

GENERAL FACULTY MEETING

Minutes

Spring Semester, 2013

Wednesday, April 17th

Townsend Center

3:00 p.m.

Reception 2:30 p.m.

Approved August 21, 2013

I. Call to Order, Welcome, and Opening Remarks to Faculty—Dr. Beheruz N. Sethna, President

II. Approval of Minutes

Dr. Abbot Packard moved to accept the minutes as written. The motion was seconded and approved by voice vote.

III. Recognition of Faculty Retirees—Dr. Beheruz N. Sethna

- Jonathan Goldstein-History
- Gloria Kittel-Mathematics

IV. Faculty and Staff Service Awards—Dr. Bill Estes, Vice President for University Advancement

V. Business of the Faculty Senate—Dr. Jeff Johnson, Chair of Faculty Senate

- Motion: The Faculty Senate moves that the General Faculty adopt the attached University of West Georgia Vision, Mission and Goals statement (*see Appendix I*) as the basis for the University's 2014-2020 strategic plan.

The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

- Motion: The Faculty Senate recommends that the proposed Mission Statement for the University of West Georgia be submitted for approval to the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.
-

The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

VI. Faculty Handbook Revisions—Dr. Jeff Johnson

- Motion: The Faculty Senate proposes that the General Faculty approve the deletion of the Self-Evaluation of Teaching Methods and Effectiveness Form (*see Appendix II*) from the Faculty Handbook 103.0602. Proposed item was acted upon in the February 15, 2013 meeting and minutes were approved at the March 8, 2013 meeting.

The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

- Motion: Change to section 104.0601 General Policy Statement, F. 2. Components of the Evaluation, 2. Evaluation Report, & G. Post-Evaluation Conference with the Faculty (*see Appendix III*).
- Motion: Change to section 104.0602 Dean Evaluation Questionnaire.

The two motions were considered together.

The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Dr. Johnson asked if there were additional nominations from the floor for Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate and General Faculty. There were no additional nominations for secretary from the floor. Ballot boxes for the election of the General Faculty and Faculty Senate Secretary and the Post Tenure Review Appeals Committee were open before and after the General Faculty Meeting.

VII. SACS and QEP Updates—Dr. Jon Anderson, Deputy Provost

Dr. Anderson reminded faculty that accreditation is important for continued unit improvement, recognition of quality education, and the basis for many financial decisions. He reviewed the work that has been completed and reported on remaining work to be done.

VIII. FY14 UWG Regents' Teaching Excellence Awards—Dr. Michael Horvath, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

The following awards were announced:

- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Award—James Dillon, Psychology
- Online Teaching Award—Kimberly Huett, School Library Media and Instructional Technology
- Individual Teaching Award—Mark Parrish, Counselor Education and College Student Affairs
- Program Teaching Award—Theatre

IX. Provost's Remarks—Dr. Michael Horvath

Dr. Horvath acknowledged the faculty for the academic work completed during the year as well as our continued commitment to accountability in our programs. He thanked Dr. Sethna for his leadership in bringing the university to its current status and increased enrollment.

X. Closing Remarks—Dr. Beheruz N. Sethna

Dr. Sethna affirmed the contributions of the UWG faculty and staff in bringing UWG to its current academic standing. He is very proud of where we are at this point and knows that many foundations are in place to move us into an even stronger position and reputation as a quality academic institution in the near and far future. He will miss guiding the university through the positive changes that are to come. His wish for everyone is to live long and prosper. This was followed by a standing ovation by meeting attendees.

XI. Adjournment

Respectfully submitted,
Dawn Harmon McCord
Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate and General Faculty

Appendix I

Vision, Mission and Goals Statements

UWG Strategic Plan, 2014 - 2020

Vision

The University of West Georgia will be Georgia's learning-centered destination university. As an innovative doctoral university with global reach, UWG will prepare students to become problem-solving leaders.

Mission

The University of West Georgia is a comprehensive residential university with roots in west Georgia and the Atlanta region. The University is committed to academic excellence and to community outreach, offering high-quality undergraduate and graduate programs on-campus, off-campus, and online. UWG enables students, faculty, and staff to realize their full potential through academic engagement, supportive services, and a caring academic community.

