteristics and on institutional priorities and contexts.

Guidelines for Qualifying a Service-Learning Course as a High Impact Practice

The University System of Georgia (USG) institutions should consider the following guidelines as they engage in a review process to identify whether a Service-Learning course should be categorized as a High Impact Practice in the Banner Student Information System. The guidelines were developed in consultation with USG institutional representatives involved in the implementation of Service-Learning courses. These guidelines expand upon those articulated by the American Association of Colleges & Universities to provide just-in-time answers for USG institution faculty:

1. Identification of service-learning site(s) for student participation that aligns with course content and material in a co-curricular fashion, intentionally designed by the faculty.
2. A minimum of 10 hours of service-learning participation required in community required by the course, at the sponsored site, outside of the classroom. These hours of service completed by students qualify as the “contact hours” identified by USG.
3. An integration of student service-learning experiences within course content (i.e., students share experiences and/or progress within service-learning sites as the semester progresses).
4. A culminating course-required activity (e.g., paper, presentation) whereby students are expected to combine course content and material with their service-learning experience in a critically reflective manner.

Characteristics of Service-Learning Courses as a High Impact Practice

- Field-based “experiential learning” with community partners.
- Direct experience with issues students are studying in the curriculum
- Ongoing efforts to analyze and solve problems in the community.
- Performance expectations set at appropriately high levels
- A significant investment of time and effort over an extended period of time.
- Interactions with faculty and peers about substantive matters
- Experiences with diversity, wherein students are exposed to and must contend with people and circumstances that differ from those with which students are familiar

- Feedback is frequent, timely and constructive
- Periodic and structured opportunities for students to reflect on and integrate learning
- Opportunities to discover the relevance of learning through real-world applications
- Public demonstration of competence

Identifying Service-Learning Courses for Inclusion in Banner

Institutions have the sole authority to establish a process and criteria for the review of Service Learning courses to determine if they qualify as a High Impact Practice. The USG does not make the determination but provides these guidelines to promote system-wide consistency. The institutional process for qualifying courses as High Impact Practices may include a review committee of faculty and teaching staff at the college or academic department level. Institutions should consider developing a process for faculty to submit courses for review. Review committees can determine the nature of the application process to approve course artifacts that should be included in the review process. Artifacts might include a course syllabus and lesson plan. With the assistance of the Guidelines for Qualifying for a Service Learning course as a High Impact Practice, each institution will develop its own criteria qualifying a course. The final decision for approving a Service Learning Course as a High Impact Practice rests at the institution-level.

The institution may qualify non-course, non-credit based experiences as High Impact Practices. Campuses have the discretion to identify these experiences in Banner as a non-credit based course option in a manner that is consistent with institutional practice. If non-course, non-credit based experiences are entered into Banner, they must use the High Impact Practice codes included in this document.

Banner Code Categories

The Banner Codes for qualified Service-Learning Courses will include the following categories

Primary Codes: Must have one primary code

Code	Description
ZSL P	Service-learning course meets institution's criteria as a High Impact Practice for Service-Learning

Contact Hour Codes: Include code indicating number of hours student is engaged in Service-Learning, if applicable

Code	Description
ZSL1	Service-learning courses that require 10 or less hours of service
ZSL2	Service-learning courses that require 11-20 hours of service
ZSL3	Service-learning courses that require 21-50 hours of service

ZSL4	Service-learning courses that require 51 or more hours of service
------	---

Required Course Codes: For each course section that meets the following institution criteria

Code	Description
ZHIR	Course meets a High Impact Practice requirement established by the institution.

The following scenarios must be met in order to successfully pass the data validations in Banner.

- Each course section must have one primary code.
- Each course section must have one contact hour code, where applicable. If not applicable, leave blank.
- Each course section must include a code to indicate it is a required course by the institution, if applicable. If not, leave blank.
- Each course section must use all required course codes if the course meets the criteria associated with the code.
- Campuses have the option to develop additional institution-based codes and establish criteria for using the codes for their Service-Learning experience courses.

Primary Code

Service-Learning course meets institution's criteria as a High Impact Practice for Service-Learning

Contact Hour Code

Number of hours a student is engaged in Service-Learning activities as defined by the institution.

Required Course Code

Course section meets a High Impact Practice requirement established by the institution.

Courses that meet an institutional requirement that graduates complete a minimum number of courses or non-course-based experiences designated as a High Impact Practice. The requirement, to include the type and number of student experiences, is determined by the institution.

The USG may add additional codes, as necessary.

Appendix C
Service-Learning Definition and Criteria
Approved by the [Faculty Senate](#), 12/4/2015

Committee VI: Strategic Planning Committee (Heather Mbaye, Chair)

Action Item:

A) The Strategic Planning Committee recommends the adoption of the following definition, created by a committee under the guidance of Tami Ogletree and Melanie McClellan.

Service Learning

Service Learning is a structured teaching and learning strategy within a course that integrates meaningful community service with instruction and reflection to enrich the learning experience, teach civic responsibility, and address community priorities.

The Instructor is equipped with knowledge and resources to ensure that:

The need is identified by the community being served.

Students engage in critical reflection.

The service is aligned with student learning outcomes for which the student receives academic credit.

It is a mutually beneficial partnership that balances student learning with service to the community.

In the discussion on this item, Dr. Ogletree explained that having a University definition of service learning is a necessary first step before applying to be a Service Learning institution (Community Engagement Classification, administered by Carnegie). After this, they will plug courses in, have a database, etc. Students get certification if they take enough courses. It was noted that service learning is tied to a course, not a program. This initiative is intended to help with RPG (retention, progression, graduation).

Item approved unanimously by voice vote.

Figure 3

Academic Affairs Handbook

The following represents the new language in the Academic Affairs Handbook that is reflective of the new policy language related to post-tenure review and annual evaluations. These modifications will require some renumbering of existing handbook sections.

4.4 Faculty Evaluation Systems

BOR Policies:

- 3.2.1 Faculty Membership
 - 3.2.1.1 Corps of Instruction
 - 3.2.1.2 Administrative Officers
- 8.3.5.1 Annual Evaluation
- 8.3.5.1 Pre-tenure Evaluation
- 8.3.7 Tenure Evaluation
- 8.3.6 Promotion Evaluation
- 8.3.5.4 Post-Tenure Evaluation
- 8.3.8 Non-Tenure Track Personnel

The USG faculty evaluation system is comprised of annual evaluation, three-year pre-tenure evaluation, tenure evaluation, promotion evaluation and post-tenure evaluation. For faculty hired as a lecturer, senior lecturer, principal lecturer, instructor, or as an academic professional, the evaluation system is comprised of annual evaluations and promotion evaluation.

Each institution is responsible for establishing definitive policies, processes, and stated criteria for faculty evaluation that are aligned with the mission, statutes, and academic organization of the institution and are consistent with Regents' policies. These policies, processes, and stated criteria must incorporate appropriate due process mechanisms and support the principles of academic freedom. Institutional performance criteria must be identified and defined at each level of evaluation and must be stated in writing and available in the institution's faculty handbook posted on an institution's website. All changes to performance criteria must be updated in the faculty handbook in a timely fashion. These updates must be done in advance of the next review cycle and allow time for faculty to incorporate those expectations into the preparation of their review documents (e.g. pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure).

Policies, Processes, and Reporting

Each institution must have written and published faculty evaluation review policies, processes, and criteria for faculty that are consistent with Board of Regents policy and USG guidelines and approved by the USG Chief Academic Officer. Each institution should develop templates for annual review, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure applications. These templates should provide clear guidance to what the faculty members need to submit. Tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty, and faculty outside of the tenure process should be evaluated based upon their academic discipline-specific criteria, and the institutional evaluation rubric, consistent with the system level review policies and guidelines detailed in this handbook. All USG annual faculty evaluations must utilize the following Likert scale:

- 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations
- 2 – Needs Improvement
- 3 – Meets Expectations
- 4 – Exceeds Expectations
- 5 – Exemplary

Noteworthy achievement as referenced in BOR Policy 8.3.7.3 is reflective of a 4 or 5 on the above Likert Scale. Deficient and unsatisfactory as referenced throughout this document is reflective of a 1 or a 2 on the above Likert Scale. Annually, each institution must submit information regarding faculty annual reviews and PTR review outcomes to the Board of Regents. The reporting guidelines, structure, and timelines will be disseminated by the USG Academic Chief Officer.

Training

The USG will develop and deliver system-wide professional development trainings and resources for academic administrators who supervise faculty. Professional development training sessions and resources will be posted on MomentumU@USG, the USG virtual professional development platform. Each institution is responsible for ensuring that academic administrators are properly trained for all levels of evaluation as-outlined in the Board of Regents Policy Manual and procedures disseminated by the USG Chief Academic Officer. Each institution must develop a robust annual professional development plan for academic administrators and faculty to ensure adherence to Board Policy procedures outlined in this handbook. In addition, the institution is responsible to provide professional development to faculty who serve on tenure and post tenure review committees.

