Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, April 5, 2017
Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House
3:00 – 5:00 PM

3:00  Call to Order & Remarks
Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair

3:05  Approval of March 1, 2017 Minutes  [Enc. A]
Brad Johnson, Faculty Senate Secretary

3:15  Dana Dunn, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor  [Enc. B]
(25 min) Remarks
(10 min) Remarks
(15 min) Questions from the floor

3:40  Resolutions (3) Senate Government Committee
Greg Bell, Committee Chair & Senate Liaison
Three (3) Senate Committees on Faculty Issues and Support
Resolution #FS04052017/1: To Establish the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Issues
Resolution #FS04052017/2: To Change the Name and Charge of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons Committee to the Professional Development Committee
Resolution #FS04052017/3: To Change the Name and Charge of the Faculty Professional Development, Compensation and Welfare Committee to the Faculty Professional Compensation and Welfare Committee

4:10  Resolutions from Academic Policies Committee
Colleen Fairbanks, Chair & Wade Maki, Senate Liaison
(15 min) Resolution #FS04052017/4: On Faculty Accessibility  [Enc. F]
(15 min) Resolution #FS04052017/5: To Revise the Academic Good Standing Policy  [Enc. G]

4:40  UNC Faculty Assembly Report Feb. 20 Meeting  [Enc. H]
Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair

4:50  Nomination of Honorary Degrees Committee Member
Stoel Burrowes, Senate Elections Committee Chair

4:55  Announcements & Adjournment

General Faculty Meeting & Reception!
3-5p, Wednesday, April 19, 2017
Alumni House, Virginia Dare Room
Reception Immediately Following Meeting in the Faculty Center
Refreshments provided by: UTLC, Faculty Senate, AAUP

Next Meeting of the Faculty Senate
Wednesday, May 3, 2017, 3-5p
Alumni House, Virginia Dare Room

NOTE: We encourage Senators, non-voting faculty and visitors to speak upon being recognized by the Senate Chair

Sign Language Services provided as needed and requested (please allow 72 hours) by:
Communications Services for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing.
Contact: 336-275-8878, or the Faculty Senate Office, 336-334-5345/mlwolfe@uncg.edu
Call to Order and Introductory Remarks
Anne Wallace, Chair of the General Faculty and Faculty Senate

- I was going to make a joke about having to be inside on such a lovely summer day, but the weather hasn't quite followed the forecast, at least not the one I saw. I guess we shouldn't be surprised anymore when events don't follow predictions . . .
- There is just a whole lot going on, in D.C., in Raleigh, and here. The meeting with Staff and Senate leaders, and the Chancellor's "external affairs" team, that I described to you in a recent email gives you some sense, I hope, of how we're keeping communications open so we can work together.
- At UNC Faculty Assembly, too, as I think mentioned, the leadership keeps close watch on legislative initiatives old and new, some of which you may have heard about in the news or through watchdog organizations—resurrected "open carry" bills, the so-called "restore campus free speech" bills that seek (among other things) to limit protests aimed at campus speakers, etc. On the positive side, the UNC system is getting a look at more draft bills than ever before, so FA can be alert as to when action may be needed. We'll bring you further details in the next Faculty Assembly delegation reports.
- I want to talk briefly about the business coming to our Senate over the next two meetings, because it's going to be a busy time. In the April 5 and May 3 meetings, you can expect to see: a number of resolutions from the Government Committee having to do with committee names and charges; recommendations from the Academic Integrity Task Force for changes in the AI policy; 2 resolutions from the Academic Policy Committee, one regarding faculty accessibility to students, and another following up on current withdrawal policies; and a resolution and discussion from GEC that will work toward launching a General Education curriculum review next year.
- So perhaps you can hear this between the lines: the May 3 meeting is a real business meeting, with important actions pending. Please, if you do not yet have a conflict (like giving a final) for that meeting, don't acquire one. We do need a good full roster of Senators present to engage these matters.
● This press of business may help explain to you why I took it upon myself to work with David Teachout through quite a bit of the early work on the Student Ratings of Instruction initiative, and agreed that an ad hoc committee of faculty organized by Dave was the best way to go in these early stages. Now, with some draft materials and preliminary ideas ready for discussion, the Senate and faculty generally can have substantive, specific discussions about whether such a University instrument is needed, and if so, what it might look like. Today is the first such discussion, and Dave will be talking to you about the further avenues for discussion in his presentation.