Goals

The University of West Georgia will provide the resources necessary to fulfill its mission and vision, and to achieve these strategic goals:

- **Academic success:** Enhance opportunities for every student to succeed, maintaining academic rigor while achieving an undergraduate graduation rate above the national average.
- **Intellectual engagement and inquiry:** Build on our unique proximity to Metropolitan Atlanta and to rural and small-town areas to offer increased opportunities for intellectual engagement and inquiry to every student.
- **Community outreach:** Make the most of our location to provide greater opportunities for community engagement to every student.

Appendix II

103.0602

University of West Georgia SELF-EVALUATION OF TEACHING METHODS AND EFFECTIVENESS

(To be submitted by each member of the teaching faculty at the close of the Spring Semester and at the time he or she is being considered for promotion or tenure. The 12 months immediately before the date submitted are the period to be covered.)

Name of faculty member _____ Date _____

Computer Code Symbol _____

	Courses Taught	
Course Qtr./No.	Title	No. Of Students

INSTRUCTIONS: on the scale to the right of each statement, check the letter representing the degree of practice as explained below. If the item is appropriate for some courses and not for others, consider the courses for which appropriate and note courses to which item is inapplicable on the back of this sheet. Make any other explanatory notes you consider necessary on the back of the sheet.

SCALE:

- A – To maximum degree practicable.
- B – To a significant degree.
- C – To some extent.
- D – No.
- E – Not applicable to courses.

EFFORTS TO INCREASE TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS:

		A	B	C	D	E
1	I studied the results of the Student Course Evaluations for the purpose of improvement.					
2	I read books or articles on instructional techniques or innovative methods.					
3	I discussed instructional techniques or innovative methods with my colleagues.					
4	I endeavored to make my courses more interesting and effective.					

EFFORTS TO INSURE THAT COURSE CONTENT IS CURRENT AND COMPREHENSIVE:

		A	B	C	D	E
5	I reviewed recent publications in my field.					
6	I discussed course content with colleagues at other colleges.					
7	I attended professional meetings.					
8	I coordinated course content with teachers of related courses.					
9	In multi-section courses, I followed the departmental syllabus.					

Appendix III

104.04 Evaluation of Academic Deans

104.0401 General Policy Statements

The Provost shall conduct annual reviews and periodic evaluations of academic Deans.

A. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to:

1. Guide the Provost in carrying out his or her responsibilities with regard to appointing, renewing, and/or terminating Deans of academic units, and to facilitate the professional development of those Deans.
2. Ensure that faculty and staff participate in the evaluation of their academic Deans.
3. Ensure Deans are afforded due process in the evaluation.
4. Afford all appropriate constituencies the opportunity to provide input.
5. Clarify the process of assembling the Review Committee, and the procedures for how it shall conduct the periodic evaluation.
6. Guide the Review Committee in producing an Evaluation Report of its findings, and delivering it to interested parties.

B. Definitions

1. For the purposes of this policy, an Academic Dean is one who carries a title of Dean, bears responsibility for an academic unit containing faculty members, and reports to the Provost.
2. In Sections 104.04, 104.05, and 104.06, a unit refers to a college, school, or the library.

104.05 Annual Reviews of Deans

104.0501 General Policy Statement

The Provost shall review the performance of Deans reporting to him or her annually. The following characteristics of that process shall be common to all units.

104.0502 Procedures

- A. Interval of Annual Review: before the conclusion of each fiscal year.
- B. Purpose and Objectives: the purpose of annual reviews of Deans is to improve the effectiveness of the unit administered, including its contribution to the effectiveness of other units and the institution as a whole. The overall objectives are:

1. To review goals and accomplishments of the Dean and unit supervised, especially as these relate to the continuing mission and strategic goals of the institution.
2. To review the Dean's job description and responsibilities, as well as the organization of the unit.
3. To review the level of resources and other support provided to the Dean and unit.
4. To discuss concerns and opportunities and to plan for changes that may be warranted or desirable.

C. Components of the Annual Review:

1. *Feedback.* The Provost shall direct the annual review process. Faculty members and staff, whenever possible, may be asked to provide input.
2. *Self report.* Each Dean under review shall provide the Provost a brief written report:
 - a. Listing initiatives and professional activities undertaken during the review period.
 - b. Listing achievements, areas in need of improvement, and efforts related to those areas, as well as future plans and goals for the unit.
 - c. Indicating any changes that seem warranted in the Dean's job description.
 - d. Contextualizing the operation of the college, school, or library within the larger framework of the university.
3. *Conference with the Provost.* The conference will be an occasion to discuss the feedback received, the Dean's and the Provost's views, and future plans and goals for the unit.
4. *Dean's Annual Review Letter.* The Annual Review Letter shall be shared with the Dean and placed in his or her personnel file. The Dean may issue a written response to this document, which shall also be retained in the file.

104.06 Periodic Evaluations of Deans

104.0601 General Policy Statement

Procedures for the periodic evaluation of Deans shall be guided by three essential principles: shared governance, impartiality, and transparency. The procedures enumerated below seek to realize these principles.

A. Interval of Periodic Evaluation:

The first periodic evaluation of an academic Dean shall cover a full three-year period occurring in the Dean's fourth year of appointment. Thereafter, periodic evaluations shall cover a full four-year period and occur every five years. All periodic evaluations begin in the Fall semester and conclude in the Spring semester of one academic year. Credit for service as an Interim Dean shall be determined by the Provost in consultation with the Dean at the time of permanent appointment. After the first periodic evaluation the Provost may initiate an evaluation of a Dean at any time, but shall explain its necessity and appropriateness. Refer to Table 1 below for a sample periodic evaluation sequence.

Table 1. Sample Periodic Evaluation Sequence.

Appointment Year	Academic Year	Evaluation Year	Evaluation Review Period
1	2011-2012		
2	2012-2013		
3	2013-2014		
4	2014-2015	2014 – 2015	Evaluates Fall 2011 - Summer 2014
5	2015-2016		
6	2016-2017		
7	2017-2018		
8	2018-2019	2018 – 2019	Evaluates Fall 2014 - Summer 2018

B. Purpose and Objectives:

1. To provide the faculty and administration with information on the performance of academic Deans who report to the Provost, both annual reviews and periodic evaluations shall be practiced.
2. The periodic evaluation will help guide the Provost in carrying out his or her responsibilities with regard to appointing, renewing, and/or terminating Deans of academic units and facilitate the professional development of those Deans.
3. To this end, a Review Committee shall be charged with collecting information about the performance of an academic Dean. Findings of the Review Committee shall supplement information from other sources (e.g., Annual Review Letters, unit financial documents) to provide the Provost with a comprehensive record of the Dean's performance.

C. Timeline of Evaluation:

1. The Provost shall notify the Dean of the pending evaluation and appoint the Chair of the Review Committee in the Fall semester.
2. Within five working days of receiving the Provost's notification, the Dean under evaluation notifies the faculty and staff of his or her unit of the pending evaluation.
3. Within five working days of receiving the Provost's appointment, the Chair of the Review Committee shall call for the election of six faculty members from within the unit led by the Dean. Refer to section 104.0601(D)(3) for guidance on the manner in which the Review Committee members shall be elected.
4. The Review Committee will provide its Evaluation Report to the Dean no later than February 28th of the academic year during which the evaluation is conducted.
5. The Dean has the right to review and respond to the Review Committee's Evaluation Report no later than March 28th.
6. The Review Committee's Evaluation Report and the Dean's response shall be forwarded to the Provost no later than March 30th.
7. The Chair of the Review Committee presents the results of the Dean's Evaluation Report to the faculty of the Dean under evaluation no later than April 30th.
8. In the event that the dates in this timeline fall on a weekend or holiday, the documents are due the following business day.

D. Composition of Review Committee:

1. The Review Committee will be composed of seven members.

2. A Review Committee Chair, who is a senior faculty member from outside the unit led by the Dean being evaluated. The Provost shall appoint the Review Committee Chair. The Chair of the Review Committee shall receive one course reassigned time.
3. Six faculty members from within the unit led by the Dean, one of which must be a department chair. The faculty governance body from the unit led by the Dean under evaluation determines the manner in which the committee members shall be elected. In the case of a unit that does not have an elected faculty governance body, the faculty at large of the unit determine the manner in which the committee members shall be elected.
4. The Provost and the Dean under evaluation shall have the right to object to the inclusion of a member of the committee. Both parties shall each be allowed only one objection.
5. No person with a conflict of interest may serve as a member of the Review Committee. All personal and professional conflicts of interest must be revealed to and reviewed by the Review Committee Chair prior to the selection of faculty to serve on the Review Committee. Such conflicts of interest include, but are not limited to, personal and professional interactions and relationships that would preclude dispassionate, disinterested, correct, complete, and unbiased participation in these matters. Spouses, immediate family members, and colleagues with an intimate personal relationship with the Dean are explicitly prohibited from participation.

E. Review Committee Procedures:

1. The Review Committee meets with the Provost and then with the Dean to be evaluated. At these meetings, the Review Committee:
 - a. Outlines the timeline for review and the evaluation criteria.
 - b. Requests relevant information to be considered during the evaluation. At this time, the Provost and the Dean may specify topics, questions, or concerns for the Review Committee to consider in making its evaluation, as well as particular individuals whose input would contribute to a complete review.
 - c. Informs the Provost and the Dean of:
 1. Their right to object to one member of the Review Committee, which shall trigger the search for a new member.
 2. The right to communicate with the Review Committee throughout the evaluation process. That is, the Committee must guarantee the Provost and the Dean the right to provide input at any time during the evaluation.
2. The Review Committee shall notify the faculty of the Dean under review of the procedures guiding the evaluation process and how the principles of shared governance, impartiality, and transparency shall be realized.
 - a. The notification shall include information about data collection, administration of the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire, how the identity of participants will be protected from unnecessary disclosure to the extent allowed by applicable law, and the Review Committee's guarantee to grant full access to anyone wishing to provide input at any time during the evaluation, unless a significant conflict of interest can be demonstrated.
 - b. Among its procedures, the Review Committee must administer the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire to the Dean's constituency. The Dean's constituency shall include, but not be limited to, Vice Presidents, Deans, Directors, the faculty and staff of the unit, the faculty governance body of the unit, and any other individuals who interact with the Dean on a regular basis.
 - c. In addition to the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire, the Review Committee shall gather information related to the topics, questions, and concerns noted by the Provost and Dean in their initial meetings.

F. Components of the Evaluation:

1. Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation criteria should be based on the duties specified in Article III, Section 2 of the Policies and Procedures of the University of West Georgia and the By Laws of the unit of the Dean under evaluation.

2. Evaluation Report

The Review Committee shall produce an Evaluation Report of its findings, which shall be descriptive in nature. The Evaluation Report shall not include interpretations of the findings, nor recommendations regarding personnel actions; however, the Review Committee may synthesize the data they collect relative to the evaluation criteria, to include the authority to edit, shorten, paraphrase or select qualitative comments as exemplary for presentation in the report. All of the comments received shall remain anonymous and shall be presented to the Provost in an appendix, in order that the unbiased nature of the synthesis can be verified. The full Evaluation Report shall remain in the Office of the Provost for the length of time mandated by BOR Standards and may be obtained by individual request.

The Evaluation Report shall include, but not be limited to, the following sections:

Introduction

- a. Purpose of the evaluation.
- b. Description of how the principles of shared governance, impartiality, and transparency have been realized through the process.
 1. Description of the procedures that guided the composition of the Review Committee.
 2. Disclosure of conflicts of interest, if any, and how they were handled.
 3. Discussion of the timeline of the evaluation.

Methodology

- a. Data collection efforts (e.g. description of the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire, distribution methods, response rate).
- b. Procedures to protect the identity of participants from unnecessary disclosure to the extent allowed by applicable law.

Results

- a. Descriptive analysis of data from the Dean Evaluation Questionnaire.
- b. Descriptive summary of additional data collected (to include interviews with dean's peers, supervisors, and relevant external community when useful).

Conclusion

- a. Purpose of the evaluation (briefly revisited).
- b. Timeline for the next periodic evaluation, per guidelines in Table 1 in Section 104.0601.

G. Post-Evaluation Conference with the Faculty. The Chair of the Review Committee shall present the Evaluation Report (minus the appendix) to the faculty of the unit no later than April 30th.

104.0602 Dean Evaluation Questionnaire

The Review Committee shall use the following questionnaire to evaluate the Dean. However, each unit may include additional context-specific items to the instrument. Additional items must be placed at the end of the questionnaire in a new section labeled Unit Specific Items.

Please tell us, what is your role at UWG?

- A. Faculty Member and/or Faculty Administrator
- B. Staff Member

Your responses may be quoted in the full report, but only anonymously and as part of aggregated data.

In your role as administrator, faculty, or staff, please rate the Dean's unit on the following questions related to leadership, faculty and program development, fairness and ethics, communication, and administration. Please use the following scale to help with your answer:

1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Somewhat Disagree; 4 = Neither Disagree Nor Agree; 5 = Somewhat Agree; 6 = Agree; 7 = Strongly Agree; 0 = Unable to Judge

If you have insufficient experience to make an informed judgment, please choose "Unable to Judge."

Leadership

The Dean...

1. articulates a clear vision for the future of the unit.
2. involves the faculty in developing plans for the unit.
3. demonstrates a commitment to intellectual integrity and the pursuit of knowledge.
4. demonstrates administrative leadership of the unit.
5. is a professional role model for the unit.
6. weighs the opinions of all segments of the unit.

Faculty and Program Development

The Dean...

7. promotes a favorable environment for individual faculty development.
8. emphasizes teaching in consideration of tenure, promotion, and merit raises.
9. emphasizes service in consideration of tenure, promotion, and merit raises.
10. emphasizes professional growth and development in consideration of tenure, promotion, and merit raises. (Note: each unit should adapt item #10 to reflect its P & T standards. For example, replace the term "professional growth and development" with "scholarship.")
11. encourages creative approaches to teaching, research, and program development.
12. is responsive to the educational needs of the region when developing new programs.
13. supports student learning outcomes in work related to faculty and program development.

Fairness and Ethics

The Dean...

14. treats all members of the unit fairly irrespective of age, race, color, religion, sex, national origin, sexual orientation, disability, or veteran status.
15. respects views that are contrary to his or her own views.
16. exhibits high ethical standards in his or her official duties.
17. strongly encourages high ethical professional standards for all members of the unit.
18. exercises sound judgment in matters relating to faculty promotion and tenure.
19. exercises sound judgment in matters relating to staff hiring and promotion.
20. arbitrates disputes among faculty, staff, and department heads fairly.
21. affords departments opportunities to explain their resource needs.
22. affords all members of the unit opportunities to explain their individual needs and concerns.

Communication

The Dean...

23. welcomes constructive criticism from all members of the unit.
24. creates an environment where individuals are free to communicate without concern of rejection or reprisal.
25. provides feedback in a constructive manner.
26. is well-informed about my department's accomplishments, challenges, and future plans.
27. communicates changes affecting all the members of the unit in a timely manner.
28. recognizes and expresses appreciation for the accomplishments of all members of the unit.
29. fosters and maintains positive external relationships.

Administration

The Dean...

30. uses administrative procedures that are clear and unambiguous for promotions, tenure, merit raises, leave, and other personnel actions.
31. exercises sound judgment in appointing associate and assistant Deans.
32. attends to administrative matters in a timely fashion.
33. conducts productive meetings.
34. handles concerns from all members of the unit well.
35. makes administrative decisions that facilitate improvement of the undergraduate programs.
36. makes administrative decisions that facilitate improvement of graduate programs.
37. integrates planning, assessment, and budgeting when making decisions.
38. is transparent about the unit's budget.
39. makes evidence-based decisions.
40. is a team player.

Open Ended Items

41. In your opinion, what are the Dean's strengths and/or contributions?
42. In your opinion, what are the Dean's weaknesses?
43. Please present any further comments you think would be helpful to the Dean in carrying out the academic mission of the school.
44. Please present any further comments you think would be helpful to the Provost.

Unit Specific Items

Units may use Likert scale or open-ended items; regardless, the items should begin with number 45. Units that opt to use a Likert scale must employ the same response options used in items 1-40.