**MINUTES**

***January 22, 2014***

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

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

ROLL CALL

Present:

Andrew Adams, Kia Asberg, Lisa Bloom, Shawn Collins, Yang Fan, Katy Ginanni, Mary Jean Herzog, Beth Huber, Leroy Kauffman, Rebecca Lasher, Will Lehman, Beth Lofquist, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Justin Menickelli, Steve Miller, Malcolm Powell, Kathy Starr, Wes Stone, Karyn Tomczak

Members with Proxies:

AJ Grube, David Belcher, Lisa Bloom, Chris Cooper, Beth Huber, George Ford, Leigh Odom, Vicki Szabo, John Whitmire

Members Absent:

Cheryl Waters-Tormey

Recorder:

Ann Green

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

Approval of the Minutes

Motion:

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of November 21, 2013 were approved as presented.

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

Chancellor’s Report/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.

General Education Council Update/Erin McNelis:

The General Education Council met on January 2nd in Chapel Hill. A report was delivered to President Ross Tuesday of this week. Erin said the most important element within the report is a recommendation from the group to proceed with investigating the designing of a quantitative assessment strategy with ETS. This would be specially designed for the UNC system instead of an off-the-shelf option.

A group from the council went to Princeton to meet with ETS. They will put on several forums throughout the state for faculty and anyone interested and faculty will be involved in the development. A request was made for pilot electronic portfolios. 4 to be awarded, 1 at UNC Chapel Hill, a shared portfolio at NC A&T and UNC Greensboro (they will share systems) and two other medium size institutions. This covers the range of those that do already have a lot of use and electronic portfolios and those that will be starting something new and institutions ranging from small to large. In total, those four programs added up to $70,000. These will be in planning stages with implementation toward the spring and full implementation in the fall with collecting of the data and reports to the council in January of 2015.

The committee has not received the results of the last survey that Erin hopes everyone had links to. Provost Lofquist sent out a couple of emails reminding everyone to participate. It was asking about the rubrics or criteria for gauging critical thinking and comprehension. They were using the AAC&U value rubrics as a basis of the sub competencies. They had three thousand responses from faculty across the system and in general, there wasn’t any disagreement with the competencies or sub competencies and they are getting back to them on the written comments. Erin requested that something formal go out to campuses soon. She hopes an update or email will be sent out via email soon.

The council will not be meeting again until March, but the proposals which will go to the February Board of Governor’s meeting will be delivered by Suzanne Ortega or someone within her area.

Erin said they are also recommending that the speed with which they wanted a pilot to be implemented of this fall is too fast to have something of quality, with recommendations from faculty.

Q/A: The ETS assessment is to assess graduating seniors? To see what their knowledge is?

A: That’s not even been decided. Originally it was proposed to have an identifier of how much knowledge or skills were gained at the university. To see what the difference is. It’s typically freshman and seniors and ideally we would have the same populations to measure those values added by the institution. This isn’t as helpful especially if you have a large transfer population. The committee wanted to stay away from value added or bench-marking a final value as much as just it should be for the purpose of helping us transform our curriculum and learn more about where our students are coming in and where the weaknesses are. What aren’t we delivering that we thought we were? ….likely at least once toward the senior year, probably the senior year and possibly an entry level. And then it’s a matter is that research needs to be done, is it sampling, is it total population. Cost will be coming into it. I think we included the BOG into it. The legislature needs to identify if they want to support this, not just in words, but financially as well…

Faculty Assembly/Rebecca Lasher:

Rebecca Lasher summarized a few things that were learned at Faculty Assembly on the topics of tenure and post tenure review. She shared that the Board of Governors is very much in support of tenure and they understand that tenure for higher education is vital. Rebecca also shared that there will be some direction to rewrite policies on post tenure review for all campuses. Rebecca reminded if an individual who works for the university wants to correspond with the legislators to do it from a personal email. Do not use email from WCU. University policies about using state email for political reasons are included in the Handbook if anyone wants to review them.

A report was released that looked at the operational and administrative side to see how we are doing things across the UNC System. Fortunately it was found that over the past 7 years, each university overall when they averaged the measures, that we really exceeded our peers in efficiency and making good use of our space. There were some recommendations and one of the best is that there is a recommendation that faculty at each institution have more input into how things can be more efficient on their individual campuses. GA will be filing a report in response to this report by December 1st. Overall the report was very good in terms of how we are doing in terms of efficiency.

