Faculty Senate

**MINUTES**

***January 21, 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, Ian Hewer, Beth Huber, Leroy Kauffman, Will Lehman, Alvin Malesky, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Bob Mulligan, Peter Tay, Cheryl Waters-Tormey, Tonya Westbrook, John Whitmire

Members with Proxies:

Lisa Bloom, George Ford, Mary Jean Herzog, Alison Morrison-Shetlar, Karyn Tomczak

Members Absent:

None

Recorder:

Ann Green

Chair Kauffman called the meeting to order and began by welcoming and introducing Kristin Rowe, WCU’s new Associate Registrar. Kristin began work at WCU on January 5th.

Senator Whitmire announced that the Department of Intercultural Affairs (ICA) will be holding an inaugural Women’s Leadership Conference at WCU on March 27 & 28, 2015. ICA is seeking folks who are interested in doing panel presentations and break-out sessions during the conference. People who are interested should look up the information on the website. Additionally, as a separate event, with the assistance of WCU alumnus and Board of Visitors member, Brandon Robinson, they have been able to secure the three women currently serving as NC Supreme Court Justices to hold a forum on March 28, 2015 from 7:00 – 8:30 p.m. John offered to answer any questions via email.

Chair Kauffman welcomed new senator, Alvin Malesky, who is filling in the senate spot after Senator McCord was elected to Chair-Elect of Senate.

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

Motion:

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of November 20, 2014 were approved as presented.

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

Chancellor’s Report/David Belcher:

The Chancellor’s Report was posted on SharePoint prior to the meeting.

In addition to items on the report, Chancellor Belcher addressed an ongoing discussion at the Board of Governor’s regarding altering the selection process for university chancellors. In general, the Board wants to know more about the chancellor’s searches as they are happening. Several proposals have been put on the table and there is a draft proposal that will be brought forward to the Board for a vote.

The Chancellor’s Report included a joint statement of the UNC Board of Governors and President Tom Ross regarding the resignation of Tom Ross as announced at the Board of Governor’s meeting this past Friday. Chancellor Belcher spoke about the suddenness of Ross’ resignation which was agreed upon by the Board and President Ross and commented that the staff of General Administration and the UNC Chancellors were stunned by the news. Chancellor Belcher shared that he is heartbroken for President Ross and his wife and commented that President Ross is a remarkable man and has been very attentive to Western Carolina. He has been a wonderful boss and a great mentor. Chancellor Belcher also shared that he has no worries about Western Carolina University. He has reached out to three Board of Governor’s members and three other members have reaced out to him and he has urged them to talk to the university chancellors. He is hopeful that the members of the board will be attentive and give guidance going forward.

Discussion following the Chancellor’s Report:

Q/C: on the chancellor’s search process, has there been any mention about openness and transparency at the campus level…?

A: No, it’s all at the Board of Governor’s.

Q/C: Will anybody speak for the campuses in terms of the level of transparency as it varies from campus to campus and a lot of it depends on how much pressure Human Resources at GA puts on the chair of the search. They have the option to make information available.

A: The staff member who staffs the governance committee is Ann Lemmon. Ann is the person who is liason from GA for every search going on…Last year, Ann contacted me and a few other recently hired to ask us our experience with the chancellor search process. There was a lot that was very good about it, but I directly told her that I did not like the closed nature of it. From your perspective I understand that because there are a whole bunch of people who had no clue what was going on until my name was released…from my perspective as a candidate, the problem was that I was announced and no one had a sense of who I was…you arrive on campus two or three months later and then you begin to get to know somebody and their perspectives. I think it’s as hard on somebody who gets the job as it is on the people on the receiving end of the new chancellor…

Q/C: I’m glad to hear that you told Ann that because Faculty Assembly two weeks ago at the January meeting passed a resolution asking for a more open search at the end when there are three finalists…the message you sent is the same as we put forth in the resolution.

A: I am all over that. I did talk to Ann about that.

Q/C: Essentially from what I’ve read about Tom Ross’ removal or release from presidency in the next year was that there is a change in direction that we needed a new start. Has anybody said at the board at the meeting what that direction is?

A: No. Discussion ensured.

Q/C: I know we don’t know the new direction…I think all of us can hear Governor McCrory saying out loud we don’t need any more sociologists and political scientists – that’s the change in direction that most of us are concerned about…the concern is a deeper concern of the understanding of a broad liberal 4 – year education and what it means and it’s a lack of confidence that people making these decisions share the same perspective. They may love NC, they may share the love of the university, they may be good people of integrity who are doing their best, but I’m not sure I’m on the same wavelength.

Discussion continued.

Q/C: …I’m moving from the assumption that the vast majority of people in this room and the vast majority of faculty are not happy with the ‘Tom Ross’ situation. What would be your advice to the faculty assuming that I’m right, assuming that we’re not happy, assuming we would like somehow to have our voices heard, but not to just to rattle chains, but to actually move toward some sort of productive direction. What would you suggest that we do?

A? Leroy may want to talk to you about this do because he has had a lot of conversation with Steve Leonard who is the chair of the Faculty Assembly, but I’ll give it it a stab. The first thing is a non-answer…if you know Tom Ross and you have a good feeling for him, let him know…I would encourage that whether it is an email or drop him a card…. Discussion continued.

Chancellor Belcher feels it is important for faculty to have voice and to take the opportunity to use the voices they have. Also from a very pragmatic point of view to recognize the Board of Governors have this prerogative and they can do as they want to. They are in charge…these are the people who are in fact going to be selecting the next president, so in addition to making a statement about any of those matters you might also choose to have an opportunity to state an expectation that faculty voice will be heard in the search process for the next president…

Chancellor Belcher suggested that Senate think about asking Board members, Joan MacNeill, Roger Aiken and Lou Bissette, Vice Chair of the Board, to come and speak to Senate. He thinks this would be an option and he would be happy to help facilitate it.

Discussion continued.

**Provost Report/Alison Morrison Shetlar:**

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

Associate Provost Brandon Schwab is here on behalf of Provost Morrison-Shetlar. The provost would like feedback on campus forums. There will be a campus wide forum at the end of the semester that will include the millennial campus development, a master plan update and SACSCOC accreditation. The provost is interested in learning what other campus forums the faculty would like to see and if faculty wish to have any forums involving her.

Chair Kauffman added that she is very willing to hold forums similar to the summer session forum held in the fall.

Q/C: What would be the point and I don’t mean that sarcastically like it sounds – what are we hoping to get out of these forums? Is this an opportunity for her to listen to us, are we affecting policy in some way, are we trying to steer the conversation in academic affairs?

A: What would you like it to be? I think her goal is to have as open communication as possible.

Q/C from Chair Kauffman: I would think all of the above. She wants to hear what the faculty are thinking

and she and I meet regularly, although I can’t share the voice of 600 people…she wants to hear what the voice of the faculty are and I think it’s important for us to hear what the constraints are from that side.

Q/C: …in a week where I feel like all faculty voice has been stripped, I would hope that faculty voice is heard, that it is received well and so forth.

Q/C: If the faculty acquiesce and quit speaking into forums and into opportunities where they have, the voice soon will be gone and I firmly believe that. We need to, kind of in response to X’s question, it feels like it isn’t going to make any difference, but if we acquiesce and don’t speak to that it for sure won’t make any difference…this is one of the things that came up at the Planning Team meeting.

Q/C: I think one of the things that came up last week with the faculty…the 5th year post tenure review plan and all that and also the minimum standards for people trying to receive tenure. I don’t know how comfortable people are going to be standing in front of the provost with that information or with those concerns, but I think it’s certainly something that’s on the minds of faculty.

Q/C: A focus on writing across campus. (It was added that we should hear more on that next month at this meeting.)

Associate Provost Schwab added that this doesn’t have to be the only opportunity to provide ideas to direct this any way you see fit.

He also gave an update on the Faculty Relations Fellow position. After receiving feedback from the Senate the announcement for a Faculty Relations Fellow was reposted by the Provost Office. A candidate has been identified who they think will be great in the role. Official announcement will come after some of the details have been finalized.

There were no other questions or concerns expressed.

Faculty Assembly/Leroy Kauffman for Linda Comer:

Chair Kauffman gave an overview of the Faculty Assembly held last Friday. Among other things, they spent time talking about faculty workload and how it is reported and used. It is understood at General Administration that teaching workload only reflects a part of what faculty do. A gentleman was there from COACHE for the COACHE survey collaboration on academic careers in higher education which will be rolled out on campus before March. It is a collaboration between COACHE and the UNC system and efforts to encourage us to participate. Brandon Schwab and Tim Metz are liaisons with the COACHE people for this endeavor.

At Faculty Assembly there was an update on Post Tenure Review and in the afternoon they spent an hour talking about open meetings. The Faculty Assembly is not subject to the open meetings law. They provide council to the president of the system from the faculty. They are not advisory, nor a whole list of other things.

A resolution was passed at Faculty Assembly drafted by the Senate chairs in favor of open searches as the hiring process gets to the end when finalists get on campus to allow for open forums for faculty, staff and community.

Staff Senate/David Rathbone, Chair:

Staff Senate Chair Rathbone seconded earlier sentiments of the great loss of Tom Ross which will also be felt by the staff senate and the UNC Staff Assembly. Steve Leonard attended the recent winter meeting and it was appreciated.

The Staff Senate Scholarship had a good year and thanks were expressed to a few of those who helped.

A UNC Assembly meeting will be held February 23rd – 24th and one will be held every two months incorporating visits to various colleges across the state. A couple of upcoming visits are to Winston – Salem and the School of the Arts.

A question was asked as to the timing of the yard sale: David shared details and that the yard sale the exact date is not nailed down yet.

SGA/Chelsea White, SGA Representative:

No report was given as Ms. White had to leave for class prior to the report.

SACSCOC Update/Steve Miller, Director SACSCOC Reaffirmation:

The process of selecting the QEP topic is moving forward. More and more posters are being noted around campus announcing the QEP topics selection process. An open forum will be held about the QEP topic selection, what the next QEP topic selection might look like, how to submit a topic, what are they looking for. All of the information is up online at QEP.wcu.edu. Topics and questions can be submitted now. The open forum will be on January 29th at 10:00 a.m. in the UC Theatre. The chancellor and provost will be there. It will be an interactive conversation about what our needs are as an institution in terms of student learning. Miller encouraged all to attend and to encourage others to attend and if any questions to please ask.

A question was asked as to who the forum was open to. It is open to faculty staff, students and the community. They are trying to get much better student involvement than last time. The submission of topics is open to students as well.

IT Governance/ Anna McFadden:

Anna McFadden explained that the provost asked that she come and share this information with Faculty Senate. This is one of the strategic initiatives and it will impact everyone on campus and every student. They had a risk assessment done on their identity governance. In areas of account management, password resets/access they were in the red. It is a manual, error prone process and there is a lot of time and cost associated with the manual process. They had a conversation with Duke University who implemented an identity governance management system and they are very happy with it. They also worked with Dell to get their recommendations for WCU. The bottom line is they need to buy a pool and we need a consultant because there isn’t anyone on campus with the expertise to set up a whole system of identity governance. Access to what data for which people and the management of certain systems are topics. It will take a year to get through Phase 1, but that will automate email, MyCat, Blackboard, the h drive and SharePoint and then they can move to other systems. $165,000 is the cost and it will result in lower operational costs.

Discussion continued.

General Education Council/Senator Erin McNelis, Chair:

There is an update now posted on SharePoint. The Council has had three meetings in the past three months. Senator McNelis discussed some of the key items from the meetings. In March to mid-April of this year, the UNC system will be helping to pilot a demo version of the ETS assessment on written communication and critical thinking. This is part of the work to identify if the questions measure what they hope to measure and will be used to set a basis for scores, etc. There will be 160 students tested from each campus to meet the required total from the system overall. This is initial testing and the actual pilot will be next fall.

There is a technical Advisory Committee that has been formed and will probably be ongoing. They are looking for membership of people who have strong documented backgrounds of statistics and educational assessment. Senator McNelis has talked with one faculty member from the Psychology Department. They need individuals from our system who would be good in this area and can play a role in recommending the best uses of data, how to incorporate it into existing assessment of the general education curriculum, and give oversight in assessing whether it is meeting our needs in the system using the ETS product. If you know any individuals you would like to recommend please let her know. The individuals will represent UNC and will work closely with ETS.

She also reminded everyone to participate in the WCU Integrated Awards. Emails have been going out this week. Each individual has their own email and the emails are tailored to the recipient and thus should not be shared.

SENATE COUNCIL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

The APRC had only one item to discuss in their last meeting and this was the revision to deal with violation of the academic integrity policy.

APRC had looked at the policy in October and sent it back with some feedback and reservations through Associate Vice Chancellor Kevin Koett of Student Affairs. It came back to APRC basically the same with no changes made in the process.

The reservations from the APRC were around the proposal of five colleges having five separate integrity boards rather than one university-wide board. The provost had shared that this was the wish of the deans.

The specific concerns shared were 1) that having separate boards would not support consistency in treating violations and 2) given the timing of most hearings being late in the semester, there is concern that deans may have trouble filling an integrity board. This policy does not need to be voted on so the APRC only gave feedback as shared here.

Senator Ginanni reminded everyone about the curriculum process and that everything that comes to Senate is not for a vote. The only things that come for a vote are new programs or programs that are ceasing. Everything else is not formally presented to Senate, however, you may speak to anything proposed; program changes, new courses, anything. This is why she sends out emails ahead of the meetings with curriculum. As Katy explained you have access to everything that is in Curriculog – all proposals. If you ever have something you feel strongly about and look at the curriculum that is coming up – this is the place to do it. Otherwise, we will not talk about curriculum in Senate. You can go into Curriculog at any time and view proposals, you don’t have to wait for the email.

Chair Kauffman spoke to the new academic integrity process and that the new procedure has separated actions on student life things from actions on academic things and lets the colleges and academics take care of academic things. There is a place where they come together so somebody can see if a student is having a problem in student life who is also having problems academically at least that is combined at one point so it can be seen.

Q/C: You mentioned it’s going to the colleges, is it where the student’s major is in that college or where the violation occurred.

A: Discussion ensured. It was clarified that it occurs where the violation took place.

Collegial Review Council (CRC) / Erin McNelis, Chair

Some materials were posted. There is nothing to vote on at this time. The council met jointly with the department heads earlier this month when classes started. It was a helpful meeting. There was a handout with a ¾ page summary of changes including topics that had come up that we needed to think about know how to address. Some changes were tracked in the PTR documents in the Handbook and these are on SharePoint. A document was brought up at the meeting for viewing.

CRC Council Chair McNelis wrote to Steve Leonard, Chair of the Faculty Assembly, copying our Assembly delegates and asking for feedback on what other institutions do to reward and recognize excellence for more than meets, exceeds expectations levels. The Senate has mentioned at one point do we give a bump in salary automatically or are we not allowed to because raises can’t be given without permission by the legislature? Senator McNelis asked for feedback on what is being done across other campuses. After faculty complete their 5-year cycle that they are on now and begin a 5-year cycle again they will then need to set their directional goals. They are hoping it will allow at least one year for departments to update their Collegial Review documents to update possible changes. None of this was brought up at the Board of Governor’s level and they are under the assumption that as long as we are working toward that it will be satisfactory in the eyes of General Administration.

Chair Kauffman added that all the units in the system are working in this; some are further along than others.

Q/C: Came up in the Arts & Sciences Department Heads meeting this week if the CRDS aren’t adjusted until next year, then those CRDs would be governing until the year after next. …changes had to be made in the CRDs next year then presumably we would talk about directional goals for anybody who is going up for PTR next year whether than has to be…

A: Yes, we do need to discuss that. I assume a little bit more on the provost office rather than having to put it into policy, but what is going to be at this stage aspect since we won’t have CRDs through and it’s not like there’s one department where those people will come up maybe (unclear). It’s a good point and we can try and work on it. Particularly if you can think of snafus that we can be prepared for ahead of time, so that we have as little damage done to faculty as possible, let us know.

Discussion concluded.

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

The council had a good discussion with their meeting with Greg Hodges (Academic Affairs Budget Resources Director), Associate Provost Brandon Schwab and Margaret Bruder talking about issues surrounding fixed term faculty. This topic was discussed because it came up in the fall Faculty Caucus. They expect to hear more on this and also expect to have a resolution coming in the next couple of months, but right now they are just in discussion.

Q/C: What kind of issues were brought up?

A: All comps; mostly salaries.

A short discussion followed.

Rules Committee / Senator David McCord, Chair:

A draft of proposed changes to Article VI of the By-laws of Faculty Senate on Voting Procedures was presented for viewing at the meeting. Two readings are necessary and it will up for a vote at the next meeting.

Senator McCord read the text to Senators while noting the proposed changes.

Q/C: Do we need to specific electronically, because really the point is that the votes are going to be recorded publically and electronically can be a catch all, but what if 20 years from now we’re voting telepathically – I know that’s silly…but could we not just say voting on substantive items shall be…the point is that we are recording new votes, does it need to specify –

A: You’re bringing up the point we haven’t talked about because the point was that we’re not doing that electronically. That was what was our agenda item is to make the by-laws (unclear due to noisy interference) – to record electronically.

Q/C: Have we decided what was substantive?

A: Yes, I knew that – we didn’t deal with electronically we didn’t have any words in general voting and then we had major and there’s no way around this except the last sentence should clarify is that anybody who wants anything on the consent agenda brought to an electronic vote can do that, any senator can do that on any issue. So, the distinction is not critical… Accepting the Faculty Senate Minutes was offered as an example of a consent agenda item. This is the trivial stuff that you don’t want to have to vote on so there is a distinction there, but anybody can elevate anything.

Q/C: There was discussion about electronic voting and that would like to be able to do it by paper for instance if the electronic voting system doesn’t work as sometimes there is a glitch.

A: We didn’t talk about that, but that is a good point.

Q/C: Any senator can make a request from the floor in a regular electronic vote is the intent that then they can request and the chair adjudicates or is the request governing here?

A: The intent of the committee was that the request would govern.

Q/C: the rule used to be about the issue with the roll-call ballot anybody could call for it if they wanted to, but we’ve now gone to – in essence we have a roll call, not quite, but a type of it for the record.

Q/C: The reason I’m interested is the previous 1/3 vote of the roll call.

A: …the sense of the committee is we were trying to get around what is major and what is minor and so one way you can resolve that is anything that anybody sees as major, they can bring it up….

The changes will be expanded to address including a backup if the electronic vote doesn’t work. McCord posed a question to ask the general feeling of the 1/3 of the roll-call versus the proposal that anybody can bring up an item for an electronic vote to gauge the reaction. There were no concerns expressed.

Discussion concluded.

Senate Chair Report / Leroy Kauffman, Chair:

Mary Anne Lochner will be at the next Senate meeting for about a half hour presentation on Policy 53 which is a newly approved policy about Sexual Harassment.

Chair Kauffman shared comments from Faculty Assembly Chair and UNC Chapel Hill Political Scientist, Steve Leonard, and from an article in the Daily Tarheel. He asked Senators for a sense of their sentiment for a response to the resignation of Tom Ross. Discussion ensued.

Q/C: I think positive is really good. I also think if we think it was wrong, we need to say that as well. We need to blast people, blast the motivation; if we speculate on the motivations. And I think we can put a lot of that thought and language in but there should be a paragraph saying we respect their right to make this decision, but we do not support it.

TQ/C: That’s what the joint statement said as well – Tom said that as well.

Discussion continued.

There was reaffirmation on inviting the 3 board members as discussed earlier in the meeting although they need to think about what we want to get out of it.

Q/C: If I think about what I would want to get out of any opportunity to voice anything it is 1) that I want to remind these people there is a constituency that they represent. I don’t know if they considered that in this situation and again would want to discuss the need for faculty to have a voice; the importance of faculty voice.

Q/C: What Steve Leonard was saying sounded like he was suggesting that the near unanimousness of the vote was the public face-over about that decision. I don’t know that there is a question here, it’s more observing. We’re not speaking to just a set a people that won’t listen, there may be a sub-set of that group that will hear what we’re saying.

Q/C: That’s the sense that I got –it’s not as unanimous as it looks.

Chair Kauffman asked if one or two other people would join he and Senator Cooper in crafting a statement from this group. He would like to craft at least one to send to Tom Ross. Senators McCord and Waters-Tormey indicated a willingness to help and they and Cooper and Kauffman will work to draft a statement and will send it to Senators once drafted.

SENATE COUNCIL REPORTS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

New Business:

None.

The meeting was adjourned.

Attendance/Voting Record for January 21, 2015 Meeting:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Senator/Ex-Officio Member- (organized by first name)** | **Last Name** | **Attendance**  **1/21/15** | **No Votes conducted at this meeting** |
| Kia Asberg | Asberg | H |  |
| David Belcher | Belcher | H |  |
| Lisa Bloom | Bloom | PR |  |
| Bob Beaudet | Beaudet | H |  |
| Shawn Collins | Collins | H |  |
| Christopher Cooper | Cooper | H |  |
| David Dorondo | Dorondo | H |  |
| Jeanne Dulworth | Dulworth | H |  |
| Yang Fan | Fan | H |  |
| George Ford | Ford | PR |  |
| Katy Ginanni | Ginanni | H |  |
| AJ Grube | Grube | H |  |
| David Henderson | Henderson | H |  |
| Mary Jean Herzog | Herzog | PR |  |
| Ian Hewer | Hewer | H |  |
| Beth Huber | Huber | H |  |
| Leroy Kauffman | Kauffman | H |  |
| Will Lehman | Lehman | H |  |
| Alvin Malesky | Malesky | H |  |
| David McCord | McCord | H |  |
| Erin McNelis | McNelis | H |  |
| Alison Morrison-Shetlar | Morrison-Shetlar | PR |  |
| Bob Mulligan | Mulligan | H |  |
| Peter Tay | Powell | H |  |
| Karyn Tomczak | Tomczak | PR |  |
| Cheryl Waters-Tormey | Waters-Tormey | H |  |
| Tonya Westbrook | Westbrook | H |  |
| John Whitmire | Whitmire | H |  |
|  |  |  |  |