Faculty Senate

Minutes

10/28/2015 Over Flow Meeting 3:00pm

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

ROLL CALL

**Present:** Mary Kay Bauer, Patricia Bricker, Linda Comer, Robert Crow, David Dorondo, Jeanne R. Dulworth, David Henderson, Cheryl Johnston, Leroy Kauffman, Kae Livsey, L. Alvin Malesky Jr., David McCord, Erin McNelis, Liz Skene, Katerina Spasovska, John Whitmire, and Bill Yang

**Members with Proxies:** Bob Beaudet, AJ Grube, Ian Hewer, Beth Huber, Will Lehman, Niall Michelsen, Alison Morrison-Shetlar, Mack Powell, Bill Richmond, Zsolt Szabo, Peter Tay, Jamie Vaske, and Tonya M. Westbrook

**Members Absent:** Robert Steffen

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES April 30th minutes- motion for approval. Approved.

SENATE COUNCIL REPORTS

**Collegiate Review Council /Mary Kay Bauer:**

10/8/2015 a meeting was held.

Collegial Review committees- The composition of committee is half of elected colleagues; others are appointed at college level and university level. We are discussing and favoring the dissolution of the policy on having deans and provost appoint members of the committee.

We decided to look into some sister institutions. Each member of council will look into two different University’s policies. Council will review again on November 12th and then will bring the proposal to the Senate at a later time.

Timeframe suggested: Senate would like an update in November, and to see an action item in January.

**CRC 1 Resolution**: **Updating Faculty Workload Policy to Meet General Administration Specifications**

GA came back with a general approval of changes made a few years ago, but asked for some additional items to be included in the policy.

Brandon consulted with department heads and associate deans on items modified in Section 5 of Faculty handbook. Would like to amend an additional item on page 3, 2nd paragraph. “According to UNC policy manual”… change to drop quotation and add “criteria for course reductions…” Reference is out of date.

Other changes are on tracked changes of the document.

Suggestion: to define Overload, paid vs. not paid. Workload policy differs for each department currently. FAC will begin to review this.

Discussion followed.

Faculty Senate approves the suggested changes to WCU’s Faculty Workload Policy, Section 5.01 of the Faculty Handbook, and recommends forwarding the updated policy to UNC GA for final approval.

**Academic Policy and Review Council/Robert Crow:**

**APRC Resolution 1: Academic Standing Policy Update**

Changes are intended to clarify that Academic Standing and Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) are determined each semester (including the summer semester), to clarify how the 67% completion requirement is for the two most recently completed semester AND the overall hours attempted at WCU, and that to clarify that transitioning from Academic Warning to Good Standing a student must also earn an overall 67% completion rate on all WCU hours attempted (not just for the most recent semester).

* Adjust terminology to use ``semester’’ rather than ``term’’
* Clarify that a student will be placed on academic warning if their cumulative GPA falls below 2.0 or
	+ if the student fails to complete 67% of their attempted hours *in their two most recently completed semesters* of enrollment, or
	+ *if the student fail to complete 67% of their overall WCU attempted hours*
* Clarify that to move from Academic Warning to Good Standing status a student must also (in addition to currently listed criteria) *earn an overall 67% completion rate on all WCU hours attempted*
* Removal of the condition that receiving all F grades or a combination of F, U, or W grades will be suspended
* Correct terminology to refer to an Academic Action Plan rather than a Learning Contract for students granted an appeal for reinstatement.

Voting on change proceeded. Passed.

**APRC Resolution 2: Academic Standing Policy – Temporary Summer Status**

These changes would create a Temporary Summer Status that would allow students who are suspended at the end of a Spring semester to enroll in summer semester classes at WCU, without eligibility for any federal, state, or institutional financial assistance, in an attempt to bring their academic status to one that permits continuing enrollment into the fall semester.

The Faculty Senate

* approves the creation of a Temporary Summer Status, and
* approves changing the Academic Standing policy, replacing the current summer contract option for students suspended at the end of the spring semester with the Temporary Summer Status

Voting on change proceeded. Passed.

**APRC Resolution 3: Updating APR 1 on Program Directorship**

The proposed changes are intended to better align undergraduate program directorship guidelines with the updated graduate director guidelines, to refer to Curriculog with regards to curriculum oversight, and to include assessment responsibilities associated with program directors.

The Faculty Senate endorses the proposed changes to APR 1 on Program Directorship.

Voting on change proceeded. Passed.

**APRC Resolution 4: Updating APR 17 – Curriculum Guide**

The proposed changes are to

* Update official procedure to reflect the use of Curriculog in the curriculum approval process,
* Include references to SACS-COC curriculum regulations and policies, and
* Update new program development and approval guidelines to reflect General Administration and Board of Governors requirements

The Faculty Senate endorses the proposed changes to APR 17 Curriculum Guide.

