**MINUTES**

***April 25, 2013***

***3:00 -5:00 p.m.***

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

ROLL CALL

Present:

David Belcher, Andrew Adams, Lisa Bloom, Shawn Collins, Chris Cooper, Yang Fan, Patricia Foley, George Ford, Mary Jean Herzog, Christopher Hoyt, David Hudson, George Ford, Leroy Kauffman, Rebecca Lasher, Erin McNelis, Elizabeth McRae, Malcolm Powell, Steve Miller, Kathy Starr, Wes Stone, Ben Tholkes, Vicki Szabo

Members with Proxies:

Angie Brenton, Katy Ginanni, Justin Menikelli, Leigh Odom, Cheryl Waters-Tormey

Members Absent:

Cheryl Daly

Recorder:

Ann Green

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

Approval of the Minutes

Motion:

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of March 22, 2013 were approved as presented.

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

Chancellor’s Update/David Belcher:

Dr. Belcher’s written report to Faculty Senate was distributed to campus via email and the full report is attached as Attachment 1.

SGA/Dylan Dunford:

Ryan Hermance is the new SGA President. Jack Stewart is the new Vice President.

Staff Senate/Robin Hitch:

Staff Senate had a successful yard sale and raised enough money for 3 $1,000 scholarships. Recipients for the scholarships were Megan Robertson, Hunter Robertson, and Kendra Douglas. Staff is interested in adopting a highway and would like Faculty and Staff Senate to adopt one as well. Highway stretches from Little Savannah up to the HHS building. Once paperwork comes in, they would need to get 8-10 signatures and get volunteers to clean the highway.

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

Academic Policy and Review Council (APRC)/David Hudson, Chair:

TESOL Minor Proposal

Senate needs to vote on a TESOL minor proposed by the English department. Guest to speak on behalf of the English department: Eleanor Patron.

 Statement from Eleanor: We thought the minor would better prepare teachers going into the public schools where there are going to be a lot of students who are learning English due to the demographic shift. It makes the teachers much more marketable and much more able to serve.

Q: Why identify as a minor as opposed to integrating some courses into the curriculum?

A: It is much easier to make it a minor and allow for add on licensure based on whether they take the praxis or an additional six credits. The curriculum is already somewhat integrated for instance it is an eighteen credit minor but the education majors are only going to have to take 9 more credit hours. There was a linguistics class that they could not find a need for it and two sociocultural classes that focus specifically on the needs of immigrants and second language learners that needed to be in the minor.

Q: Do all the students get some ELS tools as they go through the curriculum?

A: Right now there are 416 which is the TESOL class. Basically it is trying to fit everything into one class but it wasn’t enough.

Q: Are you referring to English majors?

A: English majors and elementary Ed students had to take it

Q: Is this faculty driven or is this student driven the need for it?

A: I would say it’s both. I know the school of education has been supportive of this and always welcomed it. The students have been coming to her asking about it. One student is ready to go and just waiting for it to pass. Also coming from the public schools, I believe that it is really needed and it is a very responsive and responsible thing for us to do as a university.

Q: Would this be anything that affects the pay scales?

A: No, it would make them more marketable. If I was a principle and I had one candidate that could would with the ESL kids, then I would go with that one. The shift in the school system is causing the second generation to come in, so 20% of classrooms will have English language learners coming in.

Q: It’s an eighteen hour minor. Across the board with the ed. degrees in whatever areas they are, what does this do to the graduation department? Can they fit the minor in without staying an extra semester?

A: Yes. And we would work hard to make that happen. The one area that would be tricky is the field placement and we would need to talk to people immediately about schools with English language learners. They cannot be placed in schools without English language learners. We are looking for inclusion classrooms where they would be hitting both and have a high percentage of English language learners.

Q: Are there any additional resources that need to be added to establish this program?

A: The reason that we are able to do this now is that we just hired a new TSOL person even though we are under program prioritization so that has allowed us to be able to do this. I think it is a great place for TESOL to grow.

Q: Is it just English students that can get the add on or can anybody?

A: Anybody. In fact, we are offering an additional methods class that is just about content.

Q: Other schools have this state?

A: We have been looking around and Mars Hill has something like this.

Q: Do you know how many students you might have?

A: There has been a fair amount of interest and I think it will be a successful minor.

**Vote in favor of TESOL minor**

**Yes: 20 (majority)**

**No:**

**Abstained:**

Curriculum: Proposed graduate school admission changes

 This proposal was talked about last meeting.

Q: Can you please reiterate the rationale behind eliminating provisional and only making conditional?