Rebecca will post full minutes on SharePoint and the Faculty Senate website.

SGA/Colton Overcash:

No report.

Staff Senate/David Rathbone, Chair Elect:

David reported the Staff Senate is beginning to have elections and nominations for new senators. They are also working on a yard sale for April 12th at the Ramsey Center for staff scholarships. If anyone has anything to donate please contact David Rathbone. Next week they have the UNC Staff Assembly Conference. For the 125 Anniversary Committee, they are accepting donations of $125 which can be donated in monthly increments. Brent Thomas is the contact for donations. There is also a $1,125 dollar option of a donation. It’s a good way to show your passion for Western.

David mentioned the Board of Governors visit to Western in August, 2014. It’s an opportunity for us to put our best face forward. The Staff Senate has a beautification committee and people are donating their time to do things around campus to help with pressure washing, painting, and other tasks to help spruce things up.

Q/C: Is there any news on the property that has been damaged in the fire?

A: …at the basketball game tomorrow night donations will be accepted…I think they have an architect that will be looking at it to see if we can rebuild.

Dr. Belcher added that they are still waiting on the estimates from a third party and they are also still waiting to hear from the department of insurance to see where they are at this point.

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

Academic Policy and Review Council (APRC)/Katy Ginanni, Chair:

There was no curriculum requiring a vote at the January meetings.

The Academic Standing Policy also known as Fostering Student Success was discussed. The Council reviewed and some minor changes were suggested to Dr. Lowell Davis. Katy said this needs to be voted on by Faculty Senate. It was not voted on by the APRC.

Q/C: For clarity, does this supersede policies for departments and schools within colleges?

A from Registrar Larry Hammer: I think they are different things. This is bounded by the students’ performance within the term, the standing end of term action. I think you are probably thinking of some specific circumstance.

Q/C: Well, our program has had several dismissals for academic (reasons) that are pretty clear cut. My concern is clinical dismissals. Obviously we have an obligation to protect the public. If we have a student who is dangerous…or is consistently not meeting the objectives that are defined…it could occur at any time, even in between semester because students go to clinicals during breaks. There are other programs within the College of Health and Human Sciences and several faculty have come to me about this. I think we need clarity.

A from Registrar Larry Hammer: This is academic standing and it sounds like a bit of what you are talking about there has a disciplinary component to it. If a college or department took action that resulted in all “Ws” being issued for a student then this policy at the end of the term when academic standing is calculated at the end of the term, the “Ws” would factor into this policy. If your dismissal resulted in all “Fs” for a student, those “Fs” would factor into the academic standing policy at the end of the term.

Q/C: Our clinical courses are graded as S/U.

A from Registrar Larry Hammer: Whatever the grade ended up being for the student would feed this calculation.

Q/C: By policy in the School of Nursing if you get one “U” in a clinical course you are dismissed from the program, not from the graduate school.

A from Registrar Larry Hammer: A student with one “U” would be in good academic standing with the institution. They may not be with your program, but they would definitely be in good academic standing with the institution.

A from Provost Beth Lofquist: And that would not keep them from getting another major even though they are no longer in your program.

Q/C: …as long as it doesn’t mandate that we can’t dismiss that student.

A: Right.

A from Provost Lofquist: I think the issue too is if you are withdrawing them, you’re getting to that 67% attempted hours issue as well. It’s not just about they got a “U” or an “F.” And the timing of that decision is crucial as to when it gets reported.

Q/C: It’s sort of a challenge, because if you tell a student because of x, y z you are going to get a “U” in this course. What does that mean? Does it mean they get to continue in their academic courses? Or does it mean that you can just outright dismiss them from the program? If they don’t withdraw…it’s a cloudy area.

A from Provost Lofquist: It is and where we want to end up, we want to honor the dispositions of the discipline and the profession, but we want to also make it so the student can be successful in some other area with their academic career at Western. I don’t know where that line is or how we do that, but I do think we want to help students to be successful…

Discussion continued.

Q/C: Policy includes exceptions…..?

