Faculty Senate

**MINUTES**

***March 25, 2015***

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

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

ROLL CALL

Present:

Kia Asberg, Bob Beaudet, Shawn Collins, Christopher Cooper, David Dorondo, Jeanne Dulworth, Yang Fan, AJ Grube, David Henderson, Mary Jean Herzog, Ian Hewer, 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, Katy Ginanni, Beth Huber, Alison Morrison-Shetlar

Members Absent:

David Belcher, Karyn Tomczak

Recorder:

Ann Green

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

Motion:

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of February 19, 2015 were approved as presented.

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

Chancellor’s Report/David Belcher:

None.

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

The Provost Report was submitted and posted on SharePoint prior to the meeting. Associate Provost Schwab was on hand to answer questions related to the report.

Q/C: I wanted to reiterate a request for an email from the Provost Office updating everybody on Academic Integrity Policy that just changed so that everyone has the same information…

A: Okay.

Q/C: …a question on the Cherokee Center Review process. It says it is going to follow the same criteria as the Board of Governors used. Their conclusion was that it should be reviewed. What do we expect the outcome to be; where are we going to go with the review? …We’re going to use the same criteria and come out at a different point?

A: I don’t have those details, but I would be happy to get back with you.

Discussion continued.

Q/C: Another comment I would have on the Board of Visitor’s meeting... It says they will serve as an advisory body to Chancellor Belcher. I would carefully use ‘provide the Chancellor with counsel.’ I don’t think they are at all a policy making body, but the open meetings law sometimes talks about advisory boards and I know Faculty Assembly is very careful to use ‘provide counsel’ as opposed to ‘advise.’

Associate Provost Schwab asked if there are any other requests for topics he can take back to the Provost or for items for next month’s report.

There were no other comments.

Staff Senate/Pam Degraffenreid:

The Staff Senate is in the voting process for Senator elections now. They have finalized the selections for scholarship awards and three students will receive awards this year. Thanks were extended to the University Club for their efforts toward the Staff Senate Scholarship.

SGA/Samir Hafiz, Vice President:

Student Body elections were finalized today. Hank Henderson was elected to the student body President-elect. It was a tight race with over 1200 votes from the student body. The student body Vice-President Elect is Baron Crawford. They don’t currently have a SGA representative to the Staff Senate, but they have talked about it and would like to remedy that.

SACSCOC Update/Steve Miller, Director SACSCOC Reaffirmation:

The compliance committee has been deep into their work and about 70% of the narratives needed for compliance certification already have at least a draft completed. There are some, such as Institutional Effectiveness and addressing how faculty are qualified to teach, that will take a long time to write. These will involve working with a number of people. Overall they are in very good shape. The deadline for the QEP topic submissions was a week ago and there were a good number of topic submissions which are being reviewed by the committee. The committee was pleased with the number of submissions, however, they have extended the deadline for submission to April 6th.

Faculty Assembly/Leroy Kauffman for Linda Comer:

The last meeting was February 20th. They met Junius Gonzales, the new Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs who replaced Suzanne Ortega.

There was discussion at the Assembly about UNC Exchange and Online Initiatives and the increased competitiveness for online education.

IT Security Issues/Anna McFadden, IT Governance:

Dr. McFadden met with Staff Senate recently about a change with IT and she is here today to update the Faculty Senate about a change. Last year, Faculty Senate was briefed about a memorandum from Homeland Security that said that anonymous hackers would be targeting colleges and universities. Since this memo, IT has made a lot of changes to security, as have a lot of other universities. A recent spam attempt containing a virus took down two of our servers and caused a lot of trouble. IT is getting ready to institute multi-factor authentication for VPN. This will affect users of the VPN.

Multi-factor authentication is being done because of phishing attempts and if someone got ahold of your credentials and got into the VPN they could do a lot of harm.

What this means is that for the VPN, a single password will not be enough. A code will be sent to another device such as your cell phone or home phone and the code will have to be entered to allow entry into the VPN.

Initial steps for multi-factor authentication have already begun with the software packages that Health Services and the Counseling Center use. The next areas it will be rolled out to are to areas that use credit cards. In March it will be piloted with the IT Division and then it will rolled out to all faculty and staff in April for the VPN.