A: Creates a lot of confusion because provisional is used differently from conditional. This consolidates both of them and streamlines them. The conditions and provisions can be put together. Basically provisional means that there are conditions that have to be met sometimes they are academic. Conditional means conditions have to be met such as GRE, test scores by the end of the first semester or they cannot continue. Regardless what it is for, they are letting the person in under different conditions. It is a different vocabulary but it serves the same purpose of some condition has to be met whether academic standards or some part of the application is incomplete before the person can be placed into full admission. What has happened is that it is very difficult to track if somebody has been admitted provisionally. The reason for this is to streamline the process to reduce confusion. They had a whole rash of students getting to the end and not having their required GREs because nobody caught it. This prevents that so we can catch it by lumping it into one category.

Q: Is it the advisor the person that catches it?

A: It will come up on a degree check now because it will be a conditional admission regardless of the condition. They would not be able to enroll in the next semester until those conditions were met.

Q: So somehow that got lost?

A: Right. Now we can put the hold on when they are admitted and it’s a conditional admitted. When the conditions are met it will take the hold off.

Q: Are there quality issues?

A: The quality issues would generally be like the 3.0 in the first term of enrollment.

This is just for first term enrollment admission. Programs can set there on standards for student but there conditional applications if for the admission of students into the graduate school.

Q: For Larry Hammer, as a regular faculty member can we go into banner and sort advisees based on GPA and number of hours?

A: You can in the banner report portal then take it to excel and sort it by program. I think you can sort it by department and if you don’t see what you want just let us know. We make very little distinction between the roles of faculty on the report portal side.

Another point toward the end is that the graduate school will not dismiss for not meeting the conditions. They will basically just not be able to move on. They do not have to reapply and reenroll. If they don’t meet the conditions there will simply be a hold on registration till the conditions are met.

**Vote in favor of Graduate School Catalog Policy**

**Yes: 21 (majority)**

**No: 2**

**Abstained: 0**

Collegial Review Council (CRC)/Vicki Szabo, Chair:

CRC had its’ last meeting two weeks ago. We went over guidelines for applications for dossiers. Corrections were suggested on reading and grammar. There was a request for improvement in the SAI presentation and revision of the border language. All of that has been suggested to the Associate Provost. We also discussed closing issues for next year and we have one final resolution.

Resolution: On abstention best practices

We took it back to legal counsel and asked for their amendments. The amendments that came back to us read as policy because it suggested that the chair of the committee be given the deciding power as to whether someone had conflict of interest or not. We thought that was not best practice to recommend. It said “the committee chair person would do the conflict of interest” and the council rejected that language. We got two recommendations: either strike everything parenthetical and expect that a dean, a department head, and a provost would be able to define conflict of interest or seek out definition of conflict of interest or to accept that language that we felt approached the policy. We chose the lesser and deferred to the fact that people who are chairing these committees should be able to determine through legal counsel or higher above what conflict of interest was. It was also suggested to me and I agree that it we wanted to emphasize that it was a best practices document and nothing more. This is not policy and not handled language. Finally because this is the end of the year without any ability to go back to legal again, we do not want to accept unresolutioned amendments on this. We can vote up or down. If it goes down it goes back to the council for August.

Q: Was there a discussion on why you left and/or instead of just saying they could be absent during discussion and voting?

A: I don’t remember why we had and/or. That was our mistake and we can strike the “or.”

Q: Committee members valid upon conflict of interest, is the implication that will be left up to the committee chair to decide?
A: No, the way we wanted to leave it exactly that undefined we don’t particularly want the committee chair to be the one who decides that. We are not setting policy. We are just highlighting. We clarified it in the preamble but not in the best practices itself. We wanted to leave it open because if the committee member says I have a valid conflict of interest then we don’t want it to police state where the committee chair says you have a conflict of interest I’m taking you off. Then department heads, deans, and provosts get to pick and choose who they want on these committees.

Comments:

We want everyone to be aware of the best practice. It is not changing any policies.

**Vote in favor of CRC Best Practices Abstention**

**Yes: 21 (Unanimous)**

**No: 0**

**Abstained: 0**

Faculty Affairs Council (FAC)/Christopher Cooper, Chair

No report

We will have a year-end write-up.

Rules Committee/Erin McNelis, Chair

 Next week there will be a general faculty vote on the changes to the constitution proposed and passed here.

Faculty Grievance Committee Outlines of Actions

Rules committee has been diligently studying the UNC code and our handbook faculty grievance post-tenure appeals process as discussed earlier. It has been asked for in faculty caucuses. We had provided on the website three different sets of flow charts done by individuals to give you an idea of what we were trying to do right now. To take their process in place and provide a flow chart thinking that would be a first start. What I’ll do is ask maybe sometime you have looked at it and offer some feedback based on the concept. Today, we want specific feedback on the post-tenure appeals committee. It is not required in UNC code. In the UNC code, it is considered a grievance and falls under the grievance committee. We want to remove the post-tenure appeals committee but first we wanted feedback from the senate.

Q: How many times has it been used in the last few years?

A: Last year it had never been used. In 2 years, they have not even elected a chair.

Since there are no other objections, we are going to move forward with recommending the deletion of that group.

Secondly, we met with legal counsel, Mary Ann Lochner, and we discussed the fund that is our process for these. We wanted to streamline/simplify the process but remain within the code. She offered that over the summer her office can create a first draft of a revised version of the grievance and hearing process. The rules committee is in favor of that. The legal committee said that they were trying to assist whatever our decisions. They are just going to revise what the rules committee sees as a priority. We wanted to make sure that there were no objections from senate or faculty that thought legal was taking control.

 Comment: when we dissolved the PTR committee, we also need to make sure that we have enough tenured faculties on the grievance committee.

The committee was talking about A: we are not in alignment with the code in our membership on the grievance committee. Code requires that we have levels of all professors including assistant. By restricting it to tenured, we do not have that, so we are going to have to make corrections to be align with the code. B: We want to increase the size of grievance committee to around 15 people, so not everyone is required to participate and the chair has a pool. It is easier to have a bigger pool of people to choose from because sometimes we have a short timeline to meet. Mary Ann is looking at other UNC systems to put in the draft. We will be working on this over the summer and will bring it back to one of the first couple of meetings in the fall.

Comment from Mark Lord: This is such a necessary step. The number thing has been almost undoable. It is a 9 person committee and 7 have to be there, and almost always we will lose people from a conflict of interest. Also, it takes a lot of time, so finding people can be really difficult.

Also, we will be sorting out different parts in the handbook to be in alignment with the code and put it all in one place. We will also be making sure that we reference the code in it so people know what parts is Western and what is from the code.

**OTHER REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Old Business:

None

New Business:

New senate appointments, draft calendar

Are there any problems with the proposed calendar? We met once at the HHS building. Do you want to meet in the same place every time? Do you want to rotate?

Comment: I think it is nice to meet over there. A couple a semester at HHS would be nice.

**SENATE REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

Administrative Report:

Interim Associate Provost Mark Lord for Provost Angela Brenton

Ann Green is back. We finished a dean search yesterday. Doug Keskula will be the new Dean of HHS. We want to thank Marie Huff for her service there and starting a great foundation for that building. The Joe Philpott position is officially filled with Greg Hodges from ECU. The two assistant Associate Vice Chancellor positions for international expended programs and for student success are active right now. We are in the interview stage for those positions. Graduate school search is still open and meetings will start soon for that. My search will be announced next week. Also, Regis Gilman has accepted a position at Eastern Illinois University. Last thing, within our division we have started one time spending. One your money got locked down you had to have a plan encumber your money and can start to reconcile entire division budget with what’s encumbered. At this point, we are confident enough and we are leasing over today and tomorrow about a half a million dollars which some notices went out today. Included in there is about $100,000 for computer refresh for faculty, staff, and computer labs. No announcement on the Chief of Staff.

Q: Where do we stand on the person who supposed to lead millennium campus?

A: That search is active now. I am not sure when the close date is.

Q: How is that search being handled?

A: Darrell Parker is the chair of that search committee. The millennial group is planning some of that initiative.

Faculty Senate Chair Report/Mary Jean Herzog, Chair:

Winners: Information Technology Council winner is Scott Huffman. Infrastructure Technology Committee winner is Dan Clapper. The two Paul A Reid Award winners are Gael Graham and Ben Tholkes. Athletics winner is Justin Menickelli.

Other items:

One issue came up towards the end of the semester about the motor pool. It may come to senate in the fall. Also, Paul Clark from the Carolina Public Press wrote an article about the UNC strategic plan and faculty response at UNCA, Appalachian, and WCU. He interviewed me for that. He first stated that the WCU faculty did not take a stand in that but he has been corrected. The stand that WCU faculty took has been duly noted.

Attachment 1:

Chancellor’s Report

Faculty Senate Meeting

April 25, 2013

Program Prioritization Update

One of the most significant undertakings of this academic year has been the program prioritization initiative.  Allow me to provide you with an update on that process.