A from AVC Lowell Davis: Yes, extenuating circumstances, however we do not control the course completion rate. So, let’s say of a student’s house burns down and they decide they are going to withdraw, we can affect their 16 credit hours, but their course completion rate is financial aid, federal government. It’s still going to be 0 percent for the semester and they are going to potentially have to appeal for financial aid when they return the following semester.

A from Provost Lofquist: This is where advising comes in. Before the only students that were in trouble with academic standing – it was based on grades, not on attempted hours. Now, you can have an honors student with straight “A”s, they go below that 67% completion rate of their attempted hours, and now, they’re on probation and in academic trouble. This is a huge part of the understanding. We don’t have any choice on that. It’s been mandated. A lot of this is being mandated as you well know.

Q/C: How is this going to affect the suspension appeals process? Right now if a student is suspended they can follow an appeal process and it goes to the board and ….basically it’s a matter of discretion with the board…

A from Registrar Larry Hammer: That part really does not change. A student who is suspended or dismissed has right of appeal. Should their appeal be granted by the board and they have the option to return. They will return under the terms of a contract which is kind of how we do it now already…they will have to meet the terms of the contract in order to continue. They return as if they were on probation-…the policy itself doesn’t preclude doing a different kind of contract. That part is not bound up in the policy of saying that everybody that we allow to return is going to be in an LC type of course. It’s more flexible than that.

A from AVC Lowell Davis: And we’re bringing the financial aid appeals committee with the academic appeals committee because now the policies are the same. Students will have to appeal to one committee instead of two different committees to come back.

Discussion continued. In summary, the two policies of financial aid and academic standing have become more aligned with each other.

Q/C from Provost Lofquist: …I think a lot of what we need to do in the future once this is finalized is take your Handbook, your policies and your procedures and make sure it’s up front and center with students before they even enter the program that this can happen to you. If you are up front, they know right off the bat; tie it in with this; I think that will serve the students well. I think the emphasis has got to be the proactive stance, not the reactive stance.

Q/C: We talked originally about this in our November meeting. We decided not to vote at that time because there were some things that were still coming down from GA. This is a different document, it’s shorter. Can someone articulate what has changed…? …there were some things that were not yet ironed out and it’s not possible to tell what has been ironed out…

A from Lowell Davis: If you go to page 7, the last two lines say withdraw for extenuating circumstances will affect satisfactory academic progress and course completion rates but will not count toward the student’s 16-hour withdrawal limit.

Q/C: So we’re not able to say it would not affect Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP)?

A from AVC Lowell Davis: It has to for financial aid reasons.

A from Registrar Larry Hammer: The good thing about that though is in the exception process, we say it’s okay,

financial aid will follow.

Q/C: So, this is essentially the only thing that has been updated?

A: Yes.

Q/C: It says a “W” for medical reasons is typically not granted course by course. Is it still possible? i.e. if someone breaks their leg and needs to withdraw from a PE class only?

A from Provost Lofquist: It’s still possible. Those decisions are made on a case by case basis.

Q/C: One thing that Lowell and Larry pointed out to us yesterday is that this document may change, right?

A from Registrar Larry Hammer: Elements from this document itself will get published in the catalog and in the catalog process there is a bit of room for editorial changes to make sure we’ve got the context within the catalog well. That’s kind of the major place the document could change. We’re having a side conversation with folks; we’ve always thought about the good standing probation/suspension. Probation is even defined in this document. It’s going to be real different going forward because of the course completion rate. We talked about how to make sure the faculty that advise, understand that. Paraphrased: You have to make sure a student raises gpa above a 2.0 and make the 67% completion rate. If they don’t do both, they are not okay. Is probation the best label? Because we need to change the existing understanding of the existing infrastructure and if we did that we probably will do that with full information to the senate, but it will probably be with an editorial change not necessarily a policy change (change in terminology, not policy).

Q/C: I would suggest on that on the document under Academic Probation to capitalize “AND” two times - it’s not pick one it’s “AND.”

Q/C: I think at the last meeting I asked about course withdrawal and whether or not advisor notification will be a part of that? Does that change or can a student still just drop a course?

A from Lowell Davis: When a student currently withdraws from Larry and his Banner workflow, it should notify the instructor that the student has withdrawn. If a student withdraws for medical reasons or for some other reasons that the provost office deems appropriate we have started in the past two months emailing the instructor to let them know why the student was withdrawn from the course instead of you just seeing that they have left.

Q/C: This is all after the fact though and so, my frustration as an advisor is that we work really hard with our students to shepherd them along and you get them on track and they get behind in a course and they panic and they withdraw. And then that’s a prereq to a course for next semester and they flunk back to a full year and this is affecting our retention rate, our graduate rate and so on. I don’t want an extra duty, but I would much rather deal with that W up front, than deal with that student for 5 semesters to come. Is it possible to require the advisor…?

A: That’s not really part of this policy, but we hear that voice very loud and clear and what that process needs to look like. It does without a doubt need to be reengineered. There is project on the books that has to do with some online automation and where things go. The hard part is getting everybody to talk within a timely fashion because often that’s done up against a tough deadline. That discussion needs to play out as part of a different policy and procedure. It’s a good point and we’re hearing it loud and clear.

Discussion continued.

A motion was made to vote on the Academic Standing Policy as presented and seconded.

**VOTE ON ACADEMIC STANDING POLICY**

**Yes: 22**

**No: None**

**Abstained: None**

**No Vote: 3**

**See Attachment 2 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

Collegial Review Council (CRC)/Steve Miller, Chair

The Collegial Review Council meets Friday before the Faculty Caucus. They will be talking about Digital Measures. Andrew Adams will be meeting with the Council about the challenges, strengths and benefits of Digital Measures. It will have a significant impact across campus. They also will be talking about having a joint meeting with the Faculty Affairs Council to talk about student assessment of instruction and standardizing reports that CoursEval puts out. They are interested in receiving standardized reports for faculty members that will summarize the faculty members SAI scores. Another concern that has come up multiple times is what happens when department heads are up for tenure or promotion? The standard now, the way it’s written in the Faculty Handbook, is that the department head presents candidates for tenure and promotion. Steve explained what is happening when it’s a department head, the colleges wing it. There is no set procedure for the university. In some colleges, they’ve had an associate dean present them. Other’s don’t have them presented and the committee just discusses that candidate. Steve said the Council started discussing this back in November and they will continue to discuss it and ways to guide this process.

Q/C: Won’t there still be ways for individual faculty members to differentiate themselves as they put their dossier forward?

A: in Digital Measures?

Q/C: When my dossier goes forward for consideration…mine looks like I want it to look as opposed to just a generic looks like everybody else. If I want to promote myself?

A: That’s a potential downside to Digital Measures then. There’s two ways to think of it. You still put it together, but the Digital Measures makes it a whole lot easier. But, now everybody’s the same. The differentiation is in the content. That is something to discuss.

Q/C: I would like to make sure that is part of the discussion.

A: That’s an interesting point.

Q/C: It think that’s a really good point because I think there have been dossiers that came together from a college committee there were some that were just a huge mess and it really reflected on that person. We’re not going to have that information. Discussion continued about this.

Faculty Affairs Council (FAC)/AJ Grube, Chair

No Report

Rules Committee/Leroy Kauffman, Chair

At the last Faculty Senate meeting in November, the Senate looked at the material about hearings and grievances. Some of it is changes to the By-laws and some changes to policies. The first reading was in November. Leroy asked for any comments.

Q/C: I’m very impressed with how much clearer this is and how there is so much less duplication. Now you can read it like a document. For people reading this it’s very easy to look at this and figure out what to do.

A from Chair Kauffman: I would love to take credit, but I think credit goes to Legal Counsel…

Q/C from Provost Lofquist: I would like to say that Legal Counsel was over in my office bragging on you all for how well you all worked together on that.

**VOTE ON CHANGES TO FACULTY HEARING AND GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE PROCEDURES**:

**Yes: 22**

**No: None**

**Abstained: None**

**No Vote: 3**

**See Attachment 2 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

Leroy mentioned he is looking into other methods of recording voting.

Q/C: Any idea of when the faculty vote will be ready for these changes to the by-laws. Any changes to the constitution or by-laws need a vote by the faculty. We want our senators to be well familiar with this so that maybe at department or college meetings you could answer questions that could come up.