Dr. McFadden said she hopes this is coming not as an inconvenience or as a surprise. It is something they are trying to do to protect against the threats against our systems. IT is trying to be as proactive as they possibly can.

Q/C: On the initial slide you had the phrase Social Engineering. When IT Services uses that phrase, what does it mean?

A: It really means that hackers out there are using social networks and social media to change behavior. Think about what hacking is. Discussion continued.

Q/C: This is only if we try to log in through the VPN.

A: (Yes). Only if you log in through the VPN.

Q/C: But, the problem happened with people clicking on the email?

A: Exactly, but the danger if you go beyond that, if you clicked on that and you gave out your credentials somebody could then take your credentials and go in through the VPN…

A suggestion was made to use the emergency services texting capabilities to text employees to alert employees about these types of phishing issues. McFadden felt that was a good suggestion and one she will take back to IT.

Discussion continued.

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

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

Curriculum was discussed. There were no curriculum items that required a vote.

The other items for possible votes:

Edits to the Graduate Policy on Enrollment at Graduation – the edited policy has been posted on SharePoint. It has gone through the Graduate School and a subcommittee of the Graduate Council, the APRC and there have been no further comments.

Graduate School Associate Dean Brian Kloeppel gave a brief overview about the existing policy which cannot be legally enforced and discussed the edited policy now being proposed.

Q/C: …the use of the word, “term,” does that mean semester? Do we use term officially to designate semesters and summer and then other term is “rollover period.”

Answer from Kloeppel: We met with Larry Hammer from the Registrar’s Office and the terminology is consistent between the graduate school and the undergraduate level…We made sure we can use the workflow processes that the Registrar’s Office uses. If someone applies for graduation and for some reason can’t finish, they either receive, either an undergraduate or a graduate student, a certified letter from the Registrar’s Office saying your intent to graduate is being rolled forward one semester and by changing and altering the text that is seen in the revised policy we don’t need the Registrar’s office to do something different.

Q/C: Is the roll forward plainer to say than the rollover period?

A: Correct me if I’m wrong, roll it forward is simply to roll it to the next term/semester. It could be spring, summer or fall (whatever the next term would be)…

The stop-out policy remains at the Graduate School level to ensure that your credentials are current if you have reason to need the stop-out policy. That policy is unchanged.

Vote on Resolution on Graduate School Policy on Enrolled at Graduation:

Yes: 24

No: 0

Abstain: 0

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

The next item up for vote is the Resolution on Multidisciplinary Writing Anthology.

This resolution has the approval of the APRC. The resolution came about because of a resolution last year to discontinue Composition Condition (CC) grades in 2013-2014. The Provost was supportive of some other initiative to enhance or support writing across the curriculum. The English department proposed to create an anthology for undergraduate student writing that is exemplary for different programs. They are proposing to request writing assignments from departments across the institution and put them together into an anthology that will be used in the intro English courses and hopefully other courses across campus.

It is optional whether you put any in, but the call has already gone out to department heads about this. It didn’t have to have Senate approval, but is thought to be helpful to have it. The students will get an undetermined amount of money if they get accepted.

Discussion continued.

Vote on Resolution on Multidisciplinary Writing Anthology:

Yes: 23

No: 1

Abstain: 0

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

Collegial Review Council (CRC) / Erin McNelis, Chair

The Resolution on Non-Proxy Voting Policy in Collegial Review is essentially codifying into our document what has been discussed in CRC previously. Collegial Review committees are deliberative bodies and proxies are not going to able to vote.

Section 4.04 and 4.07 both deal with the Collegial Review Proxy Voting.

Q/C: I’m sympathetic with this resolution. I understand why you would not want proxy or absentee voting. On the other hand, having served on these committees there are often people who cannot come because of the scheduling and who do a very thorough job of analyzing their dossiers. I have mixed feelings about it.

Q/C: If you can cast a good vote, by reading the whole time, then we shouldn’t have meetings. The whole point is that you are listening to other opinions; that you are getting your opinion changed by other people in the room.

Q/C: The discussion is for a purpose.

Q/C: This doesn’t make it impermissible for someone to call in or be in GoToMeeting or Skype in.

Discussion continued:

Vote on Resolution on Non-Proxy Voting on Collegial Review Committees (Section 4.04 and 4.07 of Handbook):

Yes: 22

No: 1

Abstain: 0

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

The next discussion was on Adding a Statement on the use of the Faculty Activity Database to Section 4.04 of the Handbook.

