**MINUTES**

***September 24, 2014***

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

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

ROLL CALL

Present:

Andrew Adams, Bob Beaudet, Lisa Bloom, Shawn Collins, Christopher Cooper, David Dorondo, Jeanne Dulworth, Yang Fan, George Ford, Katy Ginanni, AJ Grube, Mary Jean Herzog, Ian Hewer, Beth Huber, Leroy Kauffman, Will Lehman, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Bob Mulligan, Peter Tay, John Whitmire

Members with Proxies:

Kia Asberg, Karyn Tomczak, Cheryl Waters-Tormey, Tonya Westbrook

Members Absent:  
David Belcher, Alison Morrison-Shetlar

Recorder:

Ann Green

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

Motion:

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of August 27, 2014 were approved with amendments.

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

Chancellor’s Report/David Belcher:

No Report. Chair Leroy Kauffman has talked with Dr. Belcher about the possibility of receiving the Chancellor’s report before the Faculty Senate meetings. It is often emailed out before the meeting is over or at least by the next morning after the Senate meeting. The thought is that if the report is available beforehand, Dr. Belcher could use his time to respond more to questions from senators during the meeting. Chair Kauffman will follow up with Dr. Belcher about this possibility.

Chair Kauffman spoke about the recent Board of Governors (BOG) visit on campus that took place after the last Senate meeting and he thanked senators for attending some of the meetings. Overall the feedback from the visitors was very positive.

**Provost Report:**

The provost is out of town at meetings in Durham and is not able to be here, but her report is posted on SharePoint. Associate Provost Brandon Schwab is at the meeting to answer questions or take questions back to the provost, as needed.

Q/C: When the Summer School APR goes to APRC what is the outcome? Are we voting on things? What are we doing with that APR?

Answer from Associate Provost Schwab: That’s a good question. I don’t know all the pieces to that. The main thing is to make sure this information is broadly vetted across the campus. There are some things like enumeration that I don’t believe require a faculty vote – that those are a provost decision. But, we want this to be a discussion and we want to make sure we get as much feedback and make as sound a decision as is possible.

Q/C: So, we’re not voting on anything, but I guess we have good and bad recommendations….(unclear), so presumably you guys will take those and decide what you think about what we’re saying. If it’s okay if I address to Senate…is it going to go after APRC to the full Senate? I’m unclear on what the process is…

A: …I’ve only talked with (Assistant Vice Chancellor) Lowell Davis briefly about the APR itself. But in reading the Faculty Handbook, it sounds like it is something that the APRC and then the Faculty Senate would vote on and approve it or not. If you look at the Handbook and see the scope of the council, it says areas for responsibility for APRC include altering admission, graduation, instructional or retention standards, modifying academic policies including grading criteria, etc. reviewing academic programs….it seems to me that (the APR) is an instructional policy- I’m not sure.

Q/C: I think we’re in uncharted territory. …I’m very familiar with that APR in its original form. Basically, it was put together to put down on paper what we were doing. It came out of that. I don’t know if at that point, it ever saw Senate….I think it was for our administrative convenience that we wrote down what we were doing. In some ways, I think we are in uncharted territory.

Q/C: I just hope if before the meeting it sounds like we’ll do that, if the senate leadership, if the provost office can figure out what it is – I want to know what the end game is before we go to the meeting that day and if it’s going to move forward I’m not sure the salary technically has to and I think there’s probably parts…that are faculty senate business, parts of it that aren’t. I know it’s confusing and I don’t expect to have perfect answers now, but I’d like to- I’m getting questions from a lot of faculty about what’s going to happen at APRC and how does this move forward…

Q/C: Just following up on that, it sounded like in the forum there was more discussion than what was in the APR and some of that discussion, what would May mini-mester term be appropriate for? There is re-thinking what course delivery and things that are curricular in nature that aren’t articulated in the APR, but any changes to those if nothing else would need to come through APRC and then Faculty Senate. I agree the pay structure isn’t a part that we have ownership over, but there are other aspects…the curriculum or programs or things.

Q/C: That’s the problem, there’s a lot of stuff in this APR some of it involves curriculum and a lot of it doesn’t. It sounded like to me that in the last Senate Planning Team meeting that Alison wanted us to review it just for feedback, but I just don’t know what the appropriate path is for us to follow.

