

**University of West Georgia  
Faculty Senate Meeting  
Minutes**

**November 14, 2014  
Approved December 5, 2014**

1. Call to order: the meeting convened in room 1-203 of the Technology-enhanced Learning Center and was called to order by Elizabeth Kramer, Chair, at 3:01 p.m.

2. Roll Call

*Present*

Nancy Penco (substituting for Banford), Basu-Dutt, Boldt, Butler, Connell, DeFoor, DeSilva, Elman, Farmer, Farran, Faucette, Geisler, Gerhardt, Griffith, S. Hall, L. Haynes, Robert Voelkel (substituting for C. Johnson), Keim, Kilpatrick, Lopez, McCord, McCullers, McKendry-Smith, L. Miller, Mindrila, Cindy Smith (substituting for Ogletree), Remshagen, J. Roberts, L. Robinson, Blynnne Olivieri (substituting for C. Schroer), Seay, Skott-Myhre, Stanfield, Lisa Gezon (substituting for Steere), Tekippe, Welch, Williams, Willox, Elizabeth Stupi (substituting for Woodward), Yates

*Absent*

Erben, Mbaye, McGuire, Neely, Velez-Castrillon, Vinson, Xu

3. Minutes: a motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of October 10.

*Item approved unanimously by voice vote.*

4. Committee reports

**Committee II: Graduate Programs Committee (Susan Welch, Chair)**

**Action Items:**

A) College of Science and Mathematics

1) Course Proposal:

a) Geosciences Department

Course: GEOL 7203 Oceanography for Teachers

Request: Add

*Item approved unanimously by voice vote.*

B) College of Arts and Humanities

1) Course Proposal:

a) History Department

Course: HIST 5505 American Foreign Policy since 1898

Request: Add

*Item approved unanimously by voice vote.*

C) College of Education

1) Course Proposals:

a) COE Doctoral

Course: EDSI 7385 Special Topics in School Improvement

Request: Add

*Item approved unanimously by voice vote.*

b) Leadership and Instruction

Course: SEED 7265 Advanced Instructional Strategies for the 21st Century  
Classroom

Request: Add

*Item approved unanimously by voice vote.*

2) Program Proposals:

a) Educational Technology and Foundations

Program: Master of Education with a Major in Media (School Library Media)

Request: Modify

*Item approved unanimously by voice vote.*

b) Program: Post-Baccalaureate Non-Degree Initial Certification in Media (School Library Media)

Request: Modify

c) Program: Master of Education with a Major in Media (Instructional Technology)

Request: Modify

*These two items were taken together and approved unanimously by voice vote.*

d) Post-Baccalaureate Non-Degree Certification in Media (Instructional Technology)

Request: Modify

*After discussion regarding the inaccuracy of the Modification Details, this item was withdrawn by the Committee.*

D) Richards College of Business

1) Course Proposal:

a) Marketing and Real Estate

MKTG 6833 Sustainable Business Development

Request: Add

*Item approved unanimously by voice vote.*

**Committee IV: Academic Policies Committee (Susana Velez-Castrillon, Chair)**

**Action Items:**

A) Proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook in the following section:

**208.04 Grade Appeals**

**F. Procedures.** ~~The student is encouraged to present their concerns to the faculty member regarding their grade. If dissatisfied with the discussion with the faculty member t~~The student can initiate ~~the~~the a grade appeal in writing, using the Student Grade Appeal Form available from the Provost's website.

**1. Procedural Summary.** Grade appeals begin at the level of the Department Chair.

**a. Department Chair.** Upon receipt of the written grade appeal, the Chair (1) consults with the ~~faculty member and the faculty member and the~~ student, (2) determines whether the grade appeal should be considered as an Academic Dishonesty Grade Appeal or a Grade Determination Appeal, (3) shares the grade appeal with the faculty member and after review the faculty member may (but not required to) submit a narrative and any supporting documentation. ~~(433)~~ examines the available ~~evidence evidence~~ documentation, and (54) grants the appeal and changes the grade, or denies the appeal. The Chair notifies the student of the decision in writing. If the Chair denies the appeal, the written notification to the student should explain the student's right to appeal to the Dean (or Dean's designee). If the appeal is denied, the student may accept the decision and end the appeal process, or request that the appeal and all associated documentation be forwarded to the Dean (or Dean's designee).

B) Proposed changes to the Student Grade Appeal Form to reflect the new Grade Appeal Procedure:

The following statement and signature line for the faculty member will be added to the Department chair box:

"I have reviewed the student's grade appeal and stand by the grade."

**Faculty Handbook Current Wording**

208.04.

F. Procedures. The student initiates the grade appeal in writing, using the Student Grade Appeal Form available from the Provost's website.

1. Procedural Summary. Grade appeals begin at the level of the Department Chair.

a. Department Chair. Upon receipt of the written grade appeal, the Chair (1) consults with the faculty member and the student, (2) determines whether the grade appeal should be considered as an Academic Dishonesty Grade Appeal or a Grade Determination Appeal, (3) examines the available evidence, and (4) grants the appeal and changes the grade, or denies the appeal. The Chair notifies the student of the

decision in writing. If the Chair denies the appeal, the written notification to the student should explain the student's right to appeal to the Dean (or Dean's designee). If the appeal is denied, the student may accept the decision and end the appeal process, or request that the appeal and all associated documentation be forwarded to the Dean (or Dean's designee).