● Let me close, then, by asking that you be sure that three Senate dates are on your calendar: March 22, when the SRI discussion continues in a Forum setting; April 5, when more on the SRI and other important matters will come before the Senate; and May 3, a real live business meeting. As a bad but beloved 1960s TV show used to put it—be there, Aloha!

Approval of the February 1, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Brad Johnson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate (Enc. A)

● No corrections.
● Minutes passed.

Provost Remarks

Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

● Remarks
  ○ Pace of the season (weather, meetings, etc.) has been fast so far this semester
  ○ Recent faculty searches indicative of expanding our faculty
  ○ Dean of the Library search is unfolding and is quickly wrapping up
    ■ 5th of 5 final candidates is on campus today
    ■ Hope to meet with search committee next week to make final recommendations
    ■ Presentations by candidates were videotaped and are available off the Provost’s website
  ○ Yesterday, members of University administration and alumni spent time at the NC Legislature
    ■ UNCG was acknowledged for its 125th anniversary
    ■ Several visits to representatives were made to keep UNCG’s agenda at the top of
      ● Importance of funding our growth
      ● Funding faculty and recruitment fund
    ■ Newly released budget does include the faculty recruitment and retention fund that was originally proposed
  ○ Grant Seed Awards have been announced (available on Provost’s website)
    ■ Funded 10 research projects linked to strategic plan (3 community engaged, 7 general)
- Funded 12 teaching projects tied to the strategic plan
  - Provost reminded us should have been working within our departments and units for resource requests
    - Deans’ requests are due to Provost this Friday, who will then spend the next 6 weeks reviewing and prioritizing requests
    - If all goes as anticipated, will have growth funding in order to expand faculty size
    - Will learn this week if modest tuition increase has been approved by the BOG
  - General Education Council’s review of General Education Curriculum
    - Provost has been working to garner interest in and support of this review
    - Gen Ed curriculum hasn’t been reviewed in over a decade
    - Provost asks for faculty to be supportive of the proposal coming forward in order to support our students and be in line with accreditation
  - Recent accolade for the University
    - Education Trust has named UNCG as one for the top institutions in the nation in terms of closing the Black-White Achievement gaps—we are near the top of the list in terms of our peers

- Questions from the Floor
  - Rumors from faculty and staff regarding a shared services model of staffing—can you comment?
    - Origin of the rumors come from a consulting engagement from McKinsey & Co.
    - Working with McKinsey and their recommendations in terms of savings in shared services
      - Shared services may not mean the same thing—across the institution instead of within
        - Example: requested Ombudsmen office
    - Currently have 2.5 year initiative underway with the Banner XE implementation—Involves review of all business processes to make sure we are as efficient as possible
      - This review may lead to suggestions for revisions in processes within and among units
    - Long-term strategy to make UNCG more efficient and effective in offering services
    - Rumors about layoffs of faculty or staff are not true
    - Provost asked that if further questions arise, please make her aware
      - She addressed this specifically at Staff Senate
  - Student brought a form from Athletic department that apparently
    - There is not a University policy requiring faculty to comply with those excused absences
    - Review of Athletics recommended that faculty entertain a policy with respect to this
Provost asked for faculty, when able, to cooperate with students and organized activities because they are representing the University.

UNCG Communications

Jeff Shafer, Associate Vice Chancellor & Chief Communications Officer

**Remarks**

- Was introduced by the Provost
  - Jeff comes to us from Lenovo where he was involved in teaching and serving on University advisory boards in his previous work
  - Was part of global communications with Lenovo
  - Problem--as a University, the narrative we want out there is not yet out there
    - How do we define our narrative before others or crises define us?
  - His problem now--how to put the platform in place to convey all the interesting stories happening at UNCG
  - Has spent time speaking with various people at UNCG in order to learn as much as possible about who we are as a University
  - Tired of being the best kept secret in the UNC System
  - What do people think of when people shut their eyes and hear “UNC Greensboro”--people haven’t developed an image like they may have for other institutions throughout the state
  - Have an RFP out to examine our logo and brand
  - 125th anniversary will begin June 2, 2017 (125 days before Founder’s Day in October)
  - Follow Jeff on Twitter (@JeffShaferPR)
  - New head of media relations starts tomorrow
  - Feels his job is collaborate with the over 100+ people on campus whose responsibilities revolve around media and marketing and public relations--brining these people together
  - Video link developed by HR and Communications: https://vimeo.com/200695515/3216a4c07d

**Questions from the Floor**

- Senator encouraged Jeff to look at Beyond Academics program here at UNCG with respect to highlighting diversity at UNCG
- Not the first marketing person to come and speak to us--listen really hard to the substantive things we could be doing (new degree programs) beyond just things like new logos, etc.
  - Appreciates that perspective
  - Giveaways and new building signs serve a purpose but they aren’t life-and-death scenarios
  - Have to talk about things that are important with faculty to help with recruitment
    - Faculty can help Jeff tell the story
- Considered possibility of designing an app to give people in the world the opportunity to take micro excursions into what faculty are doing
Have talked about various opportunities--app may or may not be the best way, but other technology could be utilized to achieve the same goals and objectives

Need to think about how we get to people where they already are with respect to media

- Senator suggested having library of podcasts, since they seem to be really exploding right now; maybe include students and faculty to highlight their research and projects
  - Jeff shared that there’s an infinite amount of content out there and coming up with a few significant platforms is important
  - What do you do with what you have to get people to use the apps and opportunities
  - Need to create the infrastructure in order to engage people and allow them to share the content with others

- Senator shared disappointed that Jeff said he wasn’t going to consider changing name from Spartans--explained history of Spartans to students over the past years; Spartan culture overall doesn’t necessarily relate to what UNCG values
  - Jeff shared not a groundswell to changing the mascot from the Spartans but doesn’t completely negate a review of this
  - Minerva and Spartans don’t always work well together as well, especially given history of UNCG
  - Jeff shared at the beginning of this exploration and he will continue to look at concerns that come up from the community

- Senator struck by slide showing # of people who work in communications in some form--but we feel our marketing and communications haven’t been very effective; Are we getting enough bang for our buck with all these people working on communications given that we feel what we do has been lost in the process?
  - End up with lots of people doing little things that don’t necessarily match up with what others are doing
  - Have administrative support who may also be doing minor marketing and public relations in a very enclosed environment
  - Job of University Communications is to create tools and capability to help all these individuals to make all the efforts of these individuals add up to represent UNCG as best as possible
  - Senator also cited would like to not necessarily hire outside people to come and tell us how to do communications better when we have all these individuals working in this area already at the campus

**Government Committee Resolutions**

*Greg Bell, Government Committee Chair and Senate Liaison*

- Resolution on changes to P&T Regs on Asst. Prof/Prof. hires (*Enclosure B*)
  - This has previously been through the University P&T Committee as well as the Government Committee
Greg read the resolution to Faculty Senate

No discussion from the floor so a call for

Revision made by Greg to resolution to change the line “BE IT RESOLVED that Section 3.E.ii be revised as follows” to “BE IT RESOLVED that Section 3.E.iiia and Section 3F

Resolution on changes to GEC chair election (Enclosure C)

Greg read the resolution to the Senators

Question from floor--why is this resolution coming up?

David Carlone shared that Provost’s Curriculum Review committee recommended this as a possible area to review

Would make work of council more transparent

Make it easier to chair the council

Question from floor--why was it originally in the College of Arts & Sciences

The rationale was that CAS provided so many of the General Education courses that the chair, as well as the majority of members, should be CAS.

Anne supported David’s statement and shared that earlier this Fall or last Spring that the committee went from 11 voting members to 12 voting members (library member became voting member)

Anne also shared that this was the only Senate Committee that has a set designation that the Chair be from a specific division

Question--if we strike this from bylaws, do we now lack a provision for how this chair is elected?

The Faculty Senate Bylaws of Constitution, which govern the Senate Committees, have a general provision for the election of committee chairs from among the committee members, so this provision would automatically take care of the GEC chair's election. [See Bylaws Art. I, Sec. 4.]

Question---what happens in a tie within the General Ed Committee?

A tie could exist if all 12 members are present and divided

Tie vote could go back to the Council again for further consideration before coming back to Faculty Senate

Provost suggested that if Gen Ed committee are tied on an issue, it may be important for the issue to come back to Faculty Senate for discussion

Question--previous ad hoc committee established by Anne that elected not to serve to come back to Faculty Senate to render a decision on that

If the motion doesn’t pass, doesn’t mean motion fails, just that it doesn’t carry

Vote last year was broken by the Chair of Gen Ed committee

Senator shared that general education should mean liberal arts education and should be preserved under CASA

Question: brought up question that resolution is addressing where chair is coming from but doesn’t talk anything about voting
Greg shared that title doesn’t really reflect change being proposed but that other chairs are voting members in their committee
  - Steve Y. Shared that when the resolution verbiage is removed, all CAS members of GEC would vote, whereas in the current form the chair does not unless there is a tie.
  - David C. Pointed out that faculty within the Arts & Sciences has become more diffused because of the creation of Colleges like Visual and Performing Arts and this would allow for their participation
  - Anne called for vote of resolution: 3 nays; rest were yeah; resolution passed.

**Presentation: Student Ratings of Instruction**

*David Teachout, Director UTLC, and Carl Lashley, Faculty Senator*

- David shared Provost approached he and Anne with this in the Fall to involve them in this process (get David’s notes)
- No particular Faculty Senate committee whose responsibilities this would fall under
- Anne suggested David set up ad hoc committee to address this
- UTLC interacts with faculty from across campus (slide with membership of SRI ad hoc committee)
- Committee started with set of evidence-based materials assembled by UTLC
- Committee drafted 26 items based on evidence of SOTL material as well as reviewed tools used by institutions across the company
- David broke down 10 members into 2 groups to work on policies and items because of scheduling conflicts
- Carl shared that 1 group discussed policy alternatives that could be presented
  - Group also discussed procedures that could be implemented to support the policy
- 2nd group developed set of university-wide items that are being recommended to appear on every SRI
  - Came from review of literature on quality of instruction
  - Looked at items on other institutions’ rating instruments
- Carl shared we have drafts of policies and instruments/questions that are to start the conversation
- Carl shared timeline--now through remainder of spring, the committee will continue to work on language in the policy and the items
  - Will be collecting information about aspects of the policy as well as items that need to be changed
  - Committee will continue working on these drafts based on feedback collected
  - Would like to get policy in place this Spring so rest of the plan can continue into the Fall but work will continue until agreement about policy and Faculty Senate have approved the policy and items
- Carl shared that Dept. chairs will be invited to work with UTLC on department-specific questions that could be added to the university-wide questions.
● Hope policy procedures, and rating procedures will be used for the first time in Spring 2018 semester
● Carl reiterated this is a work in progress and are looking forward to feedback and suggestions from the Faculty Senate
● David shared discussion is most valuable if put in a form that the committee can access and review (Google form link will be sent out shortly)
● SRI is a hot-button topic and David feels students have something to tell us but also SRI shouldn’t be the only form of feedback or data collected, especially given critical decisions being made on promotion and tenure
● Questions or Concerns from Floor
  ○ Senator shared for a common set of questions provided that it deals with context-specific issues that depts may have
    ■ Most other campuses do something like this
    ■ As institution, can do interesting analyses with common set of questions
    ■ Some senators have problem with the name (SRI); do we need to develop other instruments to discuss pedagogy
    ■ Suggested collecting what kind of assignments professors require? How are those assignments evaluated?
    ■ Committee may need to provide something about the theory of education and what constitutes good teaching
    ■ Some questions on draft questionnaire are too broad (#6 was pointed out as example)---could elicit more of an affective response
    ■ Ask questions to students: How much time did you spend for this class? Was this class challenging?
    ■ Expressed fear or concern articulated by others that we should be mindful that these ratings are often used to determine decisions about who should teach certain courses, who to hire, etc.
    ■ David shared that senator take these ideas and put in the Google form to help the committee
    ■ David shared that SRI is culmination of the common items and dept-specific items that current exist
      ● Good opp to reexamine dept-specific items that are desired in each dept
      ● Most dept-specific items are between 16-20 items
    ■ David discussed item #6 (overall rating)--is reviewing materials to see what is currently included in all ratings--this particular question appear in over 60% of evaluations vs. #1, which only appeared in 16% of the instruments reviewed
    ■ Carl shared he was on items team and shared their job in constructing 6 items was to strip out dept context and to develop indicators of good teaching across the board
      ● Responsibilities of dept would be to add those context items back into the SRI
Senator shared some concerns of constituents represented by the Senator; majority of faculty are sharing they would not be in support of standardized forms, specifically questions that focus on the instructor instead of the learning and the course; studies and books published that share that students have biases and those biases come out in such instruments (e.g., required course where issues make students feel uncomfortable)

- David asked for clarification on items focusing on instructor--David reiterated these are drafts and to provide feedback
- David asked if common set would be fine if questions focused more on course and student--Senator responded “No”
- Provost shared that she feels strongly that we need common set of questions for evaluative purposes
  - Familiar with research cited by Senator
  - Do need questions related to instructor to account for information on faculty meeting basic responsibilities
- Participant from audience brought up concern about faculty being absent from classes for conferences, etc.
  - Provost shared no policies prevent faculty from missing or not holding classes because of professional activities and also asked faculty to also make considerations for students participating in activities that represent the University
- Senator asked about the results--sometimes problems don’t come from the responses but how responses are analyzed and shared committee should address appropriate analyses of the SRI
  - David asked Senator to include comments in Google form, and to explicitly include information on research faculty may be aware of
- Anne called time on the discussion of this topic in order to discuss Senate Apportionment Follow-Up Report
  - 2nd part of faculty forum will be devoted to this same subject and information will be collected there as well

**Senate Apportionment Follow-up Report**  
*Stoel Burrows, Elections Committee Chair*

- Presented Powerpoint--available on Faculty Senate website
- Currently at 37 this year and will be at 35 next year instead of the 36 dictated by Constitution
- Concern raised by University Libraries who went from 2 Senators down to 1
- Committee looked into why the Libraries’ number changed--ran numbers for Senators up to 45 total Senate but the number for the Libraries still remains at 1
- Senator shared University Libraries found 1991 document related to Constitution in the Archives
  - Document made it clear that all units should have no less than 2 Senators
- Anne shared that communication has happened between Faculty Senate and University Libraries
○ Language of the Constitution has changed but Anne can’t find any way to change the number for this election cycle
○ Anne hopes that by mid-August to have resolution for Government Committee asking that the Constitution goes back to requiring that each unit has at least 2 faculty senators

● Senator shared that University Libraries fears that something could happen without representation if the 1 Senator happens to be absent; also allows for mentoring between 2 Senators for the Libraries (new and returning)
● Stoel shared that because faculty is larger now than when it was first founded, its membership should reflect that growth
● Stoel hopes to continue the discussion on this so a resolution can be made next year

**Announcements**

● Faculty Forum on March 22, 2017 from 3pm-5pm
  ○ 3p-4p on UNCG Sustainability by Marianne LeGreco
  ○ 4p-5p with David Teachout and UTLC on the Student Rating Inventory

**Adjournment**

● Move to adjourn. Seconded
● Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Brad Johnson
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

*Pending approval at the April 5, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting*
Reply to Senate Budget Committee Questions

1. Could you enlighten us about what you expect Deans and Department Heads/Chairs should be communicating about the budget to their faculty constituents? It is clear from the survey that this process of communication from Deans and DH/Cs is often vague and sketchy.

