**MINUTES**

***January 27, 2010, 3:00 -5:00 p.m.***

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

ROLL CALL

Present:

John Bardo, Mary Kay Bauer, Richard Beam, Heidi Buchanan, Kyle Carter, David Claxton, Beverly Collins, Chris Cooper, Terre Folger, Eleanor Hilty, John Hodges, Christopher Hoyt, Rebecca Lasher, Frank Lockwood, Ron Mau, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Sean O’Connell, Jane Perlmutter, Philip Sagner, Jack Sholder, Jack Summers, Vicki Szabo, Michael Thomas, Chuck Tucker, Laura Wright

Members with Proxies:

Wayne Billon, Jane Eastman, David Hudson, Barbara St. John, Cheryl Waters-Tormey

Members absent:

Steven Ha, Elizabeth McRae,

Recorder:

Ann Green

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

Motion:

A correction was received by email and a corrective footnote was added to the December 3rd and December 10th meeting minutes. Motion was made to approve the minutes of December 3rd and 10th as amended. The motion was seconded and passed by majority with no further discussion.

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

Report from Chancellor John Bardo:

I just wanted to spend a minute or two with you updating you on what we know and don’t know about where the state is… The state’s economic situation is still very dicey. Unemployment actually

went up last month rather than down, I believe if I remember the number correctly, we are running

about 11.6%. There are individual counties that are really, really bad -- they tend to be peripheral counties, rural counties. But there are also very significant pockets of unemployment,

heavy unemployment in the greater Charlotte area and in the Old Fort, Marion- that whole Morganton

area. These are two of the areas from which we draw students and it is certainly something that can impact us and something that we need to be aware of. Collections have been a little better than expected in terms of tax revenues, but I would not encourage you to get excited about that at this stage. The biggest month for tax revenues is April and until we really know what the income taxes look like in the state, we won’t know a lot about what the legislature has to work with in the budget.

What we do know is because of all the unemployment, Medicaid is up about $250 million from

what was expected. Things are going to remain difficult in the state and just be aware of that.

I don’t think that is new news to anyone, it is just so you know what I know about where we are.

The other is that the letter that I sent out, sending those letters is not a fun way to start the semester.

The reason for that is when you look at a university and talk about the buildings and talk about the equipment that we have and the nifty props and other things that we have, the realities are that the bottom line is that if we do not have our people, we do not have anything. And so what we are trying to do this semester is to slow down our spending and collect as many positions as we can so

that if in fact there is a budget cut as I anticipate there will be, that we won’t have to do lay-offs.

That if we have to do them at all they are minimal. It really is an effort to try to preserve the people of the University. I know that using old computers isn’t fun and not having a piece of equipment that you would really like to have to be able to expand your work isn’t good, but the alternative is not having the people. If you look at our budget the way that it is structured, roughly 70% of the gross

budget is in academic affairs, roughly 30% of the budget is in other divisions. Of that 30% a pretty significant percentage of that is in some costs, meaning that we have to keep light, water, internet connections, etc. and when you look at personnel, almost 75% of personnel costs are in academic

affairs. So there is no way to get where we need to be without some pain in academic affairs, there is just no way around it . At the same time I have had Chuck not fill positions, any of the maintainers that leave, a lot of the physical plant people that leave, we are just not filling those positions at all.

We will get to a stage that we will have to fill some of those, but if we have to have an electrician to keep the lights on, we’ll have to hire somebody. Right now we are spreading our people around. The reorganization has occurred in all other areas except academic affairs. Because of the complexity here giving Kyle time here to do what he needs to do with the administrative aspects-to look at all of the administrative options. The reality of it is, is there is a push by the President to rationalize and minimize administration. That is what we are all doing. Western is in a better position than others and that we didn’t really grow the administration that much as we grew the University. Our administrative load if I remember correctly Kyle is the lowest in the system but that doesn’t mean that

we still do not have to go back and do it again. That’s where we are, we will continue to go through all of this process. My intent is to preserve as many of our current people as we can as we go through this so that we don’t have to deal with layoffs and that is why the local version of a freeze. This is not a state mandated freeze as it was last year as there was no choice. This is our option to try to collect money, to manage what we know is likely to be a problem out there. What does that mean? If there is a position that we have to fill it is we fill. It isn’t a matter of saying well it’s a hard freeze, we can’t touch it, the governor has to approve it. I approve several this morning, but the notion being

that I am asking the Provost and each Vice Chancellors to say-yea I have to have this because….there is no way around it, we have got to fill that position. So understand this is an internal, let’s collect the money and see if we can preserve our people, rather than the Governor saying absolutely under no circumstances can you hire. Now that still could come later in the year, but we’re trying to be rational and reasonable with it and move forward. If you hear in your areas that you represent, that there is a position that became vacant that really needs to be filled. Bring it on forward. We are not going to say absolutely no way. It does mean that if there is a flex or possibility to delay it, we will probably do this. It is all about preserving the people. I hate layoffs.

