**MINUTES**

***April 24, 2014***

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

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

ROLL CALL

Present:

Andrew Adams, Kia Asberg, David Belcher, Lisa Bloom, Shawn Collins, Christopher-Cooper, Yang Fan, George Ford, AJ Grube, Mary Jean Herzog, Leroy Kauffman, Rebecca Lasher, Will Lehman, Erin McNelis, Justin Menickelli, Steve Miller, Alison Morrison-Shetlar, Leigh Odom, Malcolm Powell, Kathy Starr, Wes Stone, Karyn Tomczak, Cheryl Waters-Tormey, John Whitmire

Members with Proxies:

Katy Ginanni, Beth Huber, David McCord, David Hudson

Members Absent:

None

Recorder:

Ann Green

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

Approval of the Minutes

Motion:

Motion to change order and do a ballot vote 1st- Approved

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of March 26, 2014, as well as the overflow meeting of April 2, 2014, were approved as presented.

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

Chancellor’s Report/David Belcher:

See Attachment 1

**Faculty Assembly Report/Rebecca Lasher:**

Hopefully, all have read the reports and resolutions that have come through faculty assembly, as well as our resolutions supporting those. The assessment plan for Gen Ed was presented to the BOG. Essentially, they didn’t vote, so we are to continue under the assumption that we have some sort of backing. The idea is that we are going to partner with ETS and the UNC system to create an assessment tool to assess critical thinking and written communication.

SGA/Colton Overcash:

None

Staff Senate/Robin Hitch:

This is the last Staff Senate for Chair Robin Hitch. David Rathbone will be taking over in the fall. They had great Staff Senate service and a successful yard sale with an increase of over $700 and staff senate was able to give 2 scholarships. They had a great election with a huge number of nominations. There is an upcoming Staff Senate forum meet and greet with the chancellor and provost. Staff members are encouraged to attend.

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

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

*Curriculum*

BSBA/Leroy: New distance learning program for the BSBA (Business Administration & Law) requires us to vote to recommend or suggest advisory to the Provost.

Q/C: Our BSBA program in Business Administration & Law is one of only three central programs in the country that requires at least 21 hours of business law content, and the other two are west of the Mississippi. Most of the courses involved in this are already taught online, so it does not require additional faculty resources. It required the preparation of three courses that had to be taught online, and that was pretty much the extent of it. We have an online minor that has been very widely received and we have every indication that the online major will also be successful.

Q/C: I just wanted to add---because we already have a BSBA online in Entrepreneurship, all of the core classes were already taught online. That is why this was so easy.

Q/C: It is an existing program, so I don’t know what the procedure is and whether it needs a vote.

Discussion continues about the vote.

**BSBA DISTANCE PROGRAM**

**Yes: 23**

**No: 1**

**Abstained: 2**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**See Attachment 2 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

**The vote passes.**

*Resolution on Composition Condition Grade*

Q/C: It’s a policy that pre-dates the field of rhetoric and composition as a field of study. There are lots of other issues with is from an administrative position and from pedagogical standpoint. What we see in looking at other UNC systems is nothing like this, they have more writing across the curriculum. We would like this policy to go away, as its time has come and gone.

Alison Morrison-Shetlar: I did not know that this was coming forward, so this is new to me, and I have a few questions. A resolution to abolish the composition condition grade. I would like to know what would replace it, or if the decision of the faculty is that we do not need to worry about students’ ability to write. I’m just asking what is going to replace this, if anything. I just pulled some numbers to see what was going on with the composition condition marks, and I get a little concerned when we talk about that we haven’t been following early policies as a reason to remove something. I’m not disputing anything, just looking at the facts here. Currently, we have 252 students who have one CC grade. 66 are graduating this May. There are 12 of those students who have CC grades that are actually documented. My concern really is how many other students are out there who are not being documented as having issues with writing? I do agree with the notion about not knowing what specific things they need to be working on, so I’m really just asking the question: What is going to replace this, if we get rid of it, and are we getting rid of it because we are not following our own policies? Would that be one way to, at least in the interim, say, “Let’s follow our policies and see what the need is,” and then at the same time address what could be done to make the situation better.

Q/C: The APRC had some other concerns. We talked about critical thinking---this assessment program that we just looked at. The issue is not recognizing that students have two CC grades, it’s the course that they have to complete to make that go away, we haven’t been offering.

Q/C: It has been offered, but not regularly, and probably when it hasn’t been offered it’s when students haven’t been identified as needing it.

Q/C: The committee felt like that one course would not be enough to address the problem in the first place. So, here is something more that is needed, but this policy is not working and administratively, we’re just not doing what is in the books.

Q/C: Okay, is that a reason to get rid of something?

Q/C: I totally understand not getting rid of the policy because we haven’t been following it. I don’t think that the necessarily---I think the reason we haven’t been following it is the reason that we’re now addressing it. What happened is that, when we switched to banner, students were no longer identified; they were no longer told that they needed to take the class. So, at that point we weren’t offering because we didn’t know, as a department, that we had to offer it. Since we found out that this happened, we are offering it for the students that need to take it in the fall to graduate. I think that this is not so much about the policy not being implemented as much as the fact that the policy seems like one that is not working anyway. Also, another point I wanted to make--- At some point, a department head before me allow students to also take 401, which is a writing for careers class, to satisfy the CC. This probably happened because there was a staffing issue, and this was a way to have a class that we taught anyway that students could take. Pedagogically, this is not an appropriate class for students who are in this position. The question of what we are going to do is a bigger question. This is something that we’re looking at in the department, but I think that this is something we need to look at this institutionally, as opposed to making this an issue where students make it to a certain point and then are set back to take a class in the English department, as opposed to being taught to write within their disciplines in the university.

Q/C: I think it would be a mistake to look at this resolution as us kind of conceding to those students slipping through the cracks. I think there needs to be a larger institutional discussion about how to serve these students, particularly giving that communication have been identified. From the disciplinary perspective, it is not considered a viable method, even if we have a very concrete identification of what across the departments that students are going to be identified for. What they need put into a single course is simply not supported by research and pedagogy. It literally pre-dates research into this area. I think that we need a more robust system and I really interpret this as really preventing us from taking that next step towards a more meaningful and robust solution.

Discussion continues about the Composition Condition Grade.

**COMPOSITION CONDITION GRADE**

**Yes: 18**

**No: 6**

**Abstained: 2**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**See Attachment 2 for Voting Record of Individual Senator**

**The vote passes.**

*Resolution on Contextual Transcript (from SGA)*

Grade reporting would have some sort of base-line type statistics given that grades would have a percentile that would say “C was in a 60th percentile” for example.

Q/C: I don’t think anyone cares, quite frankly, looking at a transcript.

Q/C: I don’t think it’s common to give a percentile on a non-numerical value.

A motion was set in place to table the resolution.

**TABLE THE CONTEXTUAL TRANSCRIPT RESOLUTION**

**Yes: 25**

**No: 1**

**Abstained: None**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**See Attachment 2 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

**The vote passes.**

*Revised Academic Integrity Policy*

There were some changes in the wording in reference to aligning the academic integrity policy with the student code of conduct. It gives the professor in the classroom the opportunity to notify the student, in writing, and the students have five days to respond to the allegation. Also, a student no longer has to participate. It gives the professor a lot of control. It removes the automatic hearing, but the student still has the option if they wish.

Q/C: The APRC supports this and there was not much discussion

Q/C: Does days mean school days?

Q/C: The policy determines days as calander days, however, we do allow for extensions in the case that is would fall over a break or something along those lines.

Q/C: Basically, there could be no more academic hearings, if everything is mutally resolved?

Q/C: That is a possibility. However, I doubt the probablilty of that.

Discussion continues about second offences and hearings.

*Written Student Complaint Log*

This is saying, at the end of the academic year, all complaints will go over to Academic Affairs Office.When the SACS officer comes, the person has to actually check the complaint log all over campus. It is not only a SACS requirement, it is a federal requirement. It all has to be locked into one place and central location.

**WRITTEN STUDENT COMPLAINT LOG**

**Yes: 26**

**No: 0**

**Abstained: None**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**See Attachment 2 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

**The vote passes.**

*Non-Degree Seeking Students*

This was an issue where we have students that are non-degree seeking, and they want to limit those student to 18 hours. There are students who come in non-degree seeking but take courses and qualify for a program, but will not earn a degree because they are not officially admitted into a program.

Q/C: For grad students it used to only be 12 hours. Is this changing it?

Q/C: I’m concerned about non-degree seeking students taking 18 hours.

Q/C: It applies for both undergraduate and graduate, but honestly, we can go to 12 for grad students.

Discussion continues about how this will affect grad students

It was recommended that undergraduate be maximum 18 credit hours and graduate be maximum 12 credit hours. Student may seek an exception to this rule.

**NON-DEGREE SEEKING STUDENTS w/ EDITS**

**Yes: 26**

**No: 0**

**Abstained: None**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**See Attachment 2 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

**The vote passes.**

*Language requirements for international exchange students*

The IVT score is 79, which is pretty high. We went from having no minimum to having a high minimum. We can go a little lower and still have good communication with these students. There is no vote on this.

At this point, senators completed ballots for the various committees needing Faculty Senate Appointments and Elections.

Collegial Review Council: Steve Miller, Chair

The Council will be taking a step back on discussing the emeritus status and process of application so they can involve some of the people who were involved in the last discussions of emeritus status in the new discussions.

The Council held a joint meeting with FAC and CRC and set up a task force on the standardization of SAI reports. CourseEval now has the capabilites to see SAI scores in a summary table. Faculty are going to need to work with it, as it is a new program. The idea is that this is something that can be custom set-up. There are a signifigant number of faculty that have strongly expressed the desire for break-downs (agree, disagree, etc.) still, but what would be added would be distributions and percentages. Examples were shown. We want to know from senators what we should be adding. Send feedback to Steve Miller.

Faculty Affairs Council: AJ Grube, Chair

The bookstore now reports to Student Affairs instead of Administration and Finance, and they are considering changes in the bookstore operations and are sending a faculty survey out.

**VOTE ON 125TH ANNIVERSARY**

**Yes: 26**

**No: 0**

**Abstained: None**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**The vote passes.**

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

*Resolution on Courtesy Appointments:*

Q/C: What was the policy on this before?

A: There wasn’t a policy before.

Q/C: under responsibilities and benefits (2nd paragraph), …a courtesy appointment – a faculty member is asked to teach a class in another department, who will do that part of an evaluation? That’s not addressed, whether its their home department or the courtesy department.

A: We did not discuss that. That’s not addressed now anywhere. We have people who teach in other departments and there’s no policy on that.

Q/C: I think it should be.

A: But, it probably shouldn’t be here. It should be a broader statement somewhere else.

Discussion continued.

**COURTESY APPTS**

**Yes: 26**

**No: 0**

**Abstained: None**

**Did Not Vote: 0**

**See Attachment 2 for Voting Record of Individual Senators.**

**The vote passes.**

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

Resolutions from UNC Faculty Assembly

Q/C: For those who were at Faculty Assembly, what was the argument against a five-year plan or having something in writing if beyond the expectations on the departmental CRD-- if you had specialized plans for yourself in the five-year plan?

A: one of the issues that was presented was that its redundant with the annual evaluation and then, one of the points on the five-year is that a five-year plan could be too long a plan for somebody to have to plan for.

Q/C: I guess I thought it could have been edited, or updated.

A: That was one of the things that people were very concerned about. In year one you have these opportunities and ideas about the things you want to do and you change (unclear)…so there was concern about the inflexibility in a five-year plan.

A: …#1 was a big issue, the evaluative review by the deans, was a big issue that they did not like.

A: And, they didn’t like the 3 categories, they wanted it basically pass/fail. My sense of the discussion – one of the biggest things- was that it’s redundant with the annual evaluations.

Q/C: …once you’ve gotten tenure…you’ve been successful…the idea to continue to ask us to take the time to have plan and deliver on them. I guess I feel on tenure you shouldn’t have to do that anymore…and then evaluating whether that plan is detailed or not, realistic or not….it seems to be adding some complications.

Q/C: Having been through post-tenure review, we don’t do that now and I’m afraid if you have a 5-year plan and something happens, then you are responsible for that.

Q/C: I know the departments I’ve been in have had plans in place for post tenure review and it’s basically your 5 years of AFEs and your annual evaluations by the committee…so the redundancy and kind of inefficiency and beauracracy is a problem.

Discussion continued.

This resolution is to support the Faculty Assembly resolution.

At some point, it’s expected the provost will get a directive from GA about what the post tenure review policy needs to include…at that point, we will have to re-write it.

Q/C: Was there a discussion about why this should be added?

A: That’s what the BOG wants. They really are struggling with post tenure review. I think this is their bargaining tool; that ok we’re going to let you keep tenure, but we want to beef up post tenure review. That’s the sense.

A: There is this sense that we’re not doing a good job with post tenure review from the heads of the system.

Discussion continued. It was decided by vote to table the discussion and take it up in an overflow meeting.

There will be an overflow meeting.

**ATTACHMENT 1**

Faculty Senate

Chancellor’s Report

24 April 2014

Resolution on the Proposed Revisions to the UNC Post-Tenure Review Policy

Later in your meeting, you will consider a resolution from the Faculty Assembly which takes issue with some aspects of the proposed revisions to the UNC Post-Tenure Review Policy. I certainly support your right to express your perspectives and do not intend my brief remarks here to be in any way a run at trying to persuade you not to adopt the resolution before you. However, inasmuch as I was one of the 7-member working group which drafted the proposal and am supportive of it, I feel compelled to share that with you. The resolution from the Faculty Assembly details four areas of concern.

* Regarding evaluative review by deans, inasmuch as deans evaluate tenure and promotion dossiers from all disciplines in their colleges, I believe that they can also do so with regard to post-tenure review. And I do think that an evaluative review at the dean level will serve to strengthen our post-tenure review processes on campus.
* I believe that the addition of a third category will allow the UNC System to effect a system of rewards which the original policy envisioned but which was never operationalized.
* I believe that five-year directional goals will assist faculty in strategically planning their own professional trajectory within the context of institutional, college, and departmental plans. The language of the policy as drafted provides adequate flexibility to accommodate unanticipated changes and opportunities, though, of course, such flexibility will need to be ensured through campus-based implementation.
* The possible undermining of faculty confidence in the university administration and governing bodies will be dependent on the manner in which post-tenure procedures are conducted on individual campuses. Provost Morrison-Shetlar and I totally agree that the process must be formative in nature, and, if we are successful in implementing it in such a manner, I believe that Western Carolina can avoid this result.

Again, I completely support your voice and will respect your vote today no matter which way it goes. But I felt compelled to note my own perspective on the topic.

The Budget

**At WCU:** We completed our budget hearing process about a month ago with strong input from around the campus. Given the year-end funding we anticipate having, we have authorized a first round of one-time purchases of critical-need, priority items which surfaced as priorities in the budget discussions. Because the state budget for next year will not be completed until the end of the legislative session, tentatively anticipated to end around the end of June, we are not in a position to know how much funding we might have to dedicate to recurring priorities. The brainstorming session with the Chancellor’s Leadership Council and the Budget Advisory Council underscored that funding for salaries, a compliance officer, and various items to support enrollment growth should be our top recurring priorities. I should note that, because WCU met its enrollment targets in the 2012-13 academic year, we should have at least a bit of recurring funding to distribute. On the issue of salaries, remember that the university only has the authority given to it through the appropriations act; even if Western Carolina has recurring funding that it wishes to distribute for salary increases, we can do so only if the language of the appropriations act allows us to do so.

**At the state level:** As you may have seen in news reports in recent weeks, state revenues are down this year over last, a situation which has prompted state officials to sound a much more cautionary note regarding the possibility of statewide salary increases. In addition, we anticipate the possibility that state agencies, including universities, may sustain additional budget cuts. We will keep you informed.

Enrollment

Western Carolina’s steady enrollment increase, strongly supported by increases in our retention rate, and the related achievement of annual student credit hour targets has sustained our university in the last few years and allowed us to grow. Continuing enrollment growth will be necessary to continue this positive trajectory. As of Monday of this week, WCU had 15,387 applicants for approximately 1,650 freshman slots. But transfer and graduate applications are, at the moment, down. The real key for achieving overall enrollment and SCH targets for next year will be retention of existing students.

Millennial Campus Lease

At its April meeting, the Board of Governors unanimously approved WCU’s proposal to lease its millennial campus for a period of 65 years to its Endowment Fund. It will take another 6 months to effect the lease, but this will be a huge boost for us as we pursue private development on the millennial campus because it will result in a shorter construction timeline due to regulatory reductions. While many were involved in getting us to this point, I must acknowledge Mary Ann Lochner who did yeoman’s work on this initiative. At least one other university has already been in contact to learn more about this arrangement with a thought to pursuing it as well.

Leadership Academy

The first year of WCU’s Leadership Academy will wrap up in mid-May with a five-day capstone tour of Western North Carolina which will take the group to Murphy, Hayesville, Cherokee, Franklin, Highlands, Cashiers, and the Asheville-Hendersonville area to get first-hand exposure to the education, health care, environment, tourism, and business sectors in this region of the state that Western Carolina is charged with serving. This capstone experience is based on the guiding philosophy that, as the university undertakes professional development opportunities to grow its own leaders, it is critical that those leaders are grounded in the area which WCU serves; thus, the experience is a natural outgrowth of our university’s commitment to its external community.

Faculty/Staff Excellence Awards Ceremony

Please join us on Friday, April 25, 3:30 p.m., in the UC Grand Room as we celebrate Western’s faculty and staff who do what I call “the real work of our university”. I look forward to recognizing particular achievement among our faculty and staff and to celebrating with you on a more personal level in the reception which will follow the ceremony.

A Note of Thanks

The end of each academic year is also a moment of Faculty Senate leadership transition. I am truly grateful to all faculty members who commit time, energy, and passion to the shared governance enterprise at Western Carolina. For shared governance to work, it has to be more than a worthy concept; it must be owned and “done”. I am particularly grateful to the Faculty Senators who are rotating off of the Senate this year. They have served faithfully in their leadership roles, and I have been thankful for their assistance and guidance in my first three years here. I truly learn a lot from these faculty colleagues.

Let me offer a particular note of thanks to Mary Jean Herzog who, as chair of the faculty, has been a fine partner in leadership during the last two years. She has contributed enormous amounts of time, energy, thought, and commitment to her role and thus to our university as a whole, and I am grateful to her.

Concluding Note

It has been a good year – not without challenges, to be sure, but a good year in which we have worked together in dealing with challenges and seizing opportunities. Western Carolina is growing its reputation as an innovative, can-do institution focused on students, their success, and excellence. This reputation is based in reality, and the reality rests on the shoulders of the faculty and staff who make this university what it is.

I offer my best wishes for a great summer!

David Belcher

Chancellor