Auditing Institutional Plans and Processes

Periodically, the USG Division of Internal Audits will perform institutional audits of annual, pre-tenure, tenure, promotional and post tenure (PTR) policies and procedures, for compliance with Board of Regents policies. The institutional audit reports and identified issues will be shared with the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Chief Academic Officer, and the Board of Regents Committees on Internal Audit, Risk, and Compliance, and Academic Affairs.

While the Board of Regents has delegated authority for tenure decisions to institution presidents, if an institution is adjudged to be carrying out its faculty review process in an insufficiently rigorous manner the Board of Regents may move the authority to award tenure to the Board level until institutional processes have been remediated. (BOR 8.3.7.1 Faculty)

Review Principles and Guidelines

Each institution should use the following Review Principles and Guidelines to develop their institution-specific evaluation systems. The institutional evaluation system must be approved by the USG Chief Academic Officer.

- Campuses will create clear and transparent assessment criteria and rubrics for faculty performance in each assessed campus category. Evaluation and assessment criteria must align to the mission and values of the institution. Departments may further develop institutional assessment criteria and rubrics specific to their discipline.
- Criteria should be developed for each stage of a faculty member's career from untenured Assistant Professor, through various levels of promotion, to stages of tenured Full Professor. Analogous criteria should also be developed for faculty who serve outside the tenure structure. These criteria will provide sufficient guidance to assess whether a faculty member's performance is appropriate to their stage of professional career development at their institution, college/school, and in their department.
- The development of these criteria should reflect the involvement of the institution through its academic affairs organization, colleges, departments, faculties,-and should be approved through the institution's faculty governance processes and procedures.
- Both qualitative and quantitative assessments are acceptable; however, all methods of evaluation should strive for objectivity and reduce subjectivity as much as possible.
- The measure of "Effectiveness in Academic Assigned Duties" should include assessments of both instructional quality and quality learning. Criteria should include measures such as an assessment of student perception, evidence of effective student learning, the use of continuous improvement methodologies, peer assessment of pedagogy, an evaluation of curricular design, quality of assessment and course construction, and the use of established learning science methodologies.

- Evaluation of the Student Success component will involve an assessment of the faculty member's involvement in activities inside and outside the classroom that deepen student learning and engagement for all learners. These aspects may include effective advising and mentoring; undergraduate and graduate research; other forms of experiential learning; engagement in other high impact practices; the development of student success tools and curricular materials; strategies to improve student career success; involvement in faculty development activities; and other activities identified by the institution to deepen student learning. Examples include, but are not limited to, Centers for Teaching and Learning, Chancellor's Learning Scholars, Faculty Learning Communities and MomentumU@USG.
- Evaluation of Research and Scholarship will take place within the context and mission of their department at that institution, whether within the faculty member's discipline area, or as part of their scholarship of teaching and learning.
- The institution will adjudge the Professional Service component by considering activities that include Institutional Service – such as various forms of active engagement, committee work, faculty senate activities, and major institution and/or system initiatives; Service to the Discipline – discipline-related service in local, regional, national, and international organizations; and community involvement.

Annual Evaluation

Faculty are evaluated annually by their appropriate supervisor as defined by the institution against the minimum criteria listed in the BOR Policy 8.3.5.1 and BOR Policy 8.3.7.3. The annual evaluation will encompass teaching; undergraduate/graduate student success activities; research/scholarship/creative activity or academic achievement; professional service to the institution or community; and continuous professional growth appropriate to the institution's sector and mission, college or school and department. Institutions must ensure that workload percentages for faculty roles and responsibilities are factored into the performance evaluation model in a consistent manner. The overall evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward the next level of review appropriate to their rank, tenure status, and career stage as noted in the abovementioned Likert scale.

- The faculty member is responsible for providing documentation and materials for the annual evaluation. The appropriate supervisor will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's annual written evaluation and his/her progression towards achieving future milestones.
- The faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that he/she has been apprised of the content of the annual written evaluation.
- The faculty member will be given a specific period (e.g., 10 working days) to respond in writing to the annual written evaluation, with this response to be attached to the evaluation.
- The appropriate supervisor will acknowledge in writing the receipt of the 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. The specific time period for this response is 10 working days from the faculty member's rebuttal/response. This acknowledgement will also become a part of the official personnel records. Annual reviews are not subject to discretionary review.
- If the performance in any of the categories is judged to be a 1 – Does Not Meet Expectations or a 2 – Needs Improvement, the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) to remediate their performance during the next year. The appropriate supervisor will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member. This will become part of the official personnel records.

Third Year Pre-Tenure Review (On Track Not Tenured)

Faculty who are employed on an annual tenure track contract will undergo a third-year pre-tenure review. Individual institutions will choose whether this review will serve in lieu of the annual evaluation or will be in addition to the annual evaluation. The purpose of the third-year pre-tenure review is to provide a rigorous analysis and detailed feedback of the faculty member's body of work in the areas of teaching, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service towards tenure. The institution is responsible for clearly identifying the policies and procedures for third year pre-tenure reviews. This process should at least include a review from the department chair, peers, college/school wide tenure committee (if used) and the Dean. The previous annual evaluations must be part of the review. The overall

evaluation must indicate whether the faculty member is making satisfactory progress toward tenure and promotion (BOR 8.3.5.1).

- The faculty member is responsible for providing documentation and materials for the third-year pre-tenure review, as outline in the institutional guidelines.
- The appropriate supervisor will discuss with the faculty member in a scheduled conference the content of that faculty member's third year pre-tenure review. A written report of the faculty member's progression towards achieving future milestones of tenure will be provided to the faculty member after the conference.
- The faculty member will sign a statement to the effect that he/she has been apprised of the content of the third-year pre-tenure evaluation.
- The faculty member will be given a specific period (e.g., 10 working days) to respond in writing to the third year written evaluation, with this response to be attached to the evaluation.
- The appropriate supervisor will acknowledge in writing receipt of the response, noting changes, if any, in the annual written evaluation made because of either the conference or the faculty member's written response. The specific time period for this response is 10 working days from the faculty member's rebuttal/response. This acknowledgement will become a part of the official records and is not subject to discretionary review.
- If the performance in any of the categories is judged to be not successful/not satisfactory the faculty member must be provided with a Performance Remediation Plan (PRP). The appropriate supervisor will develop the PRP in consultation with the faculty member with feedback from any committee that participated in the third-year review. The PRP must be approved by the Dean of the academic unit. The faculty member will have one year to accomplish the goals/outcomes of the PRP. This will become part of the official personnel records.

Renumber **Award of Tenure** as 4.5 (Keep Current Language)

Renumber **Award of Promotion** as 4.6 (Keep Current Language)

4.7 Post-Tenure Review

Post-Tenure Review

The post-tenure review process shall support the further career development of tenured faculty members as well as ensure accountability and continued strong performance from faculty members after they have achieved tenure. The primary purpose of the post-tenure review process is to assist faculty members with identifying opportunities that will enable them to reach their full potential for contribution to the academic discipline, institution, and the institution's mission. Post-tenure review is intended to provide a longer-term and broader perspective than is usually provided by an annual review. The review should be both retrospective and prospective, encouraging a careful look at possibilities for different emphases at different points of a faculty member's career.

Timeline: All tenured faculty who have rank and tenure with an academic unit must undergo post-tenure review five years after the award of tenure and subsequently every five years unless it is interrupted by a further review for promotion to a higher academic rank (Associate/Full Professor) or academic leadership promotion (e.g. department chair, Dean, Associate Provost).

A tenured faculty member may voluntarily elect to go up for a post-tenure review before the five-year time limit. This enables a faculty member to take full advantage of the feedback and insight provided by their colleagues at a strategic moment in their career, rather than having to wait for the usual 5-year cycle. Early post-tenure reviews should include a review of the faculty member's accomplishments since they were last evaluated for tenure or a previous post-tenure review, whichever was most recent. If the faculty member has a successful review, the next post-tenure review will be five years from the voluntary PTR post-tenure review date. If the faculty member is unsuccessful, the 5-year PTR review date remains in place.

Areas of Evaluation: The evaluation must address the faculty's accomplishments related to teaching, student success activities, research/scholarship, and service. Annual reviews encompassing the previous five years for the 5-year span must be incorporated in the post-tenure review processes. Tenured faculty members are expected to document successive contributions to furthering the mission of the institution through their teaching, student success activities, scholarship/research, and service. Contributions should be dated from previous tenure and promotion milestones and encompass the previous 5-year period.

Outcomes & Consequences of Post Tenure Review

The results of a positive post-tenure review should be linked to recognition or reward. Faculty members who are performing at noteworthy levels should receive recognition for their achievements. Each institution will prescribe how the review results will be related to possible rewards such as formal recognition, merit pay, promotion, educational leave, etc.

