

Faculty Senate

Minutes

3/29/2017 Overflow Business Meeting 3:00-5:00 pm

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

ROLL CALL

Present: Bob Beaudet, Mae Claxton, Ian Hewer, Beth Huber, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Niall Michelsen, Alison Morrison-Shetlar, Mack Powell, Brian Railsback, Bill Richmond, Damon Sink, Liz Skene, Katerina Spasovska, Zsolt Szabo, Cheryl Waters-Tormey, Bill Yang

Members with Proxies: Rus Binkley, Catherine Carter, Dan Clapper, Robert Crow, Kae Livsey, Robert Steffen, Wes Stone

Members Absent: David Belcher, Patricia Bricker, David Dorondo, Frank Lockwood, Andrew Mannion, Alex Sargsyan, Jamie Vaske, Tonya Westbrook

EXTERNAL REPORTS

Taskforce on Racism Report: Kathleen Brennan

The draft report was available before the meeting on SharePoint and via email. The recommendations were brought on screen.

Kathleen asked if there were any questions.

Question- Are there any recommendations that point directly to the response as to why the task force was created originally?

Response- We are not watering anything down; the recommendations are not in priority order. There are some curriculum items and training opportunities that are already in process.

Bill Yang responded- We do not see this as one task force that is going to resolve the issues. This is a great start and gets us on the right track. We will need to monitor the direction in the future.

Follow up question from Kathleen- What are you hoping for or wanting out of the recommendations?

Response- I was hoping for some prioritization, but I now understand why.

Comment from Brian Railsback- We reviewed the recommendations at SGA, and it occurred that the recommendations are interlinked and are built off of each other. Holistically, the document is clear and outward facing. The students as a whole were very supportive and positive as a whole. One recommendation that resonated was more support for the CDO to implement the things discussed. When I think of diversity education, I want to see more brought in about our international programs.

Bill clarified that there is no action needed today, and this was for our information. At a later date, the Senate will endorse/enhance the draft recommendations.

Question- Regarding the student code/creed, is there anything specifically speaking to race or diversity issues? Do we do more in the first year with the creed? I'd like to see it posted more. Have some "Western is a ... institution" in your face. Where does this fit in your recommendations?

Response- The “respect compact” area of the report addresses this. We want it geared towards everyone tied to the campus. Including ideas with more direct statements. There are 5 points to the creed that are fairly general and not specific to race/diversity issues. This would be something that coming on to the campus, you would understand the expectations on our campus.

Please send any additional comments and feedback to Kathleen.

Of note- Forum April 17 2-3 pm at UC Theater. The taskforce will provide recommendations, and administration will be present as well.

To appeal to the values of the university, we need to add some language about the international students. Maybe this can be a discussion item this at the forum? Brian Railsback can work with senate on the international language.

Rules Committee: Brian Railsback

- There is a procedure change to the Faculty Handbook section 3.02 that is up for discussion in the committee. We will vote on this resolution at the April meeting.
 - Procedure changes to 3.02- added some language regarding election timelines.
 - Non-substantial 3.02 colleges are defined
- Gift review committee resolution- this includes language to add a member of library faculty. The suggestion is that CONEC should manage elections. Another suggestion is to add the same verbiage to the constitution.
- Procedure changes to Liberal Studies- language was added regarding members from the college. Exception was actually discussed last year.

SENATE COUNCIL REPORTS

APRC Report: Cheryl Waters-Tormey

- Curriculog- no items to vote on. No questions or comments received.
- Minimum GPA for minor’s resolution- updates were brought on screen. Open for discussion. These changes are for the new catalog. **Vote proceeded and passed.**
- Military excused items- updates were brought on screen and open for discussion. **Vote proceeded and passed.**

FAC Report: Mack Powell

Graduate Council resolution was brought on screen and opened for discussion.

The resolution is to change the make-up of the faculty representation on the graduate council. The dean will decide on how many representatives will come from each college. This change affects the faculty handbook.

Question- What is the issue with having the elections based off SCH’s?

Response- The timing is off. Several colleges could have 1 or less than 1 since there are only a minimal number of graduate courses in their respective college. This resolution will eliminate time delays and

additional reviews. This is a straightforward way to represent all of the colleges on the graduate council. Everyone will receive the same representations. We would be inviting Fine and Performing Arts and Engineering & Technology to elect additional members.

The decision should come down to the dean. This verbiage allows the grad dean to invite up to 3 representatives. This verbiage gives the most flexibility.

Question- Why do we need admissions and financial aid representation?

Response- It is important to have those connections between recruiting, software, applications, etc. Financial aid is an ex-officio member and helps us make intelligent decisions on the graduate council.

Another suggestion is to add the language to include ex-officio “non-voting” members for financial aid and undergraduate admissions. Suggested adding language to the last sentence to modify to “all elected” members.

CRC Report: Erin McNelis

At the last meeting, the council reviewed minor changes proposed to the tenure and promotion guidelines. There was some lengthy discussion on whether a portion printed out from the FAD should be printed out twice. After discussion, it was found that it indeed should be printed out twice. A recommendation is to put a CV in the index. No votes are required at this time.

Non-tenured track faculty member report- The collegial review committee is looking at recommendations for promotion and track. They are in support of the non-tenured track faculty. There is no consensus on the path regarding fewer adjuncts moving to full time, and lecturer to instructor, to senior instructor, some didn't feel the descriptions would fit a promotion status and it wasn't clear what the give and take would be for a promotion. The discussion went on and if there was a need to do something right away, they could complete an outline regarding procedures. They are asking for clarification beforehand on faculty that are currently non-tenured track that aren't assistant or associate professors, or visiting definitions.

I believe Jamie Vaske came up with a potential survey to get more feedback from those in the positions regarding the issues of promotion/contracts. The committee has not met as of yet to discuss.

The Provost has reached out to other universities to gather their protocols and Brandon Schwab is working on those along with Jamie.

Strategic Initiatives Task Force report: David McCord, Erin McNelis

The survey is still active for the areas of distinction. At the CAO meeting, they went through the same process. We need to synthesize what we have and give it to the Chancellor.

The metrics will be how we are assessed on a system level. Each institution will have five top tiers. The provost office has a group working on this- in collaboration with faculty.

Chair Report: Bill Yang

I've been part of discussions on NC Promise and the impact this will have on the admission process. Everyone anticipates a significant surge in applications. In terms of growth, it is complicated. Resources, facilities, space, dining, lodging could be potential issues... we can sustain roughly a 200-300 person

growth a year. As faculty senate, we want to help out with those conversations and participate in those discussions. This process is administratively lead and guided and we want to be included in this.

What is the faculty role in how many applications we should take? If we get 10,000 more applications, I would guess the GPA has to be higher? Do we want to ramp up our average SAT and GPA scores? How do we blend this with our mission to serve our region and our area? Those conversations will be really interesting. How we balance these will be complicated. Faculty need to be involved with the mission oriented and philosophical issues.

Please take this discussion to your department and colleagues.

The Chancellor talked about this and if we have more applicants, how do we make sure we are still regional, and that we are still preserving diversity in our student body? We should have this discussion. Should we value only SAT scores? Other considerations?

We want our students to be better prepared...do we just take the top?

Comment made- You will look at kids from a privileged area if we only look at SAT scores. If we opt to do our 4 top points, we must address this. In the spirit of NC Promise, we have to prioritize our region. We need some benchmarks and terms. What does our student look like? We will find a balance in the tweaking of the strategic plan. What do we want? Not just a number. What kind of profile do we want? We should also look at how we are spending scholarship money. This will have an impact on what our admissions profile looks like.

In Margaret Spellings report, she talked about the need to look at legacy scholarships and the idea of increasing need based aid across the system.

We need to think about NC Promise as diversity, access, and opportunity.

Review of faculty caucus issues:

- Naming the buildings- leadership will collect info, and send to faculty
- Non-tenured track structure
- SACSCOC report results in December disseminated to all of University
- Student fees, leadership will have those folks share information
- University requiring laptop for student use, APRC reviewing
- NC Promise, (Alison shared that the house and senate are supportive of the 51 million request)
- Related to non-tenure, and what tenure really means.

MEETING ADJOURNED

VOTING ROLL

Both votes passed unanimously: 28 ayes, 0 nays, 0 abstentions