I hate them. There is no way around it, it is just not good. It is not good for the people to get laid off, it is not good for the institution and so it is the last thing in my mind to do, so you try to preserve as much as you can.

Comment from Kyle Carter:

Faculty searches this Spring are not affected, because they are applying for next fiscal year. We’re

talking about hires through June 30th.

Comment from Chancellor Bardo:

Now if a faculty member leaves I’m looking at it as-is that a position that you really need to fill or

could you delay it a year if you need to. Is there a demand that requires it, but we’re not being, it is

is not a “heck no” or “no way” type response. It’s a let’s be rational, let’s be reasonable about it.

If there is a piece of equipment that is absolutely critical, we’re going to figure it out. If it is something that would be nice to have-let’s delay it.

Comment: I’m curious if you’ve been greater flexibility in how to spend, did you secure that?

Chancellor Bardo: There is some flexibility that we have and some flexibility that we don’t have.

For example faculty salaries really do have to be spent on faculty salaries. For example-if I collect

a fee for health services and health services just does not use all the money this year that they collected, I can’t take that money and put it on computers. That is not legal. In this case that actually happened this year so we did not go for an increase in health services next year, knowing that we already have a bit of a surplus and we could absorb additional expenses with this surplus. The categorical money is still very much the categorical money. I do not see the state changing that.

We have what is called full budget flexibility. Which means within the state operating budget, we can move a lot of money from, if Kyle needs to buy a computer and the money was originally in

operations, he can move that money and do that. We can do that. But as far as if we’ve got money to build a building I can’t hire faculty, that is not legal. But it is also true with every fee. I can’t move money between fee accounts. So if housing has a surplus this year and athletics is in a deficit, I can’t

take housing and put it into athletics. Neither one of those are state funds. I still can’t do that. I don’t see that state changing that. In fact given the tower structure changes in the state I think there will probably be more control than last year. The people who are empowered in the senate, tend to be more reliable and focused.

Comment: John is there any sense as to what might develop regarding tuition requests?

Chancellor Bardo: The tuition request is an interesting issue. The budget this year calls for

an 8% across the board tuition increase, that all funds will go to the general fund of the state

meaning we would not see the money as any kind of increase in revenue towards the University.

The Speaker of the House and the President Pro-Tem of the Senate agreed to let the President

to put in an alternative strategy, which is a campus initiated tuition which we would see as increased revenue. We’re not allowed to use that campus initiated tuition for salary increases, we have to use half of it for fee based financial aid and half of it to support program development. Not that doesn’t mean however that within those funds if one of you were to get a job offer and in order to keep you

here we would counter with an offer. We can use these funds for that, but we were specifically instructed to not use these funds for salary increases. But that will go to the legislature as a recommendation to the Board of Governors. So there will be two tuition issues in front of the legislature. The current one which is an 8% increase to go to the general fund or the alternative

which will be a 6.5% increase which will go back to the University. It puts the Legislature in an

interesting position because there struggling with income, at the same time our proposal will cost the students less and this is an election year. That’s where we are.

Thank you all very much and if there are other things that I can answer, I would be happy to do so.

Faculty Assembly/David Claxton and Beverly Collins:

We were suppose to leave tomorrow for the faculty assembly meeting in Chapel Hill, but it has been called off due to the impending bad weather. Erin sent out an email asking for any input from you

on one issue that they would like for us to bring with us the next time we do go to the assembly and

that is a request for good ideas. Specifically as we’re dealing with the budget issues some things that we think need to be maintained with the money that we do have left, we want to preserve. And there

was another request and that was a view from the front lines, specifically stories about students and

the impact the economic crisis is having on their ability to come to school, stay in school and get the courses they need. If you have any good examples of how this financial crisis has impacted students, if you would email that to Beverly, Richard or me and we can take those stories down to Chapel Hill

or email them down there to the chair of the faculty assembly. And likewise if you have some important issues that you think we really need to support and I did receive one from Brian Railsback,

if there are other issues that you would like us to bring up down there please do that.

Comment: I think John, you and Kyle may want to correct me, one thing that is apparently being looked at very seriously is what is generic individual centers, which somebody has decided to include the Honors College. So that is somewhat threatened as a number of other centers both our campus and across the system.

Chancellor Bardo: Yea that is coming out of the Governor’s office and they are looking at what they are calling scrubbing the budget and so anything that somebody in that office determined was different, we (being everybody in the state, agency in the state), was asked to explain. And in the case of UNC with centers and institutes the Honors College was here.

Comment: All the centers and institutes that we have listed here, I think we mentioned the Coulter

Faculty, etc.

Comment: Oh Dear! That is just a wonderful resource.

Chancellor Bardo: Well there’s a lot of things that are wonderful on there. I honestly don’t think this is going to be an off-of-their heads kind of approach, but we may be called down to defend pieces I think that we have to defend. What also made it interesting is that a number of centers haven’t existed here for six to seven years and they hadn’t updated their records, so we also had to explain why certain centers did not have any budget at all, they obviously didn’t exist, but that sort of thing deals with cleaning up records as well. This went to every agency, this wasn’t just go pick on the Universities, they went through everybody’s budget and picked up things that they were trying to understand.

Comment: But please let me know we just strongly ask for support for the faculty center as we have had to go to online teaching, as we have had to change in technology, those people have just been wonderful.

Chancellor Bardo: If you look at them and you look at the Honors College, those things make no sense to me. They are just not logical, but they don’t know from a distance what it is.

Comment: David I did get a couple of ideas from people on our faculty. Do you just want me to give them to you later?

Comment: Yes, that’s fine.

Comment: I confess a certain prejudice on the adversity of this college. From what she has told me,

Not only is that obviously what I thought it was is apparently a very strong recruiting tool for us. But

at this point they have potentially committed more scholarship funds then what they actually have at this point. So they are concerned about our acceptance rate for those students are. And these are all really good students, they are not the low end of the spectrum. They are the cream, who have been admitted to Western and admitted to the Honors College, at hopes of getting the scholarship support.

SGA/Josh Cotton:

No report

Staff Senate/Brenda Holcombe:

No report

Employee Wellness Task Force-Angie Hagstrom Frederick:

Thank you for giving me just a few minutes and I promise that I will try to be brief. My name

is Angie Frederick and I am the new director of campus recreation and wellness. In addition

that I am a member of the employee wellness task force. Kelly Monteith is our campus leader for employee wellness on campus. We have some initiatives that we are trying to help people become more healthy and well. One thing that we’re trying to do with the employee wellness task force and campus recreation and wellness is to give people the opportunity for whatever reason cannot be a member. One of those things on this brochure which has information about campus recreation and wellness membership, opportunities for the campus recreation center and the other brochure is 411Fit

and it was developed by UNC-Charlotte. It is a free online program that you can track your nutrition,

exercise and it will give you feedback. Faculty members you may or may not appreciate that fact that at the end of the day it gives you a grade. One of the things that is nice about that is it tells you why you are getting that and how you need to improve your grade. In addition to 411Fit, we have a program which started a few years ago called the “Cross Training Challenge”. This is through the physical action committee which is a part of the student wellness council. We’ve expanded the program to anyone who would like to become a member on campus. It is totally free, you can track your exercise and there are recreational activities such as walking, running, swimming, cycling, etc.

You can also win prizes. You don’t have to do all of those things, the idea of this program is to

Experience a variety of exercising. I am just encouraging people to try something different that they have not tried before.

A couple of other things that I want to mention is that we have been working with publications, some of you may remember on the older maps of campus that there were some walking trails on there and with the construction they are no longer there. We have put together some new maps and these are on our website- wcu.edu, click on “we walk”. We have a 10,000 step program which we also have to offer, which includes a quarter mile walk, to a 5K walk. Which brings me to the last thing, we have teamed up with the student organization-National Student Speech Hearing and Language Association.

On April 17th we are going to be doing a 5K route on campus at 5:00 p.m Membership at the recreation center is $15.00/month or $60.00/semester through payroll deduction. We really do want to see people become healthy and well. And finally starting July 1st smoking will affect your benefits. We are offering employees help with this process to kick this habit if they choose to do so. February 22nd we will be starting a faculty/staff 3 week training session to help with this. Please check it out on our website.

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

**Academic Policy and Review Council:**

CurriculumChanges**-**All curriculum changes were approved

Report from Erin McNelis: APRC did meet and Wayne is currently following up on some information regarding gathering a task force that can select data on programs that have more than the maximum allowed number of credit hours generally due to accreditation issues and looking at other universities that are comparable and what are those programs size wise and everything else,

so to provide that data to the Liberal Studies task force for consideration when they are

looking at that.

Also discussed at the APRC meeting was the January mini-mester term. Beth Lofquist brought everyone up to date on that. Beth Lofquist shared that she will be sending out an email to let you know who is on the task force, so if you have questions or concerns, the task force members will be listed. The Associate Deans are representing your colleges so Beth requested that Senate members contact them if they have input. A question was raised as to whether or not other faculty members were on the task force and at this point there are not. Beth commented that if the college desired other representatives that would be fine. Discussion continued and Kyle Carter commented that it is really just an exploratory exercise right now and that any actions would come to Faculty Senate. Discussion continued and it was decided that Senate member, David McCord, will serve on the Task Force.

There was discussion of whether or not there would be any more changes coming up to the Academic Honesty Policy. Brian Gastle had talked about bringing something forward but had not been able to follow up yet, so that is in our potential future. Next time, Wayne will be following up with people on a task force data regarding the oversized programs just to get into liberal studies task force.

Comment from Beth Lofquist: Brian Gastle will be talking with the department heads at their workshop about this Academic Honesty and Appeals Procedure.

**Collegial Review Council / Mary Kay Bauer, Chair**

No Report

**Faculty Affairs Council / Frank Lockwood, Chair**

We’re moving forward with the issues of childcare, professional, we’ll meet in the spring to finish the Patent Policy & Jack is working on another resolution to how we’re doing grants so we can get more funding for grant work.

Comment: I thought we were going to create a resolution on that.

Comment: This is something that I wrote and has to do with faculty raising money from external sources for use in research and scholarly activities… Reference was made here to a written resolution.

The resolution says that senate is in support of faculty working to secure external funds from external agencies and it recognizes different characteristics of different granting agencies and two of these important characteristics are matching funds and indirect costs. Typically if a grant is acquired from a large source, the grant supports direct costs or indirect costs but does not require institutional match. Donations from smaller agencies typically require a match and do not provide indirect costs. If university establishes a mechanism for faculty members to apply for matching funds then they will in the future be able to bring larger grants in that provide indirect costs.

The proposal was made that the senate resolve the university not adopt policies that discourage faculty from applying for grants even if those grants do not support costs. Be it resolved that the university establish a trust fund to be committed when matching funds are required from granting agencies. Its important that these funds not be rolled up at the end of the year. Be it resolved that 10% of indirect costs received on grants be deposited to fund this trust fund for a year. I’d like to see the university establish a committee to administer these funds. Be it resolved that faculty requesting matching funds supply reviews of their proposal to the committee once the reviews become available. If faculty member requests money and puts in a proposal, the granting agency will review the proposal and give their candid and honest review of the merit of the science or the work and that information should be available for making future decisions. So be it resolved that review or evaluations from prior proposals be considered when deciding whether to commit money from these funds.

Comment from Richard Beam: This is, I assume, a report from the committee so it does not require a second.

Comment: We probably need to defer to the chancellor or the provost initially.

Comment from Kyle Carter: I think, all of us sitting around here are going to support the goals of what you’re trying to do and I think the first resolve, if anyone is putting a roadblock into grant applications that do not require indirect costs, I need to know about it, that shouldn’t happen. But there are some mechanical issues with what you’re proposing. Ten percent of the indirect costs coming into the institution right now would be less than $30,000 and that is not sufficient for a match. Also, I think that there are probably some issues with putting that into a trust fund. So, I would encourage you to think about not prescribing so much how to get it done, but talking about the goals that need to happen in order to accomplish what is very good here and also I’m a little hesitant to support the idea of a committee determining whether a researcher would get match funds. In my experience it has typically been a dean or a provost. I think that what you’re saying is, we need to have some resource to provide a match. The goals seem good but the specific suggestions of how we accomplish them would be problematic for us to be able to implement.

Comment from John Bardo: I also think you would be disappointed at the amount of money available for match if you did that and so the way that I have dealt with match has to do with the fundamental question of where is the match coming from, not a particular source because our indirect costs are so low that we’re not even really covering our basics much less having money we can transfer. That money needs to come up and then we’ll spread the money around more and it does become a viable tool but a lot of match, we actually would do through faculty alternative release. What we might do, in terms of one time money, depending on the nature of what is needed, Kyle might have, as a result of faculty salaries that we haven’t hired or a person was a little cheaper than we thought in terms of salary, he might pull it out of that. There may be fifty different sources. I too agree that the encouragement of match where feasible, absolutely. I would encourage you too not be quite so descriptive. I would support, whole-heartedly, the Senate encourages wherever feasible, match money to be made available because it is to the institutions advantage.

Comment: I think that even if there is a very small amount of money available from this, I think it would be good a mechanism in place where faculty feel that they have a buy-in, where if they get a grant, some of that money would go towards helping Junior colleagues who are going to be trying to find sources of matching funds. I would just like to see some mechanism put into place.

