

Faculty Senate

MINUTES

April 23, 2015

3:00 -5:00 p.m.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

ROLL CALL

Present:

Kia Asberg, Bob Beaudet, David Belcher, Shawn Collins, Christopher Cooper, David Dorondo, Jeanne Dulworth, Yang Fan, Katy Ginanni, AJ Grube, David Henderson, Mary Jean Herzog, Ian Hewer, Beth Huber, Leroy Kauffman, Will Lehman, Alvin Malesky, Erin McNelis, Alison Morrison-Shetlar, Bob Mulligan, Peter Tay, Karyn Tomczak, Tonya Westbrook, John Whitmire

Members with Proxies:

Lisa Bloom, George Ford

Members Absent:

David McCord, Cheryl Waters-Tormey

Recorder:

Ann Green

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Motion:

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of March 25, 2015 were approved as presented.

EXTERNAL REPORTS

Chancellor's Report/David Belcher:

The Chancellor's report was posted on SharePoint prior to the meeting and emailed to campus. Dr. Belcher spoke to each of the report topics and discussion ensued.

Q/C: One request that pertains to the forum next week. It's going to be hard for a lot of people to attend because it's the last week of classes, could we do something akin to that maybe in the fall?

A: We talked about that just today. Not necessarily replicating it; it would be different, but maybe doing something in September...we recognized that...but felt it important to collect information from the university at the end of the academic year. But, we have already talked about that because we think more people would be able to be involved.

Q/C: ...who is on the leadership statement committee (a committee involved with the UNC President search already ongoing)? How many faculty are on that?

A: Two, maybe three. Discussion continued. There are a lot of BOG members, the entire search committee (12 members), 3 faculty, 2 staff, a student board member and at least one other student, believed to be 7 chancellors, 4 community representatives, and 8 board representatives from various boards around the state. It is very large... Discussion continued.

Provost Report/Alison Morrison-Shetlar:

The Provost Report was submitted and posted on SharePoint prior to the meeting.

The report outlines some of the initiatives set forth at the beginning of the year and the accomplishments during the year.

Provost Morrison-Shetlar commented that one of the things we should be most proud of are the professional development things listed on the report. This is actually a small bit of the things that are happening. The Human Resources website lists many more. A lot of hard work has gone into developing these professional development opportunities.

Staff Senate/David Rathbone, Chair:

The Staff Senate has organized a photo shoot with the staff scholarship recipients for tomorrow. They also would like to have another photo shoot with the U-Club for their generous help in fundraising. Rathbone expressed appreciation to the U-Club.

Chair Kauffman thanked David Rathbone for his leadership on the staff side. Kauffman thanked Rathbone also for inviting the staff and faculty chairs of the Faculty Assembly at the state level to our awards ceremonies tomorrow. Both chairs are attending tomorrow.

Senator Tay announced that the U-Club had raised \$1500 in a recent fund raising event for the scholarship fund.

SACSCOC Update/Steve Miller, Director SACSCOC Reaffirmation:

The Provost recently announced that Steve Miller will be leaving his position as SACSCOC Director which leaves an opportunity for another faculty member to step in. Miller described the position as a great professional development opportunity for faculty. He is leaving for a position with Troy University in Alabama. The SACSCOC reaccreditation process is well underway and is well-organized. Miller credited his assistant, Amy Johnson, and the chairs of the sub-committees, Mike Smith and Sloan Despeaux and all the people on the committees for the excellent shape that the reaccreditation process is in. It is a great learning opportunity. Miller shared that he has learned a lot about how the university works and about higher education in general.

Morrison-Shetlar acknowledged the hard work that Miller and his assistant, Amy Johnson, have done.

Faculty Assembly/ Linda Comer:

The last meeting was busy. They did not have a report from Tom Ross as they usually do. They had a budget update from Charlie Perusse, the UNC Senior Vice-President and Chief Financial Officer. A hand-out was shared that Comer will have put on the SharePoint site for others to see. Comer's Faculty Assembly Report is also on SharePoint. She reviewed the items from this report and Chair Kauffman shared additional comments.

SENATE COUNCIL REPORTS

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

Council Chair Ginanni said she has been out for almost a month and having just returned she thanked Kia Asberg for filling in on the chair responsibilities and Ann Green for help with the questions and issues related to Curriculum.

There are two Certificates that require a vote, the Certificate of Internationalization and the Primary Care Certificate. Ginanni asked if there were any questions or concerns about these.

Q/C: about the Internationalization Certificate...

A: They came to the UCC to talk about it...the courses are already on the books, then the program they supported was taken away. This is trying to bring it back but they did not want it to be international business, they wanted it to be more broad, which is what the UCC required at least to entertain the use of other required courses because they had restricted it to use of business courses only.

Q/C: that is a question...I wish someone was here for it. A lot of programs, i.e. international studies, consider themselves very international, so I worry about the signal that we're sending to the students to say this is the International Certificate...I have some concerns...

Q/C: a statement from the actual proposal was read. "...emphasis on culture, societies and markets."
Discussion continued.

Q/C: I was chair of the UCC, Steve Henson who proposed the certificate came and answered our questions. They wanted an international flair to this business; I believe it's part of the 2020 initiative.
Discussion continued.

Disagreement about what the name represents...your concern is that international is a word that is used by international studies, sociology, political science, modern foreign languages and probably others. I worry that if that is the Internationalization Certificate that it is sending a signal to students that if you are interested in international issues that you should choose this...
Discussion continued.

A motion was made and seconded to table the discussion on the Internationalization Certificate.

Vote on the Nursing/Primary Care Certificate:

Yes: 20

No: 0

Abstain: 2

The motion passes. See Voting Record in Attachment 1 for vote details.

Vote on Tabling Discussion of the Internationalization Certificate:

Yes: 18

No: 4

Abstain: 1

The motion was tabled. See Voting Record in Attachment 1 for vote details.

The next item of discussion was a resolution on **changing and deleting instructors in Course Evaluations**. Brian Kloepfel, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, was on hand to introduce the resolution.

Kloepfel explained the underlying issues of why this resolution is needed. The issue was brought to APRC for discussion and was slightly revised before being presented today.

Q/C: Where will this be recorded as policy so it will be visible...?

A: I'm not sure if this is a catalog item; I'm not sure if this is a standing policy for the OIPE office to help guide them...

Q/C: OIPE was the one who asked the question because they are responsible for administering the instrument. Faculty Senate kind of owns CourseEval and what's on it. In the fall, Provost and Alison Joseph of OIPE called me and said they had this situation and they had 3 or 4 conversations. We picked what we thought was the best alternative at the time. They're looking for policy to guide them. It was discussed that there is no place in the Faculty Handbook that discusses CourseEval.

Q/C: The Faculty Affairs Council is in charge of SAIs...the only think I can think of is there is a Handbook of some sort that is related to SAIs. It's available on the Provost website. I think something needs to be documented somewhere if there is a resolution to change policy...

Q/C: Could it go up on OIPE website? ...a department head manual – question to Brandon Schwab. Could it be included in that?

A from Schwab: it's a virtual folder, and we could include it.

Q/C from Kloepfel (paraphrased): the goal was to have the mechanism to have support or a process to remove the faculty member name in certain situations before it was turned over to a post tenure review and there wasn't a recollection years later. The course evaluations would still exist in the system so the department heads would still have access.

Discussion continued.

Q/C: There is a place for it to be attached which is APR 14 which deals with administration. Statement about updating in the APR 14 and in the Guidelines and Procedures for Administration and Oversight of Student Assessment of Instruction which is available off of the Resources for Faculty and Staff page.

Chair Kauffman asked that the minutes reflect that the CourseEval resolution be updated in the two places mentioned immediately above.

Vote on the Course Evaluation Resolution:

Yes: 22

No: 0

Abstain: 1

The motion passes. See Voting Record in Attachment 1 for vote details.

The next discussion is on the **Leave of Absence Policy for Graduate Students**. Brian Kloepfel, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, introduced the resolution.

This item is in the Graduate Catalog and the proposal was triggered when drafting their SACSCOC documents regarding several graduate school items. They wanted to request and update the Leave of Absence policy. The major item in the event we are ever asked the approval policy such as approving a student an additional semester beyond the six-year time limit. Typical leave of absence requests that come up are: Military Service, documented medical issues, legal issues and other extenuating circumstances.

Q/C: This is only graduate school, correct?

A: Yes. There is a stop-out policy in the Graduate Catalog. This would be something that is longer than the stop-out policy which is one year.

Discussion continued and it was decided that "graduate" needed to be added before "student" in the resolution in several locations to be clear this is a policy for graduate students only.

Vote on the Leave of Absence Resolution:

Yes: 22

No: 0

Abstain: 1

The motion passes. See Voting Record in Attachment 1 for vote details.

The **Transfer of Credit Policy** was discussed next and Graduate School Associate Dean Kloeppel also introduced this resolution.