In the event of a post-tenure review that does not meet expectations or needs improvement, the faculty member's appropriate supervisor(s) and faculty member will work together to develop a formal Performance Improvement Plan (PIP) in consultation with the PTR committee based around the deficiencies found by the committee. Consistent with the developmental intent of the PTR, the PIP must be designed to assist the faculty member in achieving progress towards remedying the deficiencies identified in the post-tenure review. The PIP must contain clearly defined goals or outcomes, an outline of activities to be undertaken, a timetable, available resources and supports, and an agreed-upon monitoring strategy. The PIP's goals or outcomes must be reasonable, achievable with the timeframe, and reflect the essential duties of the faculty member. The PIP must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the institution's Office of Academic Affairs. Formal meetings for assessing progress on the PIP should be scheduled no less than twice per semester during the fall and spring semesters. The institution should create appropriate due process mechanisms for a faculty member to appeal an unfavorable post-tenure review as outlined below.

The assessment of the PIP will take the place of that year's annual review. Failure to successfully remediate the identified deficiencies, or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation, within one year subjects the faculty member to disciplinary actions up to and including, but not limited to, reallocation of effort, salary reduction, and tenure revocation and dismissal. The institution will follow appropriate due process mechanisms for a faculty member to appeal the final assessment of their PIP and the resulting remedial actions as outlined below.

The appropriate supervisor must meet with each faculty member to discuss the results of PTR. Each faculty member must receive a letter documenting the summary of the findings of the PTR. In the event of an unsuccessful PTR the letter must also include next steps, due process rights, and the potential ramifications if the faculty member does not remediate or demonstrate substantive progress towards remediation in the areas identified as unsatisfactory. The faculty member can provide a written rebuttal that will be attached to the final document however no action is required by the appropriate supervisor.

Corrective Post Tenure Review

A faculty member evaluated as deficient in any one of the elements of teaching, student success activities, research/scholarship, and/or service for two consecutive annual evaluations will participate in a corrective post-tenure review. Note that the deficiency does not have to be in the same area; but could be a different area from one year to the next. This review will be initiated prior to the normally scheduled five-year review. The faculty member will follow the institution's guidelines and procedures for post tenure review. If the outcome of the Corrective Post-Tenure Review is successful, the faculty member will reset the post-tenure review clock. If the outcome of a corrective post tenure review does not meet expectations or needs improvement, the same process for an unsuccessful PTR will be followed. The institution should follow appropriate due-process mechanisms for a faculty member to appeal a corrective post-tenure review as outlined below.

Due Process Following an Unsuccessful Post-Tenure Review or an Unsuccessful Corrective Post-Tenure Review

If, after conducting a final review of appropriate materials and allowing the faculty member an opportunity to be heard at the conclusion of the performance improvement plan, the department chair and dean determine that the faculty

member has failed to make sufficient progress in performance as outlined in the performance improvement plan (or has refused to engage reasonably in the process), the department chair and dean will propose appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies. Upon request by the faculty member, the PTR committee will review the materials that attest to performance improvement plan progress and the proposed remedial action and make their recommendation.

The faculty member has 10 business days from receiving the recommendation of the dean/dept. chair to request the PTR committee review. Upon request to review the recommended action by the faculty member, further due process will include the following:

1. The PTR committee will review the recommendation of the department chair and dean. The PTR committee may exercise its judgment as to whether an in-person hearing is necessary. The recommendation of the PTR committee may be based solely on a review of the record. The PTR committee will issue its recommendation to the Provost and the faculty member within 20 business days of the request for review by the faculty member.
2. Within 5 business days of receiving the recommendation(s) from the PTR committee, the Provost shall send an official letter to the faculty member notifying him or her of the decision.
3. The faculty member may appeal to the President of the institution within 5 business days of receiving the decision from the Provost. The President's final decision shall be made within 10 business days and should notify the faculty member of his or her decision and the process for discretionary review application as provided for in Board of Regents' Policy.
4. If the remedial action taken is dismissal by the President, the faculty member may complete their faculty assignment for the current semester at the discretion of the institution; however, the semester during which a final decision is issued will be the last semester of employment in their current role.
5. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to Board policy on Applications for Discretionary Review (6.26).

Academic Administrators

Academic administrators who hold faculty rank and are tenured at the institution aligned with an academic unit will receive an annual review by their appropriate supervisor and will undergo a comprehensive evaluation, including a 360° feedback assessment every five years. Each institution should specify the process and procedures for a comprehensive evaluation of academic administrators. It is intended that an academic administrator's annual and comprehensive evaluation include a review of traditional faculty activities (teaching, research, student success, and service) that align with the responsibilities of the administrator.

Elements of the Performance Remediation Plan (PRP) and the Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)

There are two different plans for addressing faculty performance: a ***performance remediation plan*** and a ***performance improvement plan***. For faculty who do not meet annual performance expectations a ***performance remediation plan*** is put in place. The purpose of this plan is to scaffold faculty growth and development, strengthen tenure and promotion possibilities. The second, a ***performance improvement plan***, is developed subsequent to an unfavorable PTR or corrective PTR. The components of the PIP and the PRP plans must include the following:

1. Clearly defined goals or outcomes,
2. An outline of activities to be undertaken,
3. A timetable,
4. Available resources and supports,
5. Expectations for improvement

6. Monitoring strategy

Performance Remediation Plan (PRP)

The Performance Remediation Plan is used to document faculty deficiencies based on the outcomes from the annual review. The purpose of the PRP is designed to enable the faculty member to correct unsatisfactory performance in some aspect of their role or responsibilities. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the institution's Office of Academic Affairs or Human Resources wherever the permanent faculty files are housed. Two meetings during the fall and during the spring must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, planned accomplishments for the upcoming quarter. After each meeting, the academic administrator should summarize the meeting and indicate if the faculty member is on track to complete the PRP. Consequences for failure to meet the expectations of the PRP must be stated at the conclusion of each meeting. Each institution should standardize their processes, procedures and forms across all academic units and provide professional development for appropriate personnel.

Performance Improvement Plan (PIP)

The Performance Improvement Plan is used to document deficiencies based on an unfavorable Post Tenure Review. The plan must be approved by the Dean and submitted to the institution's Office of Academic Affairs or Human Resources wherever the permanent faculty files are housed. Two meetings during the fall and during the spring must be held to review progress, document additional needs/resources, planned accomplishments for the upcoming time period. After each meeting, the academic administrator should summarize the meeting and indicate whether the faculty member is on track to complete the PIP. At the conclusion of the academic year the faculty member's progress will be determined by the department chair and dean after taking into account feedback from a committee of faculty colleagues. Each institution should standardize their processes, procedures and forms across all academic units and provide professional development for appropriate personnel.

If the faculty member successfully completes the performance improvement plan, then the faculty member's next post-tenure review will take place on the regular five-year schedule.

If the faculty member fails to make sufficient progress in performance, then the institution shall take appropriate remedial action corresponding to the seriousness and nature of the faculty member's deficiencies. The President will make the final determination on behalf of the institution regarding appropriate remedial action. An aggrieved faculty member may seek discretionary review of the institution's final decision pursuant to the Board Policy on Applications for Discretionary Review.

Interruptions to the Post-Tenure Review Timeline

Institutions should follow existing processes to allow faculty the opportunity to pause the post-tenure review timeline as are already in place at the institution.

Implementation Process and Timeline

Institutions are approaching the process to make changes to their institutional policies in a variety of ways. In order to support the various processes, the USG will have one submission deadline for all revisions with two status updates in April and in September:

Submission Deadlines	Dates
Status Report on Changes to PTR and Annual Review Policies	April 1, 2022
Status Report on Changes to PTR and Annual Review Policies	September 1, 2022
Institutions submit updated PTR and Annual Review policies to USG Chief Academic Officer for approval	No later than October 17, 2022*
USO staff review institutional submissions and provide feedback	No later than November 18, 2022
Institutions take final PTR policies through the formal shared governance process	November and December 2022
<i>Institutional Policy Implementation</i>	
Annual Reviews	The new annual review should be utilized during the first full cycle following its adoption. For example if an institution evaluates on a calendar year cycle, 2023 will be the first year the faculty member will be evaluated on the new standards. If the institution evaluates on the academic calendar, the next cycle will be AY2023-2024.
Post-Tenure Review	No later than AY 2023-2024*
<i>Reporting to the Board of Regents</i>	
Preliminary Report	August 2022
Annual Review	August 2023
PTR	August 2024
<i>Training and Development</i>	
Opportunities for institution collaboration/Q & A	January 2022
Department Chairs, Deans, Academic leadership	February and March 2022
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the new annual evaluation process for development • Recognizing and eliminating bias in the annual review process 	January every year following
*We encourage institutions to send forward annual review and PTR plans as they are ready for USG review.	
Note: Faculty who go up for post-tenure review during the first two years of implementation should be given flexibility based on the adoption of new expectations.	

Figure 4

Report of the Joint Parking Subcommittee 2021-2022 February 9, 2022

Heather A. D. Mbaye, Chair, FITC
John Haven, CBO (before his departure)
Mark Reeves, Interim Chief Business Officer
Philip Grant, FITC
Gavin Lee, Budget
David Nickell, Budget

The Committee met beginning in the Fall of 2021.

