

Faculty Senate

Meeting Minutes

November 8, 2019

Approved December 6, 2019

1. Call to Order

Chair Butler called the meeting to order at 1:01 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Present:

Barbour, Bertau, Besnosov, Boumenir, Branyon, Cheng, Chwialkowska, Dahms, DeFoor, Dutt, Elman, Fuentes, Gault, Gordon, Green (sub. Griffin), Hansen, Hong, Ivory (sub. Cook), Kellison (sub. Lane), Kimbrel, Koczkas (sub. Zapata), Lanier (sub. Perryman), McKendry-Smith, MacKinnon, McLean, Miller (sub. Pearson), Moon, Morris (sub. Swift), Neely, Nickell, Ogletree, Pashia, Pazzani, Penceo, Pidhainy, Reber, Rees, Remshagen, Richter, Scullin, Self, Snipes, Sterling, Taylor (sub. Capponi), Tweraser, Wadlingdon, and Wang

Absent:

Faucette, Geyer, Gu, and Towhidi

3. Approval of Minutes from October 11, 2019

Minutes unanimously approved by voice vote.

4. Committee Reports

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

Action Items:

A) Tanner Health Systems School of Nursing

1) [NURS 3000 - Holistic Health Assessment](#)

Request: Modify

Items 1 and 4 were taken as a block and approved unanimously

2) [NURS 3201 - Health Care of the Client I](#)

Request: Modify

Item approved unanimously.

3) [NURS 3210 - Medication Mathematics](#)

Request: Add

Item approved unanimously.

4) [NURS 3301 - Clinical Practice I](#)

Request: Modify

Items 1 and 4 were taken as a block and approved unanimously

- 5) [NURS 4000 - Preparation for Nursing Licensure](#)

Request: Modify

Item approved unanimously.

- 6) [NURS 4103 - Professional Nursing Concepts Capstone](#)

Request: Add

Item approved unanimously.

- 7) [NURS 4202 - Health Care of the Client IV](#)

Request: Modify

Item approved unanimously.

- 8) [Nursing, Pre-Licensure Track, Carrollton, BSN](#)

Request: Modify

Items 8 and 9 were taken as a block and approved unanimously.

- 9) [Nursing, Pre-Licensure Track, Newnan, BSN](#)

Request: Modify

Items 8 and 9 were taken as a block and approved unanimously.

B) University College

- 1) [XIDS 4985 - Special Topics in Interdisciplinary Studies](#)

Request: Add

Item approved unanimously.

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

Action Items:

B) College of Education

- 2) Department of Communication Sciences and Professional Counseling

- e) [College Student Affairs](#)

Request: Add

Item approved unanimously.

C) Richards College of Business

- 1) Department of Marketing and Real Estate

- b) [MKTG 5823 - Logistics and Supply Chain Management](#)

Request: Add

- c) [MKTG 5828 - Green Marketing](#)

Request: Add

All items from the Richards College of Business Department of Marketing and Real Estate were taken as a block and approved unanimously.

Information Items:

A) College of Education

- 1) Department of Communication Sciences and Professional Counseling

- 1) [Professional Counseling and Supervision, Ed.D.](#)

These modifications add a minimum graduate GPA of 3.5, a minimum GRE writing scale score of 3.5 to the admissions requirements for this program, revise the language associated with master's degrees in related fields based on the current professional terminology used in mental health, and clarify the language regarding the related fields that are appropriate for consideration for admission.

- 2) Department of Sport Management, Wellness, and Physical Education

- a) [Sport Management, M.S. Concentrations in Intercollegiate Athletics Administration, Sport Analytics](#)

This modification adds the GMAT as an option for admission to the program.

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

Action Item: (Figure 1)

B) UWG Academic Catalogs

- 3) Undergraduate Catalog - Admission

- a) Opportunities for Students During High School

Request: Modify

Item approved unanimously.

Committee IV: Rules Committee (Anja Remshagen, Chair)

Information Item:

- A) Angela Branyon is chair-elect of the Rules Committee.

5. Old Business

6. New Business

7. Announcements

- A) Senate Liaison Reports

No Liaison Reports.

- B) General Education Assessment Committee, Angela Insenga (**Figure 2**)

Dr. Insenga presented the Charter for the standing General Education Assessment Committee, as well as a brief overview of the committee's purpose in and plan for assessing Core Areas A-F.

C) Budget, David Jenks and Micheal Crafton

As the time was 1:18 p.m. and a previously circulated email to university faculty stated that the Faculty Senate would begin the budget discussion at 1:30 p.m., Dr. Sterling asked to wait until 1:30 p.m. to begin the discussion. Dr. Ogletree then asked for an update on the current Presidential Search.

Chair Butler stated that of a total of 92 applicants, they have narrowed the pool down to 14. The committee then ranked their top 8 candidates in order of preference based on a rubric measuring three themes in order to further narrow that pool down to 10 candidates with an unspecified number of alternates. She further noted that the ad for the search closed on October 22, 2019, and that the last listening session had taken place. She then reminded faculty of the current survey on the website. When asked if all candidates had a terminal degree in their fields, she stated that she did not recall. When asked if faculty could see a list of faculty-submitted questions for the candidates, Chair Butler stated that the committee has looked for frequently asked questions and composed a list from that pool. She then updated the faculty on the timeline of the search, stating that interviews would take place the week before Thanksgiving and that the candidate pool would be narrowed further to 3-5 candidates around December 1.

At the 1:30 p.m. mark, Chair Butler invited faculty and students waiting outside to come inside and thanked the students in attendance for their love and support over the past week. She then invited the students to read their prepared statements, which have been included as (Figure 3). After a round of applause for the students, Chair Butler then turned the discussion over to Interim President Crafton and Interim Provost Jenks, who also read prepared statements of explanation and apology for any confusion and lack of information over the past week. Both promised that they will make sure that there is no gap in communication moving forward, and both stated how impressed they were with the support and love from our students during this time.

