**MINUTES**

***September 2, 2009, 3:00p.m. -5:00 p.m.***

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

**ROLL CALL**

Present:

Mary Kay Bauer, Richard Beam, Wayne Billon, Heidi Buchanan, Kyle Carter, David Claxton, Beverly Collins, Chris Cooper, Jamie Davis, Terre Folger, Steven Ha, John Hodges, Christopher Hoyt, David Hudson, Rebecca Lasher, Frank Lockwood, Ron Mau, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Sean O’Connell, Jane Perlmutter, Jack Sholder, Barbara St. John, Michael Thomas, Chuck Tucker, Laura Wright

Members with Proxies:

Phillip Sanger, Jack Summers, Cheryl Waters-Tormey, Vicki Szabo

Members absent:

John Bardo, Jane Eastman, Eleanor Hilty

Recorder:

Ann Green

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

Motion:

To approve the minutes of April 30, 2009. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously with no further discussion.

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

Faculty Assembly/Richard Beam:

Delegates will include Beverly Collins and David Claxton. Beverly is also a temporary Senator. David has a number of conflicts with other things so the Senate will know he won’t be here on a regular basis. Because our complete delegation was elected last Fall, and since David has served in the past on the assembly I took it upon myself to request that he serve as our Senior Assembly Delegate for this year. I hope that will not create any problems with anyone as far as the Senate is concerned. (No Dissents were noted.) We will proceed with the assumption that David will function as our Senior Elected Delegate and when he can’t be here between Beverly and me we will try to keep the Senate informed of the actions of the Assembly and we don’t know exactly what form that will be this year.

We have some tentative dates, but we don’t know what form they will be. If they will go back to being face to face meetings in Chapel Hill or if because of budget constraints we will have to have those meetings in other ways.

SGA/Josh Cotton:

Right now still trying to get our feet on the ground with the regular senate. We’re really trying to push for a Clean Energy initiative this year and we would love support from the Faculty Senate.

 (unclear) by October. I will be at those Chapel Hill Meetings, if you guys have any correspondence for that.

**Staff Senate/Brenda Holcombe:**

Brenda is not present. No report

Learning Management Systems Update/Anna McFadden, Carlie Merritt, and Craig Fowler:

Anna McFadden introduced the topic of researching and investigating Learning Management Systems and reminded everyone that the recent Faculty Forum written by Carlie Merritt addressed this topic as well. A task force is in place and they are in the process of asking for input as they begin to make a decision on which Learning Management System will be selected. A document was distributed to all Senate members in attendance containing details of the task force and the opportunities for faculty input.

Carlie Merritt, a member of the task force currently filling in as the Chair, reported that the task force was asked by Provost Carter to take a very holistic view of where we as a University want to go with our online course offerings. Our license with Blackboard expires in 2011 which is not a lot of time. Carlie pointed out that if we stay with Blackboard the interface (what you see as you develop and offer your course) is different than the current system in WebCat.

The task force is comparing two systems: Blackboard 9 (a new version of the existing system) and Moodle. Only Moodle was chosen as the alternative to Blackboard for funding reasons. Moodle was chosen for several reasons more fully addressed in the forum and which include the fact that it is less costly in some ways and also because NC high schools, elementary schools, the community colleges and a number of our sister universities have gone to Moodle.

Anna reported there are 2 sites open to faculty members. One is a sample site created on Moodle and the other one links to a site that you can view in the new version of Blackboard 9. A wiki site has been set up where faculty members can collaborate, talk about feedback, and give cost estimates as they come up. The task force wants as much faculty input as possible and will be conducting two open forums, one at the end of September and one in November. The task force will be making a recommendation to Provost Carter and the final decision will be made by Provost Carter, Anna McFadden and Craig Fowler.

Questions/Comments were taken:

COMMENT: Could you comment to some degree about the ease with which current courses that are written in WebCat might be ported into Moodle vs. Blackboard?

RESPONSE: Chris Baxley is going to talk about that. We have discussed migration issues and Chris will go into that.

Anything about process, faculty input, anything you would like to relate to regarding this process?

COMMENT: Is it true that anything you create in Moodle has to be public source?

RESPONSE: It isn’t public source, you’re going to have the same level of security for your course that you would if you were in Blackboard, but it will be supported by our personnel and the host. We will have to get more personnel to support that because it is open source. We still have FIRPA; we can’t do something that’s open that everyone can get into. It will be protected in that regard.

COMMENT: Are you thinking more about intellectual property? I don’t think the platform makes any difference on that.

COMMENT: The folks that oversee WebCat system can get in and look at everything. Don’t they sign a non-compete disclosure?

RESPONSE: Open source simply means if we develop a new application in Moodle it goes through the review of the open source community and anybody out there can use that application, it does not mean anybody can get in your class. If you have a class in Moodle and want them to sign a non-compete you can still do that.

COMMENT: I’m not worried about my students. I’m worried about somebody who is supporting it.

RESPONSE: I don’t think that’s an issue.

COMMENT: Can you say a word about cost generally and about how cost will factor into the process?

RESPONSE: I’m going to introduce Craig Fowler who will talk about this.

Craig Fowler reported that the top 3 online presences from the university system are: #1 - ECU, #2 - NC State and WCU - #3 and felt it very interesting that WCU is #3 in its online presence.

He reported that we’re looking at this from the following perspectives:

1. Total cost of ownership including cost of hosting including looking at hosting both internally and externally.

Craig stated that the university is currently shared hosting with Charlotte and Wilmington and we believe we can host this either internally or externally not in combination with others and it’s going to be the same or less cost than what we’re doing now.

2. Licensing: No cost with Moodle, there is with Blackboard. But with Blackboard there are other kinds of support to look at.

3. Support: Will be interesting… we have been talking about the fact that using Moodle you also need to then be able to play in the open source situation and that requires a certain protocol that Craig doesn’t think is one that we want to grab and not make any changes or not contribute into the open source process. So we’re going to have to from a support perspective be able to put that in place and that means they’re going to have to have some people additions.

Also taking a look at it from a support perspective is where are some of these supports that go on? How does Moodle integrate with Banner? One person in the world understands how…these are some of the things that we have to think about.

4. Another thing we are looking at is the cost of change, not just the cost of moving servers here and there, what the cost is with IT, but faculty has a huge investment of time and faculty time isn’t free, how much time is involved?

5. Architecture and infrastructure – what has to be in place.

6. Skills – not only with IT, but also at the Faculty Center

7. Interfaces – what kind, how sophisticated do they need to be? What will it take to put those in place?

Anna and the team have done an initial draft of the costs involved. If anyone is interested, talk with Anna. This is a work in process and these are not the final numbers. The data shows so far that we are looking at a 4 year breakeven.

COMMENT: Is it a 4 year breakeven either way: Blackboard or Moodle?

RESPONSE: Yes, for Moodle to breakeven you are looking at 4 years, Blackboard will actually be a little more. You also have to look at what happens with the software over those 4 years, is there going to be another release. This is only with the costs we currently have here and I don’t think we have put in cost of change and some of the other activities. Whatever way, it is not a quick pay-back.

COMMENT: Will the resources be available to provide the support when it breakdowns at 12:00 at night or are we limited to 9 to 5 Monday-Friday support?

RESPONSE: The team is looking at what resources are needed to do that. If we as an institution are saying we really don’t want to add additional people, then that influences where we’re going to go. We have an issue around off hours support. It impacts several areas. We know we’re going to see more enterprise activities especially from the IT side. One of the activities we’re going to do this fall is take a look at that. We have it on the radar screen, independent of this activity.

Chris Baxley, System Administrator for Webcat and Moodle pilot was introduced.

Chris talked about the migration of courses to the new systems. One of the huge concerns is that you’ve invested all of your time in WebCat, now what can you do with that? Moodle does offer a conduit to get your content from WebCat into the system, but a lot of it comes over very broken. You end up spending a lot of time redeveloping the course anyway.

Blackboard 9 offers a more smooth import. Either way, however, there will be some investment of time.

Chris spoke about security and Banner integration and both products will integrate with Banner. The public will not have access; only the students enrolled via Banner will have access. With the issue of support, these are currently hosted off campus by an external company, right now hosted with Blackboard. If the system goes down, they have a team of engineers 24/7 to help with the situation. Of course we are looking at hosting internally and externally.

Anna reminded everyone that Blackboard is coming to campus on 2 different dates as indicated on the sheet passed out. She is getting ready to take one of her courses and migrate it to Blackboard 9. If anyone has any questions, get in contact with John, Carlie or Anna and they will get it to the task force.

COMMENT: Do you have any inkling which way this will go thus far?

RESPONSE: We don’t have enough results from the pilots yet. All information is not available.

COMMENT: I see on the handout that Mac users have to use Firefox. Is there a possibility that all the major web browsers will be supported in the future for Moodle?

RESPONSE: It’s certainly possible as versions increase that things will look better, but also possible other features may break.

COMMENT: Have any other universities migrated from this current type of system to Moodle?

RESPONSE: Yes, and that’s part of what the task force is doing; looking at that. UNC-Charlotte is going through that process now. They have not integrated Blackboard 9. They’re at the same point we’re at with their license running out the same time ours does.

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

**APRC/ Wayne Billon:**

Resolution on Special Studies Programs

We have two reports. One is a resolution for special studies programs to stop at the college level instead of going through Senate. If a student wants to major in a specialized area that we don’t have a degree in, and the area might involve more than one program and might even bridge colleges, the student with their advisor, can initiate a special studies program. They go to the advisor of all the areas they want to work with and they design a program of set courses from each area. It involves those advisors, the deans, the University Curriculum Committee and the Senate.

It is an arduous task and it happens 2-3 times a year. The resolution allows this to be stopped at the college level where the advisors from each program involved would work with the student. The student would choose a home college. That home college dean would then approve it, then the home college’s curriculum committee would approve it and then the degree can be granted by that college anyway. Then it can go to the Provost Office to go through the University Curriculum Committee (UCC).

The report is from a council committee and requires no second to bring it to the floor. The motion on the floor is resolution from APRC on stopping special studies programs at the college level.

**A vote was held and passed with these results:**

Yes: 25

 No: 0

Abstain: 0

Resolution Passed.

Updating of AA-4 and AA-5 forms

The second item is changes to the process of AA-4 & AA-5 forms.

The AA-4 in the past has been abused because multiple changes could take place over the year and essentially the whole course may have changed through the AA-4 without it going through the University Curriculum Committee. The AA-4 stops at the Dean’s Office then goes to the Provost Office.

Most people thought the AA-5 was too cumbersome to use. Now you can make as many changes to the course on an AA-4 as long as it involves only the department that you are in. There is a place at the top where you indicate it involves only your department. No syllabus needs to be attached.

AA-5: Is converted to 2 forms AA-5 and an AA-6. The AA-5 is for changes that involve another department beside yours or a new course. This is just courses, not programs. You do not need to attach syllabi.

The really good thing is there is a list for the curriculum committee (technical review checklist)

The AA-6: Is for a program change or new program. Still no syllabi is attached. Follow the list included of things that will be watched for.

This came before the APRC and we approved it so this is for your information only. Beth Tyson Lofquist will send it out by email to all of academic affairs. It will also be available on the website in the future.

COMMENT: If you make a change in the AA-4 and you change the course number or name, that affects the program, does it not?

RESPONSE: You will have to do a program change like you’ve also have had to do.

COMMENT: So, does that then become an AA-5?

RESPONSE: Program change is an AA-6, changing a course is an AA-4. If it only affects your dept, you would do an AA-4 to change the course and an AA-6 to change the program.

COMMENT: Anytime there’s a change that is going to change the way it looks in the catalog you will have to do 2 forms a 4 and a 6, right?

A: If you’re not changing the course; if you’re just changing the courses around in the program or deleting some courses in the program; you do an AA-6 only. Unless you’re changing a course or adding a course you wouldn’t need to do anything except an AA-6.

COMMENT: Is this in force now, or do we have to vote whether it will go into place?

RESPONSE: My understanding was the approval levels everything goes through; the senate wants to vote on. In terms of the forms and clarifying the process, the APRC needed to see it and endorse it. My understanding was it didn’t need to come to a vote, but I think anything could be brought to a vote, that’s my understanding, Richard?

COMMENT: Yes, this comes to the Senate for information, but does not preclude the senate from deciding to take specific action on it.

COMMENT: Our department has started some significant program revisions and so on. Would it be possible to delay the specific implementation for proposals for that are already underway? We have AA-4s and AA-5s that are already started that are virtually very close to being ready to send to you.

RESPONSE: I’ve already told the depts. if they already developed the old forms that is ok. I would like people from this point on to use the new form, but we’re not going to go back and have people re-do forms they have already developed this summer.

COMMENT: Are these paper forms or are they on-line?

RESPONSE: These are not electronic forms although if you open the form in the shared drive it has check boxes and text boxes that will make it much easier. You submit it through the shared drive electronically – still the same process.

COMMENT: The only real substantive change is that AA-4 becomes exclusive within the department’s activities for a course. For a course, the AA-5 becomes the major document and we’re taking the program changes out of the AA-5 and creating a separate document, the AA-6 for that.

COMMENT: It was commented that if for no other reason than our purposes in the Senate then the new process will be simple because AA-4s and AA-5 only come to the senate for information and AA-6’s will automatically require Senate action. It will simplify it.

COMMENT: If we change a course number in a program, we use an AA-4?

RESPONSE: That’s correct if no other dept. is using that course. That’s when you go to the AA-5.

COMMENT: If you change the number or the name then you then also have to do an AA-6.

RESPONSE: You’ve always had to do a program change if you’re going to change the program as well as the course.

COMMENT: So then the Senate has to approve that change?

RESPONSE: That’s correct.

COMMENT: Is there an instance when you would use the AA-4 and not the AA-6?

RESPONSE: Yes, you could change a course that doesn’t affect the program description in the catalog.

Example: If you change a number of a course that’s an elective not specifically listed in the program. Or, if you change a course description that’s within the program.

RESPONSE: Yes, if the program just lists the course and the title you don’t have to change anything in the catalog.

COMMENT: Anytime you change a course description, prefix for a course

 you are going to have to do an AA-6 if it is one of your required courses.

RESPONSE: If it’s just a description change, you won’t have to do an AA-6.

Scott Higgins brought up that since syllabi will not be required with the AA-5 at Question 10-B the Graduate Curriculum Council needs an explanation of the graduate course when you are proposing a cross listed 400-500 level course. Scott asked that this information be shared widely so that the Graduate Council doesn’t hold up on approving a course pending this information. This is information they need to differentiate between the 400 and 500 level courses.

Discussion continued. No desire to move this to an action item noted.

No formal vote is necessary or was conducted.

**Collegial Review Council: Mary Kay Bauer**

No report.

**Faculty Affairs Council: Frank Lockwood**

No report although it was shared that there are two carryover issues from last year that will be discussed at the next meetings: 1) Supplement to the CourseEval manual to help us understand when and how to use it and 2) the Patent Policy.

OTHER BUSINESS\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Old Business/Richard Beam**

Section 4.0 of Faculty Handbook. Changes from the Board of Governors

There were 2 documents sent to you. The first one, the great big one related to things the Senate has already dealt with. That document has been approved. About the time we passed it, the BOG met and made some changes to the Code and sent them to us with the requirement that we now have to conform to those changes.

The smaller document sent out today is a brief summary version and discussion of those changes that were mandated.

The only significant change is to the tenure promotion and reappointment. The change is that it initially stops at the Provost level so that if there is an appeal that must go to the Chancellor, the Chancellor is not being required to hear an appeal based on a decision he or she has already made. Other than that, it’s largely just cleaning up some language and fixing those kinds of things, making sure that timely notice provisions are in fact correct as required by law and that sort of thing.

Copies of the letter from GA that had the things they wanted us to change were passed out.

In some cases and it’s documented on the GA response that came out today there were a couple of places where University Council said we’re fine and don’t need to change anything. They brought up a couple of issues but there was no need for us to make any changes.

A Motion was moved by Erin McNelis and seconded by Wayne Billon.

Discussion?

COMMENT: I wondering if any of what’s in the Post Tenure Review might also relate to people who are on long term contracts at the University. Is there any sort of appeal process there?

RESPONSE: We have a committee working on the Collegial Review Process streamlining the AFE process. This is not exactly an answer to your question. One of the things they are looking at is the reappointment process for multi-year fixed term contracts. So, an appeals process in that they might consider, I don’t know.

COMMENT: Might this serve as a template for this?

COMMENT: Whether any of this might apply in the future to non-tenure multi- year contract faculty?

RESPONSE: Kyle Carter: Probably not with the exception. I guess it depends. Multi-year faculty has a contract. If you serve to the end to the contract and it’s not renewed there’s nothing to be done. If there’s some move to try to terminate a faculty member during the middle of the contract there will be an appeals procedure. I don’t know exactly what you’re referring to, but dismissal for cause in that situation would be dealt with in a similar fashion. Does that answer your question?

COMMENT: Not entirely. If you’re not renewed, if you have a contract you serve at the pleasure of your dean or the upper administration. In other universities in my area, they often do not tenure people, they give them multi-year contracts. I’ll do some research just to see how that works there, maybe I can send you some white paper on that.

RESPONSE from Kyle Carter: What typically happens is that you could request a commitment of renewal if you’re in a 5 year contract, and you’d like a commitment in your 4th year. We tried to have a revolving contract where faculty said they want a 3 year appointment and their performance was great in the first couple years, then at the 3rd year they automatically got a another 3 years and it continued to revolve like that. GA didn’t like that. They wanted a set term contract and that had to be renewed.

COMMENT: Would these be in the current faculty handbook electronically once it goes through the Board of Governors. Are these next year’s faculty guidelines or this year’s?

RESPONSE: I think we would have to look at the guidance of GA. I suspect they would want to have them effective immediately. Further discussion was had.

**A vote was held and passed with these results:**

Yes: 20

No 2

Abstain 0

Invalid: 3

This concludes the discussion of old business.

New Business/Richard Beam

Forming the Rules Committee

One of the things we are required to do by our By-laws is to establish a Rules Committee. The Rules Committee according to the By-laws is chaired by the vice-chair of the faculty and consists of five members. Five volunteers are needed.

What the Rules Committee basically does is look at the Constitution and By-laws of the General Faculty and of the Senate to see if there are changes that need to be made. The history is that in most years there are relatively few of these.

COMMENT: Some things have come to life if there are questions, for instance, the University Advisory Council, the University Curriculum Committee are bodies that are included in the Handbook, very specifically make up how you get people on there. Who’s allowed to vote as the Chair vote? The Liberal Studies Oversight Committee has had questions about things that could be addressed in the By-laws. So there are some outstanding requests about considering putting new things in the By-laws that will help aid groups in such decisions.

The volunteers are: Erin McNelis, Jamie Davis, Sean O’Connell, Christopher Hoyt, and Chris Cooper.

Kimmel School Representative for Senate Planning Team

In order to meet the required membership of the Senate Planning Team we need a representative of the Kimmel School. Phil Sanger was named.

Discussion of Faculty Caucus Topics

Erin reported that the Planning Team met and helped to identify which council most of these items would go to and we also had some information on things that could go not through council.

Erin previously sent everyone her notes from the Faculty Caucus and led discussion on the topics as follows:

Topics:

1. Faculty/Staff Union - had been at Western in the past, are we interested in bringing it back? References to the American Association of University Professors and the NC Chapter of it. A couple of our sister universities are included in that. This is one that would be deemed to go to Faculty Affairs Council with hopes of working with the University Advisory Council and Staff Senate.

2. Hiring Foreign Nationals – that policy came out recently, but it didn’t include something that it affected a lot – the needing of a hard copy in advertisement as well as issues in costs associated with advertising as well as there was a question, legal costs. It was pointed out that most legal costs are on the burden of the faculty member rather than the departments. This issue is for follow up with FAC because they have dealt with it before, as well as with Human Resources.

3. Desire to have the Board of Trustees (BOT)/invite the BOT to meet with the Senate, know who they are, perhaps come to a Faculty Senate or something a little less formal – Kyle Carter reported he has been talking with the Deans about how we can get more information to the BOT about things that you do and the Colleges do. There are two approaches: one is each time there’s a subcommittee meeting of academic affairs I don’t chair it, I’m the University liaison; a board person chairs it, I’ll put on the agenda, a Dean who will give updates on things the colleges are doing. Robert Kehrberg will be at one on Thursday.

In addition, each division gets about 1 hour 15 min. if they’re lucky or 45 min. as a program for the board breakfast meeting - ours is in December. We’re featuring faculty research. We’re going to do poster sessions so that instead of a faculty member getting up and talking to the board. The board will get up and wander around in a room like this and talk to faculty and find out what they’re doing. We’ve done sessions like this with students and it worked really well, but we think it’s time we showcased the faculty.

If it is the will of the Senate, Richard was going to talk to the Chancellor about what other possibilities might be arranged for more formal session of the Senate with the Board or members of the Board. Or some kind of informal setting, where faculty or the Senate would have a chance to meet, greet and converse with members of the Board. The Senate agreed informally that they would like Richard to pursue this with the Chancellor. Richard will pursue this with the Chancellor

4. In the Chancellor’s opening address he made the comment about his number of publications and did that matter as much for instance to those people in Dillsboro who are dealing with economic strife. He was really pushing more the engagement aspect. It was giving mixed signals to those of us, especially to those who are un-tenured as to doing CRD documents, those that haven’t been approved and the emphasis on the types of scholarship and the importance of scholarship and including publication and now the Chancellor had just said something that kind of diminished (on the importance of scholarship and publications). It was pointed out that it was probably more embellishing on the Chancellor’s point; he was not meaning to embellish the value, but it was put out and it was going to be spoken to the Chancellor. Kyle Carter spoke to the Chancellor and reported that there’s no confusion between the CRD document and what the Chancellor said. You need to worry about the CRD document. The Boyer Model opens up scholarship. If you decide to focus on engagement that’s great, if you don’t, there are other options within the Boyer Model. As an institution, we’ve been talking a great deal about having engaged activities. I think we’re going to see a mixed profile. I think we’re going to see people continue to publish in traditional journals; there will also be other kinds of scholarship with much more engagement. We hope to see some undergraduate research. But, there’s no conflict in what he said and the process we’re through now with the CRD document so don’t be misled.

COMMENT: If your colleagues ask you about this question, there is, I believe, no question. Approved curriculum review documents coming out of departments do take precedence, period. End of story, that’s what matters. Those are the criteria that people are expected to be judged under.

This conversation then led to the idea, is there unspoken criteria imposed on other levels and even just knowing who is on university tenure review committees, things of that nature. Dr. Carter indicated he would be working on the knowledge of who’s on committees and that would be able to be worked on website wise in terms of information and availability. And we take to **CONEC,** the Committee on Nominations and Committees and Elections with the idea of having additional information about those people who put their name into running so that people who may not know the name on the ballot, can at least find out some information before deciding do you want them setting potentially on a tenure review committee or things of that nature.

COMMENT: The discussion of these matters; to whom does this fall, you’ve been categorizing them thus far.

RESPONSE: The university tenure, essentially that wasn’t going to a committee per se or not. The awareness would go to the Provost Office in making aware to the public who is on what committees. The elections and information regarding elections would go to **CONEC**.

RESPONSE: It was my understanding once we got done this discussion, there would be a short memo that would come from Erin or Richard or someone to me, asking me to help to clarify certain things. Please make sure that the members of the University Promotion and Tenure Committee are clearly posted on the web and any other items that you thought would be administrative that we can work to take care of.

COMMENT: The reason that I asked is because last year in Faculty Affairs Council there was significant discussion about the creation of a 4th category for Tenure consideration that would more exhaustively cover some of the innovative initiatives here at the university other than scholarship, research …unclear.

RESPONSE: I would say, not having realized that was part of Faculty Affairs, I would say it was something that Faculty Affairs not having finished that, and that it would be something they continue to work on. Noted to Frank Lockwood.

5. Matching Funds pooled request about having a pool of money that could be dipped into that did not go away at the end of the year that could be used when grants require matching funds. Dr. Carter addressed this that essentially it’s not a council issue its more whether whatever restrictions we have put on us by the state

types of items for budget. You can’t have something that rolls over as a budget item. There was the pool of money that comes from lapsed salary funds that are returned and a decent portion of that returns to the college of the faculty members that the lapsed salary belongs to and that could be sent to this matching funds.

RESPONSE: That’s correct, the problem is that in this current budget environment it’s unlikely we will have dollars left over so that they will be available to dean’s as they salary lapse because we’re depending on savings and vacant positions and so on to pay off some of the obligations that we have.

6. Wanting to make sure there was faculty input on the move from the Provost Model to the College Model and making sure there was some ownership there and Dr. Carter also addressed that with respect that process will be open there will be forums this Fall with regard to how we go about that process and so this one will not go to a council either. It is information provided to the Provost for which he is starting this process this fall.

7. There is a recurring theme of transparency needed particularly with respect to the budget. These again for the most part can go in the memo to Dr. Carter with respect to administrative items. Making things especially on the web or through our resources more accessible; this was going to be something that was a task for administration as best we could.

8. CourseEval came up and there was the idea of not allowing students to access their grades without having at least logged in to CourseEval, not necessarily having completed anything, but logged in. This will go to Faculty Affairs; they are the body for continuing policy issues. Faculty Affairs has the CourseEval for the rest of its life.

COMMENT: I thought that Larry Hammer had already addressed this issue and that it was impossibility.

RESPONSE: Phil had put it down and said that this was not going to be accessible; this particular idea is not going to work, but the idea of other possible incentives for instance falls under Faculty Affairs.

RESPONSE: It is a very complicated question; the liability is affected by incentives as well as by the lack thereof, so it’s not an easy simple question; how you encourage greater participation in the CourseEval process.

COMMENT: Just curious, Kimmel School has a laptop requirement. This is a perfect opportunity for us to begin to look at how the laptop requirement is going to affect the response rate on CourseEval because what we’re all thinking about is once we have a university wide laptop requirement that faculty would set aside 15 minutes and at some point in the class have everyone log on and do Eval reports. Have you all starting talking about that?

RESPONSE: I know some people will reserve one of the computer labs and take them there. My class is too big so I don’t do that but that’s I know some people who have good response rates have done that.

COMMENT: You would think that all the students who have been taken into the computer lab would do the Course Eval. I’ve talked with faculty who have done that and they’ve gotten 10% of the people sitting there that didn’t it.

COMMENT: I took 20 students last fall to the computer lab the last 15 minutes of class specifically for course evaluations and I got 6 course evaluations. We actually walked up there as a class. There was lots of looking on Facebook, those kinds of things but they did not do course evaluations.

RESPONSE: We will mark one more item for Faculty Affairs to work on.

9. Pay for Print: the discussion of investigating how Pay for Print will affect instruction and pedagogy. In particular this one may fall to Faculty Affairs as well, but Dr. Carter commented he will take this to a task force that he is on; you and the CIO.

10. Faculty Voice on IT: came in part on policy coming out without not necessarily a lot of input from faculty. Dr. Carter informed the Senate leadership it is likely the task force that works with IT will be reformed as it has predominately executive council or committee members and one faculty member; David McCord, I believe it was? There is the chance that that will be reformed to have more faculty participation. That is on the Provost Webpage; they have a link.

11. General Education/General Studies/Liberal Studies: Where do we proceed from here? Since this was brought up at the caucus there has been the email and the report that the Provost and Dr. Beam worked on this summer has been sent out and is available on the Provost webpage along with the flowchart of the process that does include options starting at the departments or colleges; white papers, putting together faculty/university open forums, discussion. So that is now answered somewhat answered to that part, but that will be dealing a great part with APRC in the future.

RESPONSE: I would like to thank Beth for sending out the announcement that listed some of the topics that are coming up, ok thank you Erin, and thank Beth for forwarding it.

12. Ombudsman: was passed a year and a little more ago in Senate and has passed and gotten approval but funding was not there for it so there was the follow up request from faculty on the part of Faculty Affairs which led to the question of a budget for the Senate to help kick start things that come to the Senate that need funding don’t have other avenues for funding. The question was does Richard go to the BOT and ask for a line item for the senate for budget.

 RESPONSE: My response was I think it’s premature to take it to the board without having discussed it with in some detail with the Provost and/or the Chancellor first, but I will pursue this.

RESPONSE: Whichever group has the ability would be willing to discuss line item budget possibly for Senate.

13. Childcare: This would be Faculty Affairs Council. The point was made that childcare and possibly lack thereof deals greatly with faculty retention and loss of tenure track faculty due to the fact that there wasn’t adequate childcare . The Director of the Kneedler Center has been in contact and referred to working with Frank in the future and Faculty Affairs. If nothing else resolutions indicating the desire for the faculty to have the university work with faculty and area child care providers to enhance and promote what options we would have: engagement.

14. Maternity/Paternity Leave Policy was described as part of that. I believe it’s part of the Family Leave Act. That’s where it stands right now is how it’s handled, but it would not be bad for Faculty Affairs to look at how other University’s deal with it and making it a little bit better known if it needs to go into by laws; taking care of that so our faculty are easily informed.

15. Handheld devices in the classroom. Would Senate consider a policy regarding handheld devices such as ipods, netbooks, etc? This faculty member would like to have some backup if they wanted to tell a student they were not allowed to use such an instrument in the classroom. The response was made to put it in your syllabus if there needs to be something if the Senate feels that’s not enough.

COMMENT: I see no reason it can’t be looked at probably Faculty Affairs could be APRC either way. The facts are, I don’t think it’s required we have a university wide policy on such things. If you put it in your syllabus it applies to your class. Period. End of Story.

RESPONSE from Kyle Carter: Turn the clock back 30 years….I wouldn’t let a student sit and read a novel. We can do whatever we need in terms of policy, but I think faculty certainly have the ability to expect students attending when they’re in the classroom and to turn off the electronic devices and put them away. But maybe we need to have something out.

Last item would be for the Rules Committee:

There’s nothing in the elections that would prohibit all the Senate Leadership coming from one college: do you want to do something and how; is there a detriment, do you want to prevent the ability to have all of the Senate leadership coming from one college?

Erin thanked everyone who was able to make it to Faculty Forum and for those comments by email.

Her intent is to have these put on the Webpage and denote as to the things that have been sent to the Council are worked on and that we keep our faculty informed as to their ideas are being followed up on.

# SENATE REPORTS \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Administrative Report/Provost Kyle Carter

Enrollment is looking pretty good. You’ve probably seen lots of figures over the last couple of weeks. As I pointed out in my newsletter, that we’re still in a state of flux until Friday. Friday is census; we have drops for non-payment, during this time and right now after those drops for non-payment; we’re at 9338 students which is almost 300 students more than last year so that’s really good. Fifteen hundred fifty new freshman which is very good; it’s more than 300 students in the previous year. The SAT is a little bit lower than last year by about 5 points but as we look at SATs across the country and also the UNC system they tend to be down a couple points so we don’t know how we can interpret that. I think the quality of the class I think we can say is the relatively the same as last year.

We have almost 2000 graduate students in this number and like 7400 undergraduate students. The thing I’m most excited about though, is the retention rate. As of today, it’s 76%. That’s a record for this institution. It’s never been that high. We’ve been bouncing around in the low 70s for several years and that’s a significant change. And, I think we can point to a number of things that are going on. We have some really good programs going on in Residential Living; one called Western Keeps which is working with students on helping them to connect to the University. We have special programs coming out of Carol Burton’s area with the first year experience. Maybe one of the best things that has happened is we have a coordinated committee looking at the first year experience across everything whether it is registration or freshman seminar or programming in the Student Affairs. So, we’re making some real head-way and obviously the major thing that keeps students coming back would be the faculty. And so you all are doing a good job in working with freshman students and encouraging them to do their best and to come back. So that’s really positive and it’s important that we have a strong enrollment base at the University because of the budget situation that we are in. That’s probably the ugly part or the bad part; one of the two.

As the Chancellor pointed out we are probably positioned better than most universities in the system because we made some really tough decisions back in the spring; we actually cut more than we needed to back then. But what is happening now is that that has really paid off. What you will read in the newspaper is that our permanent cuts have to be somewhere around 5% or 6% for this year. Yet, we cut almost double that when you count fringe benefits. And so you begin to wonder why he is saying that’s a good thing. Well the State is only giving us 95% of our budget. So even though we’ve cut our budget on a permanent basis, we are getting 95% of that reduced budget. We’re able to use the amount we cut last year to help us through the reduction. The other thing that most people are assuming is that there will be another perm cut next year. If the economy begins to turn around a little bit and we begin to get 100% of our budget back, we still have that money that we can use for next year. So, we are really in pretty good position in that regard.

The other thing that I will tell you is that General Administration; one of the really positive things is that they are getting very serious about not reducing faculty which I take as a good sign and I’m sure you do as well. The part that bothers me though is that if you read the newspapers and *The News and Observer*, Erskine feels under attack and is trying to recover. The way he is trying to recover is showing that he’s going to be in command and he’s going to get rid of waste and unfortunately the things that have happened at NC State and the reports on administration coming out of Chapel Hill is painting everybody with a broad brush. So, we are being looked at like everybody else and most likely will have to reduce some administrative positions and GA is defining Senior Administration very broadly. Anything with a Chancellor, Provost or Dean in its title and I learned today, Directors, are being considered Senior Administration. So, if you have an Assistant Vice Chancellor, Assistant Dean you are suddenly considered Senior Administration. I will tell you we are the leanest administration in the system, but we are caught up in a political cult and I’m not quite sure what it means for us, but I think you all ought to be aware of it. So the ombudsman budget, as an example, although it might not have dean or vice chancellor in its title, it gets caught up in the ability for us to create new positions for those kinds of purposes.

H1N1 is another issue we’re dealing with. We have over 100 cases of people with flu like symptoms, we’re not declaring them as H1N1 but that takes awhile to get that information back. We also have 12 students in the hospital. UNC-Wilmington has over 240 cases right now. So, we are in the midst of this. I sent out an email to everyone reminding the faculty that we need to take this seriously and please don’t put pressure on students when they really shouldn’t be in class. We don’t need to have this spread. If you are not quite sure how easily this can spread just go to the dining hall and think about walking up to the 2nd floor and touching the banister. So this is something that we’ve all got to work on and we’ll keep you updated on that.

If you’re not aware, I’m doing a follow up to the dean’s evaluations that occurred in the spring. Your dept heads will be talking with you over the next couple weeks and what I’m going to be doing is meeting with dept heads to get feedback about some of the things. There are actually 2 questions: What are the things the dean has done to promote the college and to provide leadership in that capacity and what advice would you provide the deans in terms of leadership and management to improve. All faculty within the department are being asked to provide that feedback and then the department heads are going to sit with me and talk about the themes that they have found and then I’m going to work with the deans directly on that information. I gather info in other ways and one of the things you may or may not be aware of, the surveys you filled out in the first 2 years of a dean’s tenure; only the dean has seen. Evidently that’s causing some consternation among faculty. The reason I did that is that we had some brand new deans that had never been deans before and I didn’t want them to feel they were going to have a “gotcha” in the very first couple of years of their tenure. So this is a way I can honor that and at the same time get information from the faculty if there’s some issues that we need to address. We may re-visit the process that we currently have on the evaluation on the deans and the discussion of whether I should be looking at those evaluations or not and some deans are sharing them with me. The process is that I ask them to look at them and I ask them to write down the things that are of concern and then talk to me about them. But, those evaluations will be taking place over the next couple of weeks.

We have a heck of a lot going on on this campus; I think you probably know that. We have Gen Ed review, we have strategic analysis, college model; any one of those could consume the institution for some time. Frankly, I’m trying to figure it out in my own mind how we’re going to manage all of it. We will have a forum on September 17th where I know for sure we will be talking about the college model and what that means and how we may be able to proceed on that. I’m not sure what other topics will be there but if you’ve been to forums you know you can bring anything else you want.

It’s going to be a busy year. We still have on the table the potential restructuring of Arts and Sciences into the College of Science and Technology and Social Sciences and Humanities. I don’t know how many of you remember the George Clooney movie, The Perfect Storm, where the shrimper or fisherman goes out minding his own business and one storm tracks this way and then another tracks and then another and then they converge. That’s kind of the metaphor I use sometimes for processes that start on university campuses independent of one another. We started this conversation about a new college in the spring, then we get Gen Ed review, then Strategic Program Analysis, then we get the budget on top of it and I don’t know what else may happen over the next several weeks. So we have multiple storms tracking and I don’t want to be the person in the boat when those storms converge. George Clooney did not come back; he was not found.

We’re in for a very tough fall in many respects. Hopefully the faculty won’t be in for a tough fall, but administratively we’re going to be in for a tough fall. But it’s going to be our job to try to minimize these effects on you. You can certainly celebrate as the beginning of the year has opened up better than expected and it’s largely due to the work that you’ve done and continue to do with your students.

That’s my report.

Chair Report/Richard Beam:

Richard welcomed Ann Green as principal staff liaison from the Provost Office for the Faculty Senate.

He also announced that Dr. Betty Siegl who is a member of our Board of Trustees and is a former dean of the College of Education a number of years ago and who went on to become President of Kennesaw State University and a number of other things will be speaking tomorrow morning on Celebrating Differences at 10:00 in the University Theatre.

Richard also reminded everyone that the official groundbreaking for the HHS bldg is tomorrow afternoon at 1:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 p.m.