We did so as a response to a fee increase that was "rolled back" last fiscal year. To be clear and open with everyone, we found out that the fee increase was "rolled back" last year only in the sense that it was not charged to faculty and staff. It is still technically on the books and the money was generated instead with CARES funds by Mr. Haven.

Our Operation:

First, we carefully reviewed all aspects of the budget of Parking and Transportation (PT). PT budgets, like all Auxiliary budgets, must zero out: that is, they must pay for themselves. We cannot use state or tuition money to augment parking and transportation. It was therefore of critical importance to review the budget of PT to ensure that it was paying for only those things which are actually PT items (parking lot acquisition and creation, buses, parking enforcement, etc). This process took several hours over the course of several months. Mark Reeves and John Haven researched several specific aspects of the budget which were carefully questioned by members of the committee.

In the end, the committee was satisfied that the budget was as lean and correct as it could be (given that budgets occasionally shift based on bus breakdowns, hires, etc.).

Second, we reviewed the revenue side of PT. All students who have on campus classes now pay a \$90 per semester (up to \$270 per year) PT fee. It is not within the purview of the committee to raise that fee, nor would that be allowed by the board.

The Faculty and Staff parking fee is \$15 per year currently. That has not changed since at least 2004. This is primarily due to prior Executive Administration opposing any change to that fee. At this point, a large deficit has been accrued, in large part due primarily to the failure of fee-paying enrollment growth to materialize to pay the debt accrued on new parking lot acquisition and construction. UWG Parking and Transportation struggles to pay the escalating debt service for parking lots, and has very little reserve to replace the aging bus fleet. The committee came to realize there was no other place to increase revenue to balance the budget.

We also reviewed peer institution policies and costs. Most of them are much more expensive, but some institutions allow faculty and staff to park free. Nonetheless, we felt that since we must balance, we needed to increase the fee.

Then we discussed how to increase it. Some of the questions we discussed are:

- Should faculty and staff pay different rates?
- Should we pay different rates based on salary?
- Should we all pay the same rate?
- Should we have lot-based or zone-based rate differences (for example, inner ring of campus and outer ring of campus differing rates)?
- Should we be allowed to buy a second hang tag?
- Should we make a one-time increase to the full amount we need for the budget deficit, or should we graduate the fee so sticker shock is lessened?

The committee agreed to the following, though each was not without dissenting opinions:

- Faculty and staff should not pay different rates based on classification. There are many staff on campus who make more than, for example, a part time faculty instructor teaching one or two classes. 3 faculty agreed; one advocated for this division because there is precedence at other universities.
- Rates will be based on salary. This will protect our lowest paid colleagues, whether part time faculty or staff. It's not pleasant being in the upper ranges, but it is more palatable to those of us making more money to pay more money. The dissenting opinion was that this was unfair since this was the only service UWG provides that is based on salary; we don't charge a variable rate for coffee, for example. However, other members pointed out that parking is the only item employees are required to buy. No one is required to visit Starbucks.
- We concluded that it is more equitable for rates to be differential based on salary. The dissenting opinion was that equitable isn't desirable, but that a flat rate would be more equal for all.
- Lot based and zone-based parking rates would provide a value that we should exploit; however, the committee concluded that they could be very complex to enforce. In addition, faculty and staff who buy a certain zone or lot would expect to be able to park at any time day or night. Some employee lots would be underutilized, and lowest compensated employees could be relegated to the least desirable lots. It could create situations where employees who come in at 3am and go home at noon could be parked at the stadium, and how will they get to their building? It's a logistics issue, and running buses all night would not help the PT budget on the outlays side.
- Employees are welcome to buy a second tag. However, second tags will not be issued for free. Partly this is because tags are movable - you can use it with any car. It's issued to the person, not the vehicle. In addition, we have been burned on free second tags - that is, faculty and staff allowing their student to use the second tag and both using it daily. We know the staff council has a concern about being allowed to get a second tag because it's inconvenient to move it from car to car. However, we

are allowed to buy a second tag to avoid that inconvenience for ourselves if we so choose.

- The committee was concerned with sticker shock, so wanted to try to reduce the categories and to keep the price lower for more faculty and staff.

Our Recommendation:

In the end the committee recommends this fee schedule, with a vote of 4-1 (John Haven having left the university).

Parking fee schedule	#F/S	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027
24,999 or less	100	15	15	15	15	15
\$25,000 to \$49,999	582	40	40	40	40	40
\$50,000-99,999	609	60	60	60	60	60
\$100,000 -149,000	90	100	100	100	100	100
\$150,000 -199,999	9	140	140	140	140	140
\$200,000 +	8	180	180	180	180	180
	1398					

The chair of the committee would like to point out that the highest tier (involving 8 current administration, faculty, or staff) will still be paying less than a student who attends on campus classes Fall, Spring, and Summer in a single year.

We would also like to address the fact that before we were able to conclude our committee work on February 1, the Budget committee met on January 28 and voted to postpone our work until a new VP and Director of PT could be hired. FITC did not know about this nor did we vote to delay action. Only one member of our subcommittee was present at that meeting. The argument made was that we should wait until we have a new permanent Director of Parking and Transportation and Vice President for Business and Finance.

The rest of the subcommittee would like to point out that the University budget, including PT, goes to the BOR on February 14 no matter what we decide or do not decide. This is not ideal, since it would have been best if this went to the Senate before the 14th.

The replacement for Mark Reeves, AVP Auxiliary Services, has been chosen from within the university. While Liz Smith has "vast Auxiliary experience", she is not an "expert" in Parking & Transportation. It also took nearly 6 months to hire Mr. Haven - we may be well into next fiscal year when that process is completed in hiring our new CBO; meanwhile, tags must be ordered and a fee structure set within a matter of weeks.

Therefore, while we cannot govern what the Budget or FITC committees - or indeed, the full Senate - do with this report, in order to maintain faculty input into the process, we decided 3 to 1 to go forward and complete our work.

After a conference committee with the FITC chair and the Senate Chair and Chair elect (the chair of budget was unable to attend), we decided to strongly recommend that we as a faculty continue to work on this issue. After the subcommittee met February 1, other faculty input pointed out several places where it might be possible to reduce spending, rather than only the revenue. We examined briefly, for example, whether the apartment shuttle be eliminated given that housing on campus is not full; however, given that we are in a pandemic and enrollment crunch right now, it may be premature to do that. However, the subcommittee does think that the faculty need to be involved in this going forward, to include reviewing the outlays (including continuing to review the need for buses and routes) and incomes (for example, student parking fees from increased enrollment could remove the need for the faculty/staff fee at all). This would also give a new CBO the opportunity to review this with us. This person may perhaps have another viewpoint or idea we have missed. Others around the university with interest, expertise, and ideas could also be included in the discussion.

The admin and faculty worked really well together on this proposal. While we may not all agree on the outcome, and no one likes an increase in the fee, we felt for a number of reasons including respecting the process of faculty input and maintaining that input going forward that we wanted to bring this to FITC and, if it passes, to Senate.

Figure 5

Parking & Transportation

Faculty & Staff fee AY2023

Spring of 2021 new fee matrix proposed :

Parking Fee for F/S proposed spring 2021				
<u>Annual Pay</u>	<u>Head count</u>	<u>Annual Fee</u>	<u>Revenue</u>	
0-34,999	299	\$15	\$4,485	
35,000 to 49,999	386	\$35	\$13,510	
50,000 to 74,999	518	\$50	\$25,900	
75,000 to 99,999	150	\$75	\$11,250	
100,000 to 124,999	66	\$100	\$6,600	
125,000 to 149,999	23	\$125	\$2,875	
150,000 to 174,999	10	\$150	\$1,500	
175,000 to 199,999	3	\$175	\$525	
\$200,000 and above	8	\$200	\$1,600	
	1463		\$68,245	

Note: \$68,245 x 5 years = \$341,225

Late Summer/ Early Fall 2021 FITC Parking & Transportation Sub-Committee
to further evaluate the financial pressures facing P&T and to make
recommendations for AY23 and beyond

UWG P&T Revenue Streams: Student, Faculty, Staff, and Citations
We also looked at what other schools were charging f/s.

P&T Expenses; including:	Staffing / wages	Fleet operations
	expected benefit inc	Fuel
	Merit ?	Repair and Maintenance
	Enrollment	Covid restrictions
		Software

Surplus generation for future purchase and enhancements

Late September of 2021, USG sent out the annual templates for Auxiliary 5-year Business Plans; including Parking & Transportation.

Proposed Business Plans due to CBO by December and then to USG in early January, 2022. The f/s fee table from spring of 2021 was the basis for one of the revenue increase steps in the fy23 budget.

Additionally, USG sent out annual templates for University's Business Plan; to be submitted in January and Reviewed in "Budget Hearing" Feb 14, 2022 at System Office; again to include Parking and Transportation.

