**MINUTES**

***December 3, 2009, 3:00p.m. -5:00 p.m.***

# ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

ROLL CALL

Present:

Mary Kay Bauer, Richard Beam, Wayne Billon, Heidi Buchanan, David Claxton, Jane Eastman, Steven Ha , Eleanor Hilty, David Hudson, Rebecca Lasher, Frank Lockwood, Ron Mau, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Jane Perlmutter, Phillip Sanger, Jack Summers, Michael Thomas, Chuck Tucker, Cheryl Waters-Tormey

Members with Proxies:

Terre Folger, John Hodges, Sean O’Connell, Barbara St. John, Beverly Collins, Chris Cooper, Jamie Davis, Christopher Hoyt, Laura Wright

Members absent:

Kyle Carter, John Bardo, Jack Sholder,

Recorder:

Ann Green

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Motion:

Motion was made to approve the minutes of November 4, 2009. The motion was seconded and passed by majority with no further discussion.

**EXTERNAL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Faculty Assembly/David Claxton and Beverly Collins:

Reported by David Claxton: Richard Beam, Beverly Collins and David Claxton attended the Nov. 20th meeting in Chapel Hill. David Claxton summarized the topics discussed at the meeting as follows:

1. Retreat Rights where upper administrators are going back to faculty and the concern is that at some institutions, administrators have returned to faculty making two to three times as much as other faculty in that department. President Bowles would like to do something about this and it will be discussed with the Board of Governors in January.

2. The linkage between graduation and retention rates and enrollment growth. Universities used to be funded on enrollment growth and the model is changing to retention rate and graduation. This discussion will be continuing.

3. Review of new programs proposed by UNC Tomorrow although, there is an issue with funding for new programs.

4. Tuition increases for next year. The legislature has proposed a $200 increase for Fall 2010 at UNC campuses with money going into the general fund. President Bowles has proposed an alternative which would be a 6.5% tuition increase cap and the money then would stay on the campuses. If approved, up to 50% of the increase would be put toward need-based aid, 25% would go toward faculty salaries with the goal still of having salaries at UNC campuses at the 80th percentile of schools in their Carnegie classifications; and the remainder of the increase would go toward critical needs.[[1]](#footnote-1)

5. State Health Plan where smoking and obesity will be targeted and people who don’t meet the standards will be relegated to the 70/30 health plan. This topic had a lot of discussion and in David’s opinion a lot of ire about Blue Cross/Blue Shield (BC/BS) in general. But it is going to move forward in July 2010 and will go into effect for people over 40 BMI changes to over 30 BMI in Summer 2011.

Richard Beam: Not sure the resentment is specifically against BC/BS, but resentment is against this external agency creating policies with apparently little input from their clients.

Comment: BC/BS will charge an amount if you don’t do it or a different amount if you do it.

6. Moving to a plan across all UNC institutions related to student health insurance. We have a hard waiver model at WCU as do 11 other institutions that students have to buy the insurance plan or have a non-campus health insurance plan. Four other institutions in the state are not on the plan, but will be.

7. The Assembly came up with one resolution in support of Centers and Institutes.

SGA/Josh Cotton:

No report

Staff Senate/Brenda Holcombe:

No report

COUNCIL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

APRC/ Wayne Billon:

There are two (2) program changes that require action by the Senate: 1) the BA in International Studies proposed by the College Arts & Sciences and 2) the Doctorate in Physical Therapy proposed by the College of Health and Human Sciences. There are numerous other items that don’t require a vote but are up for discussion. Hearing no discussion, these routine items are approved. A clarifying comment was made by Beth Lofquist that with the new curriculum review process by General Administration, these programs even though they may be approved on our campus, we are not approved to offer them yet until word is received from G.A. This applies to new programs.

Scott Higgins informed us that the Doctorate in Physical Therapy program will go before the UNC Graduate Council in late January or February. The Physical Therapy program was Approved to Plan by GA, and the next step is the Approval to Establish, but that just because a program is approved to be established does not mean that funding comes with it.

Comment: If approved, but if GA has no money, but we decide to find the money elsewhere, can we do that?

Comment: Yes.

Response from Scott Higgins: As a matter of fact new programs are being approved. There are 40 in the pipeline and many of them went through; that’s how they are approved. There’s an Educational Planning and Policy Committee that is a part of the Board of Governors and the Chancellor speaks to it before the committee; that if the funds are not available that your campus will pay for it.

Motion was made to approve the two (2) new programs and seconded.

Discussion was had about concern being expressed about establishing a new doctorate program. The Doctorate in Physical Therapy is replacing the Masters of Physical Therapy on a national, possibly international level. The Masters level is no longer the appropriate credential for the accreditation process.

**VOTE:**

**The two new programs (the BA in International Studies and the Doctorate in Physical Therapy) were approved by voice vote.**

**Senate Resolution on Liberal Studies**

The next topic was the Liberal Studies Review proposal initially brought forth by Jack Summers. It was debated in APRC and compared with the plan that is on the Provost web site by Richard Beam and Dr. Carter. Changes have been incorporated; compromises made and the revised proposal is in front of the Senate today.

Discussion was had about several specific items within the current version of the proposal.

Concern was expressed about the second paragraph of the second page and the responsibilities of making further recommendations being given to the Liberal Studies Oversight Committee which is not responsible for policy.

Concern was also expressed that the Liberal Studies Oversight Committee is selected by the Deans of the Colleges and that liberal studies colleges (Arts & Sciences) has three times the representation of the other non-liberal studies colleges including Kimmel, Education and Allied Professions and Health & Human Sciences.

Simple amendments were made to language in the second paragraph for clarification.

The 3rd paragraph of the Resolution addresses the number of faculty members per College on the Task Force. The distribution of representatives came from from the Fact Book 2002 – 2007 with the percentage of degrees conferred by college and also out of recommendations that Dr. Carter and Richard Beam worked on. The Task Force ultimately comes to the Senate which uses a different distribution for determining its membership so different ideas of how the distribution of representation of faculty are being met. Senate is based on the number of faculty; task force on the number of degrees.

Wayne Billon explained the discussion within APRC of tenured vs. non-tenured faculty being on the Task Force. Initially they felt only tenured faculty should be considered. Then the idea of allowing non-tenured faculty was raised. But, if non-tenured faculty served they could possibly be concerned about voting a certain way because some administrator or someone over them could be dissatisfied because they are not tenured. Then someone raised the fact that most of the instructors teaching these courses are non-tenured. Eventually it was agreed that non-tenured be able to serve on the Task Force.

Comment: And it is by election. A person would not only have to agree to be on the ballot, but also has to agree after they have been elected to accept the responsibilities having been forewarned there are sensitive issues to be decided.

To summarize: concern about non-tenured faculty being on the task force was expressed with differing views also expressed. Views were expressed that all faculty including tenured, tenure track, non-tenured, fixed term and part time faculty should be eligible to be elected.

A motion was made and seconded that change be made to the language to include all faculty.

**ELECTRONIC VOTE ON THE SPECIFIC AMENDMENT:**

**YES: 15**

**NO: 10**

**The Vote passed.**

The language was finalized as follows: *“Be it resolved that these members should be elected from all faculty members of the various Colleges as quickly as possible at the commencement of the 2010 spring semester with the chair of the Task Force being elected by the voting members of the Task Force.”*

Wayne Billon continued discussion by saying that we currently have a Liberal Studies Oversight Committee (LSOC). We have a University Curriculum Committee (UCC) with better representation from each college. The By-Laws changes that Sean O’Connell is proposing will affect this and it will be a more uniform distribution, but the changes are not approved or final and wouldn’t go into effect until after this Task Force is put in place. Once approved, each year there will be a rotation of members. The discussion now is that this Task Force be elected from all the different schools with equal representation and would take on the task of the plan of this Liberal Studies overview. What APRC does is come to an agreement to come to this body. Some people thought LSOC was fine like they are and the UCC could be combined to do this. There are 3-4 different options, one big giant committee of all three committees or the Task Force to do it alone.

