

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

July 19, 2013

Approved July 26, 2013 via electronic vote

1. Call to order: the meeting convened in room 1-303 of the Technology-enhanced Learning Center and was called to order by Jeff Johnson, Chair at 3:00 p.m.

2. Roll call

Present

Basu-Dutt, Butler, DeFoor, Hasbun (substitute for DeSilva), Erben, Faucette, Gant, Geisler, Haynes, Insenga, D. Jenks (substitute for C. Jenks), Sinkey (substitute for Kassis), Keim, Kramer, Moffeit, Morris, Noori, Packard, Parrish, Ponder, Popov, Robinson, Sanders, Olivieri (substitute for Schroer), Stanfield, Steere, Tekippe, Van Valen, Velez-Castrillon, Welch, Willox

Absent

Banford, Blair, DeFoor, de Nie, Erben, Farmer, Griffith, Halonen-Rollins, Hooper, Kilpatrick, Lloyd, Mayer, Penco, Riker, Rutledge, Samples, Skott-Myhre, Thompson, Yeong

3. Approval of the minutes of the April 19th meeting: these were approved on May 14 via electronic vote, but the chair reopened discussion. No additions or corrections were suggested, so the minutes stood as approved.
4. New business: welcome and introduction of the new president, Dr. Kyle Marrero:
Upon introduction by the chair, Dr. Marrero addressed the Faculty Senate for about ten minutes. He expressed appreciation for the warm welcome he received. He said that he has spent the previous three weeks and two days going around town and learning of the relationships of people in the community to UWG. Only one in ten people he spoke with have been on campus in the last year, despite the University being the fourth largest employer. It will be a main focus of Dr. Marrero to get folks to come on campus. He mentioned that he will be “a big storyteller,” talking about us to everyone, like about the \$300M in new construction on campus. Dr. Marrero will be learning and listening; he

spoke about listening to 21 of 23 people around the University in an embedded group to help him learn about the institution. He asks them, “what are you most proud of at this institution? What are your risks? Obstacles? Culture? What are your decision-making processes, and how are those communicated?” He is seeing common themes among the movers and shakers. Dr. Marrero stated that there is much to do, citing the SACS reaffirmation visit and the refashioning of Institutional Research & Planning as examples-- looking at the totality of operations based on data. He will be pushing the academic master plan to inform the strategic plan. It must be a living, breathing document and ready by early spring, 2014. It is necessary to align the budget to the strategic plan. Dr. Marrero emphasized that the takeaway from his speech is to remember that throughout the year’s process, we have to say who we are, what we are, what our mission and vision are, and align all of them. Dr. Marrero concluded by thanking Dr. Sethna, said that he was thrilled to be here, and asked for questions. He added that he will have an open door policy and he is currently meeting with the deans, Board of Regents, and chamber leaders.

5. Committee reports

Committee II: Graduate Programs Committee (Chair, Mark S. Parrish)

Action Items:

A) College of Arts and Humanities

- 1) History
 - a) 5251 The Second World War
Request: Add
Action: Approved

Item approved unanimously by voice vote.

B) College of Education

- 1) Leadership and Instruction
 - a) Master of Education with a Major in Secondary Education
Request: Modify
Action: Approved

Item approved unanimously by voice vote.

- b) SEED 7500 Diverse Classroom in a Pluralistic Society
Request: Add
Action: Approved

Item approved unanimously by voice vote.

2) Clinical and Professional Studies

- a) Master of Education with a Major in Reading Education

Request: Modify
Action: Approved

Item approved unanimously by voice vote.

C) School of Nursing

- a) NURS-6107 Pathophysiology and Pharmacology II
Request: Add
Action: Approved

- b) NURS-6108 Epidemiology for Nursing Education and Practice
Request: Add
Action: Approved

- c) NURS-6109 Informatics, Technology, and Healthcare Outcomes
Request: Add
Action: Approved

- d) NURS-6110 Curriculum Development in Nursing Education
Request: Add
Action: Approved

- e) NURS-6111 Nurse Educator Role Practicum I
Request: Add
Action: Approved

- f) NURS-6112 Nurse Educator Role Practicum II
Request: Add
Action: Approved

- g) NURS-6113 Evaluation and Testing in Nursing Education
Request: Add
Action: Approved

- h) NURS-6116 Leading Human Resource Systems
Request: Add
Action: Approved

- i) NURS-6117 Health Systems Leadership: Role of the Leader/Manager I
Request: Add
Action: Approved

- j) NURS-6118 Health Systems Leadership: Role of the Leader/Manager II
Request: Add
Action: Approved

- k) NURS-6119 Health Systems Leadership Leader/Manager Practicum I
Request: Add
Action: Approved
- l) NURS-6120 Health Systems Leadership Leader/Manager Practicum II
Request: Add
Action: Approved
- m) NURS-6122 Health Systems Leadership Clinical Nurse Leader Practicum I
Request: Add
Action: Approved
- n) NURS-6123 Health Systems Leadership Clinical Nurse Leader Practicum II
Request: Add
Action: Approved
- o) NURS-6124 Health Systems Leadership Role of the Clinical Nurse Leader
Request: Add
Action: Approved

Items of C presented together.