This was brought to CRC by Andrew Adams in the fall and it has gone through a few variations. The resolution proposes using ‘Faculty Activity Database,’ and not be dependent on a name brand of database in the Faculty Handbook.

We need language at the university level in university policy that clearly notifies faculty that we are using an electronic faculty database.

Q/C: Who has access to the data?

A: The oversight of the database is from the Provost Office from the Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness and the Faculty Senate. The standing committee that will run this database will be a sub-committee of CRC.

A: But access to the data right now is David Onder, correct?

A: David Onder is the campus administrator for the database.

Q/C: Is the data accessible to anyone off-site?

A: No…a detailed discussion continued. Dr. Anna McFadden offered assistance in this answer and shared that there are detailed agreements with vendors of these type programs that spell out who can access the data, where the data is stored and this is in place. She feels it is not something we need to be concerned about. This is a secure database.

Q/C: ….this is annual faculty evaluation, reappointment, tenure promotion…that’s peer review, so that is our data that is going in and yet we’re not deciding actually…we’re getting word of mouth about how it’s being shared outside of the committee. I hear what we’re saying now, it’s just the CV, but we’re agreeing to having this put in as we will do this…and it’s undefined what this is…

Q/C: in terms of several departments, not just ours, what used to be Digital Measures, if it is just the CV and that’s pretty standardized and if there are other pieces that didn’t really fit what some of these programs are doing so they’re not using it not because of being obstinate, but because it didn’t seem to measure what we did accurately. So, again, this is saying you will do this, but what this is, maybe now this is CV…

Q/C: There must be way to put in artifacts your department would use in doing AFEs.

Q/C: it does not reflect our CRD. Discussion continued. I feel like we are being told, yes, you have to do this, but a lot of the framework hasn’t been established or approved by the people who are going to use it.

Q/C: …my impression has been that David Onder, et al, whoever has been involved with that has been very willing and has worked very hard to make sure it will take things that are compliant with Departmental CRDs.

Q/C: Yes, I’m not questioning that. I’m saying the reason that there’s only seven depts. or programs that are using it.

Answer from Andrew Adams: The reason there are seven is because when Kyle Carter was Provost there was the Delaware Study on outside of classroom activity and that report was cancelled by GA, but College of Business and Education and Allied Professions kept using the database so that’s why there are only seven and some intermediary Provosts who wanted to go that route and didn’t. Beth Tyson Lofquist really took up the banner and started my position and Provost Morrison-Shetlar wants to go that route…

I sent out an email to 18 department heads in January about the tour I’m going on to all departments and in the email, I said please send me any AFE templates to make sure that can customize the reports. Some of them are quite complicated and we’ve been working to make sure the report is customized to needs. Digital Measures is very good at customizing those AFE reports. It’s what they do best. We would like to have a unified input screen that is more or less standard across campus, but the AFE reports are highly customizable.

Q/C: Yes, I get all that and I’m not at all making a stand on anybody’s efforts. This is we have to do it, but some of the process about what it is have not established yet. It gives concern about access to the data.

Q/C: We talked about the data security policy and this all came up in the first or second time in the Collegial Review Council and we were unaware of the data security policies and regulations with that.

Answer from Andrew Adams: I had several meetings with Craig Fowler and Tim Metz and Sherry to make sure that the database and the policies for the database are covered in Policy 97; that the existing security policies cover this database. And that’s another reason, one of the reasons why we delayed last year…was to make sure we were looking at those policies. Also made sure any personal information, anything personally identifiable is not in the database such as social security number, birth-dates, anything personal. The only thing wanted in the database is faculty activity on teaching, scholarship and service. There is nothing sensitive in the database now and we’re even trying to get rid of more…

Q/C: The dossier of my activities for which I get paid for by the state. How much of that should I consider as private and inaccessible to people I don’t choose to make it accessible to. Is that private information? There is a sense that it is. Is that legitimate thinking? Is it really private?