Voting on change proceeded. Passed.

**Faculty Affairs Council/Jeannie Dulworth:**

We have been looking at salary and fixed term value, awards, funding opportunities, security. Asking task force to look at sister institutions. Reviewing multi-year contract, and promotion without tenure.

Report will come back in late spring. Thank you to COB and Kimmel for the volunteers.

FAC will review courtesy appointments, mobile device policy, and Workload policy.

**Senate Chair Report/David McCord:**

Importance of participating in campus conversations.

* Monday Nov 16- total student experience
* Tuesday Nov. 17- invest in our people
* Wednesday Nov. 18- enhance campus diversity
* Thursday Nov. 19- supporting scholarships.

**New Business**

**Advising Day Technical Report**

Jed Tate gave a brief summary on the Degree Audit Issue that happened on Advising Day- queues were backed up, had bad data, and the program stopped working. They worked with GA and Ilucian to correct the issue. We had server time-outs; the response was to open capacity. Issue was resolved around 1:30pm, with degree audits worked as designed afterwards. The root Cause will go to IT to process to find out the exact cause so we can prevent it from happening again.

**Proposal to Establish a Center for the Study of Free Enterprise**

The following comments and replies from Ed Lopez were read aloud as requested:

Each of the Concerns in the proposed "Faculty Senate Position Statement on the Proposed CSFE v3.0" is a genuine, appropriate, and necessary item of discussion. However, none of the Concerns is presented so as to reflect the reality that each has been discussed, both in open forums among faculty, and consistently between the administration and the sponsor.

Furthermore, there are fact-based counter points that pertain to each Concern, as follows.

1. Financial costs: The university's share of the budget outlay represents expenditures that were already planned and budgeted for in the extant staffing plan. Committing the funds as proposed enables the university to raise external support, thus freeing up other areas of the personnel budget. Dollars are fungible. This proposal provides a net positive to the university's budget, a subsidy. While the commitment after five years is there, it would be there in the case of any faculty hire in any situation, so this is not a concern that is unique to the proposed center.

2. Need: There are extant activities that will be folded into the proposed center. However, this Concern ignores the reality that there are a number of new activities in the list of planned deliverables that are not currently being offered, and thus are not redundant, and thus makes the proposal not redundant.

3. Academic freedom: The Senate's position statement focuses on past ("previously set forth") problems with academic freedom on other campuses. It offers no factual basis, but instead relies on intuitive speculation, to suspect that problems with academic freedom are a concern with this gift, at this time, on our campus. Furthermore, contrary to Points of Agreement #1 and #2 earlier in the position statement, this Concern #3 relies on the claim that the proposed center will not proceed "well within the mainstream of the the discipline of Economics" and will instead produce results that will be "dismissed by reputable scientific communities". At minimum, this contradiction requires a revision of either Concern #3 or Points of Agreement #1 and #2.

4. Reputational costs: The university's role is not to avert faculty members feeling "uncomfortable". Nor should the university proceed with a strategy that minimizes negative publicity that may or may not materialize. On the contrary, the university's role is to pursue the mission of presenting all points of view, and the proposed center is a unique entity in that pursuit.

5. Absence of peer review: Policy 105 does not require peer review, therefore the absence of peer review in the proposal is not grounds for its dismissal. Instead, if the sense of the faculty is that peer review is required, then the Senate ballot should not include a vote on the overall proposal, but instead a vote on whether peer review is desirable. Note that every faculty member is reviewed through the DCRD process, so peer review is built into the proposed center as is any other faculty activity on campus.

Edward J. Lopez

Professor of Economics and

BB&T Distinguished Professor of Capitalism

Western Carolina University

Discussion focused on reviewing the draft response (v3.0) which was posted beforehand:

* Item 4 received discussion. Agreed to remove the last sentence and to reword “cost-saving” initiatives sentence.
* Item 1 received discussion. Add verbiage to include that there could be an immediate increase into what WCU would have to commit to. Based off increase in Faculty hours and addition of an Admin Assistant. Made an additional statement in Concern 1.
* Item 5 received some discussion.

In summary, while we support the legitimate right of our colleagues to propose this new center, and we view its focus as within the mainstream of the discipline of Economics, we have a number of substantial concerns. At the current time we are not convinced that the benefits outweigh the costs.

Voting proceeded in two parts: 1) The statement was approved and 2) the proposed center was opposed, each by a large majority.

Dean Kloeppel will submit comments regarding the research center to Provost Council on Thurs. Oct. 29th.

MEETING AJOURNED

Voting Record