Discussion ensured as to the appropriate role and charge of the Task Force. It was proposed that the resolution be amended to state: “*Be it resolved that the Task Force shall have an open meeting with the faculty from each of the academic colleges, the Kimmel School, the Library, the University Curriculum Committee, the Liberal Studies Oversight Committee, students, and invited external consumers that hire our graduates (to be determined by the Task Force) where all are allowed to express their concerns orally or in writing,*” and that the second paragraph of the second page be deleted.

A motion was made and seconded that these amendments be made to the proposed resolution.

**ELECTRONIC VOTE ON THE SPECIFIC AMENDMENT:**

**YES: 22**

**NO: 1**

**The Vote passed.**

Other minor changes were made to coincide with the changes voted upon and discussion continued regarding the appropriate role of the Task Force and specifically to the language contained in the next to the last paragraph.

Comment: I think it’s telling the task force exactly what to do.

Comment: I’m trying to think back to the report Kyle and I put together. My suspicion is that we envisioned a 2 stage process. The 1st stage which the bulk of this appears to address is what should the nature of a liberal studies program be at this time and place? Then, it could in turn assess if the current program meets that. Then the process, once that question is resolved, the current program meets it or it doesn’t. There’s a second stage to develop a different program where these issues become appropriate. I’m not sure we want to charge a task force with dealing with that entire process at one time.

Comment: I think by creating this task force you are past that.

Comment: I disagree.

Comment: That second to the last paragraph, what is in there that isn’t in the paragraph above?

Comment: Paragraph above talks about QEP and that’s where the Education Briefcase is located (which is referred to in the second paragraph).

Comment: The second paragraph talks about a comprehensive review and I think if we don’t hint at what we think should be done; if it needs to changed we are kicking the ball down the road. We could say in a sentence “…and then the Task Force will decide how to implement changes.”

Comment: I would say that the Task Force should come up with a specific set of skills that are needed and determine which classes the skills are offered and determine how we’re going to go about the assurance of learning that the skills are being learned by the students. Those are the three steps that we need to do to get the curriculum squared away.

Comment: So you are saying give the second stage to the same Task Force?

Comment: They’re going to do all the work to determine. You might as well list the skills, be able to write, be able to communicate…and then what classes do you have in the liberal studies program do you have communication skills taught and how are you going to make sure the students take that class and have demonstrated they learned those skills.

Comment: It’s not the Task Force’s job. You have an implementation stage; once you decide what your general education program is through this Task Force, each college will have to decide and create those assessment tools and decide how they want to implement. It will be different by program/college.

Comment: Does this resolution ask the Task Force first to determine what we want general education to accomplish? And second to review general education to see if it’s accomplishing those tasks and make needed changes?

Comment: The second paragraph does say a comprehensive review.

Comment: But we haven’t said determine what we want general education to accomplish.

Comment: Once we determine what we want the program to do; if you’ve got a program in Liberal Studies that doesn’t offer skills that are part of what the 21st century student needs to have, then those classes ought to be removed from the Liberal Studies program.

Comment: Right, but that’s the second stage.

Comment: Is the 21st century skills what we have all agreed our students need to meet?

Comment: I think this is getting under the SACS requirement that requires us to have a comprehensive assessment plan in place at the beginning of any proposal for a liberal studies program…

Discussion continued with some of the major points being that the first question is what should General Education be? What do we want, then how to craft a program that meets that and how do we assess that it does in fact do that. If the Senate or Faculty wish to address this issue, I would be in favor of adopting the practice or recommendations that the provost and I put together and having it be a Senate initiated Task Force as opposed with one mandated by the Chancellor. He then chose after that report was created to say that this may not be the right time for the university for me as Chancellor to mandate.

Comment: I would agree that what we are missing is a very clear statement of the charge.

Comment: Or maybe that’s the charge of the task force; it’s implicit. I think there is a point here.

Comment: The proposed planning team briefly, but lost 2/3 of the team; planned a survey to see what faculty were interested in. Were they satisfied with the current Liberal Studies Program; did they feel it should undergo review; what kind of time should be put in the review; what time would they personally be able to put into the review. What do they like; not like? Has been preparing the survey and getting opinions on it so that it is not leading to a certain answer. Purpose: Opinion poll to get information. The survey was offered if members would like the survey to give to their colleges.

Comment: It could also be used by the Task Force.

Concern was expressed about poll overload

Comment: And that I would think with the Task Force this would be one of the first things they would want to do.

Comment: It was kept very short. My personal reason for liking it is it’s the most information I could have. If the majority of faculty said, I don’t want to invest the time right now; that would change how I might vote on this right now.

A motion was made and seconded to amend language in the second to the last paragraph of the proposed resolution to: *“Be it resolved that after such review, the Task Force will develop a series of general educational learning objectives suitable for meeting the needs of Western students in the 21st Century.”*

Comment: Don’t we want this Task Force to do a general review; meet with all the constituencies and then prepare a report of their conclusions and any recommendations? It could be that where it’s sensible for them to articulate a series of general education learning objectives, but we want them to represent us, meet with all these groups and say what does your review show about general education in place; more general than what is stated in that sentence here.

**ELECTRONIC VOTE ON THE SPECIFIC AMENDMENT:**

**YES: 23**

**NO: 3**

**The Vote passed.**

The last paragraph was then addressed and language revised with the final outcome as stated here: *Be it resolved that once the Task Force has collected comments it will finalize a report and present its recommendations to the Senate for action. Once this report has been accepted by the Senate, the President of the Senate will forward its recommendations through the Provost to the Chancellor for final approval.*

A motion was made and seconded to amend the paragraph as stated above.

**ELECTRONIC VOTE ON THE SPECIFIC AMENDMENT:**

**YES: 24**

**NO: 2**

**The Vote passed.**

A motion was then made and seconded to vote on the Resolution as amended (full Resolution with all amendments).

**ELECTRONIC VOTE ON THE ENTIRE RESOLUTION AS AMENDED:**

**YES: 24**

**NO: 3**

**The Vote passed.**

A resolution was just adopted that requires colleges to have elections to elect members to the task force. It was decided that a copy of the resolution and request should be sent to Anne Aldrich in the Office of the Provost to be added to the Agenda for the Council of Deans.

The next item discussed was **online course observation** and concern about how to evaluate online courses and it was resolved that the dept heads were not aware of all the privileges they have. Next semester, Beth Lofquist will discuss this at the Department Head Meeting. If any questions about online courses and how they should be evaluated, talk with your department head and they can come to that meeting where it will be discussed.

One last item; the **Academic Integrity Policy** revision was voted on and approved. The changes included changing the name to *Student Committee Ethics* from *Office of Judicial Affairs*.

Another significant change is that with the new Academic Appeals Policy we no longer have an Academic Problems Committee. Each college now has their own Appeals Committee. The change is to reflect the new Academic Appeals procedures that is now through a college academic action committee rather than to the old Academic Problems Committee which we no longer have.

Comment: What is being requested is that we endorse practices that are already in place?

Comment: Yes it goes in the catalog; handbook, etc.

A motion was made and seconded to approve these changes.

Comment: I wasn’t aware that we were doing that in the colleges now; how did that change come about?

Comment: It got passed in Senate in the Spring of last year and it is now policy for this year so it is now in the catalog.

**A VOICE VOTE ON THE ACADEMIC APPEALS REVISION**

**YES: 24**

**NO: 3**

**The Vote passed.**

Collegial Review Council (CRC) /Mary Kay Bauer, Chair:

The Collegial Review Council met and made a recommendation in reaction to the Task Force created to simplify the Reappointment Process. The Task Force recommended proposal #2, but when that proposal was given back to the Task Force; the Task Force came back with two proposals. What you see is a proposal for a 3rd year review with a 6 year (3, 6 review) and the 2nd one is a 2, 4, 6 year review.

The CRC was in favor of the 2, 4, 6 proposal because in some disciplines having research done and published was not possible in 3 years. Being reviewed for research and for teaching was not possible particularly in the sciences.

Comment: The other thing is when you’re going up in the 3rd year, you’re doing that fairly early in the Fall of the 3rd year, so you’re really being evaluated for what you’ve done for 2 years. That’s going to be your up or out; at 3 years and you’re halfway through and you’ve only had 2 years to get it done, that could be problematic.

Comment: Let’s look at them in 2nd year, they have had a year to get teaching under the belt, give them 2 more years to get research going and then we can make an evaluation them at that point.

Someone else thought it was important in the 4th year to have a review before they come up for tenure review just so they know where they stand. They’re not left alone for 2-3 years without knowing.

Comment: Is this just referring to the University reviews? I assume faculty will have an annual review?

Comment: The annual faculty evaluation is mandated by the Board of Governors. We can’t change that. There will be an annual faculty evaluation.

Comment: So this still has an AFE and a TPR?

Comment: This is the TPR portion.

Comment: Correct.

Comment: One thing we talked about in the Arts & Sciences was what the review really was or whether it was a statement or not out. Was that discussed? The idea being that the cause committee said yes you are fine for now, but this is what should change; sort of goals. And if a candidate didn’t meet that, what does that mean. Did you all talk about that?

Comment: Well, so fine. Each college would have a set of procedures for the review?

Comment: Yes.

Comment: Would it be appropriate or desirable that this proceed all the way up through the Provost office?

Comment: The Provost requested the 2nd year review not come to him.

Comment: We’re not talking about changing the process, only the number of times.

Comment: The Provost said if we do a 2 year, 4 year review he doesn’t want to see the 2 year; only the 4 year.

Comment: He doesn’t now.

Comment: Yes he does. The Provost sees all reappointments.

Comment: I believe; I see a note that his recommendation was that if we adopted the 2 year, 4 year model that initial 2 year review could be conducted just within the department.

Comment: Does that mean if the department and the department head and the dean decided a faculty member is not going to be reappointed, the Provost wouldn’t be involved?

Comment: You can call for an administrative review if you see problems, in the odd years when you are not going up for an administrative review.

Comment: The 4.0 document says all reappointments go to the Provost. You have to change your 4.0 document to say only the 4th year goes to the Provost unless it’s an administrative review. That would be my understanding.

Comment: Question regarding the intent, when you say the dean and the provost, does that mean the college level committees and the university level committees or does that mean individually looked at by the dean and the provost?

Comments: The dean and the provost would be referring to individuals.

Comment: For instance, I believe when you go to 2nd year they do not have the college collegial review committee, but on the 4th they do, but on both cases the dean is included.

Comment: The reappointments right now do not go to a university committee; only tenure promotions go to a university committee. Reappointments just go from the dean to the provost. Some colleges have a collegial review committee for reappointment and some don’t.

Comment: What action are we being asked to do?

Comment: They are asking for a decision for proposal 1 or proposal 2 or neither.

A motion was made & seconded and approved by vote to table this discussion until the overflow meeting next week.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

1. Please refer to Faculty Senate Overflow Meeting Minutes of December 10, 2009, under the heading of External Reports, Report from Chancellor John Bardo, for corrections to this discussion on tuition increase and faculty salary. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)