The other is the format in which we keep it. We have not separated those things. When it was in a 3-ring binder which was also dictated by the Office of the Provost…we’ve been told how to do this always…but when you do it in the 3-ring binder there’s inherent funky privacy because nobody knows where the thing is… Now we are talking about changing the format to one that is much more efficient and has many other advantages, but what it brings to light is that it’s not, we don’t have the privacy by default. I would discuss this as two issues. One is: format. We can convert to electronic form without making it any more visible to others than it is now, if that is what we choose. The fact that it is so easily, that you can click a box and make it much more available, it what is creating the paranoia.

Discussion continued.

Vote on Resolution on Faculty Activity Database language (Section 4.04 and 4.07 of Handbook):

Yes: 15

No: 6

Abstain: 0

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

The next item discussed was **Revising Emeritus Faculty Status** (**Section 4.11B of the Faculty Handbook).**

The Provost asked the Council to look at Emeritus Faculty or approval for Emeritus Faculty and to clarify requirements and expectations as well as procedures for applying.

A subcommittee discussed and brought feedback to the council and ideas were also added by the council. New language was added and some language was deleted. Dr. McNelis gave background and thought processes behind the proposed revisions.

Q/C: … I want a more efficient process too, but if out of efficiency, you lose due process and you lose voice, I’m worried this has gone a little bit too far in that direction. Imagine a faculty member at the end of their career. Let’s say the university president got fired, just say that it happened…and he had a faculty member at the end of his career and starts firing off op-eds to the Asheville Citizen Times…let’s say that person goes up for emeritus, clearly has a distinguished career….do we really want a process where out of the three people who vote, two of them are administrators…I would rather have more faculty voice than less faculty voice, even if that means every committee meeting is 15 minutes longer. That is a small price to pay. I worry, again, on just a CV if somebody is going up really just based on teaching, that’s a really hard thing to put on a CV. Let’s say you’re an extraordinary teacher, but you didn’t have a very good publication record, and you were doing tons of community service, you should meet this requirement. Without at least an option for a statement, I don’t think that there’s any way for a person to make that case… Concern about 15-20 years

I worry that someone who has 20-30, maybe 40 years being denied emeritus because they raised hell at the end of their career. It would be a horrible way to end your career. Question if it has to go to Board of Governors (it does with Tenure and Promotion). The answer is that it does not. I would make the case that should be taken out.

A: …X is right. There is nothing in the UNC Policy Manual or The Code regarding that. Emeritus Status is not even in the Policy unless you are a Board of Governor member. It’s up to us and I will take this back to the committee. The reason we are doing two meetings – it’s not required—but we think both of these last two things are very important and we want more feedback.

In response to one of X’s points and I agree, the removal of the college and the problematic part. I’d ask people to consider and give feedback if an appeal process were available for the person who did the nominating or the person up for emeritus status. We were trying not to avoid the college, but to shorten the process for the individual. We don’t want the chance that two individuals can over-ride a committee of peers… But would an appeal process be a worthwhile balance. I don’t need an answer now, or if you want to send us some information or debate it now.

Q/C: It seems to me like one of the things. I agree with x on the opportunity to make your case and I thought that was allowed in here…attach supplemental information?

A: It’s not disallowed, but it could be written more clearly that the candidate has the option of adding a statement…

Q/C: Ability to apply for grants is one of the things that CRC wanted feedback from the full Senate.

Q/C: Point that you are competing for grant money with somebody who is retired.

A: Or that you are tenured track and not yet tenured -

Discussion continued.

Q/C: I like the idea of it being there, but I also like the idea of it being with remaining funds…I’m trying to imagine the committee trying to evaluate one of those applications and knowing you are making a decision (unclear) at the beginning of their career as opposed to the end. I don’t know how you make that choice because we don’t ever have any extra money sitting around. Maybe the committee can consider making that remaining resources or additional resources…it says remain professionally active and I like that phrase in there… It’s not giving instructions to the committee about how to make that choice.

Q/C: I wonder do the people who make these decisions know who is tenure track and who is emeritus? They may not even know.

A: I can address when CRC addressed this at their most recent meeting what was the final conclusion was that we are not trying to say one deserves it more or less; that they should just be eligible to apply the same as others. We believe the Chancellor’s Travel Fund as a group should discuss as a group what their prioritizations are. That we aren’t trying to dictate how it’s done, but that the groups who are determining funding for their own purposes identify priorities.

Discussion continued.