Discussion took place on this. The president and legal counsel at GA have to approve any changes to 4.0 according to Provost Lofquist. It was also discussed that any changes to the Faculty By-Laws have to be voted on by Faculty and a faculty forum is needed.

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

New Business:

Faculty Chair Mary Jean Herzog asked everyone to encourage faculty in their college to come to the spring Faculty Caucus on Friday from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. Refreshments will be offered.

David Rathbone from Staff Senate brought up the topic of possibly painting the buildings that were damaged by fire. If someone wants to initiate the discussions with legal that perhaps they could paint the wood pieces the same color as the building. Joe Walker had the idea of maybe asking for art work from students in the art department.

Provost Lofquist added that she has a similar idea on the agenda for the executive council this coming Monday. Anything along these lines would have to be blessed by the Executive Council.

Wes Stone brought up that the fire happened on the day of the last Faculty Senate meeting and he thanked everyone on behalf of at least one business for all the emotional and financial support. Wes said there were a lot of donations that helped their employees and they appreciate it very much.

Old Business:

None

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

Administrative Report/Interim Provost Beth Tyson Lofquist:

The Provost Report was distributed previously and Dr. Lofquist talked through the bullet points from her report including informing that she is officially acting Associate Provost until the end of February. Dr. Alison Morrison-Shetlar is officially our new Provost.

Q/C: If there is policy around Digital Measures where does that come from? Who formulates that?

A: We haven’t really figured that out yet. You probably know what we did around CoursEval. We had policy and procedures around CoursEval that came from Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate working with the administration…we came up with a policy that we could all live with. I foresee something like that as we move forward, but we don’t want to hold back implementation. We can work on these things simultaneously.

Andrew Adams, Faculty Database Coordinator, said he was on the phone for over an hour with legal counsel, She Browning talking about privacy, security, to existing policies on personnel files, tenure files relate to Digital Measures. Those are questions he is looking at to. Their first meeting is coming up and they will talk a lot about that and privacy and security issues.

Q/C: Fostering Student Success: Is there a roll out plan for communicating to students?

A from AVC Lowell Davis: We are meeting on Friday with Phil Cauley from Admissions and a group of people to decide what the roll out plan is going to look like. The GA policy says that we have to have a plan for communicating with students. We hope to have something in place by March.

Q/C: Advising Day is in February? That’s the best time for us to get our students.

A: I think we can get some talking points. Part of it is that it’s not this semester that it goes into effect until next semester, so the bullets that everybody should be saying to their advisees, is that sufficient?

Q/C: Yes, “be aware of these, things are changing, be aware of these things.”

A: We’re building a website. We have some little colorful handouts for you to stick up on corkboards. We’re going down the road. For faculty, I think we are pretty much there. For students, it’s going to take us awhile.

Discussion continued about how to get student’s attention and how important it is that students understand these changes.

Q/C: A question was posed about NCCAT coming back to WCU and discussion ensued. The outcome is still unknown and it depends on funding and wether the funding is re-curring or non-recurring.

Faculty Senate Chair Report/Mary Jean Herzog:

Chair Herzog mentioned the spring Faculty Caucus again and encouraged everyone to attend and encourage faculty to attend. Rebecca Lasher will be finishing her term as secretary this semester and the position will be open. Leroy Kauffman is the chair elect for next year, but with the recent faculty senate changes, this is only a one year term. Chair Herzog asked that everyone keep encouraging their collegues to participate in faculty senate whether as senator, working with councils, submitting their name as nominees for elections.

The meeting adjourned.