Dr. Crafton noted that he and Dr. Jenks had just met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee in a productive meeting to discuss the current budget situation, and they welcomed faculty to join him in crafting a solution here and at subsequent meetings and town halls on the subject. The first Budget Town Hall will take place on Monday, November 11 at 2:30 p.m.

in the Campus Center Ballroom, and Dr. Crafton stated that much more information will be provided at that meeting.

Dr. Crafton clarified that non-renewal letters were not a termination. Instead, faculty receiving said letters were not guaranteed a new contract for AY20. Still, he said, that does not diminish the feelings of those who received a non-renewal letter.

A timeline of events was then given. In the Fall, enrollment became clear. From Fall 17 to Fall 19, we have lost 818 first-time, full-time Freshman, and that loss of credit hours resulted in a loss of tuition revenue. The loss of tuition revenue from the loss of 500 students for the current fiscal year is estimated to be a little over \$3 million. This causes a multiplier effect, as this loss is compounded year after year. The university budget is based on expenditures and costs of running the university and earned revenue, which is primarily enrollment-based. When thinking of the big picture, the budget is an effect of those two things. The goal is to grow enrollment and retention, as well as try to strategize on the management of the budget without sacrificing student success and academic rigor. This campus-wide budget analysis will continue during the current fiscal year.

Dr. Crafton reiterated the November 11 meeting, stating that much more detail about the current budget situation will be provided then. They are also in the process of learning everything they can about the budget by looking at enrollment ideas, and what has worked at other institutions. He then reiterated his invitation for feedback and questions from faculty at this meeting and the subsequent meetings that follow. Dr. Crafton stated that faculty voice and involvement is critical to this process before turning things over to Dr. Jenks.

Dr. Jenks thanked the students and faculty for the time to talk today, and he echoed Dr. Crafton's apology on how the situation over the past week was handled. He stated that moving forward, they promise complete transparency, and we can get through this by working together. The situation is fluid and under development and they have been in conversations with PAC, Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Dean's Council, and Admin Council. These conversations will continue as they work with campus stakeholders to address the issue. They will keep an open dialogue moving forward, and will update faculty with more information as it becomes available and they are committed to a transparent process.

Dr. Jenks stated that faculty non-renewals are not the only area where they are seeking savings, and the non-renewals were addressed at this time due to policy deadlines. They are also reviewing administration departments, other non-personnel budgets, travel technology, and campus operating expenses. The goal is to minimize the impact on students.

When the extent of the fall enrollment decline became more clear, Dr. Jenks stated, they immediately began exploring necessary steps to mitigate the impact with priorities put on student success, enrollment management, academic program quality, and student safety and mental health. All future conversations and decisions will be guided by these priorities moving forward. He stated that the loss of 500 undergraduate students in the Fall of 2019 requires action on our part and is a serious matter.

With regards to the non-renewal letters, Dr. Jenks stated that these letters were sent in time to meet our campus deadlines and notify faculty members with certain levels of seniority. They seek to notify faculty that they will not be guaranteed a contract for the upcoming year. While they will try to minimize any disruptions to faculty employment moving forward, he stated that they have to address the reality of the enrollment budget shortfalls. This analysis of our faculty includes the assessment of several possibilities, such as vacancies, shifting full-time and part-time faculty, and critical hires. He stated that they are looking at new enrollment strategies, and enrollment is our top priority. They are re-evaluating our 2010 Go West Campaign in order to develop a new strategy in order to consider demographic changes and identify ways to reach prospective students with marketing strategies directed at other constituencies. They are also increasing their focus on examining student retention strategies, as well as student yield strategies, which is the percentage of students who choose to enroll after being admitted. He reiterated Dr. Crafton's statement about reaching out to other institutions who have faced similar issues.

Before opening the floor to questions, Chair Butler noted that Dr. Sterling wanted to make a statement. Dr. Sterling prefaced his statement by stating that this was not a personal attack, but a discussion of how the Department of Physics has been affected. A second-year tenure-track biophysics professor received a letter of non-renewal. This is a new area for the Physics Department with a lot of opportunities for growth, and this faculty member has interdisciplinary collaboration with Biology and Chemistry. He has created a lab for this purpose, and this professor, his students, and the Physics Department have all invested a considerable amount of time and money towards this collaborative program. Biophysics is now being offered for the first time by an incredibly popular professor who has glowing course evaluations. Dr. Sterling stated that this has ripple effects across the College of Science and Mathematics and unintended consequences that could irreparably damage the future of their department, the new biophysics program, our students, and our university as a whole. This affects our ability to recruit and retain students and faculty who come to UWG

because of what we offer. Dr. Sterling stated that serious these are sacrifices that are being made, and our future is being sacrificed. He added that we are at this university as faculty because we are problem solvers, and we can be part of this process, so let's make that happen so that we can work together to make the least destructive decision possible for our colleagues, departments, and students.

Chair Butler then opened the floor to questions, which were asked and answered as follows:

Q: At the recent AAUP meeting on the budget crisis, a PowerPoint slide showing an excerpt of the language from the non-renewal letters sent to faculty members in question reflected stated that "this is a termination year for you" and "we wish you success in whatever future endeavors you have," and did not seem to leave the door open to this being a mere policy issue allowing us to leave all avenues open. Can you address that?

Dr. Jenks: This letter is a standard letter used for non-renewals based on a board template and it has not changed in a decade. That issue was brought to our attention and something that we are exploring in special circumstances like this, that we could deviate from the template.