Q/C: Point that we should eagerly include everybody and then fight for enough funding. Rather than throwing lines around tenure track and this sort of thing. We should be fighting the battle in a different spot.

Q/C: The publicity that the university derives from retired faculty can be very beneficial.

Discussion continued. The discussion items will be taken back to Collegial Review members for more discussion.

**Post Tenure Review Policies and Procedures** was discussed next. This resolution is brought for a first reading for discussion and feedback.

In trying to make sure they were in compliance with the changes to the UNC policy on review of tenured faculty there was more detail that was added in. Some procedural aspects were added and the reappointment and tenure and promotion process and the stages and when they occur were incorporated. The UNC policy did pass.

Requirements:

1. We are now required to have three potential outcomes of the review: Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations or Does Not Meet Expectations.

2. The dean must take an evaluative review. They will evaluate the Post Tenure review.

3. All involved in Post Tenure review are to have directional goals. Sometimes referred to as 5-year plan, but it is not written this way in the UNC Policy.

The directional goals must:

1. Contain milestones,
2. Be referenced or used in annual faculty evaluations

There are additional things such as the provost has to certify yearly that we are in compliance. There is training that is required to be done at the institution, as well as training material to be provided from the UNC system.

McNelis explained they made sure they met these criteria and adjusted to having three categories as above. They included the dean in the process. It’s a peer’s committee, department head and dean that will review. There was much discussion on the three decisions (not recommendations) according to the Policy and on what is the final outcome. They decided to present that the most common outcome from the three groups is to be the final outcome. Should three different groups have three different outcomes that the Exceeds and Meets will balance off to be a decision of Meets Expectations?

They do not plan to implement. Everyone is expected to meet this process immediately starting in those who come up for post tenure review in the next academic year, 2015-2016. When you have the post tenure review is when you will develop your directional goals. What is required is that those directional goals have to be approved by your department head. This is UNC system policy. If you receive tenure next year at that time you talk with your department head about directional goals. As an example: If you come up for post tenure review in 3 years, you will be reviewed on our current process. When done with post tenure review, you would work on your directional goals with your department head. Our department heads cannot handle completely changing over everyone who is tenured right now in this first year, so we’re trying to stagger it to give everyone an opportunity. Additionally, our CRDs need to change to include the policy changes at the UNC system.

CRC Chair McNelis explained we do not know what a directional goals plan looks like and the institution or the Collegial Review Committee do not want to tell you what that looks like although they would like to work with the department heads next year to develop a best practices document.

The CRC is planning a forum in early April prior to the next Faculty Senate meeting so all faculty will have the opportunity to have read the documents or the summary of the post tenure review changes and attend the forum for discussion. McNelis encouraged Senators to go out and ask their peers for feedback and talk to departments at departmental meeting. She offered to attend or have someone attend departmental meetings to discuss this topic if requested. This is an important decision. We don’t have the best options, but we would like to give the faculty the best options with the requirements that we have.

Q/C: If an evaluation in the post tenure review process is based on criteria in the departmental CRD, not based on the directional goals, there should be reflection on the directional goals, but that is not the basis of the evaluation. The basis of the evaluation is CRDs.

Q/C: I think you did a good job this- as I read through it, that message came through loud and clear.

A: We tried to set up the review process that deference was always given to the committee or peer committee. As the decisions went up, if you disagree with the decisions at the lower level you had to justify why.

Q/C: I would like to support that. I can see why from an outside point of view having the department and dean have a role makes sense from an efficiency view, but having two people…I like having this system (unclear).

Q/C: Limit on the brief reflective summary. Concern that in ten years ‘brief ‘might be interpreted as 10 pages.

Other concern is the 3-member committee and some accommodation of the fact that one of the three might be up for post tenure review themselves and that it should be 3 exclusive of (unclear).

Q/C: The tenure document, etc. does that include a place for a personal statement there? Is that limited? It seems like that language could potentially be incorporated into this document there.

Q/C: One concern is the way that we’ve done this…is that there’s no place where the buck stops. Given that we are saying the majority of the decision is right. Even if we had set up a hierarchal process, the department, the committee, department head, dean and we’re at 2 – 1.