Items approved unanimously by voice vote.

Information Items:

- A) College of Education
 - 1) Leadership and Instruction
 - a) Master of Education with a Major in Middle Grades Education
Request: Program Deactivate
Action: Information Only
- B) Richards College of Business
 - a) Request: MBA Admission Policy Review

The RCOB Graduate Business Programs Committee and the RCOB Graduate Faculty voted and approved the following measures:

- Any student who has completed a RCOB discipline bachelor's degree with a 3.0 or higher overall GPA will be admitted without the GMAT requirement to the MBA program.
 - o This process is similar to the MPAcc program GMAT waiver policy, whereby MPAcc applicants with an accounting degree and a 3.2 GPA can apply to waive the GMAT.
- Eliminate the requirement of any, and all letters of purpose or intent to receive admission to the MBA program.

- No MBA applicant has ever been denied admission based on a letter of intent.

6. Old business:

Information item:

Response from Dr. Sethna regarding reconsideration of termination of the MURP program.

What is considered healthy for the Faculty Senate to comment on? This was a central question of the discussion on this item. Dr. Sethna observed that the MURP termination was not an official agenda item of the Senate; he received it outside of the course deletions, etc. In the last two years, program activations and deactivations have been taken out of Senate and put back into the College, so they come to Senate as informational items, not action items. Dr. Jon Anderson elaborated that the UPC, GPC, Rules, and Academic Policies Committees formulated a Senate document about shared governance and he referred interested faculty to it as the guiding document. Dr. Rob Sanders talked about the resolution function of Senate. Dr. Javier Hasbun discussed how course deletions and additions go through a committee. As part of a healthy process, the Senate is the only avenue in which reconsideration may occur. Dr. Sethna said that offering one program for deactivation was an action of the Provost and has been a common theme across the country and state during these difficult financial times. The (former) president supports the Provost making sure all programs are viable programs, but the decision was initially made at the College level and he would not want to second-guess that decision. A question was asked: so should discussion be directed to the Dean in future, or the Provost? The Chair, Dr. Jeff Johnson, noted that nothing is preventing the Senate from making a motion for reconsideration; but these discussions and/or decisions should occur more at the College level. The President's recommendation was to have the Dean reconsider the decision.

At this point, Dean Jane McCandless expressed appreciation for the opportunity to address the Senate for five minutes and share a PowerPoint presentation about the future of the College of Social Sciences. She said it took time to reflect on a two-year process; they do have a shared governance structure. Dr. McCandless found two specific problems: 1) there was not a defined process, and 2) not all colleges gave a program up for deactivation consideration. In spring 2013 they completed their strategic plan. Dr. Houston Davis, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Acting Officer of the University System of Georgia, wrote a letter dated April 3, 2013 concerning the viability of low-producing programs. Dr. McCandless used the guidelines from that letter to consider programs with fewer than ten graduates over a three-year rolling period. She also conducted a literature review and came out with a number of talking points and looked at the numbers. The discussion in COSS involved more than MURP; they did an evaluation of all their graduate programs, producing a 30-page report. She encouraged the faculty to look at each program, urging them not to be afraid and to drill deeper. "What can we do to create viable programs?" she asked them. They came up with a number of strategies, including certificate programs, community engagement, and interdisciplinary synergies. They included these

strategies in their discussion for every graduate program in the college. Making sure programs are viable is necessary as RPG (retention, progression, graduation) will be a primary factor in determining funding for UWG and other USG institutions. Dr. McCandless concluded with the fact that the MURP program is not deactivated at this point. It is reactivated; it is breathing. They are working hard to make it a viable program.

7. New business:

Information item:

Protocol for Employee Civil Rights Complaints – Item from Myrna Gantner and Juanita Hicks

Dr. Gantner stated that the new protocol is required by the federal government for every institution receiving federal funding. The Title IX Committee developed the protocol document over the last year and is sharing it with Senate for feedback. Dr. Gantner requested that any feedback be provided to her office by August 1, 2013. Is the clarity of the language okay? Let her know what you think.

Jane Simpson, University General Counsel, discussed Title VII and IX complaints in response to a question about not seeing a difference in the new protocol from what was previously required. She noted that although the 1964 laws remain, the current (2011) administration is interpreting compliance differently. The hearing/grievance process is to allow a complainant a chance to appeal. Ms. Simpson observed that UWG has had potential issues regarding religion and race complaints.

8. Announcements: none

9. Meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Shelley Rogers,

Executive Secretary of the Faculty Senate and General Faculty