*After discussion regarding the Procedures, this item was withdrawn by the Committee.*

**Committee VI: Strategic Planning (Nadya Williams, Chair)**

**Information Item:**

- A) Update regarding the QEP and on-going work on Core Area B.

Dr. N. Williams reported that the ENG 1101L got a "NO" from the Board of Regents because they considered it remedial. There are two meetings on Area B to come: Monday at 4:00 p.m. and Tuesday at 2:00 p.m. All chairs in Area B need to attend. In January there will be a couple more townhall meetings for all faculty. Area B is Institutional Priorities, which is fluid; classes may be added and discussions are on-going. Strategic Planning is meeting next Friday. Contact your chair to give your input prior to January.

**Committee IX: Facilities and Services Committee (Ben Steere, Chair)**

- A) Presentation by Mark Reeves, Auxiliary Services, about recycling efforts on campus.

This was tabled until the December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of Faculty Senate.

**Committee XII: Budget Committee (Andrea Stanfield, Chair)**

**Information Item:**

- A) Dr. Marrero informed the committee that the goal of raising all staff salaries to market entry point will be met this month. Previously, only pay grades 1-10 had been raised to the entry point. All salaries in pay grades 11-19 that are not at the market entry point will be raised. The Mercer study is now two years old, so the office of Business & Finance is looking at doing a new study in an effort to keep the pay scale current. The committee supports these efforts.

Drs. Crafton and Marrero will update the Faculty Senate at the December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

5. Old business:

- A) Peer and Aspirant Institutions (Faye McIntyre)

Dr. McIntyre is a member of the Key Performance Indicators (KPI) team. She spoke for a few minutes with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation. She began by mentioning the 2008 study. The current review included an initial list of 7,735 institutions, with substantial quantitative analysis that identified a smaller list of 28 institutions. After qualitative analysis including input from across campus, the new list has been compiled. The purpose of the Peers and Aspirants lists is to give us baseline, quantitative data for our 75 KPI. We look at our peers, make goals, and measure results.

The new list follows.

Suggested Peers and Aspirants  
for the University of West Georgia

USG Sector Institutions

1. Georgia Southern University\*‡
2. Kennesaw State University\*‡
3. Valdosta State University\*\*

Suggested Peer Institutions

1. Central Washington University (WA)\*\*
2. Eastern Kentucky University (KY)\*\*‡
3. Sam Houston State University (TX)\*\* ‡
4. Stephen F. Austin State University (TX)\*\*‡
5. University of Central Missouri (MO)\*
6. University of Colorado – Colorado Springs (CO)\*\* ‡
7. University of Minnesota – Duluth (MN)\*\* ‡
8. University of Northern Colorado (CO)\*
9. University of Tennessee – Chattanooga (TN)\* ‡
10. Western Illinois University (IL)\*

Suggested Aspirational Institutions

1. Ball State University (IN) \*
2. Indiana University of Pennsylvania – Main Campus (PA)\*\* ‡
3. James Madison University (VA)\*
4. University of North Carolina – Wilmington (NC)\*\* ‡
5. University of Northern Iowa (IA)\*\*

\* AACSB - Both Business and Accounting

\*\* AACSB - Only Business

‡ ABET - Computer Science

B) Engagement survey (N. Jane McCandless)

Dr. McCandless has been chairing the Engagement Survey and spoke for a few minutes about the process and results with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation. She said that they have completed their townhall meetings and are almost ready to remove the word “DRAFT” from the document. The committee built a survey based on a literature review and discussion. They want to administer the

survey in February, which will be one year later from the initial survey. It will be close to last year's survey, but "a tad different." She commented that it can't get far from the Action Plans. This year we will run the entire survey, but in other years we may not, as opinion on each module may not need to be gathered each year. The idea is a process and we can change it; it will keep improving each year. The committee is meeting with the Studer Group on December 5<sup>th</sup>, who will actually administer the survey. Dr. McCandless pointed out the irony in paying an outside firm to do something that we do around the country for other organizations—but an organizational culture with a lack of trust makes that desirable for now. She stated that we own the survey, which will create revenue through Studer's use of it. The results will be structured such that employees are not individually identifiable; there must be five completed surveys in a unit, or the results are rolled up to the next unit to maintain confidentiality. All people employed by December 1, 2014 will be included.

## 6. New business

President Marrero gave a brief budget update. A total of \$10M in new money was requested by all divisions, over \$6M from academic departments. This was prioritized at each level and finally the VP level using the following sifters: 1) the UWG Strategic Plan; 2) Complete College Georgia for UWG, which is RPG; 3) the USG Strategic Plan; 4) enrollment growth and resulting stress to programs and services; 5) accreditation; and 6) compliance with regulations. The resulting lists of Tiers 1-3 and RPG money were disseminated to the deans and faculty. The president commented that we have set a goal of over 12,600 students next fall, projecting \$1.6M in new revenue for Tier 3. Tier 2 funding would be realized from a graduate student tuition increase. The budget we will actually receive in new funding request (Tier 1) from the BOR may be less than the request of \$1.5M in new money (all three Tiers equal over \$4.6M in needs). Dr. Marrero and Provost Crafton will address the Faculty Senate at the December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. Any faculty that wish to comment or have questions, please contact Andrea Stanfield, Chair of the Budget Committee.

## 7. Announcements

Faculty were encouraged to sign the get-well card being passed around the room for Myrna Gantner, who has suffered a broken foot.

## 8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Shelley Rogers,  
Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate and General Faculty