Q/C: Is the goal now to exceed? … It might be helpful to clarify that still meeting expectations is still really, really good? …I don’t know if that’s a philosophical or policy level sentence, but I think that might be useful especially if trying to keep things consistent across departments…it may be for Best Practices…

Q/C: I know in Senate we had tried to talk about Exceeds with some sort of reward and it states in both UNC Policy and everything that it is to be recognized and I think x had mentioned salary bump and we had discussed that and it’s not done elsewhere in the system and we were thinking that legally, it isn’t okay for us to make that statement because it depends on whether or not funding is allowed for that earmarked matter from the legislature. We tried to decide what could you get then, to make the ‘Exceeds’ seem extra good, to be clear that ‘Meets’ is perfectly fine. There was no solution that we found and right now, other than with word choice there’s not much difference between meets or exceeds. It’s kind of like the 2-tiered again which was satisfactory, unsatisfactory that we had previously.

Discussion continued.

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

They are in the process of discussing issues around fixed term faculty. They plan to meet with the chair of the CRC to see if some of the discussions that the two council are having may overlap. At the past meeting they were presented with a proposal for changes to processes for graduate faculty status. They did not vote on it, but they anticipate they will vote in April and will bring the resolution to the next Faculty Senate meeting. They will be talking about the results of the recent salary study.

They have also been discussing and working toward getting all the Graduate School Council on the ballot for Faculty Senate so all elections could be on one ballot.

Rules Committee / David McCord, Chair:

No report.

Senate Chair Report / Chair Leroy Kauffman:

Chair Kauffman sent Senate a copy of an announcement about an AAUP meeting in Greensboro. There are copies of the announcement available at today’s meeting.

The COACHE survey will close on April 10th. We will see the summary results and the results of the last three surveys are also available for viewing through OIPE.

The Priority Access Registration group has met twice and they are working bringing something to Senate, possibly at the April meeting.

The April Senate meeting will also be the meeting where the Senate chair is blessed with being able to make appointments to various committees. Last year, the chair got wide counsel in form of a ballot from the Senate to help with those appointments. They will be doing that. The Senate Chair or Senate appoints various people to some committees. Chair Kauffman gave a summary of the committees and the spots on each committee that are open and need to be filled. He will be sending out a list prior to the next Senate meeting and an election will be held at the meeting.

Faculty Senate elections are coming along. The ballet goes out this Friday through CONEC.

The next Faculty Assembly meeting will be in a couple of weeks. They will be organizing the Assembly for next year and will be electing a chair-elect. The Faculty Assembly has 2, 3, 4 and 5 delegate’s schools. WCU has three delegates. They will select someone to be part of the Faculty Assembly Executive from the three delegates group. There is a Chair, Secretary, Parliamentarian and at least one person from each of five groups to be selected. An alternate will be elected for WCU this year.

OTHER\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

New Business:

None.

The meeting adjourned.

|  |
| --- |
| **Voting Record for March 25, 2015 Faculty Senate Meeting** |
| **Senator** | **Graduate Enrollment**  | **Writing Anthology** | **Disallowing Proxy** | **Database** |
| Kia Asberg | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| Bob Beaudet | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| David Belcher |  |  |  |  |
| Lisa Bloom | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| Shawn Collins | Aye | Aye | Nay | Nay |
| Christopher Cooper | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| David Dorondo | Aye | Aye | Aye | Abstain |
| Jeanne R. Dulworth | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| Yang Fan | Aye | Aye | Aye | Nay |
| George Ford | Abstain | Abstain | Abstain | Abstain |
| Katy Ginanni | Aye | Aye | Abstain | Abstain |
| AJ Grube | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| David Henderson | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| Mary Jean Herzog | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| Ian Hewer | Aye | Aye | Aye | Abstain |
| Beth Huber | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| Leroy Kauffman | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| Will Lehman | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| Alvin Malesky | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| David McCord | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| Erin McNelis | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| Alison Morrison-Shetlar |  |  |  |  |
| Bob (Robert F.) Mulligan | Aye | Aye | Aye | Nay |
| Peter Tay | Aye | Nay | Aye | Nay |
| Karyn Tomczak |  |  |  |  |
| Cheryl Waters-Tormey | Aye | Aye | Aye | Nay |
| Tonya M. Westbrook | Aye | Aye | Aye | Aye |
| John Whitmire | Aye | Aye | Aye | Nay |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Aye** | 24 | 23 | 22 | 15 |
| **Nay** | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |