**MINUTES**

***March 26, 2014***

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

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

ROLL CALL

Present:

Andrew Adams, Kia Asberg, Shawn Collins, Yang Fan, Katy Ginanni, Mary Jean Herzog, Beth Huber, Leroy Kauffman, Rebecca Lasher, Will Lehman, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Justin Menickelli, Steve Miller, Alison Morrison-Shetlar, Malcolm Powell, Kathy Starr, Wes Stone, Karyn Tomczak, Cheryl Waters-Tormey, John Whitmire

Members with Proxies:

Lisa Bloom, Christopher Cooper, George Ford, AJ Grube, Leigh Odom, David Hudson

Members Absent:

David Belcher

Recorder:

Ann Green

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

Approval of the Minutes

Motion:

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of February 20, 2013 were approved as presented.

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

Chancellor’s Report/David Belcher:

No Report

**Digital Measures Update/Andrew Adams:**

The Digital Measures database implementation is delayed by one year. Andrew states four reasons for this. First, there was no university policies use of the database. The 20-20 Vision 4.2.4 says, “Ensure that all faculty and staff understand performance evaluation processes and criteria.” Many faculty members expressed confusion and nervousness about the implementation. Second, we need to define university-wide data needs. Thirdly, we want to look closer at College of Business and College of Education and Allied Professions to learn from their experience with the implementations. Lastly, we don’t want to have to go through a re-implementation process because university policies were not initially set. So, we are working on defining university-wide needs, reassessing current use, defining roles, and preparing training guides. Programs can implement earlier if they wish, but only after university policies and data needs are set in place and the steering committee and associate provost are okay with it.

Q/A: Can anybody go in now and put data in there? It’s just not mandatory?

A: Not everybody, because of contractual agreements with Digital Measures. Some programs just aren’t online yet and the original Council of Deans implementation schedule was related to contractual issues. So, not all faculty are able to go in.

Q/A: If you do go on and put it in now, what can you do with it? Can you do any reports?

A: Typically, the annual faculty evaluation states are going to stay the same even if we rename it or move it around. You could put stuff in there now and it will stay there.

General Education Council Update/Erin McNelis:

Recommendations were made to President Ross in January about formally recommending the two competencies: critical thinking and written communication. Also, it was recommended to pursue working with Educational Testing Services (ETS) to develop an instrument to be used by the campuses to assess those two competencies. Things have not been completely detailed because it requires approval from the Board of Governors to even pursue that. An academic affairs representative presented to a sub-committee of the Board of Governors at their last meeting. She must present to the full board in April. They will determine then whether or not we get permission to follow up. Ongoing, as far as the UNC strategic initiatives, was a pilot testing of the Collegiate Learning Assessment Plus (CLA Plus)—given to freshman in the fall and seniors in the spring. Western is one of the five institutions participating. Part of the pilot was whether we like the CLA Plus, but it was mostly geared towards issues that would arise from administering the test to large groups of people across the system. Other pilots are to inform us on issues that could arise if any portfolio were used to collect material for assessing those two competencies. Updates should come later. A proposal should indicate that the board brings its money into resources. As we stated in our resolution, we didn’t want those resources coming at the expense of any academics or programs.

SGA/Colton Overcash:

SGA is working on a campus safety committee to help improve sense of security on campus. Next weekend, Association of Student Government will be hosting their monthly meeting. Four reps from each of the UNC system schools will be on campus. Starting the week after next, we will be campaigning for senate, president, and vice president. The following week, elections will be held and results will be announced that Wednesday.

Staff Senate/Robin Hitch:

The scholarship fundraiser yard sale will be held April 12 in the Ramsey Center from 8-2 pm. Staff Senate elections end on Monday the 31st. Staff “Days of Service” during Spring Break was a success and the e-newsletter will be out next week.

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

The order of the meeting was changed at this point to allow the Collegial Review Council report to go first.

Collegial Review Council (CRC)/Steve Miller, Chair

A graph drafted by Laura Cruz was shown. It is a response to the likely requirement of certification of faculty readiness to teach online. This is not going to be voted on in April, but we want input from the Senate.

Laura Cruz: This is a response to a GA mandated taskforce on the issue of quality in online education. They have asked for certification for faculty readiness to teach online and that efforts are in place to make sure faculty have resources they need in case they are not certified. Also, for students, that we will have a process in place to certify that they are able and ready to take an online course. We are, as a system, ahead on student-readiness. We don’t currently do anything institution-wide to look at faculty readiness. It was talked about with the council that when teaching qualifications are discussed, that we leave it at the level of programs. Details will follow up about specifically how it will manifest itself. Understanding questions about the word ‘certification’, I would propose using the word ‘endorse’ as a more neutral alternative.

Q/C: I thought there already was a system in place for training faculty for online courses.

A from Laura Cruz: Not at all

Q/C: So when I first came here years ago, we used Webcat at the time and I remember doing something that was training.

A from Laura Cruz: We have lots of things that are voluntary, partly in response to training for Blackboard. It is strictly voluntary and not reportable.