Q/C: From a curricular perspective, we’re not changing course, not changing programs. We’re probably using independent study or directed study headings for some of the creative things. So, if there are new courses that would grow out of that…that would be something that would follow the regular curricular process…would be reviewed by APRC. The parts of term thing would be one thing I think we would speak to and from input from the registrar side and the administrative side as well as what that means for us and how we deliver…

Q/C: I have a question about part of (Provost) Alison’s report on program prioritization, annual assessment and the program review processes. I wondered if any of the senators had any comments about that. I looked at some of the attachments and I couldn’t really make much out of it because for instance somebody might be listed as a .45 load, but what do I know about what else they’re doing so I just wondered if anybody had any comments or reactions to that?

It was asked that question be repeated…and additional comments in the process of repeating: the last bullet is on merging program prioritization and annual assessment and the program review processes and that is one of the issues that has come up a couple of times and I think we’ve been told that we’re not doing program prioritization per se. We’re going back to program review and so I looked at some of the documents that are posted on the share drive and…well, ok, they’re there, I just couldn’t make much sense out of them in terms of any sort of reaction to them because I don’t know, I know my own dept. some. I just wondered if anybody had any reaction to that part of the report.

Q/C: All I can say as one of the 5 or so programs going through it this year, the data was generated from OIPE based on the requirements set for program review. I haven’t delved into the parts that talked about faculty load or…what were requested or told that was to be part of the report to know. I know that you can’t find it online and it wasn’t quite as easy to get to the documents or guidelines for program review…I still was not quite clear where the program prioritization measures or values were added or merged with program review…

Q/C: I thought it was really good, I said it a number of times (unclear) we have all these processes running parallel, we all have different data and it’s kind of a mess and so…I was actually impressed that we moved forward, progress and the last half of the program prioritization report…the really important stuff, I thought that’s what it really called for. I thought it was really—I’m sure it’s not perfect, but I thought it was really nice…Tim could probably talk about the data since he is here.

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Institutional Planning and Effectiveness Tim Metz reported that Associate Provost for UG Studies Carol Burton and Director of Assessment David Onder have been working diligently especially on the program review interface and guidelines associated with that. Tim wasn’t familiar enough with the data to comment.

**Faculty Assembly Report/Linda Comer:**

Chair Kauffman reported that Linda Comer wasn’t able to be here today. She posted her report on the Faculty Assembly which Leroy Kauffman and Damon Sink were also able to attend. Leroy brought up UNC Online and that there is something happening out there. He encouraged everyone to go there and snoop around on the site and see what is going on. It is a UNC driven online sharing of information, etc. The data is interesting. Ultimately, people can register for the online courses very easily, it shows up as transcriptable credit and works pretty slick. It came up in the context of summer school and it is a competitor of our own doing. The website is online at northcarolina.edu.

Q/C: Didn’t you say that the headcount and funding goes to UNC Online and not to us?

Q/C: I don’t remember for sure.

Q/C: I thought it was said at the planning meeting that funding went to the institution that offered it…if Winston Salem had cheaper courses that it would show up on their transcripts here, but over there in terms of that tuition.

Q/C: …I thought it was that if the seats didn’t fill then they used it – the funding went to UNC Online.

Chair Kauffman will follow up and try to get further information on the funding information. This program is in its infancy but it’s going to move forward.

Q/C: If we tweak our programs, we need to know what’s funded and what’s not.

Discussion continued. Online courses are pulled off Banner and go onto the UNC Online site as courses offered.

From Faculty Assembly we will be seeing a couple of forthcoming resolutions. There is one on health assessment that goes along with our health insurance. We get about $10 deduction if we fill out the assessment information and there is concern because it’s a third party provider that gathers that information. Some of the questions that were asked had really nothing to do with what they thought it should be and how secure is the data is an issue.

There will be a resolution on the definition of status for the UNC system employees for health care coverage. This deals with part time employees whose total time combined with working at another institution may make up the necessary threshold for coverage to be required to be offered.

Q/C: In the report, the big buy for 2014, I’m guessing these are the big things to watch out for: student aid and assessments, the revalues, post-tenure reviews and MARs. What are MARs?

A: Minimum Admission Requirements. They are set by the state, by GA, and they send them to the admissions offices.

One of the things that happened is they raised the minimum GPA…from 2 to 2.5 (approximate), one of the consequences of that is that some of our sister institutions saw their applicant pool cut by one-third. There’s concern about what is happening with that and how it selectively impacts certain institutions.

Q/C: There is also something referred to in system developments as I3 and Exchange Initiatives and Academic Curriculum.

A: I3 – I don’t know what it stands for. (Maybe) Innovation, Instruction, something. It was hosted at Biltmore Park the week before school started. It was a UNC thing. We had 3 people there, I think, plus Laura Cruz. I know enough to be marginally dangerous. It has connections probably with UNC Online.