Note: at the time of these submissions we were still uncertain about fall enrollment, fuel prices, repairs & maintenance, merit increases, \$5000, etc

Business Plan Overview

		<u>fy23</u>	<u>fy24</u>	<u>fy25</u>	<u>fy26</u>
Revenues	Student Fees	\$1367k	\$1394k	\$1422k	\$1450k
	Citations, Trips, etc	\$255k	\$260k	\$265k	\$270k
	Faculty / Staff fee	\$68 – 73k	\$68 – 73k	\$68 – 73k	\$68 – 73k
Expenses:	Staff	\$582k	\$600k	\$618k	\$636k
	Operating	\$387k	\$406k	\$426k	\$448k
	Debt Service	<u>\$538k</u>	<u>\$549k</u>	<u>\$565k</u>	<u>\$580k</u>
	Surplus/ Deficit	\$185,000	\$169,000	\$148,000	\$126,000
	Cumulative Reserves	\$281,446	\$246,446	\$396,446	\$222,446
	Purchase new bus(s)			(\$300,000)	

Faculty Senate – FITC – Subcommittee Recommendation

Parking Fee for F/S proposed spring 2021				Faculty Senate - FITC - Subcommittee recommendation Spring 2022			
<u>Annual Pay</u>	<u>Head count</u>	<u>Annual Fee</u>	<u>Revenue</u>	<u>Annual Pay</u>	<u>Head count</u>	<u>Annual Fee</u>	<u>Revenue</u>
0-34,999	299	\$15	\$4,485	\$24,999 or less	100	\$15	\$1,500
35,000 to 49,999	386	\$35	\$13,510	\$25,000 to \$49,999	582	\$40	\$23,280
50,000 to 74,999	518	\$50	\$25,900				
75,000 to 99,999	150	\$75	\$11,250	\$50,000 to 99,999	609	\$60	\$36,540
100,000 to 124,999	66	\$100	\$6,600				
125,000 to 149,999	23	\$125	\$2,875	\$100,000 - 149,999	90	\$100	\$9,000
150,000 to 174,999	10	\$150	\$1,500				
175,000 to 199,999	3	\$175	\$525	\$150,000 - 199,999	9	\$140	\$1,260
\$200,000 and above	8	\$200	\$1,600	\$200,000 and above	8	\$180	\$1,440
	1463		\$68,245		1398		\$73,020

Note: \$68,245 x 5 years = **\$341,225**

Note: \$73,020 x 5 years = **\$365,100**

Figure 6
 [Sign In](#)
 [Search](#)
[UWG Home](#)[Work West](#)[Menu](#)
[Home](#) / [Administration](#) / [Web Editor Guide](#) / [Web Editors List](#)

Web Editors List

President's Division

- Legal Affairs: Marie Melkowski
- Public Service and Outreach: Amanda Wright
- President's Office: Colton Campbell

Academic Affairs

- VPAA: Sonya Adams
- College of Arts, Culture, & Scientific Inquiry: Gwen Davidson
- College of Education: Morgan Kirby
- Continuing Education: Erika McClain
- Extended Learning: Pepper Copenhaver
- Graduate School: Alicia Freed
- Honors College: Jenna Miller
- Library: Angela Pashia
- Richards College of Business: Kathy Cannon
- School of Communication, Film and Media: Mitzi Thompson
- Tanner Health System School of Nursing: Charles Akin
- Registrar: Jennifer McManus, Caley Motes
- University College: Stephanie Urich
- UWG Online: Janet Gubbins, Jason Milam

Administrative Services

- HR: Beverly Dittmer
- ITS: TBA
- VPAS: TBA

Business & Financial Services

- Auxiliary: Sherri Shelnutt
- BF: TBA
- Student Accounts & Billing Services: TBA

Student Affairs

- All Student Affairs sites: Lauren Adams

University Advancement

- Alumni: Kate Theobald
- UCM: Ewa Zennermann

Strategic Enrollment Management

- Admissions: Emily Wurst
- Financial Aid: Wilmani Humphries
- ISAP: Danielle Plummer

Senate Bill 377

By: Senators Hatchett of the 50th, Dugan of the 30th, Mullis of the 53rd, Miller of the 49th, Gooch of the 51st and others

**A BILL TO BE ENTITLED
AN ACT**

1 To amend Titles 20 and 50 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to education
2 and state government, respectively, so as to require state agencies, the Board of Regents of
3 the University System of Georgia, the State Board of the Technical College System of
4 Georgia, units of the University System of Georgia, units of the Technical College System
5 of Georgia, local boards of education, and local school systems to take measures to prevent
6 the use of curricula or training programs which act upon, promote, or encourage certain
7 concepts, with exceptions; to provide for such exceptions; to provide for construction; to
8 require such entities to prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, skin color, or ethnicity;
9 to require that diversity and inclusion training programs and similar efforts directed to the
10 employees or students of such entities shall encourage such employees or students not to
11 judge others based on skin color, or ethnicity; to provide for a complaint resolution policy,
12 process, and appeals for local school systems; to provide for promulgation of model policy
13 and guidance by the State Board of Education; to require the board of regents and the State
14 Board of the Technical College System of Georgia to adopt complaint resolution policies;
15 to provide for penalties; to provide for remedies; to provide for certain responsibilities of
16 state agency heads; to provide for definitions; to provide for related matters; to repeal
17 conflicting laws; and for other purposes.

18 BE IT ENACTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA:

19 **SECTION 1.**

20 Title 20 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to education, is amended in
21 Chapter 2, relating to elementary and secondary education, by adding a new Code section to
22 read as follows:

23 "20-2-243.1.

24 (a) As used in this Code section, the term:

25 (1) 'Divisive concepts' means any of the following concepts, including views espousing
26 such concepts:

27 (A) One race or ethnicity is inherently superior to another race or ethnicity;
28 (B) The United States of America and the State of Georgia are fundamentally or
29 systemically racist;

30 (C) An individual, solely because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity, is
31 inherently racist or oppressive, whether consciously or subconsciously;

32 (D) An individual should be discriminated against or receive adverse treatment solely
33 or partly because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity;

34 (E) An individual's moral character is inherently determined by his or her race, skin
35 color, or ethnicity;

36 (F) An individual, because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity, bears
37 responsibility for actions committed by other individuals of the same race, skin color,
38 or ethnicity, whether past or present;

39 (G) An individual should feel discomfort, guilt, anguish, or any other form of
40 psychological distress because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity;

41 (H) Meritocracy or traits such as a hard work ethic are racist or were created by
42 individuals of a particular race to oppress individuals of another race; or

43 (I) Any form of race or ethnic scapegoating or race or ethnic stereotyping.

44 (2) 'Race or ethnic scapegoating' means assigning fault, blame, or bias to a race or
45 ethnicity or to an individual of a particular race or ethnicity because of his or her race or
46 ethnicity. Such term includes, but is not limited to, any claim that an individual of a
47 particular race or ethnicity, consciously or subconsciously, and by virtue of his or her race
48 or ethnicity, is inherently racist or is inherently inclined to oppress others.

49 (3) 'Race or ethnic stereotyping' means ascribing character traits, values, moral and
50 ethical codes, privileges, status, or beliefs to a race or ethnicity, or to an individual
51 because of his or her race or ethnicity.

52 (b) Each local board of education and local school superintendent shall prohibit employees
53 from discriminating against students and other employees based on race, skin color, or
54 ethnicity.

55 (c)(1) Each local board of education and local school superintendent shall ensure that all
56 diversity and inclusion efforts directed to the employees of their respective school
57 systems shall encourage such employees not to judge students, other employees, or other
58 individuals based on race, skin color, or ethnicity.

59 (2) Each local board of education and local school superintendent may provide for
60 curricula and training programs that foster learning and workplace environments where
61 all students, employees, and school community members are respected and that promote
62 diversity and inclusiveness; provided, however, that any curriculum or mandatory
63 training program, whether taught or facilitated by school personnel or a third party
64 engaged by a local board of education or a local school system, may not teach, act upon,
65 promote, or encourage divisive concepts; and provided, further, that this subsection shall
66 not be construed to prohibit a school administrator, teacher, other school personnel, or an
67 individual facilitating a training program from responding in an objective manner and
68 without endorsement to questions regarding specific divisive concepts raised by students,
69 school community members, or participants in a training program.

70 (d) Nothing in this Code section shall be construed to do any of the following:

71 (1) Inhibit or violate the rights protected by the Constitutions of the United States of
72 America and Georgia or undermine intellectual freedom and free expression;

73 (2) Infringe upon the intellectual vitality of students and employees of local boards of
74 education and local school systems;

75 (3) Prevent a local board of education or local school system from promoting diversity
76 or inclusiveness; provided, however, that such efforts do not conflict with the
77 requirements of this Code section and other applicable laws;

78 (4) Prohibit the discussion of divisive concepts, as part of a larger course of instruction,
79 in an objective manner and without endorsement;

80 (5) Prohibit the use of curriculum that addresses topics of slavery, racial or ethnic
81 oppression, racial or ethnic segregation, or racial or ethnic discrimination, including
82 topics relating to the enactment and enforcement of laws resulting in such oppression,
83 segregation, and discrimination;

84 (6) Create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity
85 by any party against a local board of education or a local school system, or its
86 departments, agencies, or entities, its officers, employees, or agents, or any other person;
87 or

88 (7) Prohibit a state or federal court or agency of competent jurisdiction from ordering
89 training or other remedial action that discusses divisive concepts due to a finding of
90 discrimination, including discrimination based on race, skin color, or ethnicity.

91 (e)(1) No later than August 1, 2022, each local board of education shall adopt a
92 complaint resolution policy for its local school system to address complaints alleging
93 violations of any provision of subsections (b) through (d) of this Code section at a school
94 in such school system. The complaint resolution policy shall provide that:

95 (A) A school or local school system shall not be required to respond to a complaint
96 made pursuant to this subsection unless it is made by:

- 97 (i) The parent of a student enrolled at the school where the alleged violation
98 occurred;
- 99 (ii) A student who has reached the age of majority or is a lawfully emancipated minor
100 and who is enrolled at the school where the alleged violation occurred;
- 101 (iii) An individual employed as a school administrator, teacher, or other school
102 personnel at the school where the alleged violation occurred;
- 103 (iv) The district attorney for the county where the alleged violation occurred;
- 104 (v) The Attorney General;
- 105 (vi) The House Education Committee; or
- 106 (vii) The Senate Committee on Education and Youth.

107 (B) The complaint shall first be submitted in writing to the principal of the school
108 where the alleged violation occurred;

109 (C) The complaint shall provide a reasonably detailed description of the alleged
110 violation;

111 (D) Within three school days of receiving such written complaint, the school principal
112 or his or her designee shall review the complaint and take reasonable steps to
113 investigate the allegations in the complaint;

114 (E) The school principal shall determine whether the alleged violation occurred, in
115 whole or in part;

116 (F) Within five school days of receiving the complaint, unless another schedule is
117 mutually agreed to by the complainant and the school principal, the school principal
118 shall confer with the complainant and inform the complainant whether a violation
119 occurred, in whole or in part, and, if such a violation was found to have occurred, what
120 remedial steps will be taken; provided, however, that the confidentiality of student or
121 personnel information will not be violated;

122 (G) The school principal's determinations provided for in subparagraphs (E) and (F)
123 of this paragraph shall be subject to timely administrative review by the local school

124 superintendent or his or her designee upon a written request by the complainant to the
125 local school superintendent; and

126 (H) The local school superintendent's decision following the administrative review
127 provided for in subparagraph (G) of this paragraph shall be subject to review by the
128 local board of education pursuant to Code Section 20-2-1160.

129 (2) Following a decision by a local board of education regarding a complaint made
130 pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, any party aggrieved by the decision of the
131 local board of education shall have the right to appeal such decision to the State Board
132 of Education pursuant to subsection (b) of Code Section 20-2-1160.

133 (3) The State Board of Education may, after hearing an appeal brought pursuant to
134 paragraph (2) of this subsection, withhold up to 10 percent of the state contributed
135 Quality Basic Education Program funds allotted to the local school system or public
136 elementary or secondary school in accordance with the provisions of Code
137 Section 20-2-243; provided, however, that upon such withholding, the Department of
138 Education shall develop and provide a corrective action plan to the local school system
139 or public elementary or secondary school to remediate each violation found to have
140 occurred by the State Board of Education; and provided, further, that a local school
141 system or public elementary or secondary school whose allotment of state contributed
142 Quality Basic Education Program funds has been withheld pursuant to this paragraph
143 shall have such allotment restored within 45 days of demonstrating to the satisfaction of
144 the State School Superintendent substantial compliance with the corrective action plan
145 provided for in this paragraph.

146 (4) No later than July 1, 2022, the Department of Education shall promulgate a model
147 policy for a complaint resolution process that meets the requirements of paragraph (1) of
148 this subsection. The Department of Education shall develop and provide guidance for
149 local school systems for use when determining whether violations of subsections (b)
150 through (d) of this Code section have occurred. The Department of Education shall be

151 authorized to revise such model policy and guidance from time to time and shall post
152 such policy and guidance on its website in order to assist local school systems."

SECTION 2.

154 Said title is further amended in Chapter 3, relating to postsecondary education, by adding a
155 new Code section to read as follows:

156 "20-3-65.1.

157 (a) As used in this Code section, the term:

158 (1) 'Divisive concepts' means any of the following concepts, including views espousing
159 such concepts:

160 (A) One race or ethnicity is inherently superior to another race or ethnicity;

161 (B) The United States of America and the State of Georgia are fundamentally or
162 systemically racist;

163 (C) An individual, solely because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity, is
164 inherently racist or oppressive, whether consciously or subconsciously;

165 (D) An individual should be discriminated against or receive adverse treatment solely
166 or partly because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity;

167 (E) An individual's moral character is inherently determined by his or her race, skin
168 color, or ethnicity;

169 (F) An individual, because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity, bears
170 responsibility for actions committed by other individuals of the same race, skin color,
171 or ethnicity, whether past or present;

172 (G) An individual should feel discomfort, guilt, anguish, or any other form of
173 psychological distress because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity;

174 (H) Meritocracy or traits such as a hard work ethic are racist or were created by
175 individuals of a particular race to oppress individuals of another race; or

176 (I) Any form of race or ethnic scapegoating or race or ethnic stereotyping.

177 (2) 'Race or ethnic scapegoating' means assigning fault, blame, or bias to a race or
178 ethnicity or to an individual of a particular race or ethnicity because of his or her race or
179 ethnicity. Such term includes, but is not limited to, any claim that an individual of a
180 particular race or ethnicity, consciously or subconsciously, and by virtue of his or her race
181 or ethnicity, is inherently racist or is inherently inclined to oppress others.

182 (3) 'Race or ethnic stereotyping' means ascribing character traits, values, moral and
183 ethical codes, privileges, status, or beliefs to a race or ethnicity, or to an individual
184 because of his or her race or ethnicity.

185 (b) The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia shall prohibit employees
186 from discriminating against students and other employees based on race, skin color, or
187 ethnicity.

188 (c)(1) The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia shall ensure that all
189 diversity and inclusion efforts directed to the employees of the board of regents or of any
190 unit of the University System of Georgia shall encourage such employees not to judge
191 students, other employees, or other individuals based on race, skin color, or ethnicity.

192 (2) The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia may provide for curricula
193 and training programs that foster learning and workplace environments where all
194 students, employees, and school community members are respected and that promote
195 diversity and inclusiveness; provided, however, that any curriculum or mandatory
196 training program, whether taught or facilitated by school personnel or a third party
197 engaged by the board or a unit of the University System of Georgia may not teach, act
198 upon, promote, or encourage divisive concepts; and provided, further, that this subsection
199 shall not be construed to prohibit administrators, faculty members, instructors, or other
200 individuals facilitating a training program from responding in an objective manner and
201 without endorsement to questions regarding specific divisive concepts raised by students,
202 school community members, or participants in a training program.

203 (d) Nothing in this Code section shall be construed to do any of the following:

204 (1) Inhibit or violate the rights protected by the Constitutions of the United States of
205 America and Georgia or undermine intellectual freedom and free expression;
206 (2) Infringe upon the intellectual vitality of students and employees of the board of
207 regents or any unit of the University System of Georgia;
208 (3) Prevent the board of regents or any unit of the University System of Georgia from
209 promoting diversity or inclusiveness; provided, however, that such efforts do not conflict
210 with the requirements of this Code section and other applicable laws;
211 (4) Prohibit the discussion of divisive concepts, as part of a larger course of instruction,
212 in an objective manner and without endorsement;
213 (5) Prohibit the use of curriculum that addresses topics of slavery, racial or ethnic
214 oppression, racial or ethnic segregation, or racial or ethnic discrimination, including
215 topics relating to the enactment and enforcement of laws resulting in such oppression,
216 segregation, and discrimination;
217 (6) Create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity
218 by any party against the board of regents or any unit of the University System of Georgia,
219 or their respective departments, agencies, or entities, officers, employees, or agents, or
220 any other person; or
221 (7) Prohibit a state or federal court or agency of competent jurisdiction from ordering
222 training or other remedial action that discusses divisive concepts due to a finding of
223 discrimination, including discrimination based on race, skin color, or ethnicity.
224 (e)(1) No later than August 1, 2022, the board of regents shall adopt a complaint
225 resolution policy to address complaints alleging violations of any provision of
226 subsections (b) through (d) of this Code section at a unit of the University System of
227 Georgia.
228 (f) Any entity, organization, or postsecondary institution that violates any provision of
229 subsections (b) through (e) of this Code section shall be subject to the withholding of
230 state funding or state administered federal funding. Such withholding of state funding

231 may include funds provided to one or more postsecondary institutions directly, as well
232 as funding for scholarships, loans, and grants pursuant to this chapter for students of such
233 postsecondary institutions."

234 **SECTION 3.**

235 Said title is further amended in Chapter 4, relating to vocational, technical, and adult
236 education, by adding a new Code section to read as follows:

237 "20-4-16.1.