First, a reminder of why we have undertaken program prioritization.  As I have stated consistently since I arrived just under 2 years ago at the conclusion of three years of budget reductions which witnessed a $32M loss of state funding, Western Carolina University does not have the resources to do everything, to be all things to all people.  We are undertaking all kinds of belt-tightening around the university, including, earlier this year, the elimination of a vice chancellor position as part of non-academic restructuring, the fiscal savings from which we utilized to reduce the structural deficit.  Program Prioritization is another of our belt-tightening efforts.  We must focus our limited resources.  And, as you are aware, the first initiative under the first goal of the first strategic direction in the *20/20 Vision* strategic plan calls on the university to undertake a program prioritization process.

Provost Brenton and the Program Prioritization Task Force have led a superb process in which they identified metrics and quality indicators for use in reviewing all programs – a much more consistent and much fairer approach than utilized in earlier WCU attempts at program prioritization.  I am very proud of the thoughtful and courageous work by our colleagues who took on a daunting task through service on the Task Force, and I single out Vicki Szabo in particular for her excellent leadership.  This group contributed enormous amounts of thought, energy, and time to the process.  They did exactly what we asked them to do.

As you know, the process was designed to review academic programs for placement into one of four categories:  programs which should be retained with enhanced resources, with existing resources, with reduced resources, and programs which should be discontinued.  The Task Force has not yet submitted its recommendations to me, but let me talk about the process going forward once I receive them.  First, I will review all recommendations with particular attention to those recommended for discontinuation.  As part of this review, there will be an appeal opportunity for leaders of those programs recommended for discontinuation.  Then, I will make my decisions.  I cannot at this point give you a timeline, but most if not all of my review process will take place in the summer simply because of the timing.

A couple of notes:

1.       For those programs which are categorized for retention and enhanced resources, please note that this designation does not indicate an instant jackpot situation.  It will simply indicate a priority status for new resources.

2.       For those programs which will be discontinued, understand that program discontinuation is a complex process which takes time to implement.  We have an obligation to students who are already majoring in the programs slated for discontinuation, and we will teach them out until graduation.  Tenured faculty in such programs will continue to have their jobs, though alternative assignments are likely.

The Provost’s Office will detail and supervise the implementation process.

Finally, this program prioritization process is not a one-time occurrence; rather, it will be on-going.  We will undertake a complete assessment of the process utilized this year to determine improvements to the process, including the metrics most appropriate for use in such a process.

Budget

There is no additional information on the budget at this time.  We continue to await the NC Senate’s budget expected to be released within the next 2-3 weeks.  The Senate’s budget may or may not resemble the Governor’s budget, but it almost certainly will be the blueprint for the final budget.  As we get news about the budget, we will share it with the campus along with our best analysis of what the implications may be for Western Carolina University.

Continual Process Improvement Initiative

The organizational structure review process in which we engaged in the first half of this year resulted in, in addition to restructuring recommendations, a long list of business processes on our campus which merit review.  As I have engaged in conversations with members of the Executive Council, it has become abundantly clear to me that making progress on this front can be complicated, for our business processes are often interconnected so that changing one process will likely have impacts on many others.  So, pursuit of process improvement requires careful and thoughtful study.

Next year, we will launch a Continual Process Improvement Initiative, a process which will be led by a university-wide task force whose responsibility it will be to identify the priorities among the business processes needing review and to study each of them thoroughly in order to understand the complete web of process interconnectivity.  The task force, in addition to considering the process list generated through the organizational structure review initiative, will solicit ideas for consideration from the entire campus community.  Once the priority processes have been identified and studied, individual processes will be assigned to stakeholder groups whose responsibility it will be to make recommendations for process reengineering and implementation, including communication and training.

Obviously, changing multiple processes simultaneously has great potential to breed confusion.  Thus, we will not tackle many processes at any one time.  But we will make steady progress year after year which will improve and streamline the way we do business.

Ombudsperson – Pilot Project

After a great deal of thought and with advocacy from Provost Brenton, General Counsel Lochner, and members of the Faculty and Staff Senates, I have agreed to pilot an ombudsperson position at Western Carolina.  We will model this pilot on the approach Appalachian State has recently engaged, providing half-time reassignment for a faculty member with appropriate mediation and conflict resolution knowledge and experience to undertake the ombudsperson role.  The ombudsperson will serve both faculty and staff.  The ombudsperson will report to the Provost’s Office which will take on implementation of this position.

Thank you for all you have done to ensure another excellent year at Western Carolina University.  I send best wishes for the end of the academic year and for a rewarding summer.

Sincerely yours,

David Belcher

Chancellor