**Attachment 1**

Faculty Senate

Chancellor’s Report

22 January 2014

Report from the January Meeting of the Board of Governors

* Presentation of Proposed Tuition and Fees for 2014-2015. Tuition and fee proposals are presented to the BOG each January and voted on at the Board’s February meeting. Inasmuch as there are no proposals to increase tuition for in-state students, I do not anticipate the tuition and fee proposals to generate controversy or much discussion this year.
* UNC System’s Policy Agenda for the 2014 Legislative Session. The System presented a set of draft policy issues for consideration by the Board for pursuit during the upcoming legislative session. One in particular proposes the implementation of a State Aid Intercept program, already in effect in other states, which has positive potential for individual UNC institutions. In such a program, if a public entity/borrower, such as a university, defaulted on its debt payments, the trust indenture would authorize the trustee to “intercept” the borrower’s state appropriations in order to pay bondholders before remaining funds flowed to the borrower. The risk is negligible inasmuch as default by a public university is highly unlikely. The upside has great positive potential inasmuch as our credit rating would be higher; typically under such programs, credit ratings are one credit rating below the state’s general obligation bond rating. NC has a credit rating of AAA, and thus WCU could expect to borrow at the AA level and even refinance existing debt at more favorable rates. This program, if approved, would apply only to auxiliary and non-state supported debt.
* Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs:
	+ Enrollment Report for all institutions in the System. Of note: WCU had both the largest percentage enrollment growth and the largest actual number growth in the System.
	+ Institutional Mission Review. As you may remember, the UNC System directed the constituent institutions to review their mission statements over the summer in 2013, asking each either to affirm its existing mission statement or to propose a modified mission statement. WCU engaged in as inclusive a process as possible last summer to consider our mission statement; WCU submitted a modified mission statement which was substantively not very different but reworded to reflect better our commitment to engaged learning. All institutions in the System submitted their proposals last fall. The System contracted with a consultant to review all of the mission statements. The consultant endorsed WCU’s revised mission statement except for one item: our proposed new mission statement referenced undergraduate and graduate academic programs; the consultants preferred that we be much more specific in relation to our graduate offerings, delineating undergraduate, master’s, and three doctoral academic programs, which specifically details what we have been authorized to offer at the doctoral level. I noted to President Ross that WCU has added two doctoral programs recently – the DPT and the DNP – as the result of evolving certification requirements, and that, while we have no aspirations to doctoral research university status, WCU may have to add other doctoral programs in the future again in response to certification standards. In such a case, WCU would again have to change its mission statement to reflect the addition of a doctoral program. President Ross, though, agreed with the consultant, and the Ed Planning Committee endorsed his recommendation. The proposal to add doctoral programs at any institution not designated as a doctoral research university will necessitate a simultaneously proposed mission change.
	+ Simultaneously proposed MFA in Film Degree Programs. Last spring, both UNCG and the School of the Arts forwarded to General Administration proposals to offer an MFA in Film. G.A. requested that the institutions consult with one another in an effort to find opportunities to collaborate. After consulting, the two institutions responded that the foci of the two proposed programs were distinct enough to preclude collaboration. G.A. asked the Ed Planning Committee to make a determination. In the process of the discussion, the group learned that UNCW planned to submit a proposal for the same degree in the near future. While the committee did allow both institutions to go forward with planning for the degree, the committee itself was sharply divided on the subject, and there is no guarantee that both institutions will be allowed to offer the degree. The concern over duplication of programs is real.
* The Board of Governors Audit Committee was informed of WCU’s clean financial audit for 2013.
* At each meeting of the Board of Governors, President Ross recognizes achievements across the System. He noted two WCU items:
	+ WCU’s recent top 100 ranking by *US News and World Report* for online undergraduate degree programs. WCU received the highest ranking of the 15 NC institutions of higher education that were ranked in the top 205 universities.
	+ Dr. Chris Cooper’s selection by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as the 2013 NC Professor of the Year.
* Two other Board of Governors-related notes:
	+ I have been appointed to a seven-member Post-Tenure Review Working Group which has a 60-day timeline for providing to the Committee on Personnel and Tenure recommendations designed to strengthen post-tenure review across the System, ensuring robust post-tenure evaluation, effective oversight, and accountability.
	+ The Board of Governors will hold their September 2014 meeting at WCU to align with our 125th Anniversary celebration.

Three Additional Items

* WCU is presenting a proposal to the Board of Governors at its February meeting to lease the Millennial Campus for a period of 99 years to WCU’s Endowment Fund. State property and construction regulations are such that, if the property remains as it is, it would take 3.5 – 4 years between making a land lease agreement with a private developer to build, for example, a health care office building and the opening of such a building. If the Endowment Fund leases the land, the time frame shrinks by 1 – 1.5 years, which is much closer to the speed of business and which would make doing business with WCU more attractive to prospective developers. For your information, a large portion of NCSU’s Centennial Campus is part of its Endowment Fund. WCU would like to have the same advantages NCSU has enjoyed in developing public-private partnerships.
* WCU is on the cusp of engaging in its annual internal budget hearing process. Kristen Crosson, WCU’s budget director, has done a great job of organizing the process and designing a new WCU budget website [www.budgetprocess.wcu.edu](http://www.budgetprocess.wcu.edu) which provides dates of budget hearings and which will, during the course of the budget process, be updated with the priorities which emerge during the process itself.
* Tomorrow, January 23, WCU will launch its year-long celebration of its 125th Anniversary. I hope you will drop in, if just for a few minutes, at the 12:25-2:25 event in the UC Grand Room to help kick things off, and then come help us support the Catamounts as they battle a tough Davidson team at the Ramsey Center at 7 p.m. tomorrow night. The halftime activities tomorrow will be pretty special.

As always, thank you for all you do for Western Carolina University.

David Belcher

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ATTACHMENT TWO** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Senator/Ex-Officio Member- (organized by College)** | **Department** | **College** | **Attendance 1/22/14 Meeting (PR = Proxy, H=Here, A = Absent)** | **Academic Standing Policy/Student Success Policy changes Vote** | **Faculty Hearing and Grievance Committee/Procedures changes to By-Laws and Faculty Handbook** |
| Beth Huber | English | Arts & Sciences | H | Yes | Yes |
| Christopher Cooper | Political Science | Arts & Sciences | PR | Yes | Yes |
| Erin McNelis | Mathematics & Computer Science | Arts & Sciences | H | Yes | Yes |
| John Whitmire | Philosophy & Religion | Arts & Sciences | PR | Yes | Yes |
| Malcolm Powell | Biology | Arts & Sciences | H | Yes | Yes |
| Will Lehman | Modern Foreign Languages | Arts & Sciences | H | Yes | Yes |
| AJ Grube | Law/Sport Management | Business | PR | Yes | Yes |
| Leroy Kauffman | Accounting, Finance, IS, Econ | Business | H  | Yes | Yes |
| Steve Miller | Accounting, Finance, IS, Econ | Business | H | Yes | Yes |
| Yang Fan | Global Management | Business | H | Yes | Yes |
| David McCord | Psychology | Education & Allied Professions | H (left before votes) | Did Not Vote | Did Not Vote |
| Justin Menickelli | School of Teaching Learning | Education & Allied Professions | H | Yes | Yes |
| Kia Asberg | Psychology | Education & Allied Professions | H (left before votes) | Did Not Vote | Did Not Vote |
| Lisa Bloom | School of Teaching and Learning | Education & Allied Professions | H | Yes | Yes |
| Mary Jean Herzog | School of Teaching and Learning | Education & Allied Professions | H | Yes | Yes |
| Beth Tyson Lofquist | Interim Provost | Ex-Officio | H | n/a | n/a |
| David Belcher | Chancellor | Ex-Officio | H | n/a | n/a |
| Andrew Adams | School of Music | Fine & Performing Arts | H | Yes | Yes |
| Karyn Tomczak | Stage & Screen | Fine and Performing Arts | PR | Yes | Yes |
| Kathy Starr | Physical Therapy | Health & Human Sciences | H | Yes | Yes |
| Leigh Odom | Communication Sciences & Disorders | Health & Human Sciences | PR | Yes | Yes |
| Rebecca Lasher | Social Work | Health & Human Sciences | H | Yes | Yes |
| Shawn Collins | School of Nursing | Health & Human Sciences | H | Yes | Yes |
| Katy Ginanni | Hunter Library  | Hunter Library | H | Yes | Yes |
| George Ford | Construction Management  | Kimmel School | PR | Yes | Yes |
| Wes Stone | Engineering & Technology | Kimmel School | H | Yes | Yes |
| Cheryl Waters-Tormey | GeoSciences & Natural Resources | Arts & Sciences | A | Did Not Vote | Did Not Vote |
|  |  |  |   | **Total Yes** | **Total Yes** |
|  |  |  |  | **22** | **22** |
|  |  |  |  | **Total "Did Not Vote"** | **Total "Did Not Vote"** |
|  |  |  |  | **3** | **3** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |