**MINUTES**

***November 21, 2013***

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

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

ROLL CALL

Present:

AJ Grube, Andrew Adams, Yang Fan, Patricia Foley, Katy Ginanni, Mary Jean Herzog, David Hudson, Leroy Kauffman, Rebecca Lasher, Beth Lofquist, David McCord, Erin McNelis, Justin Menickelli, Steve Miller, Malcolm Powell, Kathy Starr, Wes Stone, Karyn Tomczak

Members with Proxies:

Kia Asberg, David Belcher, Lisa Bloom, Shawn Collins, Chris Cooper, Beth Huber, George Ford, Will Lehman, Leigh Odom, Vicki Szabo, John Whitmire

Members Absent:

None

Recorder:

Ann Green

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

Approval of the Minutes

Motion:

The minutes of the Faculty Senate meeting of October 23, 2013 were approved as presented.

Before beginning the business of the meeting, Leroy Kauffman asked the senators and the senators responded by taking a few minutes of silence to think about and reflect on the losses that occurred this morning to the people and businesses along Centennial Drive that were affected by the fire this morning.

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

Faculty Assembly/Rebecca Lasher:

Most of the Faculty Assembly material will be presented later in the meeting today through discussion or resolutions. The proposal on parking is being presented to the fees committee. The proposal is for a tiered system based on income at the university. Parking charges will be prorated starting in 2014 and will be phased in over a 4-year period. A hand-out was passed out with more details and Rebecca asked the senators to share the information with others in their colleges. This is information on what is being presented based on feedback received.

Q/C: Is there a sense that this will lead to a parking garage?

A: Not necessarily. That is not a done deal. There is a lot of sentiment and comments; the hope that maybe we might not have to have a parking garage because of the beauty of our campus…we are looking at other alternatives, but we have to plan ahead for some changes in parking.

Q/C: Is this a way to put the parking system on better financial ground to do whatever we need to do in the future?

A: Exactly.

Q/C: is this money set aside to once all this income is generated and it could become?

A: It could. It’s in a reserve fund.

Beth Lofquist added that there is a different proposal for students if anyone is interested.

General discussion took place on the student parking proposals.

Discussion continued.

SGA/Kevin Grimes:

Kevin shared that they had also a parking meeting last night. Nobody was really happy with it. He said they were led to believe the funds from the increases would be going toward a parking garage. If that’s not case, the Student Government needs to be informed.

Beth interjected that the current thinking is that funds will go to a parking garage, although she understands people are questioning it.

Kevin did not have any additional items to report.

Staff Senate/David Rathbone, Chair Elect:

David thanked Phil Cauley for his work on the Parking Committee. The Shining Star Award will be presented to Phil for his work on the committee and for his consideration of the interests of everyone. David reported that the Staff Senate has been working on revisions of their By-laws. They are planning for a Staff Senate Forum and will be inviting Dr. Belcher and the new Provost, Dr. Morrison-Shetlar. They are also working on a second staff survey. They are considering having two representatives from retired staff on the Staff Senate.

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

Academic Policy and Review Council (APRC)/David Hudson, Chair:

There is no curriculum to be voted on. David gave everyone the opportunity to bring up any curriculum items for discussion. Nothing was raised for discussion.

David brought up the new policies for Academic Policies that have been under discussion. There were two points discussed in the Council meeting. One is related to the bullet that states “Students who attempt the final exam in a class will not be allowed to medically withdraw.” There is concern with the comment that “Instructors will need to provide the student’s last date of attendance to make this statement enforceable” because faculty don’t necessarily know the last date that someone was in the class in order to record it and that is going to have importance on determining whether or not they were there within the first 60 percent of the semester.

Lowell Davis explained that at the 60% point in the semester, students will possibly have to return financial aid money back to the federal government for loans. Anything after the 60% point, fostering student success says we can’t withdraw them, but we need to know the last date so we can determine whether or not we need to send the money back to the government or if the students would just owe that money back when they graduate from the institution.