Q/C: it was a week and half long workshop for people that had very little or no experience teaching online so the idea was to provide instruction to them…

Q/C: One other thing within the report in what was lifted at what the various committees are going to be looking at. The student success group had some things and the last one was contextual grading so is that the same thing we brought up? Is it coming to the UNC system level for investigation?

A: It’s being talked about at that level. I don’t know if it’s being talked about positively but it is one of the things that was raised. It’s just an issue on the radar.

Q/C: …I’ve never even heard the phrase contextual grading and it sounds ominous to me.

A: It’s actually a contextual transcript and the students brought it to us last spring…and I don’t remember if they were advocating for it or putting it on the table for discussion, but it would be a transcript that would include information about for example, 50% of the people in this class got A’s. It would give your letter grade and give a context for that…you got an A and 90% of the people in the class got an A.

Chair Kauffman offered to get more information on this topic at the UNC level. It is not believed to be an initiative, but rather a topic of discussion. He shared that with the MARs, one of the things GA has done is standardize the weightings that high schools are to use for honors and AP courses.

It was shared that Chapel Hill is implementing the contextual transcripts this fall.

General Ed Council /Erin McNelis:

Erin McNelis asked if there were any questions. A report and attached document were posted.

Q/C: Is ETS a foregone conclusion?

A: It is decided that we will be working with them to try to develop something that they will pilot with our campus. We will be their testing grounds for validation and verification of the initial stuff. We will also have the opportunity for faculty, or campuses or system to choose to add questions to that core of what they have already been working on. It could be something more directed toward what our system may be doing but they didn’t assess with their piece of if there is something with your institution, maybe your QEP has to do with critical thinking or written communication, but a different aspect and you want to use that same instrument to get data as well.

Q/C: Would that also include if we thought something they were doing is just wonky?

A: If it’s part of their course, I don’t believe we have that ability….but we’re not obliged to use their thing. We have a trial period. Part of the policies that were set up…is that reassessment every 2 years – are we happy with this instrument?…I would think if we disagree with a part or with the assessment that this is a trial the first years and we’re not happy.

Q/C: Just FYI, at X department everyone’s heads blew up about this and it’s being talked about at (unclear), writing program administrator conferences. From writing program administrators across North Carolina there is much consternation.

A: They are hosting workshops across the state where individuals can learn about the principles from which ETS creates their items and also to help people develop their own such items…

Discussion continued.

Staff Senate/David Rathbone:

Staff Senate members are working at Mountain Heritage Day and will be selling ornaments there. They are partnering with Human Resources in several areas. One area is working on employee discounts with local stores and restaurants near campus and the Biltmore Park area. They have been trying to add additional signage about the staff scholarships and the sale of ornaments and are trying to increase communication.

SGA/:

No Report.

SACSCOC Update/Steve Miller, Director SACSCOC Reaffirmation:

Steve Miller reported there will be an open forum next week on the SACSCOC Reaccreditation/Reaffirmation. It will be October 1 from 3 to 4:30 p.m. in Blue Ridge Conference Room A. Tim Metz who is also SACSCOC liaison will be joining Steve in the forum and is also along with Steve, accountable for SACSCOC reaccreditation. Chairs of the two big SACS committees are Sloan Despeaux from the Math Dept. (chairing the QEP committee) along with Mike Smith, chair of the Compliance Committee. Both Sloan and Mike will be at the forum along with several of the committee members.

Steve has had a lot of the same questions and knows a lot of people are curious about the QEP so he wanted to have a chance for those that are involved in the committees to answer questions from everyone. He reminded everyone about the reaffirmation timeline. Our reaffirmation year is 2017. The on-campus visit is April 2017. We are officially reaffirmed in December at the annual meeting. We have to submit all compliance documentation in August/September of 2016. This is less than 2 years that we have to gear up for the compliance effort. Over the next year we will be selecting a QEP topic determining how we implement the new QEP and how we assess it. It’s actually a shorter time frame than it seems and it will be very busy over the next year and a half.

Q/C: Is reaffirmation the same as recertification and who is the reaffirming agency?

A: It’s our university level accreditation, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). They are the regional accrediting body for 11 southeastern states basically every institution

Faculty Athletics Committee Report/AJ Grube:

AJ Grube clarified that she is not giving the Athletics Committee Report. There is an Athletics Committee that has 9 faculty members on it. Brent Kinser was the chair and AJ said she thinks he submitted a report last spring for the 2013-14 year. However, AJ is also required to give a report as the faculty athletics representative. She goes to the committee meetings, but she is ex-officio on that committee. She submitted her report and passed out an athletic summary page at the meeting. She requested for the coming year that they would really like for faculty members to please pay special attention and complete as many progress reports as possible. They’ve lowered the number of reports requested to the 5th, 8th and 11th weeks. The comments on those reports are very important. They don’t just go into a black hole where no one sees them. Randy Eaton, director of athletics, is at this meeting to help explain how they are used. Please encourage all faculty to complete and make comments on these reports.