Comment: Let me explain where we are hoping to move to, Chancellor and I have been working with Scot on this for some time. There are models that there was essentially revenue sharing of indirect costs that came on a grant, a specific amount would come back to the department or even the principal investigator. The problem that we have right now is that our total indirect costs is around $280,000 and with the inflexibility of the state budget, we cannot spend state dollars on a lot of things so we have to find resources that can be sued for those things and historically we have taken some of the money from the indirect costs to do that. We need to accumulate more indirect costs to be able to spend it in a different way and as we do that, we can begin to share more with the faculty and that can be an incentive to do more. There are some mechanisms that we can look at into in terms of the matching. We want to do exactly what you’re talking about.

Comment from John Bardo: I would ask you to modify the document to say “faculty-generated grants.” Many of the grants are not generated by faculty members and therefore, the actual money available would be even less. It would be unfair to say that all the money generated, even if the grant is written by student affairs, would go into faculty pool as oppose to going into an institutional pool. If you limit it to faculty generated grants, it would be less money but it would make your point in terms of having commitment to that. I recognize your point and I want to honor it but let’s do it in a way that doesn’t hurt others.

Comment: There are lots of demands of these funds and it might be appropriate to set some levels, once indirect costs reach a certain threshold, a significant portion could go into this reserve and setting destinations for the funds at different levels.

Comment from John Bardo: Absolutely, and that is very much where this conversation has been. We’ve been trying to understand, what is the institutional floor? Remember indirect costs actually the reason those are negotiated is the reason has nothing to do with the grant itself, it has to do with the cost to the state of managing the grant. For example, when you put through a purchase order, state employees put through that purchase order so the negotiated rate is supposed to account for their time… There is a flexibility and we’ve been trying to get at what is the institutional level that meets the general demand and then let’s be very flexible above that. At the same time, I understand what X is trying to do and I would like to honor that. The key from my perspective in terms of supporting is that it would be faculty generated and faculty would be rewarded for it; there’s a clear link.

 Comment from Kyle Carter: Don’t box yourself in with indirect costs. Don’t target them with matching funds because there’s just not going to be enough there for a long time and you could use those funds a whole lot better. Have a much more broader view of how those funds can be used and lets look at other sources for match, don’t say that indirect costs is your only source for match because you’re really going to limit yourself. As you develop this resolution, you may just want to go over the mechanics with Scott. It is something that we have been struggling with but if the senate comes forward with a resolution, we can start looking at it again.

Comment: We have made some great strides recently with indirects. We have a report that we put out frequently. I’d be glad to share that. We are not where we want to be… this has been a 3 year project and it is not something that has dropped off the radar but at the same time, there is some use for those dollars and it’s just not a big pot of money to be pulled from. You said something earlier about discouraging grants because somebody isn’t going to pay indirects? If an agency indicates to us, then we need to have that documentation that they don’t pay indirects. We go forward with that and we just need to have that letter that they document they don’t pay indirects. We certainly don’t discourage it because there are no indirect costs.

 Comment: If your deans discourage because there are no indirect costs, there may be a good reason why the dean is discouraging it, but there shouldn’t be that attitude that you can only go for a grant if there are full indirect costs included.

Discussion continued on this topic….

Comment: Trying to get this moving, Would you be open to a resolution that creates a taskforce in conjunction with the faculty and the administration to move this from a discussion into some action. It’s been discussed for 3 or 4 years. Perhaps its time to resolve this.

Comment: I think it would be really worthwhile to have a discussion on this with faculty. I would ask you to put Chuck & Scott on this task force. I support the Senate assigning people to this task force

Comment: This taskforce should have a time limit to come back and report to the Senate.

Comment: This date should be in the Fall.

Comment: We have proposed a change in Section 5 of the Faculty Handbook to rename the Research Council to be the Faculty Scholarship Advisory Committee. The Name will change, the focus will change, the role will change, and the composition of the committee will change. As approved by the present research council and the council deans, that will come before the Faculty affairs committee.

Comment: Can we relate this to the taskforce and the resolution at hand?

Comment: Yes, I am suggesting that this be the same committee that we put this onto the Faculty Scholarship Advisory Committee as oppose to creating a new taskforce.

Comment: Perhaps we can restructure this resolution along those lines and restructure the membership and come back next time and implement it.

Discussion continued

Comment: I suggest we make them two separate groups because otherwise you’re bogged down and you’d never get anything done.

Comment: This is clearly an issue that needs to be addressed. We all have more knowledge now of what the implications are and we have a process in mind therefore we can proceed.

Comment: We’ll come back in February requesting a Taskforce.

**OTHER**

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

**Old Business**

The Rules Committee: In October, proposed some changes to the Constitution and Bylaws of the General Faculty. They eventually need to roll in some additional changes into the list but these have had a first reading. Perhaps we should start with some additional briefing as to what the intent was.

Committee: I regret that I missed the last 2 Senate meetings where a lot of this was discussed but the general idea was that the four councils of the Senate that would be all curriculum are not written down anywhere in the constitution or the Bylaws so the intent was to make those changes to one of the documents and there was a recommendation to the Bylaws and the Faculty Senate. Either one of those would be fine because ultimately it gets into the handbook and that is the big picture. The attempt was to spell out what the Professional Education Council does, what the Graduate Council does, what the Curriculum Council does and what the Liberal Studies Committee does. So I think the biggest issue that we’ve had to deal with is the Liberal Studies Committee, how its operating and who comprises that committee. Basically what we would do in Rules Committee, was you had the two major discussions last Fall about the alternate liberal studies in the Honors College and also a resolution about there being just one liberal studies program. So we took information that was from the discussion here to try to put that into the rules committee language and we’re definitely hoping to collect people’s opinions and ultimately the senate will propose something that goes out to the faculty hopefully within the next month for a wider campus hearing and hopefully some more discussion and a full faculty vote. That was specifically section 10 in the Faculty Constitution that was trapped to this case.

Comment: The structure of the Senate and what this does is creates these other committees that are all in line with the Senate. I came from the idea that we count on creating policy. These committees come up with a great way for implementing those policies but we hadn’t charged them with creating policies on their own. We reserved that for the APRC. Two years ago when we tried to streamline this , in the process we moved the University Curriculum Council so it went directly into the Senate. This was written giving policy generation responsibilities into these other bodies and removing it from the APRC and I questioned whether that was what we wanted to do or not. I’m not really attached to this, it just seems strange that we are now extending the curriculum into policy making bodies by the way this was structured. How do we get representation on these and it wasn’t just liberal studies, it was graduate council as well. That the committee of these councils be basically elected but have a representation that is proportionate to their constituents. So that the representations of those bodies are linked to the graduates and the people that are impacted by those policies.

Comment: I would say that I share that thought that the representation of the bodies should represent the graduates and not the faculty. That is because we have a lot of faculty who are tied to liberal studies. So if we have 40% of our faculty are from the School of Arts and Sciences and only 25% of our undergraduate degrees are from the Arts and Sciences, then you have like 15% of faculty in the Arts and Sciences who are teaching liberal studies. The point is, if we are allocating funds based on student credit hours, and there are large proportions of some disciplines where the representation faculty load comes from liberal studies than there is a bit of conflict of interest for those people.

Comment: These bodies are serving a constituent. And we as faculty are serving a constituent. Those constituents are our graduates and that is who should have the voice in proportion to their number.

Comment: In the original proposal, the liberal studies committee discussion specifically addresses the number of members of that committee to be elected from each college to be determined in proportion of full time equivalent undergraduate students in each unit. That sounds to me like it is proportions based on students rather than based on numbers of faculty.

Comment: No, that’s credit hours. I think that is more who is taking the courses as opposed to who’s graduating, the student.

Comment: Whether your department has classes in it or whether it could have classes in it, it is a conflict of interest if you want to call it a conflict of interest.

Comment: I’m not sure I would go down the conflict of interest angle. I didn’t say that.

Comment: To clarify, if a department has 50% of its student credit hours coming from liberal studies, than 50% of the faculty in that department get their paychecks from liberal studies salary. So if a department has 1% of its student credit hours coming from liberal studies than they have much lower incentive to push people through liberal studies.

Comment: What we’d like to do is push people for not so much liberal studies in our major. That’s what we’d like to do.

Comment: We have to be consistent in giving you a voice that is proportionate to your graduates.

Comment: We have a lot of graduates.

Comment: There is another issue I think that should be related to some of this. Personally, I would take issue with your assertion that these groups are policy making bodies. What it says is that this is recognizing what is in fact already standard practice. The Professional Education Council for example deals with questions relating specifically to the professional education sequence and program. All that is being proposed is that once they have these proposals, they can send them directly to the Senate. Changing course titles is not a policy decision.

Comment: No, but they’re using words like, “All matters related to curriculum, including total revision to this program.” That’s pretty broad.

Comment: it says that the faculty senate receives all recommendations from the above curriculum councils and has the final vote.

Comment: That’s extending the breadth of the organizations that report to the Senate.