Q/C: The point that was brought up at the APRC meeting is that the instructor doesn’t always know the last date that they attended because not everybody takes roll every day.

Q/C: That has financial aid implications for the university. The bottom line is that the cut-off is; whenever it is, as Lowell mentioned, the university has to return money to the federal government. If there’s nothing reported, they assume a date. That’s all they can do.

Q/C: So should we estimate the last date or do we all have to take…

Q/C: either you can estimate it or somebody else will.

Q/C from Lowell Davis: It’s hard because it’s a financial aid implication that will impact the student long term. I think that as X said you kind of have to take a guess and as a faculty member be on the safe side, you probably want to say if they came up until the 60% date, if not they have to immediately, in that semester, return that money back.

Q/C: Another question was is it possible for a student to withdraw for more than 16 hours? I think the clear answer to that is yes.

A from Lowell Davis: Yes, but it’s an F.

Q/C: is that per the policy?

A from Lowell Davis: Yes, it will turn into a W-F, which will calculate as an F grade.

Q/C: It says 4 courses or 16 hours. Sometimes 4 courses could be 20.

A from David Hudson: That actually came up…I don’t know that any final determination has been made other than they are going to leave that ultimate decision 4 courses or 16 to the institution to make their own individual decision. …boil down to some institutions and I’m not sure where we fall as to whether we would want that decision at the institutional level – everybody the same (16 or 4) or break it down into the colleges. For instance, nursing may do some things that are 12 credits…could easily see that as 48 credits that could be dropped. Same thing with teaching practicums and things like that with high credit. How many of those…?

Either way the 4 or 16 hours is going to stay; it’s just how are we going to handle it?

Q/C: is there a grandfather clause for people that have already dropped a class before this?

A from Lowell Davis: Yes. They do not count. Starting in the fall everyone’s clock will start.

A from Beth Lofquist: All of this was discussed extensively yesterday at the Provost’s Meeting at Chapel Hill and you are absolutely right. It is up to each institution to determine whether that is going to be 4 courses or 16 hours. Some institutions have said “whichever is reached first.” That in my mind would be a nightmare. Also to implement, one college does this and one college does this would be difficult as well. I think we’ve got to think about how we’re going to make this a user friendly way to implement, not just pick one.

Q/C: …it will still be legal if a student withdraws completely and they are possibilities for exceptions case by case?

A: Right, extenuating circumstances are not included in this. Those extenuating circumstances the bottom line is there is always an appeal process; at the end of the line on a lot of this stuff there is an appeal process.

Q/C: Will they be tagged differently in Banner? At one point there was discussion of a W vs. a special medical W…

A: I think that still needs to be hashed out…

Q/C: One of those that don’t go against your total hours, W for extenuating circumstances, it’s the only one I noticed that said withdrawing for extenuating circumstances will affect the satisfactory academic progress and course completion rates, does that mean that the others that were special withdrawals will not count toward the SAP?

A from Lowell Davis: The initial document or policy says that regardless of the reason that a student withdraws, whether it is an extenuating circumstance or they just decide to withdraw from a course it counts as a “W.” At the meeting in Chapel Hill, the majority of us felt that’s not fair. We are waiting on language from GA to tell us if we have to turn in a report of the number of withdrawals on our campus to give us the codes we need to use. We don’t know if it’s going to be “WX” for withdraw for extenuating circumstances. We’re going to be trying to figure that out. We’re going with if it is an extenuating circumstance, it will not factor to the students satisfactory academic progress or course completion rate.

Q/C: all of those that are special cases that don’t count toward a “W” then it should also not be intended to count toward their satisfactory academic progress.

A: That’s where we want to go. Financial aid and federal government still says a “W” is a “W.” That’s the federal government and we can’t change it… Our director of financial aid here is very understanding when we get to the point in the appeals process in helping students continue to take classes.

Q/C: So if you are having to withdraw, you don’t necessarily lose financial aid, but you would have to do the appeal if you… (unclear)

A: Yes, you will have to go there (to appeal), unfortunately.

Q/C: …the same statement is included under university withdrawals and under course withdrawals. If a student is registered for 15 hours which they need to be to get out of here in 4 years, per semester, they violate that if they withdraw once. A university withdrawal says I’m leaving the university period; it’s not a withdrawal from this class or that class…

A from David Hudson: This was a large topic of discussion, about the difference of the course withdrawal vs. university withdrawal and what it boiled down to…the university withdraws really has a lot to do with non-academic things when they starting to do contractual separations from residential life and other things…we didn’t really know what to do, where to go with this other than someone withdrawing out for an entire semester if they separated from the university, then they can’t come back to the university at another point and start the clock over again vs. I’m just need to leave for a semester because my mother was ill or something like that. Those count as the same as far as withdrawal pattern.

There’s also a discussion about whether we should carry between institutions. Nobody was really interested in going there except financial…most people were not.

Q/C: When a student fails first and it’s required that they have to re-take, is that the same as a repeat? With a grade replacement?

A: They have limited number of grade replacements already.

Q/C: I was under the impression at one point in Faculty Assembly they said if you had a failure for a course there was something about that was different and federal financial aid didn’t treat replacing that as a grade replacement…

A: We haven’t discussed that…

Q/C: Some of the federal financial aid stuff is satisfactorily completing two thirds or whatever. I think it might make a difference in terms of that calculation.

Discussion took place about the vote on the Academic Standards Policy and on adding a grandfather clause to the policy. The decision was to wait to vote on the policy until amendments have been incorporated. The vote is expected to take place in the January Faculty Senate meeting. This will give APRC the opportunity to work on amendments.

Q/C: On page 11, under the heading of *Revised Course Repeat & Grade Replacement Policy*, it says students may repeat a maximum of 16 credit hours. It was discussed and decided that the true meaning is that students may repeat “for grade replacement” a maximum of 16 credit hours. It was recommended that “for grade replacement” be added to the sentence.

Q/C: Does that mean somebody would not be able to earn a degree in their program if they repeated something outside of the program and then the 17th hour was a course required for graduation…

A: They could still repeat the course and get credit for it to satisfy the degree requirements, but they don’t get to replace the grade.

Other topics were discussed in Chapel Hill through break-out sessions with the faculty. They were given talking points of general things in the pipeline and what we can expect to see from G.A. David Hudson explained one of them is that we need to be accountable for the general education courses that are offered on our campus and showing they will be offered in a timely manner for people to graduate in 4 years. One of the first questions heard was will that pertain to online courses too? This seems to be a barrier. David said these are things to be thinking about as senators go back to their colleges and about how to track this.

David said another topic at the meeting centered on some of the barriers that prevent students from getting into majors. Discussion also took place on grade point average requirements to get into certain majors and if they are prohibitive? What is the justification for the GPA and what happens to the student that doesn’t get in? Do they have other pathways within the university to stay so we’re not losing students to outside the system? They will be asking for accountability here and asking why we need to have these requirements and what will happen to the students if they don’t make it into a major. Some of these same talking points came up in program prioritization.

Q/C: If you have a program that has a GPA requirement…are they just looking for that you have advising or avenues for that student so that if this particular major isn’t for you, but you like these courses…

A: I think they are looking more for a dovetailing with other programs so that students don’t get so far behind that they now go into these higher than 141 credits to satisfy the degree so it’s not a re-start after their sophomore year and they have to take a bunch more credits. They should be able to move over fairly seamlessly to something else. Discussion continued.

Beth Lofquist talked about core competencies as part of the comprehensive articulation agreement. The goal is to get all the institutions to agree to core competencies that can be assessed state-wide so that we can prove to the Board of Governors and our constituencies that our students are meeting or obtaining these competencies. The two competencies that have risen to the top are critical thinking and written communication. Each campus is asked to provide endorsement from their faculty for these two core competencies. Once this is done, a tremendous amount of work will need to be done about how to assess these competencies. A lot of conversation is taking place around this topic. Do you assess that you meet a threshold or is it going to be value added; i.e. freshman started here, seniors ended here. What kind of value is added? Another set of issues is do we want the assessments to be formative or summative? In all of these, is there somewhere in between. There is a hand-out that provides some points to consider. Beth said a tremendous amount of work has gone into this and even more work is going to be needed now because the stakes are higher when we are talking about deciding competencies and how to assess them.

The resolutions before Senate today are about saying that we as a university support critical thinking and written communication as core competencies.

Mary Jean explained that the resolutions fall under the heading of New Business and are brought forth out of order of the meeting agenda because Beth Lofquist has to leave the Senate meeting early today. The highlighted sections of the resolutions came out of a forum earlier this week. The resolutions came from Faculty Assembly and the highlighted sections from the WCU forum.

Erin McNelis said the original resolution points out that this is not a new change; it has been going on for over a year. What has been added came out of discussion of those that were at the forum and if we’re making a commitment to these competencies and know that means assessments are coming down the pike, we want to make it clear that we believe we need to have support from the UNC system, financially, administratively, clerically to go forward with the development of assessment. This is not going to be put on the students…(rest unclear).

Q/C: I wanted to share as Faculty Assembly delegate that all the UNC campuses are looking at this resolution to affirm it. We are the only campus that I know of that has added the piece about the finance. How many have approved?

A: I think 13. It may be one other institution, Winston Salem State had its own resolution, but from what I recall there wasn’t a comment about finance.

Discussion continued.

Erin McNelis said a report is needed in January of what the choices are and how we’re hoping to include support from campuses, why they were our choices, what was our process of determining them, plus a concise statement of what we are doing moving forward and what is intended to be the assessment implemented as a pilot next fall. Is it qualitative, quantitative, is it formative, is it summative, and/or how do you mix them? We have to have these stated in the report in January to President Ross.

Q/C: When you administer tests do we say every student in the university takes it or…

A: We have to suggest…one of things we have to decide is does every student take it? Generally they look to freshmen and seniors and that’s allowing for that value added that Beth talked about and there’s also the issue of how to you handle transfers because they are usually not identified as full-time first-time freshman. Then do they count as seniors if you can’t call them value added…Are you going to do a sampling; is it a percentage of your population, is it a minimum number of students, is it a stratified sample, a random stratified sample? Other institutions have offered incentives for students to take the test.

Q/C: I think what is in front of us right now, I think these two core competencies are reasonable ones and they are consistent with our own QEP that we developed on our own. I don’t see a problem with them and I would vote yes on the resolutions in front of us. There is a huge amount of detail yet to come and we want to be attentive to it, but…on identifying the two competencies, I would be comfortable – that’s all we are doing right now.

Discussion continued. Motion to approve the resolution was made and seconded.

**HAND VOTE on System Wide Competencies:**

**YES: 27**

**NO 0**

**ABSTENTIONS: 0**

**The motion passed.**

Beth added that she has asked Erin to work with Carol Burton and the Liberal Studies Committee on the conversations moving forward with General Administration.

Beth asked for feedback on the general education core of 30 hours instead of a 44 hour core from the community college system transfers. Carol Burton added that GA has established a process that has been intentional about involving the administrators on campus. They’ve gone directly to faculty for disciplinary panels which is great, we need that feedback, but at the end of the day we have always been a fairly strong transfer institution.

Erin McNelis said because the community colleges shrunk their general education core to 30 hours there was the worry that this was a system move and she re-iterated that the core is not being moved. Their general education is the core that everybody takes identically, and then depending on the degree and interest in the major, students generally have to take another 15 hours in general education. They have a 45 hour general education requirement for the Associate in Arts and in Science. Erin commented that in general she likes the spirit of the change and that it helps students progress toward their degrees. She expressed concern that there isn’t much detail in the comprehensive articulation agreement and concern about how the changes would impact the courses that have been set aside as upper level perspectives. Apparently everything talks about waiving the lower level GE classes, if you’ve completed all the GE requirements. WCU has not made them come back and take what’s now an upper level perspective. The health requirement is also an issue. If we have a health requirement, students don’t get that waived. Officially they have to take that. The question is, as an institution, are we going to be transfer friendly and say you’ve fulfilled the GE program? Is that satisfactory to us or not? Erin feels more details are needed. Mary Jean noted that the packet of information that Rebecca Lasher distributed includes attachments from the comprehensive articulation agreement starting with the message from Suzanne Ortega.

Q/C: I would want to make sure that we continue to be transfer friendly. We have a lot of of incoming students from the community colleges and if they don’t come here, they’re going to go somewhere else.

C from Beth Lofquist: Erin is correct, we are friendlier than a lot of our sister institutions.

Q/C: I was going to ask about transfer (unclear) how does that work?

A from Beth Lofquist: One thing about the 30 hours, part of it is if you go to just 30 hours, is what transfers into our gen ed/liberal studies program. The community colleges have to report completers whether they are certificate completers, degree or program completers, just like we do to their state office. In doing just the 30 hours instead of the 44, the concern was they won’t have completer of anything beyond 30 hours. Students will just take the 30 hours and transfer to the university. That’s why there is talk about their being a reverse transfer where once they do come to the university and take courses toward the major or toward finishing liberal studies, that they can actually reverse transfer those courses and they will earn an associates degree in abstention, basically. They will get it by finishing at a 4-year institution. Beth said this is her understanding.

Registrar, Larry Hammer, added that we are part of a pilot for that. There are 4 schools in the pilot, ASU, UNCC, the students are given the opportunity if they completed so many credits, they can opt out of the program and after they have hit a threshold of combined hours, we start automatically pushing grades back to the community colleges. It’s happening through an automated process. Once the community college articulates it back, they will award the associates degree.

Q/C: they don’t actually have to finish here to get that done do they?

A: That’s correct…they can earn it along the way.

Discussion continued.

Dual Enrollment questions came forth. Nursing is an existing dual enrollment program. Students can not actually receive financial aid from 2 institutions at the same time. They have one institution “home.” Usually the one that is granting the most hours and aid. There are some ways to do some agreements between the two institutions. Usually the financial aid directors work those out if they’re completing a class that’s going to come back that’s required degree credit they can add the cost of that attendance to their aid package here. It’s a lot of manual work to do that, but there are ways to do it.

Collegial Review Council (CRC)/Steve Miller, Chair:

Steve explained the purpose of the resolution proposed by CRC (CRC Resolution 3, Addition of Language to Add More Classifications to Protected Classes in Reappointment decisions).

In the section on reappointment in the Faculty Handbook, the UNC Code is quoted in the discussion of impermissible reasons for denying reappointment or terminating employment. Some of the impermissible reasons are faculty members’ race, color, sex, creed, national origin, religion, age, disability or veteran status. WCU Policy 10 has a longer list of protected classes than those listed in the UNC Code and includes gender identity or expression, genetic information, sexual orientation and political affiliation. Because Policy 10 expands the enumeration of protected classes, the CRC proposes revising the handbook language to reflect the additional classifications.

Steve explained it would be more smoothly presented if they could put all the classes in one list, but that wouldn’t have successfully quoted the UNC Code.

Q/C: … Section 4.01 of the Faculty Handbook is about equality of opportunity; there is a long list of classes. Should we add it there in addition to?

Q/C from Steve Miller: The easiest thing would be to mention it again everywhere. I’ve been looking through the Handbook and there are other places we could mention it.

Q/C: …in 4.01 it talks about WCU emphatically states that it will provide equal opportunity employment opportunities for all persons regardless of race, color, etc. …This is in keeping with 5.07 and the Civil Rights Act as amended and Executive Order 111246….NC General Statutes and other applicable laws…

It was suggested and agreed that the language should be placed in this location as one place where we say what we are protecting and we could refer back to it “protected, as covered in “X” so we don’t have to look to 5 places to make sure we have it updated. I’m fine with putting it where it is now, but I think maybe we can add this to the list of to-dos of the rules committee.

Discussion continued.

**VOTE on CRC Resolution 3: Addition of Language to Add More Classifications to “Protected Classes” in Reappointment Decisions**

**YES: 27**

**NO: 0**

**Abstain: 0**

**The vote passed.**

The CRC will have a meeting tomorrow. Steve said a lot of things that have been under discussion were tabled due to meetings with Mary Ann Lochner and discussion of the memorandum drafted by Mary Ann at the Provost’s request that was sent out to deans, dept. heads. On the council and senate in general there has been a lot of feedback on the memo. Faculty feedback was given to the legal counsel and Mary Ann had a 4-point checklist and she had an explanation that this was a memo of legal advice to managers; it’s not policy and wasn’t intended to scold them.

Faculty Affairs Council (FAC)/Pattie Foley, Chair

Provost Lofquist met with the council and brought forth changes to the university faculty awards. After some discussion, the council was pleased with the changes and they are endorsed by the Council. The changes were sent out. There were no comments or questions from the Senators.

**VOTE on Resolution of Changes to WCU University Faculty Awards**

**YES: 27**

**NO: 0**

**Abstain: 0**

**The vote passed.**

Pattie Foley thanked Andrew Adams for stepping up to serve as Chair for the Faculty Affairs Council next semester. Pattie will be leaving WCU at the end of Fall Semester. Mary Jean thanked Pattie for her dedication and wished her the best. This is Pattie’s last senate meeting.

Rules Committee/Leroy Kauffman, Chair

Changes are being proposed to both the by-laws of the general faculty and to the Faculty Handbook. There are two sets of By-laws in the Faculty Handbook, one for the Faculty Senate and one for the General Faculty. The Rules Committee has been working on By-laws for the General Faculty. Article 7 of Section 3.03 explains the process for amending By-laws for the General Faculty.

Leroy explained that Mary Ann Lochner with feedback and guidance from the committee looked at the Grievance Hearing Committee and the Faculty Hearing Committee which hears non-reappointment type things in general. Last year they became aware there was a piece in the By-laws about a Post-Tenure Review Appeals Committee that should not be there because PTR Appeals are actually reviewed by another group. This piece is in the process of being struck from the Handbook. As they started working on these sections, they decided to re-write the entire section about the Faculty Hearing and Grievance Hearing Committee. Leroy did not send the full red-line version but distributed a document showing the amendments and a memo from Mary Ann Lochner regarding the suggested revisions to the faculty hearing procedures. The memo summarizes the substantive changes that are being made to the By-laws and Leroy reviewed these in this meeting. Mary Ann was on hand to answer any questions.

Speaking specifically to the By-laws, Leroy stated that this is the first reading of the amendments to the By-laws and they will be brought forth again in the January Faculty Senate meeting for a vote.

Comment on the process: Part of the rationale for expanding…they’re big issues with getting a hearing committee convened in time because there is a limited time window…the logistics are very difficult…

Leroy explained that they queried a lot of peer schools and faculty chairs and the suggestions presented are borrowed heavily from NC State processes. The amendments being proposed are similar in the review panel and size of the committee to a lot of other institutions.

Faculty Handbook Sections 4.01 to 4.10 are also being subjected to modifications. Leroy explained, if this body takes action and passes these changes, they will go to WCU legal counsel, to the Board of Trustees, our Chancellor, and to the President of the UNC system before it becomes official. There are major re-writes within these sections including the deletion of Section 4.10(C) (about the Post Tenure Review Appeals Committee), and the insertion of the proposed 4.10D (Draft #3 10-17-13).

Mary Ann Lochner interjected that she talked with the Rules Committee, Erin McNelis, and a number of folks. The changes recommended to the By-Laws came about because of significant changes to the Faculty Hearing Committee Procedures and the Grievance Hearing Procedures. The Grievance Hearing Process was found in the By-laws of the Faculty Handbook which made it very difficult to change them to conform to UNC policy and also to find them. They want to pull these out of the By-laws and put them with other employment policies that are found in Section 4.0 of the Handbook. Employment policies would then be all together. Grievance procedures would be a new Section 4.10 in the employment policies. The Faculty Hearing Committee procedures are found in Section 4 to 4.10. Those were changed substantially to bring some standardization and to pick up some things from UNC Code and Policy and to make it easier to amend the procedures and for faculty to find out what to do and when to do it. These changes require little to the By-laws, but a lot of changes to the Procedures.

Leroy commented on how the changes to Section 4.10 lay out the section nicely without having to go elsewhere for information. This is an improvement over what is currently in place.

Q: The membership of the committee…and the issue of duplication of membership on these committees with someone on a dept., college, university and hearing committee. Did you address duplication?

A from Mary Ann: We put in a new conflict of interest section to address that issue. With respect to elections of representatives on collegial review committees and then faculty hearing committee, that would be in the by-laws or other governing documents, but it is addressed for the first time because we have conflict of interest provisions in both the Faculty Hearing Committee procedures and the Grievance Committee procedures. Mary Ann explained this means that anybody whether on collegial review committee at department or university level, if they have prior knowledge of a reappointment or tenure issue from before the hearing, they would have to be recused.

Discussion continued.

The vote for these proposed amendments will take place at the next meeting.

Public voting and a proposed Resolution on Public Voting were discussed next. Leroy brought up for consideration the question of whether votes should be recorded with the minutes and posted on the website? Leroy explained that they discussed several things and the committee decided if somebody wanted the information, it could be made available to them as opposed to placing it on the website.

Mary Jean went to a demonstration of Poll Everywhere software. Poll Everywhere would require some type of texting device or a computer in order to record individual votes. Some people have a reaction to using personal devices for this purpose. There is also a possibility of using the current clickers already in use and assigning a clicker to individuals so votes can be captured and recorded. Another option is to take a roll call vote, but the committee was generally not in favor of this method.

Q: How would proxy voting be affected by this?

A: Hopefully when people give you proxy there is a discussion on how they would like you to vote…

Q: Does open voting necessarily mean recording the vote of each individual? I thought that is what we were getting at, but I wasn’t sure if it meant a summary, i.e. there were 5 “No”, 6 “Yes”…

A: I think the tenor of the proposal was that I could know how you voted.

Q: Remind me why…

A: The concern was for untenured faculty that they could be consequences to them aside from losing an election

Discussion continued.

**Vote on Public Voting Resolution**

**Yes: 25**

**No: 0**

**Abstain: 0**

**Unanimous**

**The vote passed.**

The exact method of recording votes will be worked out later.

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

New Business:

New Business was discussed earlier (Resolution of System-Wide Competencies).

Old Business:

None

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

Administrative Report/Interim Provost Beth Tyson Lofquist:

Beth Lofquist had to leave the meeting early, but her written report was distributed before the meeting.

Faculty Senate Chair Report/Mary Jean Herzog:

Mary Jean distributed her written report earlier and asked for any questions. There were none.

Mary Jean asked the Senators if they wished to continue having refreshments at the Senate meetings and went over the cost of having them. The general consensus was to keep having refreshments and to add caffeine.

The meeting adjourned.