Q: Are you both telling us that we are going to change the model on how we will make the next round of decisions? We understand that this is a budget cut. Assuming the next batch of non-renewal letters will go out too, are we saying that there will be similar dialogue?

Dr. Jenks: Yes, there will absolutely be additional dialogue as we move forward to the next set, and we have much more time before the next set is due. To be clear, non-renewal policy set by the board for anyone who has been at the university in an instructor or a tenure-track line requires 9 months advanced notice of non-renewal. Anyone who has been at the university for 2 years requires 6-months-notice, and anyone who has been at the university for 1 Year or less requires 3-months-notice. The next iteration will be forwarded to the deans in December 2019, with a response date of January, and letters going out in February of 2020. We have quite a bit of time to have multiple conversations at a variety of levels.

Q: Can you identify who the chief stakeholders are in the budget process?

Dr. Jenks: Everyone. Students, faculty, staff across the university and across all divisions, as well as the community foundation boards and anyone who has a stake in the long-term health of the university.

Q: Is non-renewal final? If not, is there any new developments coming, and if so, what is the timeline for that?

Dr. Crafton: The budget is always evolving, and that budget is a function of enrollment that we anticipate for next fall and the strategies of being able to find sources in and around the budget. While we don't have all of the details yet, but with every passing month, we have a clearer sense of what the budget is going to be. That will guide our alteration, and extension of contracts to those who were sent non-renewal letters.

November is a very informative month for admissions, and we will know more then and even more in April.

Q: With regards to state allocation for education, it is important to state that we live in a climate that is increasingly anti-scientist, anti-liberal arts, and the politics of the day are certainly pressing down on this problem in a way that ought to be addressed.

Dr. Crafton: We can't really talk about that in any real detail here just off the cuff. State allocation is in many ways a function of enrollment, but the level of it is where it is.

Q: To what extent will you address student demand and request for being part of the conversation?

Dr. Jenks: We would love to have their participation at all levels, and we will reach out to them and make those opportunities available and figure out how we can involve them in the process early and often.

Q: Why wasn't there more transparency regarding the policy of non-renewal letters, and what exact steps do you plan on taking to avoid a surprise like this in the future?

Dr. Jenks: With regards to transparency, we had this conversation early in the year when we realized that enrollment might be lower within Admin Council and Dean's Council. The initial non-renewal recommendations are sent from the Department Chairs in late September, early October, to the Deans. They then have a conversation with the Department Chairs about their recommendations for non-renewal. The final list is then sent from the Deans to the Provost.

Dr. Crafton: As for planning, we can extend the date of notice from October 31 to November 15, and revise the language of the non-renewal letter.

Q: We keep hearing that this is a fluid situation, and that these notices were for 2nd year faculty, and that further notices could go out to more faculty. When will these professors know for sure whether or not their contracts will be renewed on behalf of their families so that they can have financial security?

Dr. Crafton: This is based upon the budget as it is, and we are waiting for more information to come. We will have a better idea by January.

Dr. Jenks: We will notify you ASAP.

Q: Seeking clarification of a few points that were discussed at the October 28, 2019 Admin Council meeting. At that meeting, Dr. Jenks noted a \$3.1 million reduction from lower enrollment and that we should count on a \$5 million cut that will affect personnel. It was also mentioned that Governor Kemp was talking about another 2-4% in cuts from our state allocation totaling \$2.2 million. In that meeting, Dr. Jenks stated that it would not be strategic to just focus on vacancies and retirements in the cuts, and that there would be no furloughs. Three days later, my colleagues received non-renewal notices. Today you note that future non-renewals will be forwarded to the Deans for consideration in December, but my understanding of the process this time is that the Deans' opinions and recommendations were not taken into consideration and were not honored by your office. Could you please clarify this process?

Dr. Jenks: The process itself for when non-renewal letters go out has been consistent for a long time and it goes to the Deans first. Not all recommendations were followed at this point due to the budget downturn. The downturn was incredibly fluid, which seems trite, but we got official enrollment data for the Fall on October 7 and the official budget numbers came in on October 15 and there was an enormous amount of overlap in the dates. At that time, we had to proceed with the budget projections that we were provided.

Q: What was the deciding factor going from the Deans to the non-renewal letters? Who decided who gets them, who doesn't?

Dr. Jenks: That would be me.

Q: Just you, David?

Dr. Jenks: Of course not, but I am the single point of accountability.

Q: Over the past two years there was an effort to diversify the university's faculty by hiring more minorities to adjust the faculty members to the diversity that we have in our student body. If these professors from the last two years that were hired are the ones who receive non-renewal letters, and if they leave then they won't come back. They are going to go to the press and UWG will be presented as an institution that is racist, an institution that is homophobic, etc, because the majority of professors who are getting these letters are part of the minority group. This happened at the University of Missouri in 2015, and the press presented them as racist. Enrollment went down drastically. After that there were more cuts, and programs were

cut, etc. I'm wondering about the impact in enrollment that all of these cuts can cost for our inclusion and how we are going to be received.

Dr. Crafton: That's what we are hoping to avoid as much as possible. Absolutely.

Q: How are you doing that?

Dr. Crafton: By increasing enrollment and cutting other areas of the budget. Those are the two ways. If we don't have to make those kinds of cuts then it won't be an issue, and we'll have to look at what ends up being the case and to respond to that. Right now, we just don't know.

Q: Why is it that faculty are the first on the line to be shot? That's how it appears anyway. When the budget cuts hit, panic sets in, it's faculty have to go. But it's faculty who bring the students here. They care about the programs and faculty. Can you tell us about other areas of the university that received non-renewal letters, perhaps the multiplicity of administrative positions that have been created over the past ten years, five years? Did anyone else besides faculty get letters of non-renewal?