Q/C: One thing that strikes me as a bit interesting about leaving it at the department level is that it can vary from nothing to very intense as the University’s endorsement of a faculty that’s ready. One department says, “You have a heartbeat and a pulse…you can do it.”

A from Laura Cruz: Yes, that was intentionally intended to be flexible. The idea is that no one knows how to teach well online. In your program or discipline, I wouldn’t know how to teach accounting, for example, and it needs to stay at that level of subject.

Discussion continues…

Q/C: If we, as a senate, did not want it to look like that and we wanted something more official, and more at the university level, then that would require resources we just don’t have right now. There is no way that the Coulter Faculty Commons could train every faculty.

Q/C: Is there any conversation in SACS about how this is handled? As a department head who does not teach online courses myself, what are we envisioning for department heads that don’t do that to endorse or certify their faculty?

A from Laura Cruz: Yes. You don’t have to have experience. Coulter Faculty Commons will offer options. So if you want to say, “If a faculty member wants to be certified you take a Blackboard training, you can.” There are things in place you can simply point them to. You don’t have to have anything specific.

Discussion continues about how the word ‘endorse’ should be used instead of ‘certification’.

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

**1. VOTE ON DISCONTINUATION OF EDS-EDUCATION SPECIALIST PROGRAM**

**Yes: 25**

**No: 1**

**Abstained: None**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**See Attachment 1 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

**2. VOTE ON DISCONTINUATION OF MAED-COMMUNITY COLLEGE ADMINSTRATION PROGRAM**

**Yes: 26**

**No: 0**

**Abstained: None**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**See Attachment 1 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

Q/C: Why not discontinue it?

A: We don’t want to cut off any possible routes to licensure.

**3. VOTE ON INACTIVATION OF POST BACHELOR’S CERTIFICATE-MIDDLE GRADES EDUCATION PROGRAM**

**Yes: 26**

**No: 0**

**Abstained: None**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**See Attachment 1 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

**4. VOTE ON DELETION OF TELECOMMUNICATIOS MINOR**

**Yes: 26**

**No: 0**

**Abstained: None**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**See Attachment 1 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

Resolutions from SGA

Colton Overcash: Chancellors List Resolution. To amend students being taken away from the Dean’s list in each college include a sub-clause it would be a supplement to the Dean’s list. Give students a competitive edge.

Q/C: Are there any other UNC schools that have a similar list?

A: Yes, there are at least 3

Q/C: Is the 3.8 GPA overall?

A: Just like the Dean’s list, it would be a semester GPA. This would be a reward or incentive for achievement.

Q/C: Do you have to be full time?

A: Yes, 12 hours. Basically follows same stipulations for Dean’s list, just a higher GPA (3.5 for Deans List).

Q/C: Why 3.8 rather than other cut-offs?

A: Other models have been looked at to reflect this.

Q/C: Is this for honors graduates and graduates?

A: Yes, both honors graduations and graduates.

Q/C: Would this be for graduate and undergraduate?

A: Originally it would be for any full-time student, but if that is something the body is not in favor of we can amend that.

Q/C: I think this would be for just undergraduate. There is no Dean’s list for graduates right now.

Q/C: I would suggest a friendly amendment that all instances of the word ‘student’ be changed to ‘undergraduate’.

Q/C: APRC did vote to forward the resolution.

**5. VOTE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF CHANCELLOR’S LIST**

**Yes: 26**

**No: 0**

**Abstained: None**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**See Attachment 1 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

A+ Resolution

Discussion continued. The APRC did vote to support the resolution.

Ryan Hermance: As most of you know, this is not the first time this has come up. This is SGA’s third time bringing this resolution.

Kevin Grimes: In times past, it hasn’t been presented in the most complimentary fashion. We know that you know much more about application processes that we tried to present before. We feel it is out obligation to address the GPA. The biggest concern had been grade inflation. We looked into the issue and have concluded that inflation will not be a problem at this university. To keep that from happening, we have capped the GPA at 4.0. Currently, there is nothing to balance out an A-. All other letter grades are balanced out, so there is an uneven balance at the top. Issue of fairness and recognition. Students who put in extra effort should be recognized accordingly. Implementing A+ will distinguish high-achieving Western students. Honors College Board unanimously supported the A+ resolution. UNCG implemented A+ in 2006 and reported no negative issues since that implementation. Again, grade inflation has been the biggest concern. An A+ will not directly attribute to grade inflation. If students have to opportunity to receive the grade they will work harder to achieve that grade. Also, employers are starting to look at GPA more and more to separate the weak and the high-achieving. If other universities are awarding there students A+, we are at a disadvantage in the career world and grad school.

Allison McAndrews: With the A+ resolution, we would hope that is would curb the worry of student too easily getting an A+

Q/C: Can we get some guidance from the Registrar?

A: Some UNC Schools weight the A+ while others do not. The Regitrar at NC State has made their transcripts a mess going back and forth from weighing and not weighing. Greensboro has adopted a policy aligned with this resolution. They cap it at a 4.0. An easier implementation would be to go in and weight it instead of capping it—it makes it harder to calculate. If you can’t discern readily from the transcript then someone could call the whole transcript into question.

Q/C: Are we saying that the A+ is 97-100?