238 (a) As used in this Code section, the term:

239 (1) 'Divisive concepts' means any of the following concepts, including views espousing
240 such concepts:

241 (A) One race or ethnicity is inherently superior to another race or ethnicity;
242 (B) The United States of America and the State of Georgia are fundamentally or
243 systemically racist;

244 (C) An individual, solely because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity, is
245 inherently racist, or oppressive, whether consciously or subconsciously;

246 (D) An individual should be discriminated against or receive adverse treatment solely
247 or partly because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity;

248 (E) An individual's moral character is inherently determined by his or her race, skin
249 color, or ethnicity;

250 (F) An individual, because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity, bears
251 responsibility for actions committed by other individuals of the same race, skin color,
252 or ethnicity, whether past or present;

253 (G) An individual should feel discomfort, guilt, anguish, or any other form of
254 psychological distress because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity;

255 (H) Meritocracy or traits such as a hard work ethic are racist or were created by
256 individuals of a particular race to oppress individuals of another race; or

257 (I) Any form of race or ethnic scapegoating or race or ethnic stereotyping.
258 (2) 'Race or ethnic scapegoating' means assigning fault, blame, or bias to a race or
259 ethnicity or to an individual of a particular race or ethnicity because of his or her race or
260 ethnicity. Such term includes, but is not limited to, any claim that an individual of a
261 particular race or ethnicity, consciously or subconsciously, and by virtue of his or her race
262 or ethnicity, is inherently racist or is inherently inclined to oppress others.

263 (3) 'Race or ethnic stereotyping' means ascribing character traits, values, moral and
264 ethical codes, privileges, status, or beliefs to a race or ethnicity, or to an individual
265 because of his or her race or ethnicity.

266 (b) The State Board of the Technical College System of Georgia shall prohibit employees
267 from discriminating against students and other employees based on race, skin color, or
268 ethnicity.

269 (c)(1) The State Board of the Technical College System of Georgia shall ensure that all
270 diversity and inclusion efforts directed to the employees of the state board or of any unit
271 of the Technical College System of Georgia shall encourage such employees not to judge
272 students, other employees, or other individuals based on race, skin color, or ethnicity.

273 (2) The State Board of the Technical College System of Georgia may provide for
274 curricula and training programs that foster learning and workplace environments where
275 all students, employees, and school community members are respected and that promote
276 diversity and inclusiveness; provided, however, that any curriculum or mandatory
277 training program, whether taught or facilitated by school personnel or a third party
278 engaged by the state board or a unit of the Technical College System of Georgia may not
279 teach, act upon, promote, or encourage divisive concepts; and provided, further, that this
280 subsection shall not be construed to prohibit administrators, faculty members, instructors,
281 or other individuals facilitating a training program from responding in an objective
282 manner and without endorsement to questions regarding specific divisive concepts raised
283 by students, school community members, or participants in a training program.

284 (d) Nothing in this Code section shall be construed to do any of the following:

285 (1) Inhibit or violate the rights protected by the Constitutions of the United States of
America and Georgia or undermine intellectual freedom and free expression;

286 (2) Infringe upon the intellectual vitality of students and employees of the State Board
of the Technical College System of Georgia or any unit of the Technical College System
of Georgia;

287 (3) Prevent the State Board of the Technical College System of Georgia or any unit of
the Technical College System of Georgia from promoting diversity or inclusiveness;
provided, however, that such efforts do not conflict with the requirements of this Code
section and other applicable laws;

288 (4) Prohibit the discussion of divisive concepts, as part of a larger course of instruction,
in an objective manner and without endorsement;

289 (5) Prohibit the use of curriculum that addresses topics of slavery, racial or ethnic
oppression, racial or ethnic segregation, or racial or ethnic discrimination, including
topics relating to the enactment and enforcement of laws resulting in such oppression,
segregation, and discrimination;

290 (6) Create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity
by any party against the State Board of the Technical College System of Georgia or any
unit of the Technical College System of Georgia, or their respective departments,
agencies, or entities, officers, employees, or agents, or any other person; or

291 (7) Prohibit a state or federal court or agency of competent jurisdiction from ordering
training or other remedial action that discusses divisive concepts due to a finding of
discrimination, including discrimination based on race, skin color, or ethnicity.

292 (e)(1) No later than August 1, 2022, the State Board of the Technical College System of
Georgia shall adopt a complaint resolution policy to address complaints alleging
violations of any provision of subsections (b) through (d) of this Code section at a unit
of the Technical College System of Georgia.

311 (f) Any entity, organization, or postsecondary institution that violates any provision of
312 subsections (b) through (e) of this Code section shall be subject to the withholding of
313 state funding or state administered federal funding. Such withholding of state funding
314 may include funds provided to one or more postsecondary institutions directly, as well
315 as funding for scholarships, loans, and grants pursuant to this chapter for students of such
316 postsecondary institutions."

SECTION 4.

318 Title 50 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated, relating to state government, is amended
319 by adding a new Code section to read as follows:

320 "50-1-11.

321 (a) As used in this Code section, the term:

322 (1) 'Divisive concepts' means any of the following concepts, including views espousing
323 such concepts:

324 (A) One race or ethnicity is inherently superior to another race or ethnicity;

(B) The United States of America and the State of Georgia are fundamentally or
systemically racist;

327 (C) An individual, solely because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity, is
328 inherently racist or oppressive, whether consciously or subconsciously;

329 (D) An individual should be discriminated against or receive adverse treatment solely
330 or partly because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity;

331 (E) An individual's moral character is inherently determined by his or her race, skin
332 color, or ethnicity;

333 (F) An individual, because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity, bears
334 responsibility for actions committed by other individuals of the same race, skin color,
335 or ethnicity, whether past or present;

336 (G) An individual should feel discomfort, guilt, anguish, or any other form of
337 psychological distress because of his or her race, skin color, or ethnicity;

338 (H) Meritocracy or traits such as a hard work ethic are racist or were created by
339 individuals of a particular race to oppress individuals of another race; or

340 (I) Any form of race or ethnic scapegoating or race or ethnic stereotyping.

341 (2) 'Race or ethnic scapegoating' means assigning fault, blame, or bias to a race or
342 ethnicity or to an individual of a particular race or ethnicity because of his or her race,
343 skin color, or ethnicity. Such term includes, but is not limited to, any claim that an
344 individual of a particular race or ethnicity, consciously or subconsciously, and by virtue
345 of his or her race or ethnicity, is inherently racist or is inherently inclined to oppress
346 others.

347 (3) 'Race or ethnic stereotyping' means ascribing character traits, values, moral and
348 ethical codes, privileges, status, or beliefs to a race or ethnicity, or to an individual
349 because of his or her race or ethnicity.

350 (4) 'State agency' or 'agency' means any department, division, board, bureau,
351 commission, or other agency of the state government or any state authority.

352 (b) Each state agency shall prohibit its employees from discriminating against other
353 employees based on race, skin color, or ethnicity.

354 (c) The head of each state agency shall:

355 (1) Ensure that his or her respective agency, agency employees while acting within the
356 scope of their employment, and any contractors engaged by the agency to provide
357 training programs to agency employees do not act upon, promote, or encourage divisive
358 concepts in any training program for agency employees; provided, however, that this
359 paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit an individual who facilitates an employee
360 training program from responding in an objective manner and without endorsement to
361 questions regarding specific divisive concepts raised by participants in a training
362 program;

363 (2) Ensure that all agency diversity and inclusion training, workshops, programs, and
364 other efforts encourage agency employees not to judge each other based on race, skin
365 color, or ethnicity; and
366 (3) Take appropriate disciplinary action against any agency employee or contractor
367 engaged by the agency who authorizes or approves a training program that acts upon,
368 promotes, or encourages divisive concepts.
369 (d)(1) This Code section shall not be construed to prohibit any state agency from
370 promoting diversity or inclusiveness, so long as such efforts do not conflict with the
371 requirements of this Code section.
372 (2) This Code section shall not be construed to prohibit the discussion of divisive
373 concepts, as part of a larger discussion related to workplace policies or training programs,
374 in an objective manner and without endorsement."

375

SECTION 5.

376 All laws and parts of laws in conflict with this Act are repealed.

Figure 8

Dear President Kelly:

On behalf of the members of UWG's Faculty Senate, the institutional body representing all UWG faculty, the purpose of this letter is to share with you and UWG's administration our collective thoughts regarding recent activity in the Georgia State Legislature pertaining to issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion in ways that have significant implications for everyone in higher education.