Dr. Jenks: To answer directly, no, because only faculty have the non-renewal policy that applies. No one else requires one. For staff, correct me if I'm wrong, I believe that the minimum amount of time required for notice of termination is 60 days, recommended 90 days, but there is no other position on campus that requires a non-renewal letter. In response to faculty first, absolutely not in no way shape or form. The enrollment term we are talking about, preparing for FY21, which we'll explain in great detail on Monday, but the enrollment for this fall created a budget downturn for FY20 that we are currently in. That entire cut was covered centrally without affecting any faculty, staff, or students. So, was it faculty first? No. It was not, and I don't think it ever would be, and if it ever was at an institution that I was a part of, I don't think I would be very happy about it either.

Q: Two Questions: Did the non-renewals occur in every college and school on campus, or were there colleges or schools allowed to manage the budget reductions strategically and internally without issuing non-renewal letters. Second, what is the status of the University College? If we are looking for creative savings, I know that there is a Dean position and I haven't seen any announcement about that. Are we going to create a new administrative position? Can you speak to the status of University College and the administrative structure surrounding it?

Dr. Jenks: I will try to answer that as best I can without providing any specifics because they are non-renewals and personnel decisions. I can say that all colleges who had

people in the non-renewal pool were considered. As to a portion, I don't think I can mention that and I'm sorry about that. The University College Dean search has concluded and they have made recommendations, but we have put that discussion on hold to have larger budget discussions.

Q: My questions are concerning the actual budget crisis itself. How long have we been operating in the red, and have there been other considerations made to the budget because there is a rumor of frivolous spending by the administration. I'm wondering what is your take on that.

Dr. Crafton: We can't spend in the red or have a budget in the red by state law. We have to balance it every year and spend it out. We have a little bit of money that we carry forward from tuition, and that's the only part that we carry forward. That's just the state law with the budget. In terms of how long have we been dealing with this, as David Jenks said, this year we had a \$3.1 million shortfall projected, and we have taken care of that through all of the non-faculty ways we could. Some of those same strategies we can do next year, but not all, because every year there are slight differences in what money is allowed. There are always claims of frivolous spending, I suppose, in every area, but we have lots and lots and lots of controls and I think each department would say that they do what they can to not allow frivolous spending.

Q: Will you please provide us with a brief overview of the specific criteria that went into UWG's decision in sending out non-renewal letters to the specific faculty that they sent them to?

Dr. Crafton: We don't have all of that detail today, but we will have it on Monday and we can talk about that then.

Q: Were any Deans recommendations regarding contract renewal taken into consideration?

Dr. Jenks: Just to clarify, all Deans recommendations, Chairs and Deans, were taken into consideration. Yes, some were followed and others were not, which gets into the nuance.

Q: The damage has already been done. All of these faculty who received non-renewal letters are already on the market. We are at serious risk of losing two amazingly wonderful professors from the Psychology Department alone, and the Physics Department as well, and that person is the only one who knows how to use that specific equipment that they paid thousands and thousands of dollars for. I'm afraid. What are we going to do when the damage has already been done. If we can't tell these faculty in the next couple of weeks, and you are

talking months from now that we'll be able to possibly cancel their non-renewal letters, they're going to be gone. What are we who are left going to be able to do to cover all of these courses that our students need to take that are no longer available to them? We need to do something immediately, and I'm devastated for the professors who we are losing. This will have long term implications and devastating effects on this university.

Dr. Jenks: We are doing everything we can.

Statement: I'd like to say something about scheduling these meetings, These meetings cannot be in the middle of the day while we are teaching. Please try to schedule something at 8 a.m. or 5 p.m., so that everyone can have an opportunity to attend these meetings. In the Geosciences Department we had a short meeting on Tuesday, and we came up with a timely plan that I would say on Monday, but since I can't make it, I am saying it now. We are offering night classes to make education accessible because we know that geologists come out of these other fields when they realize that they don't like those fields. That's where we get our majors. This plan about talking about enrollment and focusing on students who never existed in the first place is not the way to tackle this issue. We need to focus on the students who can't make it during the day like moms and dads who are working and need to come at night.

Q: How many non-renewals were sent?

Dr. Jenks: I can't speak to the specifics of the non-renewals.

Q: My question to you both is the same to my chair and my dean and which was what should I do? Am I supposed to look for another job? What would you do if you got one? Would you start looking for another job or would you fight, because I'm going to tell you that is my plan and I'm going to fight like hell for my job because I'm not just an assistant professor here, I am a graduate of the program that I teach in and I am passionately dedicated to my students, so at the end of the day if I am here as a professor or not, I still have a relationship with the university and I still hope and pray to speak kindly of the place that raised me. To see the growth in our concentration and we are growing enrollment in our area and we are attracting more students and it blows my mind that we are in this position right now.

Q: To add to that, we are in our second year here. I want to know, because budget cuts don't just happen, and you see this coming. Why were we even hired, only two years later to be told say you may not have a job next year?

Dr. Crafton: To answer your question, you don't always see them coming. When I became Interim President in April and May, I had a budget projection that was positive.

The difference was the number of students who actually showed up to pay tuition. That was the source of the cut. So, it was a surprise. To answer your question about fighting for your job, yes, fight! Absolutely. Stand up and talk about your significance. Keep doing that. What we're trying to do, and I'll go back to your question about the effects, and the effects aren't good and if the bell has been rung and we can't unring it, but we can work as rapidly as possible to get the picture clear enough to do what we can do. But we have to come back and say that what we are seeing for next year is a real big deficit. It's larger than an entire division, so we have to take it seriously. Let me mention also that we have another meeting on this subject to try to get some solutions in about fifteen minutes that we'll have to leave here to attend, so I don't want it to appear that we are running away, but we do have to go work on it.

Q: Thanks for sharing the numbers that I hadn't heard before. You let us know that we've lost 818 first-time, full-time Freshmen, which I hadn't heard before, but I had heard that we lost 500 this year. So that means we lost 318 last year. What steps were taken last fall to staunch the bleeding, so to speak, and do we know if those steps work? Why did things get worse if we did do something new? What's going on with recruitment and marketing that it got worse over a year?

Dr. Crafton: Well I wasn't in the job at that time, but I know from talking with them that they are working their tails off to try to correct this issue. In the Fall 17 to Fall 18, we had graduate growth that offset the downturn in undergraduate growth. So part of this strategy is pushing graduate growth, and that worked for one year. But graduate growth can't keep going to offset what's happening. Undergraduate enrollment was going down, but it did come back up, but then it went down again. We will share all of this data on Monday and we'll have more detail for you then. So Fall 17 was down 300, but Fall 18 it came back up just a tiny bit, and that was a sign that it was moving, but it was back down in Fall 19. But the projects that I was shown showed that it was back up.

Q: Will you be able to talk Monday about the reserves?

Dr. Crafton: Yes, Monday.

Q: I'm also concerned about the lack of trust. You are making lots of promises and saying that we'll be involved, why should we believe you? Particularly because in terms of how these decisions were made, I feel like a lot of us feel that our trust was broken because in the Faculty Handbook it says that recommendations for non-renewal shall be made by the Department Chair in consultation with the tenured members of the Department. Tenured

faculty members and Chairs were not aware that this would happen when the recommendations were made. Then when the decision came from the very top down, that breaks all of our trust. Why should we trust you and how are you going to make sure that we are involved?

Dr. Crafton: Academic Affairs was involved in all of those non-renewal letters, and so they would speak to that, but the only thing that I can say in response is the same thing I said at Executive that I have to try everything I can and I have to have your support. I actually want to close on this point. That means helping me contribute to doing what needs to be done. The only element in trust is in the doing, and it's only in the doing that the trust can be earned.

Q: I have two questions: Can we talk a little about solutions before you go, and are your answers being directed by the Board of Regents today?

Dr. Crafton: No, my answers are not being directed by the Board of Regents. The first part, I don't really want to go into those kinds of solutions and I can only go into the larger abstract buckets of where the solutions are. The budget is twofold: One you have to drive the enrollment and increase the revenue and two you have to work on expenditures and decrease the budget size. Sadly, you have to have hiring pauses. You have to analyze every kind of operating budget and expenditure in the budget. Every division is doing that and coming up with their solutions to their chunk in the budget.

Q: In what ways are upper administration coming to bat for our faculty-at-large to the USG, any state boards that make decisions about funding, etc. What way is our upper administration working with the state to make sure we get the funding we need, and how are we working with the state government to get more funds so that things like this don't happen?

Dr. Crafton: Of course, you are talking about areas outside our control. We do all the advocacy that we can. We are allowed to make a budget presentation each year, and we do, and we make them as passionately and extravagantly as we can. But those areas outside our control, we can't affect.

Student Follow-up statement: Yes, but this is outside student control too, and we're here and we're standing up and we'd love to see our upper administration do the exact same thing. What are we going to do if we can't get the education we need if we lose professors? If we can't get the classes we need? Our programs are going to collapse.

Student Follow-up statement: Going on what was just said about trust, trust also needs to be built among students as well. There needs to be more transparency with students about the budget process and the renewal process.

Dr. Crafton: yes, and that's exactly what we've been saying that we need to create those structures and we'll be doing that in the next few weeks and putting them to use. It's in the doing. Our goal is to try to work through this and get it solved. I can only do it with your help and I'll do the best I can.

Q: It feels like student enrollment is also out of your control. So I'm wondering what lessons have you learned from other universities that are facing budgetary cuts. What do you know as administrators and what do you plan to do and what is your action plan to ensure faculty and students? What is your action plan for us?

Dr. Crafton: Let me close on that one, because I think the enrollment plan is very good. We'll talk about it more on Monday, but I can talk about it briefly here. Since I noticed what was going on with the enrollment, I started a different structure of meeting with the enrollment management people, looking at the various things they were pushing as a recruitment strategy. We did a few things to enhance recruiting of first-year, full-time freshmen and we started moving in five areas of enrollment: retention, graduate programming, international, dual enrollment, and adult learners who have no degree and take classes at classes. So we are exploring and recruiting heavily in those areas, and the enrollment team meets weekly now to talk about new strategies and new targets. We are doing all that we can do.

Q: Those of us who cannot attend Monday's meeting, is there some way to record that meeting to make it available?

Dr. Crafton: I don't know, but we can ask, and certainly the materials would be available.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:48 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted by
Colleen Vasconcellos
Executive Secretary, Faculty Senate

FIGURE 1

UWG Undergraduate Catalog Modification of Admissions, Opportunities for Students During High School

Rationale:

1. SAT and ACT can be cost-prohibitive for high school students.
2. The Accuplacer was made available for all USG Dual Enrollment students on 7/19/19 with the 3.1.1.4 Dual Enrollment Requirements.
3. The Accuplacer is run by The CollegeBoard nationwide which also administers the SAT exam.
4. Currently, 11 other USG institutions use the Accuplacer as a test to measure enrollment eligibility.
5. All but one of the 11 institutions use the requirements that are being suggested for UWG. Georgia Highlands College is the exception.
6. Beginning Spring 2020, we will begin to administer the Accuplacer as one of the tests UWG uses to measure enrollment eligibility for 11th and 12th graders only.
7. The Accuplacer has no bearing on the current ACT or SAT requirements for Dual Enrollment students.

Other USG Institutions Using Accuplacer for Dual Enrollment Admissions

1. Albany State University
2. Atlanta Metropolitan State College
3. College of Coastal Georgia
4. East Georgia State College
5. Fort Valley State University
6. Georgia Highlands College
7. Georgia Southern University
8. Gordon State College
9. Savannah State University
10. South Georgia State College
11. Valdosta State University

APPROVED REVISED VERSION

Opportunities for Students During High School

Dual Enrollment, formerly Move On When Ready (MOWR) is Georgia's dual enrollment program that allows high school students to earn college credit while working on their high school diploma. The Dual Enrollment program includes provisions to help remove some of the financial barriers that may prevent students from participating in a dual enrollment program.

Admission Requirements:

10th Graders:

- Student must be a High School Sophomore when enrollment begins
- 3.5 un weighted, academic High School GPA

- One of the following:
 - 1650 Composite SAT score*
or 25 Composite ACT score
 - 650 SAT Critical Reading score
or 26 ACT English score
 - 650 SAT Math score
or 26 ACT Math score
 - 600 SAT Writing score
or 26 ACT Writing score

**Composite SAT includes Critical Reading, Math, and Writing*

11th & 12th Graders

- 3.0 unweighted, academic high school GPA
- The following test scores:
 - 970 Combined Critical Reading and Math SAT score
or 20 Composite ACT score
 - 430 SAT Critical Reading score
or 17 ACT English score
 - 410 SAT Math score
or 17 ACT Math score
 - OR
 - Accuplacer Classic / Next-Generation
63 Reading Comprehension / 237 Reading
4 WritePlacer / 4 WritePlacer
67 Elementary Algebra / 258 Quantitative Reasoning, Algebra, & Statistics

Please note: Redesigned SAT scores will be converted to the former scoring system. To convert your scores, please visit: collegereadiness.collegeboard.org/sat/scores

Steps to Acceptance

1. Take the SAT, ACT, or Accuplacer: Send your test scores directly to UWG. (Codes - SAT: 5900, ACT: 0878, Accuplacer: Test Score Release Form)
2. Apply to UWG: Log onto <http://westga.edu/applynow> and follow the directions to complete the application process.
3. Send required documentation: official high school transcripts, test scores, and a Dual Enrollment Participation Agreement.
4. Questions? Contact Dual Enrollment at dualenroll@westga.edu

FIGURE 2

Presidential Standing Committee on General Education Assessment

General Education Assessment Committee

Authority: The President has the authority to appoint special committees as set forth in *UWG Policies and Procedures, Art. II, Sec. 1(C)(4)*:

"In the implementation of these duties, the President or his or her designee shall" ...
(a) Appoint such special committees as are necessary to advise and assist him or her in planning and administration."

Based on this authority, as of the date below, I hereby designate the creation of a standing committee to be called the "General Education Assessment Committee" (GEAC). This Committee will replace the *ad hoc* General Education Assessment Committee, which was established in January 2018 to assess extant general education data and review current assessment practices. The newly-constituted GEAC will not impede any other committee charged with vetting, recommending, or making curricular changes to general education.

Purpose and Functions: GEAC, charged by the President and functioning to fulfill Section 2.9 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual on Institutional Effectiveness, facilitates the assessment of general education in the Core Curriculum via the organized gathering of data; reports assessment data related to courses in the Core Curriculum via committee-generated documents; and participates in devising general recommendations based on said data for departments or units in which general education courses reside. To that end, the committee's functions shall include but are not limited to: writing policies and procedures related to assessment of the Core and General Education, coordinating systematic assessment practices across all areas of UWG's Core Curriculum, working with Core stakeholders to ensure alignment of identified tools and measures, vetting and approving assessment processes, and composing assessment-related documents and larger annual reports.

Further, the Committee will have authority to request the attendance of UWG employees that possess knowledge related to the CAP and/or assessment practices in question during Committee meetings to assist the Committee with the implementation and review of assessment practices and data.

Membership: GEAC will include members either appointed by the Vice President for the division, Dean for the College/School, department Chair, or position title. These members will have full voting privileges. *In the event that the stated chair position is not filled, the committee will be responsible for electing an Interim Chair until said position can be filled.*

- General Education Assessment Director, *Chair*
- Minimum one faculty representative from each Core Area Program, *Work Group Coordinator(s)*

- Minimum of one representative from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment
- Representative from eCore
- Representative from the Office of the Provost

Term Limits:

- Minimum three-year membership with one-year on-boarding during which voting privileges are withheld
- Two years of active membership, with final year being a one-year transitional period
- Chair-elects must have served as part of a CAP Work Group member for at least one year and will serve as vice-chair during a one-year transition process

Additional Membership: The following representatives will be *ex officio* members of the General Education Assessment Committee members, serving as liaisons:

- Representative from Faculty Senate

Meetings: GEAC will meet at least twice each fall and spring term, or more often as deemed necessary by the Chair. If a member is unable to attend the scheduled meeting, they may appoint a delegate to attend and report information. If a member is unable to attend a meeting for a scheduled vote, said member may submit the vote in writing to the Chair prior to the meeting, or they may defer to a delegate to vote by proxy in their stead. Notice of any meeting will be sent to each committee member by the Chair or designee.

Signed: 

J. MICHEAL CRAFTON, UWG Interim President

Date: 10-24-19

FIGURE 3: PREPARED STUDENT STATEMENTS

6th November 2019

To the interim provost Dr. David Jenks, the interim president Dr. Michael Crafton, and whomever else it may concern,

As graduate students in the University of West Georgia's psychology program, we are deeply concerned with the recent decision to terminate the contracts of two of our department's recent hires, Dr. James Christopher Head and Dr. Nisha Gupta. We understand that the current budgetary crisis has imposed urgent and difficult financial pressures, and that the proposed solution is to let go of these faculty members. However, as integral members of the University of West Georgia community, we cannot agree that this is the most constructive solution possible. For this reason, we would like to be involved in resolving the budgetary crisis in a way which prevents this impending job loss.

Both professors have, in their short time here, made outstanding contributions to the department both professionally and personally. You have likely received several letters detailing just how impactful Dr. Head and Dr. Gupta have been in their commitment to the university, the department, and their individual students. Both are currently engaged in ongoing commitments to the department in the form of research labs—Dr. Head's *Narrative Research Group* and Dr. Gupta's *Phenomenological Film Collective*. Dr. Head and Dr. Gupta are at the forefront of critical psychology, feminist psychology, and qualitative research scholarship, infusing new lifeblood in our department.

Successful completion of the Masters and PhD programs hinges on the existing faculty in the Department. As graduate students, we rely on their invaluable advisement as well as the teaching of required elective courses. Losing these faculty members would result in fewer classes being offered. Both Dr. Head and Dr. Gupta are, in addition, actively chairing several dissertations or serving as committee members. Many graduate students have developed their dissertation proposals and are now in the terminal stages of the Masters and PhD programs. We cannot even begin to articulate how directionless all of us feel in losing our mentors, who profoundly shape our intellectual trajectories and professional identities.

We are also deeply saddened about how the unceremonious non-renewal of these professors damages the reputation of our university in the larger academic community. Our professors have enabled us as students, teachers, and practitioners to build a student centered and compassionate community aligned with the mission and values of the University of West Georgia. We strongly believe in our vision of promoting equity, fairness, and cultural diversity. Both of these professors have fostered community-engaged scholarship with their commitment to social justice, including a focus on liberatory activism aimed at addressing structural injustices. We

urge you to consider the devastating implications for the UWG institution at large and for our program: what kind of scholarship do we wish to foster? How do we ensure we retain our faculty members, and ensure longevity and quality of educational leadership at the university and within our department?

We are painfully distraught by how these administratively implemented budgetary cuts may result in long-term costs to the university community. If we lose these professors, the devastating impact trickles down throughout the university system. It impacts not only Masters and PhD students training to be educational leaders and innovators in their respective fields, but the undergraduate students that we help to guide. We are deeply worried about the core values we wish to nurture in our university, and the value of our education once we leave. Additionally, we fear that our widely reputed psychology program, which attracts international scholars to our department, will gradually die down if we fail to provide the opportunity for students to train in the kind of cutting-edge work in which Dr. Head and Dr. Gupta engage. We consider this collective shouldering and scaffolding to be the cornerstone of our university community. For this reason, we propose the creation of a working group with students, teachers, and administrators to share joint strategies on how to prevent further loss of jobs, while sustaining opportunities for educational achievement and meeting budgetary requirements.

We express uncertainty over the financial constraints and the decision-making process that directly impacts us as students. Owing to this, we urge you to consider a policy change in order for us to be included in further discussions. Administration should not be able to cut critical faculty, and our department and student representatives should be involved in budget discussions that directly impact our department. We believe that the department should have the autonomy to figure out how to re-allocate and manage the resources we are given.

Regards,

Students in the University of West Georgia's Psychology Department

1. Lori Jordan Fountain, Alum of the B.A. Program, Ph.D. Student and Research Assistant, Psychology Department
2. Akanksha Adya, M.Phil., Ph.D. Student and Graduate Teaching Assistant, Psychology Department
3. Micah Ingle, M.A., Ph.D. Student and Instructor, Psychology Department
4. Corri A. Johanson, M.A., Ph.D. Student, and Instructor Psychology Department
5. Peder Schillemat, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
6. Holly M. Gibson, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
7. Charlotte M. Gibson, M.A. Student, Psychology Department

8. Ryan Jones: Alum of the B.A. Program, M.A. Student, Psychology Department, UWG; Adjunct Professor of Psychology, Psychology Department, Georgia Northwestern Technical College
9. Hope Ridley, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
10. Breale Howard, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
11. Bethany Morris, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Psychology at Lindsey Wilson College
12. Alexander Aronson, M.A. Graduate, LPCA
13. Marta Stefanyshyn, Ed.S, LPC, Ph.D. Student and Instructor Psychology Department
14. Alison Hall, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
15. Ben Morgan, M.A. Graduate, UWG Psychology Department
16. Kyle Brown, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
17. Jen Drinkard, M.A. Graduate, UWG Psychology Department
18. Gabriella Kiser, Undergraduate and hopeful future graduate student, Psychology Department
19. Toyosi Pius, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
20. Lee Gianuzzi, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
21. Sarah Farrar, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
22. Destiny Holloway, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
23. Jim Buuck, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
24. Michael Steder, Ph.D. Student, Psychology Department
25. Gabrielle Perez, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
26. Louise Grann, M.A. Ph.D. Student/ABD, and Instructor, Psychology Department
27. Isabel K. Tweedie, M.A., Ph.D. Student, UWG psychology department
28. Meghan Klein Touns, M.S., LPC, PhD Student and Instructor, Psychology Department
29. Gordon Jackson, Ph.D Student, Psychology Department
30. Ayurdhi Dhar, PhD, Alum and Instructor of Psychology
31. Sebastienne Grant, PhD, Alum, Professor of Psychology and Director of MA Critical Psychology and Human Services at Prescott College
32. Kimberly Prince Korobov, MA, M.Div., RYT, Licensed Professional Counselor, United Methodist Minister, Yoga Instructor, Ph.D. Student, Psychology Department
33. Tayha Smith, M.A., Student, Psychology Department
34. Brian Harris, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
35. Kurt Youngberg, LCSW, Ph.D. Student, Graduate Teaching Assistant - Psychology Department
36. Garri Hovhannisyan, M.A. Graduate, UWG Psychology
37. Nancy McLaughlin-Walter, M.A., Ph.D/ABD
38. Jacob W. Glazier, Ph.D. Alum, M.S. Ed., LPC, NCC, Adjunct Professor, Licensed Professional Counselor, New York University, Life University
39. Suraj Sood, B.A., Ph.D. Student, Psychology Department, Sustainability Professional

40. Emily Jarl, B.A. Graduate, Psychology Department
41. Thomas Dailey, Ph.D. Candidate, Psychology Department
42. Spencer Wright, B.A., M.A. Graduate, UWG Psychology Department
43. Rebecca Gaylor, M.A. Graduate, UWG Psychology
44. Lucas Elmore, B.S. Graduate, M.A. Student, UWG Psychology
45. Patti Moynihan, M.A. Graduate, UWG Psychology
46. Virginia Smith, M.A. Graduate, UWG Psychology
47. Nick Charles, B.A. Graduate. M.A. Student, Psychology Department
48. Deedra Climer, M.A. Student, Psychology Department
49. Melissa Malaspino, B.A. and M.A. Graduate, UWG Psychology Department
50. Gabriella Browne, B.S. Undergraduate, UWG Psychology Department
51. Lisa P. Watts, LCSW, PhD Student, Psychology Department
52. Stephan Antczak, PhD Student, Psychology Department
53. Allyson Tarpley, B.S. Graduate, M.A. Student, UWG Psychology Department
54. Lukas Kalfleish, B.A., B.Ed, M.A., Ph.D. Candidate, Psychology Department
55. Haley Morgan, B.S. Undergraduate Student, UWG Psychology Department
56. Jessica Davis, B.A. Graduate. M.A. Student. UWG Psychology Department
57. Debra Katz, Ph.D. Student, UWG Psychology Department
58. William R. Campbell Sr., M.A., Ph.D/ABD, Adjunct Professor at Piedmont College,
Chief Executive Officer Impact Counseling & Consulting, LLC
59. Ethan Williams, B.S. Undergraduate, UWG Psychology Department
60. Kelly Jennings, Graduate. M.A. Student and Graduate Teaching Assistant, UWG
Psychology Department, Adjunct Professor, Business, Business Department, GMC,
Fayetteville, GA Air Force Retired Veteran.
61. Georgia Faye Underwood, B.S. and M.A. Graduate, UWG Psychology Department
62. Ally English, B.S. Undergraduate, UWG Psychology Department
63. Mikayla Rogers UWG Psychology M.A. Student, Graduate Assistant
64. M. Sherri Lord, B.S. Undergraduate, UWG Psychology
65. Christopher M. Aanstoos, Professor Emeritus, UWG Psychology

Contact Details:

1. Lori J. Foundation, Alum of the B.A. Program, Ph.D Student and Research
Assistant, Psychology Department

Email: ljordan6@my.westga.edu
2. Micah Ingle, Alum of the M.A. Program, Graduate Teaching Assistant, Ph.D
Student, Psychology Department

Email: mingle1@my.westga.edu

3. Akanksha Adya, Graduate Teaching Assistant, Ph.D Student, Psychology Department

Email: aadya1@my.westga.edu

4. Ryan Jones, M.A. Student, Psychology Department

Email: rjones31@my.westga.edu

5. Peder Schillmet, MA. Student, Psychology Department

Email: pschill1@my.westga.edu

6. Lisa P. Watts, LCSW, Ph.D. Student, Psychology Department

Email: lwatts4@my.westga.edu

To whom it may concern,

If you have been present on campus over the past week, it has been nigh impossible to be unaware of the developing situation concerning the delivery of contract non-renewal notices to certain faculty members. I am drafting this letter as a response to these policy developments in the wake of the meeting held on November 8, 2019 in room 106 of the Nursing Building. On that note, I want to express just how blindsided I, like so many other students, found myself feeling upon learning of these notices. I remained completely unaware of the developing budgeting crisis until the eve of the aforementioned meeting.

I would like to supply some context for my situation. I am a 26 year old non-traditional student. I graduated high school in 2011 from Carrollton High School before attending Auburn University for two years on a Presidential Scholarship; I lost that scholarship after the first year. Largely due to this, I took a hiatus from higher education until the summer of 2018. Due to convenience and cost reasons, I returned to school at the University of West Georgia. What began as a decision of pragmatism has completely morphed into one of the best decisions of my life. The investment in me as a person displayed by my professors is something that has truly touched me and created an advocate for UWG for life.

It is for this reason that I am writing this. In my short tenure at UWG, I have been fortunate to be graced with so many possible opportunities. I have been able to participate in the Wolves in Training Program through the mass communications department. I have been a supplemental instructor through the Center for Academic Success. I have been a workshop leader and lab TA through the chemistry department. I have also begun research with a professor on campus. It is only through the efforts of my professors that these have been made available to me.

Through my conversations with other students, I have come to one clear message: what makes UWG so great is the time, care, and attention that the faculty afford their students. How terrible that we repay our faculty for their investments with uncertainty in their position. How disrespectful that communication is handled in such a way that an environment of such hostility and anger is fostered. Students, faculty, and their families deserve so much more than this.

Anyone who is marginally familiar with this situation should be able to see the complexity and difficulties that it presents. Accounting for a decrease of \$3.1 million in available funds is no small task. However, this does not imply that students or faculty should be so thoroughly excluded from the conversation. No one cares more about this institution than the students and faculty that have invested so much of their precious time in it. I ask that you keep us completely involved in the coming conversations and utilize the power of a force that will bend over backwards to protect the home that they've come to love.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Russell Ives', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Russell Ives