This item is also in the Graduate Catalog. They have had several students request to transfer credit from other universities. For example for master's credit at another institution we are being asked to substitute for doctoral credit at Western. It's not a good policy to do that, but we didn't have anything to back it up...

Q/C: Reading from the policy, "Course credit taken as part of a masters from another institution is not transferable into another master's degree program at Western." This says if I took a graduate and masters course that was part of my master's program at Institution A, that I could not transfer that here to satisfy the requirement here?

A: Correct. You can't double dip from institutions.

Q/C: So, you might have to re-take requirements in statistics in order to get any sort of science that relied on that even though you've already had that at the previous institution?

A: Correct.

Q/C: Wouldn't you be able to substitute another course if you have had graduate level statistics, you could substitute?

A: You could do a course substitution with your academic advisor or program director.

Q/C: In essence that requires you to complete the number of hours at Western to get a master's degree from Western?

A: Correct.

Vote on the Transfer Credit Resolution:

Yes: 17

No: 4

Abstain: 2

The motion passes. See Voting Record in Attachment 1 for vote details.

Collegial Review Council (CRC) / Erin McNelis, Chair

The first discussion was Post Tenure Review. There was an open forum held for the university on Weds. April 8th. Approximately 25-30 people attended. They gave a brief overview and took questions. They reflected on the questions posed at the first reading of the Faculty Senate. Reservations were made based on the three person committee at the department level especially if one member was going up for post tenure review as well. The council said that the three person committee was a minimum size. It does not have to be the required size. They also decided not to say anything against allowing someone to serve on the committee if they were then going to be evaluated later. They, of course, would not participate in the evaluation of themselves. Since this is not judgements made about comparisons, they felt that the individual should be trusted to make judgements about their peers. There was a request to see a limit on the number of pages on the brief statement. The committee added a parenthetical, "(departments will determine the length and depth of this summary)."

There were comments about if the goal is now to exceed. Maybe it will be helpful to clarify that meeting expectations is still really, really good. The council decided to adjust the description associated with being rated as

exceeds expectations and added the statement that, “In addition, suggestions to enhance performance may be provided” when someone exceeds expectations so that they are pretty much identical now to meeting expectations. Not to imply that if you exceeded expectations there are no recommendations on which things you can improve. Other than what is in the departmental collegial review document which should differentiate between meets and exceeds. The committee did not feel that it should make those definitions.

There was a comment that there is not much difference between meets and exceeds and the committee admits that this is true. Again the expectations would be different and elaborated in CRDs.

There was a request for a calendar or timeline of who falls under this new policy and when. The council decided rather than putting it in the policy that it would be handled within the best practices and working with the department head’s council next year in providing materials and resources.

Another comment within the Council was to ask Associate Provost Schwab to ask the department head workshop to look at directional goals and the potential that we may not get approval to have five years for everyone to wait to be covered. Schwab put this down and said it would be looked at in the future. What is passed here would still go to General Administration for approval.

Vote on the CRC Resolution 3 Post Tenure Review Policies and Procedures (Sections 4.04 and 4.08 of Faculty Handbook):

Yes: 22

No: 0

Abstain: 1

The motion passes. See Voting Record in Attachment 1 for vote details.

Emeritus Faculty was discussed next. McNelis thanked the subcommittee, Chair, Ellen Sigler, and members John Whitmire, Tim Carstens, Bob Mulligan, Jon Jicha and Beth Jones for shaping these changes. This is the 2nd reading of the resolution. There was previous concern with taking out the college level in the process. The council had no problem with putting the college level back in. They did stop with the college level collegial review rather than having it go to the university level collegial review. They agreed that putting the college level review back in gave faculty more voice and a shared governance more than a divided governance and it legitimizes the status of the emeritus title.

There was a request to consider that more than just the CV be provided. If a candidate’s CV if going up on excellence in teaching that the CV may not easily reflect that and rather than requiring a statement, the council decided that there must be a nomination letter provided that could be a self-nomination or nomination by another. The letter must indicate why the faculty member was deserving of emeritus status. This way should the individual faculty member being nominated not want to go through with that process another person can do it for them or they can self-nominate and provide that report. This provides more information than a CV can and gives more support to the nomination. The packet is to include the nomination letter that would include a brief statement of why the individual deserves emeritus status.

Another request was that we referred to funding possibilities that the emeritus faculty would be eligible for and had written at the end in other words, Chancellor’s Travel fund. They removed the “e.g.” Chancellor’s Travel Fund and now have no funding options named.

Under benefits of emeritus faculty status the option that said they are not eligible to hold office or vote in faculty elections was removed.

These were the comments received from Senate and addressed by the council and subcommittee.

Q/C: #14 under may request office space if available. It makes it sound you can request office space unless it's available. It's really "may request office space." It will be provided if it is available.

Item #14 was changed to "May request Office Space."

Vote on the CRC Resolution Emeritus Faculty Status (Section 4.11B of the Faculty Handbook)

Yes: 22

No: 0

Abstain: 1

The motion passes. See Voting Record in Attachment 1 for vote details.

McNelis shared that the council met April 15th with Associate Provost Schwab and Andrew Adams to talk about dossier guidelines for the 2015-2016 tenure and promotion dossiers. Andrew Adams talked about potential changes regarding inclusion of the faculty activity database and where that will come into place. A decision was made to have two different versions for the time of the dossier guides, one for the colleges who are to be using the faculty activity database and one as it is until you come into the time where you are using the database. They are expecting additional revisions and feedback to be forthcoming.

Faculty Affairs Council / A.J. Grube, Chair:

There are three resolutions all up for a vote today. They passed unanimously at the council level.

The Gender Equity Salary Resolution is in response to the salary study the university conducted.

Q/C: How is it expected for the university to conduct a follow up study in essentially two months?

A: I don't know that it has to be done in two months, but our EEO affirmative action plan states that we will do a review similar to this yearly. I think the intent of this was that it happens yearly.

Q/C: I would say that July 1 is a very short time frame given that this is being presented right now for action and that it's not necessarily reasonable for July 1.

A: We didn't know if the university was in the middle of doing one as it said in the EEO plan we are to be doing this yearly. So, we assumed we were doing this. We weren't saying start from scratch right now from July 1.

Q/C: Do we have any report from them on how far?

A: I agree that July 1 is not a reasonable date, but the assumption was that we didn't know if it was done this year.

A from Jane Zanglein: I chose July 1 for a couple of reasons, one is that July 1 is the beginning of the budget year so that it didn't make sense to put it in this year's budget. The 2nd is that the last evaluation must have been done in March or February of last year so it's been about a year, year and a half since the last one.

Q/C: I guess in some ways then I would like to have a report from...HR?

Q/C from Provost Morrison-Shetlar: That's correct. Every year a report is written and distributed to the Provost Office and all of the deans. I'm not sure about follow-up study. That means to me that you want to re-do the study that was done- the comprehensive study. Those are two different things.

A from Jane Zanglein: No, it doesn't mean to re-do it. It means to look at the same group or new group if added since then and make sure that things are not being changed as people get promotions, get new jobs and I think it needs to be done each year to be able to ensure that after that first round that people were not left out.

Q/C from Provost Morrison-Shetlar: That is done on an annual basis and that report is to all of the—everybody's salary is done on an annual basis and sent out for review and discussion...I think I put everybody's salaries up on the Faculty Senate page quite a few months ago when we had this conversation. So, we do I want to assure people we do look at all of salaries on an annual basis. What we do not do is a follow up study.

A: I figured you were looking at them on an annual basis. It's something that you're doing that really shouldn't take that time. Is the Equity Report on the website? I looked and couldn't find that.

Q/C from Provost Morrison-Shetlar: It's on the HR. It should be up on the HR website.

A: Yea. I could not find that.

Q/C from Provost Morrison-Shetlar: Along with the PowerPoints that Henry Wong presented at the open forum. If it's not, I can certainly check on that. I think that the term "follow-up study" is where I'm just un-clear. I'm happy to do whatever is needed. If it's a follow-up study similar to the depth that was done before then we will not be able to do that by July 1. If that's the case, I certainly hope we can do it within the 2015-2016 academic year. The data is sent to all of the deans and shared with the appropriate administrators.

A: I think one of the issues is that the report was done – I didn't go to the initial meeting, I was teaching – but I'm afraid it has fallen into an abyss and there not being a follow up on it.

Q/C from Provost Morrison-Shetlar: As I said at the open forum, I'm committed to this. We do review everybody's salaries looking for equity and making sure that we know the metrics behind those salaries. If there is something you want in addition to that, happy to provide it. I just need to know what it is.

Q/C: What if you change the language to something like instead of conduct a follow up study...produce a report or re-evaluate? It's not re-doing it; it's making sure that—it's being followed up on. While it's not creating a new study, it's still a follow up study. It's looking to see if this has been done...

It was decided to replace "study" with "review" in the resolution after "follow-up."

Q/C: I'm trying to figure out what the key part of this is, is it that the annual review that is done is not a (unclear) with the gender equity study. Is the case that the annual review would provide the information that is needed to do the kind of follow up that you're requesting?

A: What I was envisioning, we've already done a review. Looking at that review to see if it took into account or perhaps left people out or that new inequities crept in in the last year when people changed jobs or whatever. I don't think that perhaps everybody was addressed the first time around.

Q/C: That's true.

A: And therefore, the review should look at that and then see – has it adequately been addressed the first time and are there new circumstances that were formed with change.

Q/C: Does the annual review that is already being done cover that?

Q/C from Provost Morrison-Shetlar: I think it does. Not reported in the format that you are looking for. I'm hearing that you're doing a review on an annual basis and that maybe you are looking for a different way to get it out to the community which I'm very committed to.

A: I appreciate that. I think there needs to be some discussion and I appreciate the fact that you're committed to it and that you're willing to put things up on the website because that shows some kind of response.

Discussion continued.

Q/C: In the final bullet, "being underpaid" is based on what metrics? How is that identified?

A: It would be the study and the annual re-posting of the salaries. Like she said the annual report and then the review of the original study looking at both pieces of those things.

Q/C: But underpaid versus is that paid less or is it the two standard deviations, which one?

A: I think that I was purposefully vague in that because I think if people were addressed the first time there was a metric used and that metric if it's being used consistently that would address the problem. It won't satisfy everyone,

it won't address all issues, but I think my concern is whether there are different metrics (not purposefully different), it is that whatever is being used, is that consistently being used?

Discussion continued.

Explanation of an overview of the current stage of the process from Provost Morrison-Shetlar: HR and OIPE do a lot of this analysis. HR provides a list of faculty members and those are given to each college dean and are reviewed based on the discussion with the gender equity study as well as looking carefully to make sure we are addressing each year as much as we possibly can... We very carefully review all of the salaries. There are significant changes made in some folks salaries because of this, but we can't do everything. I'm committed to making sure that we progress toward equity at all levels.

Q/C: I think it would be true and you can correct me if I'm wrong, but we won't know what we have for next year until the legislature finishes up what they do in terms of approving a budget. It goes to GA and GA divides it up by 17 and that's why those letters come out, I remember them being as late as November.

A: Yes, that's my concern here.

Discussion continued.

Q/C: A statement such as the one you've been making (addressed to Provost) would go a long way in terms of assuring people that this is not over, that its being addressed and it's not taboo to talk about it.

A from Morrison-Shetlar: Absolutely, you have my complete commitment to that. It's ongoing for the rest of my career. As to the July 1, we can say there's inequity and we're going to address it, but we can't say how much or to whom because we won't know as x just said.

Q/C: That's ok if you don't have the amounts at that time, you can still have the review in the fall and the plan in place and pay it out as you are able.

Discussion continued.

It was discussed to remove "April 1, 2014" from the very last sentence in the proposed resolution and be changed to the "date of approval."

Discussion continued.

The resolution will be taken back to the council for discussion and clarification of wording and will be brought back to the overflow meeting of Faculty Senate being held next week.

The meeting recessed and will be continued April 30, 2015.

April 23, 2015 Faculty Senate Voting Record

Senator	Table Motion on Internationalization Certificate	Primary Care Certificate	Course Eval	Leave of Absence	Transfer of Credit	Post Tenure Review	Emeritus
Kia Asberg	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Bob Beaudet	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Lisa Bloom	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Shawn Collins	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Nay	Aye	Aye
Christopher Cooper	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
David Dorondo							
Jeanne R. Dulworth	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Nay	Aye	Aye
Yang Fan	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
George Ford	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain	Abstain
Katy Ginanni	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
AJ Grube	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
David Henderson	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Abstain	Aye	Aye
Mary Jean Herzog	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Ian Hewer	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Nay	Aye	Aye
Beth Huber	Nay	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Leroy Kauffman	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Will Lehman	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Alvin Malesky	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
David McCord							
Erin McNelis	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Bob (Robert F.) Mulligan	Nay	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye

Peter Tay	Nay	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Senator	Table Motion on Internationalization Certificate	Primary Care Certificate	Course Eval	Leave of Absence	Transfer of Credit	Post Tenure Review	Emeritus
Karyn Tomczak	Nay	Aye	Aye	Aye	Nay	Aye	Aye
Cheryl Waters-Tormey							
Tonya M. Westbrook	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
John Whitmire	Aye	Abstain	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Aye	18	20	22	22	17	22	22
Nay	4	0	0	0	4	0	0
Abstain	1	2	1	1	2	1	1