Comment: When these proposed changes came out, they were sent to the Senate. I believe this is the Faculty Constitution was sent and the amended Faculty Constitution was sent. Each of these were several MB in size. Anyways, there were a lot more to those than anybody at this table wants to read.

Comment: The point is that people don’t read the entirety of what you send them so you can’t say that the senate has the final word if they’re not able to read the entire constitution.

Comment: It’s their responsibility…

Comment: Again, I think the big point was that it was not over a page that was added but it’s not in the Faculty Handbook. Something needs to be there about these four councils.

Discussion continued…

Comment: We’re all in Liberal Studies together, We are all in graduate education together and we have these curriculum committees represented proportionately by the number of students taking the courses seems to be about as evenly as you can represent the faculty.

Comment: But the students are required to take their liberal studies courses all the way across the curriculum. And those students are not forced to be represented. I think that’s Phil’s point.

Comment: As much as you may want to push out liberal studies, you can’t go much lower and have an accredited university. As it is now, the scheme that we came up with by dividing who we have on the committee, it’s a good cross-representation of who we have teaching our undergraduates, from the various colleges, various programs, and various interests. So we are a faculty, trying to construct a good education for all of our undergraduates. So we take representatives from across the university who are currently educating them and we ask them to discuss, “What’s a good undergraduate education.” It’s a pretty fair way of trying to decide.

Comment: That really basically agreed with the changes that I asked for. Say for instance, the liberal studies committee would be constructed in line with the way we created the taskforce, which was a good mix of the colleges.

Comment: They come out about the same, I do believe.

Comment: No, they don’t. That’s why the Provost and Richard came up with the formulation. I didn’t create it. They did by looking at it; it’s quite a bit different.

Comment: You have to have some liberal studies.

Comment: Nobody is arguing that.

Comment: But the point is, then to try to push out the people who provide that education to the students from the discussion of what liberal education should look like is a pretty weird thing to do.

Comment: I don’t think anybody said that.

Comment: What I’m proposing is that you have a voice in proportion to the graduates that you have and that’s perfectly balanced to me.

Comment: Under liberal studies where it says, “the number of liberal studies council members are LSC members to be elected from each college to be determined by calculating the proportion of full-time equivalent undergraduate students in each unit.” What does that mean? What does that data represent?

Comment: I will not enter the debate on how this should be done. SACS require no fewer than 30 hours in general education. That is SACS Standards. FTE is a term of art. FTE is the number of student credit hours at the undergraduate level divided by 15 per semester. It is something that basically every university in the United States uses.

Comment: I Suspect, the further part of your question is the FTE students that are reported by the Arts and Sciences, for example, would be all students who have taken courses who are claimed in arts and sciences regardless of what their major is.

Comment: If the Political Science Dept. produces 3,000 credit hours then divide 3,000 by 15 and that tells you the number of FTE students that they teach that semester.

Comment: So one course difference means 300 FTE’s.

Comment: There is a 12-fold matrix and you apply the credit hours based on the state’s categorization of your discipline whether you agree with the categorization or not. That is how you get the faculty positions is through that matrix application of the student credit hours.

Comment: And on average, last year, it was a little bit over 500 credit hours would equal one faculty FTE from the matrix.

Comment: In terms of what I would like to see my students to take, I would like my voice to be heard.

Comment: Who are you serving? And those who are being served ought to have a voice.

Comment: It’s a discussion over who gets the students. Are they my students? Are they your students? If you’re teaching them, they are part of your students, If they are in your major than they are part of your students. So what we’re talking about in real terms is, changing the composition of the committee.

Comment: I want to see this because these are the people that I serve, I serve the health science people, I serve the kimmel school people, and that’s who I serve.

