

**Faculty Senate**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**October 11, 2019**  
**Approved November 9, 2019**

1. Call to Order

*Chair Butler called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.*

2. Roll Call.

*Present:*

*Barbour, Bertau, Besnosov, Branyon, Cheng (Colley, sub.), Chwialkowska, DeFoor, Elman, Fuentes, Gault, Geyer, Gordon, Green, Hansen, Hong, Ivory, Kellison, Kimbrel, Koczkas (Kilpatrick, sub.), Lanier (Chibbaro, sub.), McKendry-Smith, Miller (Insenga, sub.), Moon, Morris, Nickell (Rollins, sub.), Ogletree, Pazzani, Penco, Pidhainy, Reber, Remshagen, Richter, Scullin, Self, Snipes, Sterling, Taylor*

*Absent:*

*Dahms, Dutt, Faucette, Gu, MacKinnon, McLean, Rees, Towhidi, Tweraser, Wadlington, Wang*

3. Approval of Minutes from September 13, 2019.

*Minutes unanimously approved by voice vote.*

4. Committee Reports

**Committee I: Undergraduate Programs Committee (Nick Sterling, Chair)**

**Action Items:**

A) College of Arts and Humanities

1) Theatre Department

a) [THEA 3591 - Musical Theatre Technique](#)

Request: Add

*Item approved unanimously.*

b) [Interdisciplinary Certificate in Musical Theatre](#)

Request: Add

*Item approved unanimously.*

c) [Theatre, B.A.](#)

Request: Modify

*Item approved unanimously.*

B) University College

- 1) [XIDS 2300 - Colleges, Slavery, & Memorialization](#)

Request: Add Course Topic

*Item approved unanimously.*

- 2) [XIDS 2300 - Critical Philosophy of Race and Racism](#)

Request: Add Course Topic

*Item approved unanimously.*

- 3) [XIDS 4186 - Internship](#)

Request: Add

*Item approved unanimously.*

**Information Item:**

- A) Wanda Taylor, PhD, RN, CHPN, is chair-elect of UPC

**Committee II: Graduate Programs Committee (Ben Geyer, Chair)**

**Action Item:**

- C) Tanner Health System School of Nursing

- 2) [Doctorate in Nursing Practice](#)

Request: Add

*Item approved unanimously.*

**Committee III: Academic Policies Committee (Agnieszka Chwialkowska, Chair)**

**Action Items:**

- B) UWG Faculty Handbook

- 2) 104, Post Tenure Review (**Figure 1**)

- a) 104.0206, Formation and Operation of Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee

Request: Modify

*Item approved unanimously.*

- b) 104.0207, Review of Chair or Supervisor (**Figure 2**)

Request: Modify

*Item approved unanimously.*

- c) 104.0208, Appeal for Reconsideration (**Figure 3**)

Request: Modify

*Item approved unanimously.*

**Committee IV: Rules Committee (Anja Remshagen, Chair)**

**Action Items:**

A) UWG Faculty Handbook

1) 103, Procedures and Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

c) 103.0201, Faculty Promotion and Tenure Evaluation

Request: Modify

*After lengthy discussion regarding the proposed makeup of the faculty promotion and tenure evaluation committee, Dr. Elman proposed a friendly amendment to remove University Statute Article I, Section 2.C: Faculties of the University and to amend the language from “no fewer than three tenured faculty members to “no fewer than three tenured voting faculty members.” The vote to remove the statute and amend the language was 12 in the affirmative and 25 against. Discussion continued.*

*Dr. Geyer proposed a second friendly amendment to remove University Statute Article I, Section 2.C: Faculties of the University and amend the language of the proposal from “no fewer than three tenured faculty members selected by the voting faculty members of the department as defined by University Statutes (Article I, Section 2.C: Faculties of the University), shall formally review dossiers submitted to the department chair” to “no fewer than three tenured faculty members selected as defined by departmental policy, shall formally review dossiers submitted to the department chair.” The vote to remove the statute and amend the language was 7 in the affirmative and 30 against. Discussion continued.*

*After a brief discussion on the remaining proposed modifications, Dr. Boldt, Senate Parliamentarian, confirmed with Chair Butler that all other proposed modifications could come up for a vote. The vote to approve the proposed modifications to 103.0201.A.5, 103.0201.B.6, and 103.0201.C was unanimous.*

*Dr. Ogletree made a motion to table 103.0201 to allow for further discussion at the committee level. The vote to table the motion was unanimous.*

d) Section 103.0205, Appeal for Reconsideration (**Figure 4**)

Request: Modify

*Item approved unanimously.*

e) 103.0206, Promotion in Professorial Rank of a Member of the Administrative Staff (**Figure 5**)

Request: Modify

*Item approved unanimously.*

D) UWG Academic Affairs Policies Index

1) UWG Procedure 2.2.3, Evaluation Process

Request: Approve

*As this procedure was directly related to the proposed modifications for 103.0201 of the Faculty Handbook, Dr. Remshagen requested that the addition of UWG Procedure 2.2.3 be tabled.*

*The proposal to approve UWG Procedure 2.2.3 for the UWG Academic Affairs Policies Index was tabled.*

2) UWG Procedure 2.2.4, Appeal for Reconsideration (**Figure 6**)

Request: Approve

*Item approved unanimously.*

5. Old Business

A) Presidential Search Update, Judy Butler (**Figure 7**)

*Chair Butler gave those present an update on the Presidential Search, which included an updated timeline.*

6. New Business

7. Announcements

A) Senate Liaison Reports

*No Liaison Reports.*

B) College Reorganization, David Jenks

*Late in spring 2019, Academic Affairs began to discuss the possibility of reorganizing the colleges that comprised the former College of Arts & Sciences. Surveys were distributed in the fall with three possible models that were developed over the summer by a committee of those who were here over the summer, mostly chairs and staff. After reviewing the results of the initial surveys, Option 2, which would combine the College of Arts and Humanities with the College of Science and Math, is no longer on the table. The committee will continue to move forward with a plan to reorganize these colleges by taking the best and strongest parts of Options 1, keeping the status quo, and Option 3, going back to a modified version of the old structure. Academic Affairs is nearing the end of this process and will continue to ask for faculty feedback regarding this organization as they work towards finalizing a solution.*

C) Program Reviews, David Jenks (**Figure 8**)

*Dr. Jenks discussed the program reviews process, and noted the programs under review by UPC and GPC this academic year.*

D) Additional Announcements

- *Dr. Kilpatrick announced the upcoming evening with renowned French historian and psychologist Jacques Semelin, who will discuss his newly translated work The Survival of the Jews in France, 1940-1944 on October 21 in Kathy Cashen Hall. The event will begin at 6pm, following an opening reception at 5:30pm, and is free and open to the public. The event is hosted by the Department of International Languages and Cultures and is cosponsored by the Cultural Services of the French Embassy, the College of Arts and Humanities, the William Breman Jewish Heritage Museum, the Department of History, the Department of Psychology, Ingram Library, the Honors College, the Department of Theatre, and the Philosophy Program.*
- *Dr. Elman reminded everyone of the ongoing gospel musical The Gospel at Colonus playing at Townsend Center Mainstage Theater through October 13, as well as the upcoming Abigail/1702 taking place in mid-November. She urged everyone to see these events.*

8. Adjournment

*The meeting adjourned at 2:31 p.m.*

Respectfully Submitted

by Colleen Vasconcellos

Executive Secretary, Faculty Senate

## Figure 1

### UWG Faculty Handbook

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

##### *Rationale:*

The previously used word ‘stellar’ in relation to the academic performance that exceeds expectations has been too ambiguous and did not convey the intended meaning. (For some having stellar performance could mean winning a Nobel Prize, while for others publishing an extra academic article above the quota specified by a college). We suggest a clearer and more uniform language. Three performance levels (consistent with previously used unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and stellar) are suggested: Does Not Meet Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Exceeds Expectations.

### APPROVED REVISED VERSION

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

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

- E. In each college and in the Library, the dean will be responsible for convening the initial meeting of the elected committee or committees. At the initial meeting, the members of the committee shall select one of its faculty members as chair. The chair will be a voting member of the committee.
- F. Each committee shall meet at the call of its committee chair. At the initial meeting the committee chair shall review the applicable departmental, college, unit, and university policies and procedures governing post-tenure review so that committee members will be aware of these before any review process begins.
- G. The documentation submitted by each faculty member shall be reviewed by committee members prior to committee meetings.
- H. The merits of each faculty member undergoing post-tenure review will be discussed to the extent desired by a simple majority of committee members. In the event of disagreement about the value of scholarly performance, job performance, or service, the review may include the evaluations of external reviewers to provide a due process protection that ensures an unbiased appraisal. This panel of external reviewers will be generated by the faculty member under review and appropriate department chair or unit supervisor and include a minimum of three professors knowledgeable of the faculty member's field of expertise from both on and off campus. The panel will serve to ensure that scholarly written work or job performance is being fairly and accurately interpreted. Any department chair or unit supervisor may be called to discuss with the committee the qualifications of a person under review who holds rank in his or her department.
- I. Voting on a colleague's status with regard to the post-tenure review shall be by secret ballot. Each faculty member being reviewed shall be evaluated as either Does Not Meet, Meets, or Exceeds Expectations with regard to his or her overall accomplishments; to be adjudged as Does Not Meet Expectations faculty under review must receive votes of Does Not Meet Expectations from at least sixty percent (60%) of the voting members of the committee. Any person with an evaluation of Does Not Meet Expectations will be required to develop a three-year plan to address deficiencies (see section K,2 below).
- J. The committee chair, in consultation with members of the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee, shall prepare a written evaluation for each candidate reviewed during post-tenure review. This evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee and must provide specific reasons for conclusions contained within it. It will report the consensus arrived at by the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee with regard to a faculty member's performance; address the faculty member's record of accomplishments and quality of contributions with regard to teaching, academic achievement, service, professional growth and development; clarify any areas needing improvement; and, where applicable, offer specific suggestions on what will be needed to improve performance. This evaluation must be written as clearly and collegially as possible. In the event that this evaluation differs from annual reviews, this evaluation shall state the exact reason(s) for this judgment. The chair of the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee shall give each faculty member being reviewed a copy of the committee's evaluation ten (10) working days prior to the deadline for submitting the committee recommendation to the appropriate department chair or unit supervisor; therefore, the person being reviewed has five (5) working days to prepare an appeal for reconsideration by the committee (see paragraph 104.0208, below).
- K. Once any appeals to the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee(s) have been heard and acted upon, the committee chair will provide a copy of the committee's final evaluation to the faculty member being reviewed and to the appropriate department chair or unit supervisor.

The faculty member, if he or she desires, will have an opportunity to prepare a written response to the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee's evaluation. Such a response shall be received by the chair of the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee within five (5) working days after the date the committee's final evaluation is received by the faculty member under review. It will be the responsibility of the appropriate dean to preserve the original ballots of rankings and to keep these on file for a period of six (6) years.

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

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



## Figure 2

### *UWG Faculty Handbook*

#### Modification of 104.0207 Review of Chair or Supervisor

##### *Rationale:*

The previously used word ‘stellar’ in relation to the academic performance that exceeds expectations has been too ambiguous and did not convey the intended meaning. (For some having stellar performance could mean winning a Nobel Prize, while for others publishing an extra academic article above the quota specified by a college). We suggest a clearer and more uniform language. Three performance levels (consistent with previously used unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and stellar) are suggested: Does Not Meet Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Exceeds Expectations.

### APPROVED REVISED VERSION

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

When a department chair or unit supervisor is under consideration for post-tenure review, the Post-Tenure Review Advisory Committee shall review the faculty member's file and make, in writing, a Does Not Meet, Meets, or Exceeds Expectations evaluation to the appropriate dean. In the event deficiencies are noted which require the development of a three-year plan, the appropriate dean will be responsible for developing the plan for faculty development and monitoring the progress of the faculty member engaged in this plan with the assistance of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. Administrators other than department chairs or unit supervisors who are tenured will not undergo post-tenure review unless or until they return to a faculty role with little or no administrative responsibilities. Any administrator returning to a faculty role with little or no administrative responsibilities is to be reviewed five years after returning and reviews shall continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review for promotion. In the post-tenure review of a department chair or other faculty member with an administrative assignment, provision must be made for his or her activities in that area. Those with administrative responsibilities will still be subject to policy and procedures regarding administrative evaluation (see, for example, Sections 104.03 and 104.04).

### Figure 3

#### UWG Faculty Handbook

#### Modification of 104.0208 Appeal for Reconsideration

##### *Rationale:*

The previously used word ‘stellar’ in relation to the academic performance that exceeds expectations has been too ambiguous and did not convey the intended meaning. (For some having stellar performance could mean winning a Nobel Prize, while for others publishing an extra academic article above the quota specified by a college). We suggest a clearer and more uniform language. Three performance levels (consistent with previously used unsatisfactory, satisfactory, and stellar) are suggested: Does Not Meet Expectations, Meets Expectations, and Exceeds Expectations.

#### APPROVED REVISED VERSION

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

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

College of Science and Mathematics: 1

College of Social Science: 1

College of Arts and Humanities: 1

Richards College of Business: 1

College of Education: 1

School of Nursing: 1

The Ingram Library: 1

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

The committee shall meet at the call of its committee chair. The committee chair shall review the applicable departmental, college, library and university policies and procedures governing post-

tenure review so that committee members will be aware of these before any review process begins.

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

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

Within fifteen (15) working days of receipt of an appeal, the University-wide Appeals Committee for Post-Tenure Review shall carefully evaluate the faculty member's file in light of the written appeal. This evaluation shall be made in accordance with the procedure established for initial consideration (e.g., voting on a colleague's status with regard to the post-tenure review shall be by secret ballot; each faculty member being reviewed shall be evaluated as either Does Not Meet, Meets or Exceeds Expectations with regard to his or her overall accomplishments; to be adjudged as Does Not Meet Expectations, faculty under review must receive votes of Does Not Meet Expectations from at least sixty percent (60%) of the voting members of the committee).

The committee chair, in consultation with the other members of the University-wide Appeals Committee for Post-Tenure Review shall prepare a written evaluation for each faculty member reviewed on appeal during post-tenure review. This evaluation must be signed by all members of the committee and must provide specific reasons for conclusions contained within it. It should report the recommendation arrived at by the University-wide Appeals Committee for Post-Tenure Review with regard to a faculty member's performance; address the faculty member's record of accomplishments and quality of contributions with regard to teaching, academic achievement, service and professional growth and development; clarify any areas needing improvement; and, where applicable, offer specific suggestions on what will be needed to improve performance.

This evaluation must be written as clearly and collegially as possible. This evaluation shall take precedence over the previous evaluation of the faculty member. The evaluation of this committee shall be forwarded to the faculty member under review, the appropriate department chair or unit supervisor, the appropriate dean, and the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

## Figure 4

*UWG Faculty Handbook*

Modification Proposal for 103.0205 Appeal for Reconsideration

### *Rationale:*

This is an update language to clarify the appeal process and ensure transparent communication between the candidate and the evaluating entity. This is also a correction of the section number.

## APPROVED REVISED VERSION

### **103.0202 Appeal for Reconsideration**

Notification of a negative evaluation shall be communicated in writing by the appropriate supervisory level no later than ten University Business Days prior to the required notification to the next level. Any candidate appealing for reconsideration at any level shall, within five University Business Days of the receipt of the report, state in writing the grounds for his or her request. The appeal shall include any additional pertinent material.

Within five University Business Days of receipt of an appeal, the party to whom the appeal has been made shall carefully re-evaluate the candidate's dossier in light of the written appeal. The results of the re-evaluation shall be communicated to the candidate in writing within five University Business Days. This re-evaluation shall be made in accordance with the procedure established for initial consideration at this level and shall replace this party's previous evaluation in the candidate's dossier. The dossier will then proceed to the next level. The candidate may withdraw the dossier at any point in the process.

## Figure 5

*UWG Faculty Handbook*

Modification Proposal for 103.0206 Promotion in Professorial Rank of a Member of the Administrative Staff

*Rationale:*

This is the correction of a section number.

### APPROVED REVISED VERSION

#### **103.0203 Promotion in Professorial Rank of a Member of the Administrative Staff**

Members of the administrative staff who hold faculty rank in a teaching area and who wish to be considered for promotion shall submit a dossier to the chair of the department in which they hold rank. Their applications shall be considered under the procedures herein prescribed.

## Figure 6: Approval of UWG Procedure 2.2.4, Appeal for Reconsideration



### **UWG PROCEDURE NUMBER: 2.2.4, Appeal for Reconsideration**

***Authority:* UWG POLICY 2.2 (Promotion)**

The University of West Georgia (UWG) faculty, pursuant to the authority of UWG Policy 2.2, establishes the following procedures for compliance with UWG Policy 2.2 on Promotion:

The purpose of the procedure is to clearly communicate to the University of West Georgia faculty the appeal for reconsideration procedure in the evaluation process for tenure and promotion.

#### **A. Appeal for Reconsideration Procedure**

Notification of a negative evaluation shall be communicated in writing by the appropriate supervisory level no later than ten University Business Days prior to the required notification to the next level. Any candidate appealing for reconsideration at any level shall, within five University Business Days of the receipt of the report, state in writing the grounds for his or her request. The appeal shall include any additional pertinent material.

Within five University Business Days of receipt of an appeal, the party to whom the appeal has been made shall carefully re-evaluate the candidate's dossier in light of the written appeal. The results of the re-evaluation shall be communicated to the candidate in writing within five University Business Days. This re-evaluation shall be made in accordance with the procedure established for initial consideration at this level and shall replace this party's previous evaluation in the candidate's dossier. The dossier will then proceed to the next level. The candidate may withdraw the dossier at any point in the process.

#### **B. Compliance**

The University of West Georgia follows the Board of Regents policies on this matter, and to the extent the language conflicts, the Board of Regents language prevails. ([BOR Academic and Student Affairs Handbook](#), 4.7 Evaluation of Faculty; and [BOR Policy Manual](#), 8.3.5 Evaluation of Personnel).

*Issued by the* [title of person charged with writing procedure], *the* \_\_\_\_ *day of* \_\_\_\_\_, *2019.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature, [title of person charged with writing procedure]

Reviewed by President [or VP]: \_\_\_\_\_

*Previous version dated:* *N/A*

**Figure 7: Presidential Search Update**



## **Faculty Senate Chair's Report on Presidential Search and Screen Committee Activities**

**October 11, 2019**

1. As you know, over the last two weeks, the Presidential Search and Screen committee has held twelve listening sessions. The audio of those has been assembled, albeit redacted, and distributed in a password protected site, for members of the committee to review.
2. A graphic and composite collection of the over 500 surveys completed by the UWG community have also been distributed to the committee. They are not available for public consumption unless an interested party asks via the open records law.
3. As your representative on this committee, I have repeatedly argued that the president should come from academia. This remains a contention among the members of the committee. If I am defending a cause not shared by Senators, please talk with me. That is the only way for me to better represent you. Below is the written statement I submitted.

Although I liked Dr. Marrero immensely, not being a part of the faculty broke a long tradition of all administrators, including the president, teaching at least one class a year. While he supported faculty in ways that we appreciated, e.g., pay equity, I missed weekly lunches, socials with faculty, and I feel he never had the camaraderie with faculty on a regular basis. With that in mind, the new president should come from the ranks of the faculties in his previous work history. As CEO, he may not have the time to teach or have regular socials or meals with the faculty. I recognize our size dictates a lot more formality. While we need someone who can raise money, think ten years or more ahead, somewhere in the person's acumen, he, or she, should have taught, gone through T&P, and other experiences, that the rank and file professors live.

4. The advertisement of the position closes on October 22, 2019.
5. The committee meets again on November 1, 2019 to narrow the pool of applicants to 8 – 10.
6. Those applicants will be interviewed in person in late November and the committee will then narrow that list to 3 – 5 names and report those names to the BOR.
7. In early December, the Regent's Special Committee interviews second-round candidates.
8. It is anticipated that a new president will be named by the close of the semester.



## Figure 8: Comprehensive Program Review Schedule

# Comprehensive Program Reviews

All templates for this year's Comprehensive Program Review have been sent to the 16 programs undergoing review this year. The Chairs for UPC and GPC have been cc'd as well. This year's review schedule is listed below. It can also be found on the [VPAA website](#).

### 2019-2020 Schedule:

- Programs will submit the review to their Dean's office no later than **Monday, December 2, 2019**.
- Dean's will submit their review to the Provost's office no later than **Monday, February 3, 2020**.
- Faculty Senate committees (UPC & GPC) submit reviews to Provost Office by **Wednesday, April 1, 2020**.
- Provost's Office shares review and Provost Summary Form with Programs by **Tuesday, June 30, 2020**.
- Provost's Office files final review and Provost Summary Form for BOR review no later than **Wednesday, July 15, 2020**.

### Programs undergoing review - Undergraduate

1. BA Art
2. BA English
3. BA International Languages and Cultures
4. BA History
5. BA Philosophy
6. BA Theatre
7. BFA Art
8. BM Music
9. Minor in Creative Writing
10. Minor in Literature
11. Minor in Public Administration

### Program undergoing review – Graduate

1. MA English
2. MA History
3. MMUS Music
4. Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Museum Studies
5. Post-Baccalaureate Certificate in Public History

A sample template can be found on the CPR website listed above.

**Please Note:** The template has not changed much since last year. The changes made were in formatting as well as we requested for programs to limit their completed reports to 55 pages. There are also response areas for GPC and UPC to write your reviews. Please be sure to put your responses in the designated areas and not in separate documents.