AJ said that the end of the year last year was so busy that she was asked to delay giving her report until this fall and this is fine with her to continue doing this if okay with the senate. She wasn’t sure what information senate wanted to see so she took her job description as athletic representative and responded to those items. If there is anything else that you would like to see in the report, please let her know. She referenced the transparency in the Athletics Financial Transparency Working Group Committee which is a UNC group. She offered to send their report to anyone who would like to receive it along with a clustering report.

Randy Eaton added that he spent about 3 hours this morning looking at 5th week reports. He looks at every grade of every athlete. He looks at 5th week and really focuses on the comments – are they attending, turning things in, are they prepared, etc. It is important for them to know as soon as possible if our student athletes are upholding their end of the bargain as it relates to being a student. This is really the one way they know how to review that. They have a penalty system in place now. For the first game at South Florida they suspended four starters from the football team for not holding up their end of the bargain in the spring. They do take these things seriously and the athletes are students first. Getting feedback early in the semester gives them the opportunity to change some behaviors.

Q/C: This is great. I wonder if we could get one additional line of the general student population if we could see how it compares.

A: Yes, I think we can do that.

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

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

The APRC has not met yet, but they do have a full committee. They are waiting to get the APR 19 (on Summer Session) from Lowell Davis. There will be a report next meeting.

Q/C: Has anyone talked to you about the student success changes that were voted on last year about whether or not to extend the drop deadline to census day?

A: No.

Q/C: I was told that was under discussion. If you could ask about that. The policy doesn’t disallow it and other institutions are doing it… To me, drop day is less important than add date. Could you also have people adding late as the census date and if they have missed 2 weeks of the 14 week class sessions what does that have?

The question is do we extend the drop day to the 2nd Friday and if so that include the extension of the add date. Right now, the add date ends on the 1st Friday.

This saves people from getting Ws in that second week. This is not being requested by the commenter, but it is understood that the idea is under discussion so it would be relevant to know the status.

Discussion continued.

Collegial Review Council: Erin McNelis, Chair

The Council has had one meeting this month. They have not voted on any resolutions because they did not have the full council, but they are nearly there. Erin shared that Andrew Adams has brought a couple of items to the CRC. The first is language to add to the Handbook probably to the section 4.04 with regard to use of the faculty database, i.e. Digital Measures. Knowing that the name or platform could be changed. Using data from the faculty database as part of your dossier and how that would be used or other potential collegial review items (annual faculty evaluation, promotion, reevaluation, etc.). Pointing out that it would be there and when it could be used. Not trying to mandate what it’s used for and how but that it will be used and your dept. should be dealing with how it will be used.

The second item is in that process trying to develop for the future college representatives. Andrew interjected that they have a steering committee and they want to transition that to the people who are actually helping people (unclear). Erin continued with create a group that would have a representative from each college that would be responsible for helping to train or be the point person for questions on Digital Measures….similar to the SAI task force that responds to SAI issues…this idea would be a standing subcommittee of the Collegial Review Council as it seems like it would be appropriate for this committee to report to CRC. Andrew has proposed language to changes to the by-laws and the Council will be looking at that.

Erin said post tenure review (PTR) is also on their agenda. Last July, the BOG passed the suggested changes to PTR that the task force from BOG had recommended. There was no mention of the fact that all the faculty senates and the Faculty Assembly did not endorse this. They will need to figure out if our guidelines fit policy or not and how to take these new changes and that we are meeting policy and how to best retain the autonomy of the faculty in this process.

There is some stuff from previous years including improving the policy on emeritus, designation of the process. There are possibilities and guidelines for promotion for non-tenure track faculty that re not included in the Handbook. This tends to be the only way you can increase your salary as non-tenure track faculty. Also, working with Faculty Affairs Council on what would be the output from SAI. What do you want people to be able to have to put in their dossier?

Q/C: About post tenure guides…the Board passed post tenure review guidelines but no faculty organizations endorsed them is that what I heard you say?

A: That’s true but according to their minutes, there was no mention of that no faculty supported. So, it was not recorded in their minutes. Keep in mind, you saw last week, who is speaking at Board of Governors meetings.

Q/C: I’m questioning the legality for workers’ rights for state of NC…I’m not a lawyer…

A: Yes, but you’re EPA so workers’ rights for the policy doesn’t apply.

Q/C: No, we’re not allowed to unionize, but I do think that those guidelines are binding contracts and that they keep being unilaterally changed. I’m not wanting to investigate this, but I’m saying if we were to want to make resolutions opposing that and all the other campuses opposed, if we do oppose it. I’m just saying I question the legalities.

A: We did oppose it last year.

It was clarified that faculty are allowed to unionize, but are not allowed to engage in collective bargaining for strikes.

Discussion continued.

Of the 3 big changes that were made that were recommended by the task force, the dean’s level review was included in the policy statement, the addition of exceeds expectations was in the policy statement as well, but what was only in the guidelines was the addition of the five years directional goals for everyone.

Q/C: That was in the guideline as opposed to policy?

A: Yes

A: Right now, it’s if you have essentially a negative review you have these five year plans. The council had decided that they very much wanted to articulate a statement as to why it is important that faculty make these moves of ownership essentially of the tenure process and post tenure review and the importance and significance of tenure…

Q/C: May I ask where one can find these documents?

A: I will post them under the Collegial Review Council on SharePoint. They are freely available at northcarolina.edu, but I have tried to cut out the pages that deal most relevantly.

Discussion continued.

The documents will be added to SharePoint CRC folder and to the h drive.

Faculty Affairs Council/AJ Grube: AJ Grube had to leave the meeting and there was no report. Leroy Kauffman said the council has not yet met and he is sending her the full complement of council members by tomorrow morning.

Mary Jean Herzog shared that most of the issues that came about at the Faculty Caucus will be going to the Faculty Affairs Council so they will be very busy.

Rules Committee/Leroy Kauffman, (Temporary Chair):

Effective Monday they will have a chair of the Rules Committee. The 2014-15 Handbook is available online.

Faculty Senate Chair Report/Leroy Kauffman, Chair:

Leroy will be calling together a small group to look at the University Athletics Committee. Brent Kinser chaired the group last year and they did a lot of work on revising their charge. The one thing that wasn’t resolved is where the committee fits into the governance structure. The group Leroy will be calling together will be asked to look at that question. The group will likely include the chancellor, legal counsel, AJ Grube, as faculty representative, Leroy and others.

Q/C: One quick comment, when you consider the mission of the university as the creation and dissemination of knowledge you’re going to have a problem all the way down the line fitting this endeavor into that mission.

Q/C: I wonder if we might want to bring up, whenever AJ is done being FAR whether the faculty should have more say so in who the faculty representative is. AJ does a great job and Gibbs did a great job before her and AJ did a great job before Gibbs so this is not a knock on any of our FARs, but universities are split. Some are appointed by the chancellor, some are appointed by the faculty. Ours is one appointed by the chancellor, and it seems to run counter to the notion that it is a faculty representative….again, I want it clear in the minutes I’m not suggesting AJ should not be FAR…we have no term. It also comes with a course release or a stipend so it’s a notion that I think people would be interested in…

Discussion continued.

Chair Kauffman reminded senators to remind their constituents that voting is now open for 2 representatives on the Faculty Hearing Committee and the vice chair of the faculty.

The Faculty Caucus was held on the Friday of the Board of Governors meeting. Steve Leonard, the chair of Faculty Assembly attended the caucus since he was on campus. Leroy, David McCord and Mary Jean Herzog went through all the topics and gave them to the councils with most of them going to Faculty Affairs Council. The report from the caucus was posted in advance of today’s meeting. There were about 15 people that attended.

A request was made for a faculty email list to facilitate sending invitations to faculty. Discussion took place and Leroy offered to follow up on this possibility.

Chair Kauffman asked if there were any topics that senators wanted to see taken up.

Discussion took place about what topics were brought up at the caucus. Increments in salaries for people who go up for tenure and promotion was on the list.

Q/C: In looking at our Western website, I didn’t realize how long our current incremental raises on promotion to associate and full professor had been in, but looking at senate documents from 2004 and the current structure where you have a $2000 raise for promotion to associate and a $3000 raise on promotion to full professor actually came about as the recommendations of a task force back in 2003 and went into effect in 2004-2005. As part of the recommendations of that body it was also included that these should be looked at again every 5 years to make sure we aren’t losing ground in respect to our peers. I don’t think we have taken a look at that since 2004.

By definition these are merit raises on promotion to associate or full and looking at that structure would be one way to potentially address some of the equity issues...

Q/C: even when we’re not allowed to give raises by the state, this is a back door to be able to.

A: And we did include that in the caucus faculty concerns.

Discussion continued.

**NEW BUSINESS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

None.

The meeting was adjourned.