Comment: There are two points that I would make and they are not speaking to representation at all, But I hope are useful. The bottom line question here, ought to be the quality of education for our students. What is it that a student needs to know, What is it a student needs to be able to do, if they are going to be a fully functioning member of the Jeffersonian Democracy in the 21st? That’s the question, I believe that we should be asking. It really doesn’t have anything to do with whether it was an English department or philosophy department. It has fundamentally to do with the question of, what it means to be an educated person in the 21st century. I have a bias, I read about this stuff, I worry about this stuff, and I think about this stuff a lot and I write about this and it is my opinion that it is in our interest to have a conversation about what is needed by our students with very little conversation about what department it is in. and I would strongly encourage you to look at educational outcomes and not subject matter specifically. What is it that you want a student to know, and What do you want a student to be able to do? That is the key and there are some things that universities, historically, have never dealt with that students ought to know. Like, for example, we do a very poor of really teaching how to work in groups yet everything in here tells us that nothing can be done individually. There’s a lot of issues out there that if you go to what students need to know and do, change the conversation and will hopefully get you somewhere. I am not particularly a proponent of a larger or smaller general education program, I am a proponent of outcomes that make sense and that I can say, Are we honoring what Jefferson intended and are we honoring what the people of North Carolina intended by creating their public university for the benefit of their children and themselves. That, to me is the key issue. Second key issue, each college, I would encourage you as you have the conversation to encourage the colleges to bring forward statements on what it is they think an educated person is from the perspectives of their disciplines and their professions. You may find that there is an unbelievable commonality but you may find that there is knowledge there that helps you educate yourself on the meaning of a general education. By the way, I was using the term “general education” to move us away from the discussion of our particular curriculum but to the fundamental question of what does a person need to know and to do as they move to the 21st century. There are some things that we don’t have, for example, Globalization was not on the table when our current curriculum was created yet we know globalization is a gigantic issue. So there is a lot of those kind of questions that I hope you will wrestle with, regardless of whether you do it by FTE or SCH’s but honestly, the core questions ought to be at a higher level and that higher level ought to be what is it that we want people to know and to be able to do regardless of their major.

Comment: If I could insert here, given the lateness of the hour, We have in fact dealt with a lot of those general issues but we have proposed a taskforce specifically to look starting that their charge was to take exactly that kind of a look. What we are dealing with here, is specific recommendation to amend the faculty constitution and bylaws. We are at the stage of what is technically referred to as the second read. We need to also understand that once the senate approves this, there is still a process that any proposed changes to the amendments would have to go through leading to a full vote of the general faculty as a whole. Given the lateness of the Hour and the fact that the people need time to think about this, I would encourage, Aaron, if I could impose on you since I have to go out of town to resend these documents out to the members of the senate and I would encourage specific amendments to these proposed amendments. If those could be sent no later than Monday so that Aaron could forward them to us, I would propose that we meet in our meeting next time and look specifically whether or not we wish to send some version of these amendments to the general faculty. There are time constraints involved. These things take some time to do but it seems to be a sound way of proceeding. My suspicion, based on the conversations that we’ve had today, is that there maybe some viable alternative proposals from what has been proposed by the rules committee. I think that we need to keep our focus on what we are doing here. We are not re-hashing or starting to re-has the validity or appropriateness of the current liberal studies program. We are trying to develop a process by which faculty members can work efficiently and practically and serve the needs of the academic community. That being said, the chair would be happy to entertain the motion to go under recess.

Comment: Chancellor made a comment about it being what the students can do, My concern about what is happening, and this has been a concern of the College of Business, is we are getting students who cannot write. They have gone through the two mandated English courses and they cannot write.

Comment: They need more.

Comment: They need to be able to write. So we are considering putting a writing requirement for the students who are taking our courses. And If they don’t pass it, they will either not admit them to the college, or we are going to advise them to go to the Writing Center and improve their writing. But what I am doing with my Seniors is, we’re sending them over to the writing center. Every paper they submit for the rest of the semester has to come through the writing center, because they can’t wait and I’ll be darned if I want to put my name on a student going out of Western Carolina that can’t write. That’s what I am upset. My concern is, we have these committees how do we have an assurance of learning process in these committees so we are getting the students who have the skills that we need them to have so that we can run them through our school of business, That is where I am coming from.

Comment: I just want to say something coming from the English department which seems to be coming up often. First of all, we don’t teach them to write short stories in 101, that is not what we’re about but secondly, and I know we are not re-hashing what we are to do with liberal studies at this point, but something that Dr. Bardo said, and to me this is something that I think we all need to think about is that one thing that our students are not learning to do is work in groups and I was like, maybe this is something that we need to show them as we teach our liberal studies, that we teach collaboratively and we work in groups. I think that might be a way to keep us from feeling like we have to own every student who does every class within each specific part of liberal studies. They do need to learn how to write differently and I would be willing to work with you on that .

Comment: I totally believe you on that, but on the other hand, Chancellor was saying, an artist or a sculptor, how much do those students need to know how to work together? That emphasis will change as it changes disciplines.

Comment: These are all pertinent topics but they don’t relate to the issue at hand which are these amendments to the Constitution.

Comment: I was just going to say that one of the reasons that there ought to be proportional representation is exactly what Frank said. Frank’s program doesn’t do a lot of liberal studies but there is a very clear point-of-view about what is needed with our students and I think that we could find that commonality. Things have changed and there a lot of different perspectives that I think could feed in that could improve the liberal studies. I am a huge believer in the liberal studies but I think we need to really get a lot of input from these different areas that are not necessarily supplying liberal study courses. I think we would benefit, the university and most of all, the students.

The meeting was adjourned.