A: It is faculty dicretion.

Q/C: What about honors students who are already doing contracts who wish to go above an beyond for an A+? Do they do double the work? Do they double dip? Does it make it harder for the honors students?

A: Honors students wouldn’t see that as an issue. We want the A+ to show students are invested in these courses.

Q/C: There are dicrepencies whether some of the UNC schools actually offer A+. I’m concerned about that statement in the original resolution.

A: That was information we got at the time the original resolution was being written. They might have changed since then. This was information from SGA to SGA contact.

Q/C: What about deleting the A-?

A: We talked about that, but we saw it as a fairness issue. The A+ would give students the initiative rather than just staying at an A.

Q/C: If an A is 90-100, faculty members are going to make it that much harder to make an A. To where students who put in effort but can’t reach an A, can make an A-

Discussion continues.

**6. CALLING THE QUESTION VOTE**

**Yes: 22**

**No: 2**

**Abstained: 2**

**7. VOTE ON A+ RESOLUTION**

**Yes: 5**

**No: 21**

**Abstained: None**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**See Attachment 1 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

The charge of the LSC and UCC was to recommend to the senate whether or not we should accept the General Education proposal. Their recommendation was no. The task is to vote on whether or not to implement the General Education report as it was presented.

Q/C: If we did vote to implement it, are there a lot of other implications in that we aren’t set up, we don’t have the resources, etc.?

A: The proposal did not suggest how everything should be paid for.

Discussion continues about the taskforce and their goals and charges.

A proposal was made to not implement the proposal. It was seconded. A discussion began.

Q/C: The general ed taskforce came to a consensus to present the senate with vision of a general ed program that you could possibly asses while meeting the new goals of the university. At the time, that did not include many of the same goals as there are now. The general ed program presents a smaller program that helps to seek out ways like service learning to tell GA and SACS where the students get the experience. The gen ed program that was made two years ago will not work now. Now, we need to assess the current program and the question is what we do next. What do we want the university to look like 5 years from now? It is hopeful that the upcoming assessment would address the concerns in the proposal.

Q/C: One of the concerns several years ago is that the current program was not accessible in any way that SACS would recognize.

A: That is going to present itself again. The current liberal studies program was written when our obsession with assessment was at a very different place. So when I came here in 2006 and came on that committee, SACs is coming, we have to assess this program, everybody said, “What does that mean?” So the miracle there was not that the assessment showed flaws and the assessibility of the program, the miracle was that the assessment was done. I think we’re going to run into that again this time, but to a lesser extent. Thanks to QEP, thanks to a lot of different things, we have a lot better idea of how assessment works. Perspective categories are still going to be a nightmare. We are trying to determine what in that liberal studies document we can get in a coherent sense so we know what changes we can make.

Q/A: (To Alison Morrison-Shetlar) The idea of having an assessment of gen ed or liberal studies initially came out of the provost office and then because of things the provost said, “Let’s set this aside” The faculty senate said no, so then we have the task force and the report and everything and I was just wondering if you would be willing to kind of reflect your perspective to relook at liberal studies and restructure it. The way it came about from gen ed to liberal studies came from a mandate from the Provost office. It said to look at the gen ed program and the directive and see what we can do better. For about three years we developed the liberal studies program. Are you sensing there is a need to do something? Do you want to get a better feel for it?

A: I think there are several things to set in place. One: Getting stability so that we are all moving in the same direction. Two: Any gen ed or liberal studies really needs to be looked at on a regular basis, and it looks like it hasn’t been in a really long time. I think there are a whole bunch of conflicting things that resulted in, “Let's hold back”. I do not have the depth of knowledge to completely answer your question. I look forward with the opportunity to look at it and look forward. Knowing that we have SACS coming up, it is not the right time to change a gen ed program, but it is the right time to make sure we have an assessment in place that can inform the next move on gen ed. I agree with the waiting, but that does not mean we shouldn’t be working on it. We need to have the evidence from our current program in place and that is more crucial than probably most of us know. If we’ve already been dinged on not doing assessment in gen ed, that is a huge red flag that impacts the whole quality of our curriculum and how it is perceived. I would hope that this group would endorse the notion to supporting people to make sure that we have a good assessment of our current lib studies program.

The motion is to not implement the recommendations from the task force.

**8. VOTE TO NOT IMPLEMENT THE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE GENERAL ED TASKFORCE**

**Yes: 23**

**No: 0**

**Abstained: 0**

**Did Not Vote: 3**

**See Attachment 1 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

**Collegial Review Council: Steve Miller, Chair**

Resolution 4- Clarification of language in Faculty Handbook 4.07 on time in rank requirements for promotion. There is no change in policy, just a clarification in language. The language was unclear before and could be interpreted in different ways.

Discussion was held clarifying the changes to the Faculty Handbook 4.07 regarding tenure and promotion. Specifically, 6 b. discussing eligibitly of promotion language was changed.

**9. VOTE ON RESOLUTION 4 WITH AMENDMENT**

**Yes: 26**

**No: 0**

**Abstained: 0**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**See Attachment 1 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

There will be a continuation of this meeting in an overflow meeting, next week, April 2nd.

