

# Faculty Senate

## MINUTES

*February 19, 2015*

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

### ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

---

#### ROLL CALL

##### **Present:**

Kia Asberg, Bob Beaudet, David Belcher, Lisa Bloom, Christopher Cooper, Jeanne Dulworth, George Ford, Katy Ginanni, David Henderson, Mary Jean Herzog, Ian Hower, Beth Huber, Alvin Malesky, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Alison Morrison-Shetlar, Bob Mulligan, Peter Tay, Karyn Tomczak, Cheryl Waters-Tormey, John Whitmire

##### **Members with Proxies:**

Shawn Collins, David Dorondo, Yang Fan, AJ Grube, Will Lehman, Tonya Westbrook

##### **Members Absent:**

Leroy Kauffman

##### **Recorder:**

Ann Green

Facilitator of today's meeting is Chair Elect, David McCord. The structure of the meeting will be changed slightly. If time allows, the business portion of the meeting will be adjourned early to allow for open discussion on the topic of shared governance of the university.

### APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

---

##### **Motion:**

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of January 21, 2015 were approved as presented.

### EXTERNAL REPORTS

---

##### **Chancellor's Report/David Belcher:**

The Chancellor's Report was emailed to campus and is posted on SharePoint. Chancellor Belcher spoke to each of the report topics and discussion ensued:

Q/C: The Board of Governors is recognizing the importance of teacher education, can't they talk to our state legislators?

A: I think, if you will look at the recommendations, and I urge you to do that, you will see they are to some extent trying to take on an agenda that is supportive of the K-12 system, not just of the university system producing great teachers. They are, for example, supporting the salary bump for teachers getting masters degrees (in some areas)...there are some subtleties to it. But, there are some things they are pushing that I think will have some support for the public schools. But, I think it's a good point.

**Provost Report/Alison Morrison-Shetlar:**

The Provost Report was submitted and posted on SharePoint prior to the meeting. Although, the written report was available, Provost Morrison-Shetlar addressed highlights from the report.

Provost Morrison Shetlar asked Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Success Lowell Davis to talk about some things related to fostering undergraduate student success and the impact that these is having and will have on student retention and time to graduation and on Grades First.

Dr. Davis explained there is a document on the SharePoint site with the fall 2014 Degree Seeking Students Cohort Stats. The document gives data for several categories including Academic Standing, Fall Course Withdrawals, Spring Course Withdrawals, Fall Course Withdrawals, Fall Students Not Registered for Spring. This is an update of where the university is with fostering undergraduate student success. A significant impact is expected at the end of the spring semester after there has been a full year with the new policy in place.

Q/C: when you say significant impact, is it a good impact or bad impact?

A: We think bad. When looking at other institutions, NC Central lost 300 to 400 students after the first year. There are articles that you can find that basically show their enrollment took a significant hit. We have things in place for students that fall in the 1.0 and 1.99 GPA. We call them, talk to them, encourage them to appeal, we try to do everything we can to ensure the student will possibly return to the university. We know this is a hard policy when 16 credit hours are allowed for withdrawals and after that withdrawals turn into Fs and students will still withdraw. We know this policy will have an impact on us.

Q/C: The withdrawal rate is still roughly the same? Do we know how many withdrawals on average students were taking over the course of their academic career prior to this?

Answer from Registrar Larry Hammer: That data is out there. I don't have it on the top of my head. We have looked at it before... you have to do some work to distinguish course withdrawals out from university withdrawals because they're treated differently...there may be some students who in the past should have taken university withdrawals, but didn't.

Discussion continued.

Morrison-Shetlar recognized Lane Perry, director of WCU's Center for Service Learning, who has been named the 2015 Civic Engagement "Emerging Leader" Professional of the Year by North Carolina Campus Compact. An article appeared in *The Reporter* today.

Morrison-Shetlar provided information from the Chief Academic Officers meeting about discussions and conversations that have been taking place at the Board of Governors and Chief Academic Officers meetings on concerns about academic advising. Discussions have taken place as a result with campuses and it is an area that is being further contemplated and investigated.

Davis reported that Grades First is a program that will allow faculty members to log in notes and files to a student's records. Others are able to use Grades First as well such as the Tutoring Center, Registrar's Office, Undergraduate Advising and One Stop. A faculty member will be able to get in and see where a student is receiving services and they can log in notes. Based on conversations with people at GA and at the CAO meeting, Davis feels it will be mandated that every school use some kind of tracking system for advising. We are ahead of the game and are being proactive rather than reactive in making this available as a resource. Every faculty member has access to Grades

First now and can start using it. Training for Grades First starts tomorrow and another session will take place in March.

Q/C: With student services, if a student goes in and requests services, will they be able to then pull that up?

A: Only if you give the student permission to see that information. Currently it is turned off, but you can allow the student to see information. Education started using Grades First through the TRACs office, we use it in Undergraduate Advising. We're just opening it up to any faculty member who would like to use it.

Q/C: Is it supposed to mesh with Banner so academic advising...

A: It does, we actually do a push nightly from Banner to Grades First. It's a snapshot that gets replaced. The demographic contact info with GPA and recent performance metric kind of stuff.

Q/C: Does it contains degree evaluation? For instance, do I want Banner open on advising day *and* this?

A: You probably do. It's a nightly refresh. When you're looking at Grades First the schedule that you're looking at in Grades First is going to be what the student is registered for this semester. It's not going to switch over and show you what they registered for next semester until you get there. But, it's pretty robust. It's nice from a crn standpoint, but it's like all crn not all the data is in that crn. The degree audit, the transcript and all that is still a Banner function.

Banner and Grades First don't currently link to each other and discussion took place about this.

Morrison-Shetlar addressed a question that was raised a few meetings ago about adding doctoral programs to WCU. She gave a written clarification in her report.

Q/C: With accreditation, it says with the new proposed PsyD since none of the 3 doctoral programs currently offered are close to this, that there will be a significant departure at the current level and it requires a prospectus for approval. Could you explain more what that is?

A: There's discussion at the moment, there's two other programs; 2 PhDs in Psychology that are being discussed at the system level. PsyD is seen more favorably because it's more clinical, but what GA decided to do is to say we are going to move all 3 forward. We are all required to put in a proposal as per the normal processes. It's a GA thing, but GA and SACs have exactly the same criteria; one of the few times where that is happening. So, if we're following SACs criteria, we're also following GA criteria.

Q/C: ...on the Chancellor's List celebration and wondering what the students thought. I heard a lot of feedback from faculty although that was nice, they really missed the 4.0 dinner. The feedback I got was the 4.0 dinner was really rich and they got to spend time with the students, but the Chancellor's List was so many people that a lot of faculty said they didn't even get to see and talk with the students. Are you going to stick with the Chancellor's List dinner or have you heard any feedback from students regarding the 4.0 dinner?

A: The 4.0 dinner was designed by Student Affairs for students who had a 4.0 GPA and were in-resident. It excluded a large number of students who had a 4.0 GPA, but didn't reside in the residence halls. The 4.0 dinner really should have been triple the size. The criteria for the Chancellor's List came from the students and this was seen as a way of actually being more inclusive. The feedback I got was that the numbers that turned up in terms of support for faculty, parents, guardians and friends was amazing and would be far fewer with the 4.0 dinner since it was primarily invited faculty to it. The feedback that we got was that the reception was lovely and that people were really happy that the faculty stayed behind. The parents got an opportunity to talk to the faculty and the reception went on far longer than it was expected too.

Q/C: .... including off-campus is great, how many students had a 3.8? (Answer: 1057). It was so inclusive with parents, students that it was less personal and I guess that's a trade-off that you make...

Q/C: I was there and it was very personal and I thought it was wonderful and I don't think there were too many students...

Q/C: I've been to both and I can see both sides...

#### **Staff Senate/David Rathbone, Chair:**

No report.

**SGA/Samir Hafiz, Vice President:**

Student Government was excited about the Chancellor's List of which Colton Overcash, now a graduate of Western, was the architect. Vice President Hafiz commented that this is his first time here as new Vice-President of SGA after a recent restructuring of leadership. He and the new President, Caroline Pierce, are excited to take on their new roles. On the Senate side they are working on trying to create some teeth. From now on, after they get a resolution passed it will go back to a sub-committee for a comprehensive action plan to be made.

**SACSCOC Update/Steve Miller, Director SACSCOC Reaffirmation:**

Dr. Miller pointed out that the posters that are distributed about the tables at today's meeting are posters plugging the QEP topic selection process with the website address. Senators were asked to take the posters with them and put them on their door as they would like as many of these out as possible. They would like as much input and topic proposals as they can. They are encouraged by faculty and students working together, and staff and faculty working together to develop QEP topics. The deadline for submitting topics is March 16<sup>th</sup>. Miller commented that he and Dr. Sloan Despeaux, chair of the QEP topic selection committee, would be happy to come and talk with faculty in colleges, departments and to help people think through how their ideas could be developed into a QEP topic. Miller also thanked the people that are helping with compliance certification, some of whom are actually in the room.

**Biltmore Park Strategic Plan/ Kevan Frazier, Director, Biltmore Park:**

Dr. Frazier gave an overview of the strategic plan for Biltmore Park which was presented to the Chancellor approximately three weeks ago. They are beginning distribution of the plan by sharing it with Faculty Senate, Staff Senate and the Provost Council, and will then send it out in a broader distribution throughout the university community. They will begin meeting with other stakeholders such as Biltmore Farms and Jack Cecil, the developers who own the Biltmore Park facility, who as friends and insiders are much more than landlords and with whom we will work with together to develop the plan. They are also putting together a strategic plan implementation team that will be made up of 10 faculty and staff members who will help put rubber to road as they work through six major goals that are outlined in the strategic plan. At the same time they will put together an external advisory group that will include community leaders, corporate non-profit leaders, WCU alumni and other folks that have a role with economic development in Western North Carolina.

Frazier described Biltmore Park as an instructional site, rather than a branch campus which is an important distinction. The conversations with SACSCOC made it clear that the site is an instructional site and Dr. Frazier explained the reasons behind this distinction.

They are working with the deans and program directors about the programs that are at Biltmore Park and how they can grow those programs and what the capacity is for the programs. The community feedback they received was that there is desire for certificate programs and other kinds of high-level continuing education programs. They're working with the deans and units to begin to formulate some of these programs.

The goal at Biltmore Park is to support the academic endeavors at each location; it is not to run a separate operation.

**Discussion:**

Q/C: Is there any news on support services available to students there? For instance, I know technology has requested service. I wonder about equivalence to WALC and the Math Tutoring Center and how you aren't duplicating UNCA programs that would cause problems with our MOU.

A: ...in terms of student support services like writing assistance, we do provide that 2 days a week. A graduate student comes 2 days a week and we set her up to meet with students by appointment. In terms of IT, that's been a real challenge for us. ....we still have as a high priority with IT and budget expansion and we really need our own IT person at Biltmore Park, but in the interim the Kimmel School has been working with them and the electrical engineering lab support person is taking on a greater IT role and he has been at BP from 12 – 9 p.m. and 8 to 5 on Fridays. This has allowed them to get by.

There has been a dramatic shift in relationship between WCU and UNCA. There have been great conversations with the new Chancellor of UNCA and they have reviewed the MOU that exists between UNCA and WCU. Dr. Frazier explained that duplication between UNCA and the Biltmore Park site means program duplications, not class duplications.

Q/C: IT guy, BP, there this summer for the immediate sign up day for the BS Engineering program that will be administered solely at BP and before that day, we thought our worst fear was no one is going to show up. Really our worst fear was a bunch of people showed up. We see this program growing and Nathan's role will grow there...what if Engineering needs more room?

A: ...I don't know that there's any program that hasn't asked that question. We have 35,000 square feet at Biltmore Park. ...the question that most gets asked is what about the old University of Phoenix site and what about Regis which is the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor of the building and houses offices. They've looked at the old Phoenix location and is not the right space for expansion and from conversations with Regis, they have no plans to go anywhere. The Chancellor and Provost have been clear that as we grow in size that gives us the opportunity to have that conversation about what we are able to do. After 2.5 years in operation between summer, fall and spring they expect to host 185 classes. They have had 75 to 95% capacity this past fall and this spring. Over two hundred groups, and over 1000 WCU meetings, conferences and programs have taken place at the location.

## **SENATE COUNCIL REPORTS**

---

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

The **Posthumous Degree Policy** was presented to the council by Dr. Lowell Davis. The council agreed it was great to have guidelines in place, but had concern that the policy was too strict and not enough flexibility. At the APRC's request, the policy was changed to change the number of hours to reflect as a percentage and to give the provost some flexibility if needed. The APRC is happy with the policy as revised.

Q/C: How does SACSCOC work on this? Is it that posthumous degrees don't count?

Answer from Provost Morrison-Shetlar: Not in the same way. This is more a recognition than anything else. They looked at about 8 different institutions to see what criteria was used and what we came up with is a good way of making sure that we're recognizing the contributions of those students who were close to getting their degree, but unfortunately, passed away.

This policy does not require a vote and was brought for information only.

On the resolution regarding the **Dean's and Chancellor's List**: Senator Whitmire gave an overview. When the lists came out, he noticed a student who he expected to be on the list was not on it and after investigating, discovered the reason was because the student had received a grade of "W" last semester, although there was a legitimate reason for withdrawal. This resolution proposes making decisions for Dean's and Chancellor's Lists and removes the provision excluding grades of "W".

It was confirmed that the resolution was received by SGA and was discussed at their meeting as well.

APRC all agreed with this proposed resolution.

Q/C: I had one faculty member contact me worried that Ws on transcripts might actually hurt students and applying for jobs or graduate schools and was against this revision and wanted to keep a climate of discouraging Ws.

Q/C: My only concern is with the wording and if it was clear they had 12 hours after you remove any Ws. We've had graduate students who have 9 hours which is full time and withdraw from one and there's been fear they would lose assistantship and we've been told this counts as hours in credit as course credit. If something in the phrasing can clarify that the W can satisfy being full time after that fact...

Discussion continued

It was decided to make a friendly amendment to the proposed resolution to add "earned" to the phrase of the last paragraph of the resolution making it "on a regular semester's work of not less than 12 *earned* hours..."

**Poll Anywhere Vote on the Resolution on Dean's and Chancellor's List with "W" Grades:**

**Yes: 21**

**No: 2**

**Abstain: 2**

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

Resolution on **Changing the Special Studies Program Name**: The APRC had some discussion and had some concerns one of which was students will try to get majors in programs we don't offer and it might be confusing in context of other interdisciplinary majors like Environmental Science. The other interdisciplinary programs are defined by the title of the program like Environmental Science and the person receiving a degree would receive a degree in Environmental Science, not Interdisciplinary Studies.

One person suggested it was an improvement, that Special Studies doesn't reflect much of anything; that Interdisciplinary Studies is an improvement, but isn't perfect. The APRC did pass the vote, so it is a motion being brought forward to Senate.

Q/C: It seems to me if what best describes it is not much of an important issue, but Special Studies is better because it is a broader term and many of these degrees are not any more interdisciplinary than all of our other degrees which every university degree is...I don't think...it's a big issue, and I understand it's got a connection to Part-Way Home and that may justify it, but what is the connection to Part-Way Home and how does this help us?

Dr. Iveta Imre was on hand to speak on behalf of the Part-Way Home program:

She explained the only connection with Part-Way Home students is that this will be one of the options available to these students. The biggest concern is that the Special Studies program doesn't currently represent what this program is supposed to be doing. A hand-out with a copy of a section from the catalog on Special Studies. There are 3 ways students can alter the existing majors: 1) by substituting certain classes within their core classes of the major, 2) by an approved program which is adding a secondary major or minor that isn't existing, i.e. a Communication student majoring in Broadcasting was able to minor in photo-journalism. We don't have a minor in photo-journalism, but we created an approved program for the student to get this minor, or 3) by a Special Studies program to take the place of a recognized major. Dr. Imre noted that the special studies has to intersect two or more recognized majors. She has researched similar programs at other universities and some of the peer universities that have the same programs call them Interdisciplinary Studies programs. Dr. Imre gave a list of the names of these universities.

Q/C: Would it not be allowed for someone to take a specialized study within a single discipline?

A: No, not based on the description in the catalog right now.

Q/C: Do we prevent that currently? Is it carefully required that a student's degree has to be interdisciplinary?

A: Typically yes. Out of the 30 students who have had a Special Studies program in the past 2 years, all of them had had at least 2 different majors that were developed in the Special Studies program.

Q/C: Did not we find some that weren't? In Business Japanese?

A: Just Business, Japanese was actually Asian Studies which is inherently interdisciplinary.

Discussion continued over the use of interdisciplinary studies and included a question if question is if programs are interdisciplinary or inter-departmental?

Q/C: Am I correct that it makes no difference to the Part-Way Home program whether this is called Special Studies or Interdisciplinary Studies?

A: Not necessarily. It makes a difference for all of the students who are graduating under the program.

Q/C: At the end of the day it's largely about how it represents the student and how the student can spin it. From our perspective when we issue the transcript and diploma, it's going to say "Interdisciplinary Studies" instead of "Special Studies" and this gives the student a different platform from which to talk about it from.

Discussion continued.

Q/C: I am still not convinced that we're not making this a narrower door...my concern is that there may have been some people currently served under Special Studies that won't qualify under Interdisciplinary Studies, although Special Studies says Interdisciplinary Studies in it, I don't know if that's always been followed. Are we narrowing the possibilities for our students?

A: Not really. That's why we have the Approval Program possibility. That is more within the one discipline....

Discussion continued:

### **Vote on Resolution to change "Special Studies" to "Interdisciplinary Studies"**

**Yes: 18**

**No: 2**

**Abstain: 5**

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

### **Collegial Review Council (CRC) / Erin McNelis, Chair**

The Collegial Review Council is now meeting twice a month.

The subcommittee has been working on **Emeritus Status** and there has been discussion and review in trying to put it in the Faculty Handbook.

SAIs are being looked at and they are getting the committee back together.

**Post Tenure Review** is a key item that the council is working on. The council has not yet had consensus on suggested changes and they are currently trying to decide between whether or not we should follow a hierarchical strategy in terms of the classifications of Meets, Exceeds or Does Not Meet Expectations. They are looking at articulating the possibilities in writing and in the Handbook and will come back next time and make their position.

Chair-Elect McCord reiterated that these are probably the biggest issues that Faculty Senate will discuss and vote on this year. He asked for questions or further discussion.

McNelis asked the provost to argue for a reprieve. She understands that CAOs may have received a one-year reprieve from having to assess that the process is in place next year. There has not been a reprieve for the candidates who start in fall 2015 and they are going to have to be reviewed according to the new process.



Response from Provost Morrison-Shetlar: My understanding is...that we would just keep doing what we are doing and Western does a good job with Post Tenure Review currently. I think we are all on track with that. Morrison-Shetlar asked for confirmation from Associate Provost Brandon Schwab who attended the last CAO meeting. He is going to get clarification from Katherine Stewart with G.A.

The discussion at the council meeting on Emeritus Status was on procedure and that it be based more on nomination and less on process and that it stop at the dean level rather than being put through the college level UCRC committee, (so that it goes from the dean to the provost). It was also discussed that minimal documentation be required such as a CV and the letter of endorsement or nomination from the individual. Most discussion was on the perks and what would be worth it. One suggestion was made for the inclusion to access university funding such as grant or travel support for presenting at conferences and things of that nature; something beyond retired faculty perks. The idea is that if you are going to be active that we should be in support of having Western's name out there in a presentation if they should be eligible for the same grants that current faculty are.

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

No report.

**Rules Committee / David McCord, Chair:**

The report was postponed.

**Senate Chair Report / Chair-Elect David McCord for Chair Leroy Kauffman:**

No report. Everyone was encouraged to complete the COACHE survey.

**SENATE COUNCIL  
REPORTS**

---

**New Business:**

A resolution regarding the forced resignation of UNC President Tom Ross was presented. Chair-Elect McCord explained that the Faculty Assembly is working on a statement for the entire system.

Motion was made and seconded to accept. A request was made to change SACS to SACSCOC.

**Discussion:**

Q/C: None of us believes this will result in Tom Ross not being fired...we're under no illusions...and none of us think they will rescind it, but we think we should ask for it, we think it's important to make a statement, we think it's important to talk about the things that we know about because we don't know everything that went behind this. We do know that faculty at Western and across the system are overwhelmingly negative – we did put university. We tried with the 2<sup>nd</sup> to the last idea to put out an olive branch – that we're really looking forward to having an open and productive working relationship and we feel like if this was passed we can do that.

Q/C: Out of curiosity, the 2<sup>nd</sup> to the last whereas statement, the system will maintain its reputation would it not be in an olive branch spirit, are you losing anything if you would say “minimize the damage” to its reputation as a pre-eminent system? I think there was damage that can't be repaired and I understand the need to work with the Board of Governors; I don't know that I would agree with the whereas as it is stated.

A: I don't know that I totally do, preeminent is a pretty big statement. They say it a lot. At least that day our point was we're still getting our point across...



Discussion continued.

Q/C: ...what are trying to do? One is to express to Tom Ross a real strong statement in support of what he has done for the system. Another, is clearly disagreeing with the action as a matter of integrity, but then to do it in such a way that it was requesting collaborative, cooperative, open door discussions moving forward rather than the rubbing salt in the wounds, unnecessarily, unproductively...

Discussion continued.

The question was called and a vote ensued.

**Vote on Calling the Question (Hand Vote):**

**Yes: 14**

**The motion passes.**

**Vote on Resolution Regarding the Forced Resignation of UNC President Tom Ross**

**Yes: 21**

**No: 2**

**Abstain: 2**

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

The meeting was adjourned.

Senator	"Resolution to change ""Special Studies"" to ""Interdisciplinary Studies"""	"Resolution Regarding Tom Ross"	"Resolution Regarding Chancellor's and Dean's List with W grades"
Kia Asberg	Aye	abstain	Aye
Bob Beaudet	Aye	Aye	Aye
Lisa Bloom	aye	Aye	Aye
Shawn Collins	abstain	abstain	abstain
Christopher Cooper	Nay	Aye	Aye
David Dorondo	aye	aye	aye
Jeanne R. Dulworth	nay	aye	aye
Yang Fan	aye	aye	nay
George Ford	Aye	Aye	Aye
Katy Ginanni	Aye	Aye	Aye
AJ Grube	Aye	Aye	Aye
David Henderson	abstain	Aye	Aye
Mary Jean Herzog	Aye	Aye	Aye
Ian Hewer	Aye	Aye	Aye
Beth Huber	Aye	Aye	Aye
Leroy Kauffman			
Will Lehman	aye	aye	aye
L. Alvin Malesky Jr	abstain	nay	aye
David McCord	Aye	Aye	Aye
Erin McNelis	Aye	Aye	Aye
Bob (Robert F) Mulligan	aye	aye	nay
Peter Tay	Aye	Nay	Aye
Karyn Tomczak	Aye	Aye	Aye
Cheryl Waters-Tormey	abstain	aye	aye
Tonya M. Westbrook	abstain	aye	abstain
John Whitmire	Aye	Aye	Aye
Results	18 ayes; 2 nays; 5 abstain	21 ayes; 2 nays; 2 abstain	21 ayes; 2 nays; 2 abstain