Specifically on the matter of Senate Bill 377, the following is a brief summary of Faculty concerns:

1. **Coordination of UWG Communication.** While the state legislature's activities generate a variety of perspectives, there is near unanimity regarding the need for more timely and regular communication from UWG administration (specifically the Office of Government Relations) to alert and inform UWG faculty on state legislative activity that could significantly impact the work of faculty. Whether it be SB377 or the House Appropriations Committee letter, it should not be the case that official campus discussions occur only *after* faculty members learn about the issues from their off-campus colleagues. The Faculty Senate's advisory role cannot be properly performed if it is not made aware of the issues upon which it could helpfully advise the administration. Resolution of these communication deficiencies can be achieved by:
 - A. UWG personnel responsible for the university's government and community relations endeavors providing regular and timely updates to the Faculty Senate on activity at the local, state, and federal levels that are pertinent to academic affairs. This could be reasonably achieved through a combination of presentations to the Faculty Senate at its monthly meetings, as well as email communications via the Faculty Senate listserv.
 - B. UWG administrators clearly articulating the processes that faculty are asked to "trust in." Specifically, this would entail providing details to the Faculty Senate as to who the UWG personnel are that are engaging in strategic conversations regarding how to respond to requests from the Board of Regents, USG, or other state officials, and what criteria are employed in determining how to collect, select, and present the data in response to those requests. Faculty trust in the process can only be accrued once the faculty are genuinely informed of that process.
2. **Protecting Targeted Faculty.** There is a significant difference of opinion between the faculty and administrators on the question of whether the textual assurances in legislative proposals that "academic freedom" will not be infringed upon are legitimate protections or hollow promises. For those whose job (and perhaps even personal) security is at stake, more is required than boilerplate language tacked onto the ends of bills the very existence of which appears to contradict and undermine that language. Faculty are seeking assurances from UWG

administrators that they will strongly advocate on behalf of faculty and defend them against unwarranted attacks. These assurances are even more crucial given the administration's admonition that neither individual faculty nor the Faculty Senate attempt to communicate directly with state officials.

It is important to emphasize that these first two points focus on 'in house' matters that are wholly within the purview of UWG administrators to accomplish. Independent of what actions the state legislature may or may not take in these areas of curriculum and pedagogy, UWG faculty and upper administrators have much to gain from stronger communication. The President and Provost are correct to stress the need for coordination, and the actions recommended here are prerequisites for effective coordination.

3. Problematic Substance of SB377. As for the bill itself, UWG faculty take issue with any interpretation of lines 192-202 that would include classroom teaching under the umbrella of "curricula and training programs" regulated by the bill. Setting aside the question of whether legislators' assumptions about "training programs" such as implicit bias training are correct or their prescriptions for such programs are appropriate, any interpretation of the bill's language that would make it applicable to course curricula taught in classrooms by university faculty creates significant problems for everyone in higher education. What follows is a non-exhaustive list of significant concerns regarding its injurious implications:

A. Precedent of Academic Freedom. Long-standing precedents for academic freedom of expression in pursuit of scholarly endeavors deny the legitimacy of SB377's primary purpose. As the Supreme Court Justice O'Connor explained in the majority opinion of *Grutter v. Bollinger*, "We have long recognized that, given the important purpose of public education and the expansive freedoms of speech and thought associated with the university environment, universities occupy a special niche in our constitutional tradition." The 9th Circuit invoked these words of Justice O'Connor when it ruled in *Demers v. Austin* that the limits on freedom of expression by university employees delineated in *Garcetti v. Ceballos* was distinct from what the Court identified as "speech related to scholarship or teaching." SB377 goes against this jurisprudence by dictating what personal beliefs related to their academic discipline faculty cannot express in the classroom.

B. Expert Consensus refutes SB377's basic premise. In this century, a large number of educational organizations have expressly stated the need for classroom discussions to occur on matters of racial justice and equity – the very concepts SB377 maligns as "divisive" and seeks to silence discussion on. Here are just a few examples of those statements:

- **Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences**

(https://www.acjs.org/resource/resmgr/files/acjs_statement_on_injustices.pdf)

- **American Historical Association**

(<https://www.historians.org/divisive-concepts-statement>)

- **American Society of Criminology** endorsed the AACU's statement expressing "firm opposition to a spate of legislative proposals being introduced across the country that target academic lessons, presentations, and discussions of racism and related issues in American history in schools, colleges and universities."
(<https://www.aacu.org/newsroom/joint-statement-on-legislative-efforts-to-restrict-education-about-racism-and-american-history>)

- **American Libraries Association**
(<https://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/statement/opposition-censorship-racial-injustice-black-history-diversity-education>)

- **Association of Theatre in Higher Education**

https://www.athe.org/page/request_support

- **Modern Language Association**

(see the paragraph specifically addressing "Academic Freedom,"
[https://www\(mla.org/About-Us/Governance/Executive-Council/Executive-Council-Actions/2021/Statement-on-Campus-Reopenings-and-Challenges-to-Academic-Freedom-Tenure-and-Shared-Governance](https://www(mla.org/About-Us/Governance/Executive-Council/Executive-Council-Actions/2021/Statement-on-Campus-Reopenings-and-Challenges-to-Academic-Freedom-Tenure-and-Shared-Governance))

- **National Council of Teachers of Mathematics**

(<https://www.nctm.org/News-and-Calendar/News/NCTM-News-Releases/A-Statement-on-George-Floyd,-Breonna-Taylor,-and-Ahmaud-Arbery/>)

- **National Council for the Social Studies** statement on "Academic Freedom and the Social Studies Educator"

(found at <https://www.socialstudies.org/social-education/80/03/academic-freedom-and-social-studies-teacher>)

C. Imperiling Accreditation. Consistent with the expert consensus of scholarly organizations identified above, many of the accrediting bodies upon which our academic units depend for legitimacy have specifically identified the need to provide instruction in the concepts that SB377 would prohibit the teaching of. Academic departments/programs such as Criminology (racial disparities in sentencing), Educational Leadership (professional standard #3 is "equity and cultural responsiveness"), and Nursing (racial disparities in health care) all have curricula that

are both required to be included in order to maintain accredited status and yet would potentially run afoul of SB377.

D. Diminished Scholarly Inquiry and Expression. The combination of SB377's vaguely defined prohibitions (at what point is the faculty in violation of line 172-173's reference to when an individual student may "feel discomfort"?") and UWG's administration's unwillingness, as of yet, to demarcate what classroom communication it will defend as legitimate decimates the foundation of scholarly inquiry and expression that any university must sustain in order to achieve its mission. Criminology faculty who are afraid to cite statistics substantiating systematic racism in the criminal justice system are not enhancing the education of their students when they self-censor so as to avoid being disciplined. Theater faculty who have to factor the sensitivities of legislators' personal views about racism into their selections of plays to discuss in class or perform on stage are not benefiting the education of their students. In addition, students themselves may be limited in their own free expression on these issues in class if their instructors' freedom to introduce "divisive concepts" in their courses is limited by state law.

The UWG Faculty Senate recognizes that strategic communication with outside authorities requires flexibility, and that some of the following may have more persuasive appeal than others for particular audiences. Our position is not that every opposing idea be incorporated into UWG's response to efforts like SB377, but rather that all of the ideas articulated by faculty whose passion for the success of this institution is undeniable should be given a fair hearing in institutional planning; the "one voice" from which UWG's position will be expressed should be discovered by processes that genuinely listen to and respect the many voices of those who care enough to speak up for UWG's students and employees.

Overall, UWG's Faculty Senate believes that circumstances require an urgency for cooperation - administrators and faculty working together to ensure the foundational principles of higher education are forcefully advocated and strongly defended. Fortunately, much of what needs to be accomplished can occur within the effective functioning of shared governance, and we look forward to engaging in those processes.

Figure 9**Resolution on the Administration's Communication
with the Faculty Senate about Government Activities**

Whereas “the General Faculty has primary authority and responsibility in formulating policy and rules and regulations in all matters concerning curriculum (including, but not limited to, programs and courses of study, major field requirements, core curriculum, and individual courses), to conduct and schedule classes and final examinations, to set requirements for graduation, and to specify the educational standards of the University” (UWG Policies and Procedures, rev. 2021, p. 18),

And, Whereas the exercise of this authority and responsibility is “subject to approval by the President, the Chancellor and the Board of Regents” (*ibid*),

Be it resolved that the faculty senate, acting as the representative body of the general faculty, and the President and the President’s office must have a clear structure and means of communication on all matters of significance that can and will impact the authority and responsibility of the faculty in the fulfillment of these designated duties, including the impact of state and federal legislative, executive, and judicial activities.

The Faculty Senate, in its role of advising the President and making policy and procedure recommendations to the President, recommends the following procedure of communication with regard to public affairs:

- The Office of the President (e.g., the office of Public Service and Outreach) will engage in regular and timely communication with the Faculty Senate regarding government activities (e.g., proposed legislative bills) that have the potential to impact the authority and responsibility of the general faculty as described in UWG Policies and Procedures documents and will share relevant available materials (e.g., proposed bills) and any proposed administrative plans or strategies for responding to such activities.
- Prior to responding to the government activity or enacting any plans or strategies, the Office of the President will, whenever time permits, give the Faculty Senate the opportunity to identify and consult with faculty who have relevant expertise and who can work with a standing senate committee, subcommittee, or ad hoc task force to compose advice and/or recommendations for the President to assist the President in effectively representing and advocating for the curriculum and educational standards of the University.
- Recognizing that the Faculty Senate's advisory recommendations may differ from the Administration's position on how to best represent and advocate for the university's curriculum and educational standards of the university, the Senate reserves the right to express the reasons for its dissenting opinion with appropriate campus stakeholders and continue its advocacy with Administration.