Deans and Department Heads should communicate information about major budget developments (e.g., legislative actions impacting our budget, enrollment growth funding, tuition and fee increases). Department Heads/Chairs should also involve faculty in the discussions regarding departmental budget priorities and resource requests, and Deans should have a mechanism for involving faculty as they prepare their budget presentations and resource requests for the annual Spring budget meeting with the Provost. Once budget allocations are finalized, the results should be communicated back to faculty by the Dean and/or Heads/Chairs. In addition to relying on Deans and Heads/Chairs to share information, I present information annually to faculty senate on Academic Affairs allocation of new resources, found at the following link: https://provost.uncg.edu/convocation-2016-slides. The attached memo is an example of the budget instructions that issue from my office to Deans every year to start the Academic Affairs budget process. It can be expected that the instructions for the current year (not yet issued) will be similar though they will also include information or linking resource requests to the new strategic plan.

2. Will the budgeting process be “zero-based” for the foreseeable future? If so, can you address exactly what the goals of the division of Academic Affairs are for this future and how these will be met? Also, can you indicate something about the trade-offs that will have to be made in pursuit of those goals?

Although the academic units are held accountable for the wide deployment of existing base budgets, UNCG does not employ a zero-based-budgeting process. When new resources are available, they are allocated in response to both detailed justifications from units indicating the compelling need and an examination of contributions of the units (see attached budget instruction example from the past cycle). In the coming year, units will also be asked to link resource requests, where possible, to themes from the new strategic plan. Periodic budget adjustments may be called for in instances where rapid enrollment growth or declines in some areas create inequities in levels of resource adequacy across the campus, but should this occur it will not be at the level of zero-based budgeting.
3. **Is there a way of annually tracking the allocation of funds for faculty, administrative, and “SPA” lines?**

   In line with this query, we note that there is a website that enables anyone to track enrollment growth ([http://ire.uncg.edu/factbook/enrollment_v2.asp](http://ire.uncg.edu/factbook/enrollment_v2.asp)) in much detail. Is there a way that similar websites could be established to track annual income and expenditures (according to faculty rank, tenured, tenure-track, instructor, temporary, part-time, etc.) separately for College and Department across that same period (2011-2016)?

   The resource allocation presentation referenced in 1 above includes information on the allocation of new resources in academic affairs to support faculty lines and staff positions. This information will be updated annually in the fall. In addition, the Institutional Research website provides data on overall numbers of faculty positions: [http://ire.uncg.edu/factbook/faculty.asp](http://ire.uncg.edu/factbook/faculty.asp)

4. **How can faculty “voice” about the budget process and concerns about any trade-offs be heard?** As the SBC, we recognize that we can serve as a conduit (along with the faculty senate itself) for such feedback from faculty to administration (along with our function to serve as a communication link between budget decision-makers and faculty). What can we do to facilitate such feedback and ensure that it arrives in a timely fashion?

   Faculty input into the budget process and priorities is important and there are several channels for providing this input. Faculty should be involved in the resource allocation request process as described in 1 above. The senate budget committee is another mechanism for faculty to provide input into the budget process and priorities. Faculty are also always welcome to contact me personally with input about the budget. Please also note that Vice Chancellor Maimone and Associate Vice Provost Boyette annually offer a “Budget 101” session for any interested faculty so they can better understand the university and UNC system budget processes. This session is important as the budget process is necessarily complex and the better one’s understanding, the greater the opportunities for participation.
Resolution #FS04052017/1
To Establish the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Issues
Greg Bell, Faculty Government Committee Chair

WHEREAS in May 2015, the ad hoc Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Issues began to address the charge set forth by the Faculty Senate to review existing policies and practices governing non-tenure track faculty, and

WHEREAS it is evident that core issues remain and continue to develop with the increasing number of NTT faculty positions at UNCG based upon task force reports and recent survey results such as: the UNC Constituent Institutions Responses to the Report of the Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty (2008); the UNCG Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Report: Phase I, Interim Report (2011); the UNCG Task Force on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Report: Phase II and Final Report (2012); The Committee on Fixed-Term Faculty and the Community and Diversity Committee at UNC-Chapel Hill (2015); and the Survey of NTT Faculty at UNCG (2016), and

WHEREAS a permanent standing committee is necessary to address the needs and concerns of NTT Faculty, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, That the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate be amended by the addition of the following text in Article II, Section 2.3:

Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Issues

Charge: The Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Issues shall review existing policies and practices governing NTT faculty and recommend change to improve NTT working conditions and UNCG.

Membership: One (1) voting General Faculty member from each electoral division, plus one (1) Senator.
Tenure track and/or tenured faculty shall comprise no more than 25% of the membership of the Committee.

Context for Faculty Government Resolution #FS04052017/1

Committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Issues

Purpose: This resolution seeks to make a permanent standing committee of the Faculty Senate whose charge is to review existing policies and make recommendations on issues and concerns of non-tenure track faculty. This standing committee would replace the current ad hoc committee. Tenure track or tenured faculty can comprise no more than 25% of the membership.

Rationale: In May 2015, the ad hoc committee on Non-Tenure Track Faculty Issues began addressing the charge set forth by the Faculty Senate to review existing policies and practices governing NTTs. Based upon previous task force reports and recent survey results, it has become evident that, with the increasing number of NTT faculty positions; core issues remain and continue to develop regarding working conditions of NTT faculty at UNCG. This new committee will address the needs and concerns of NTT faculty.
Resolution #FS04052017/2

To Change the Name and Charge of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons Committee to the Professional Development Committee

Greg Bell, Faculty Government Committee Chair

WHEREAS the Committees of the Faculty Senate should periodically review their charge and membership to ensure that each committee is functioning as intended, and

WHEREAS the purpose of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons Committee is to advise the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons personnel on programs for developing teaching expertise in the faculty, and

WHEREAS the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons organization has undergone a name change to the University Teaching and Learning Commons (UTLC) and its mandate has broadened to include other concerns, and

WHEREAS the locus of professional development activities is beyond the UTLC and found in the individual divisions and in UNCG Online, and

WHEREAS with the proposed changes to the name and charge of the Faculty Professional Development, Compensation, and Welfare Committee, the role of faculty development would be removed from the charge of that committee, and

WHEREAS the nature of the faculty at UNCG has changed to incorporate non-tenure track and clinical faculty who engage in teaching and learning, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, That the name of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons Committee hereby be changed to the Professional Development Committee, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT, the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, Article II, Section 2.3 be changed as follows:

Professional Development Committee Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons Committee

Charge: In consultation with the Director of the University Teaching and Learning Commons and other campus entities, the Committee shall provide recommendations to the University Teaching and Learning Commons, the Faculty Senate, and the University administration regarding matters of faculty professional development and programs for the enhancement of faculty professional abilities and effectiveness, including participation in seminars, workshops, colloquia and other professional development programs, professional travel and similar activities. The Committee Chair shall serve as liaison to the University Teaching and Learning Commons Advisory Board.

The committee shall serve as a policy formulation body with respect to the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons. The Committee shall review and make recommendations to the Director of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons. The committee shall act in an advisory capacity to the Faculty Senate and to members of the University administration.

Membership: One (1) voting General Faculty member from each electoral division (excluding the JSNN, at their request) plus one (1) Senator. Ex officio and nonvoting: Director of the University and Learning Commons, and the Chair of the Academic Computing Committee.

Context for Faculty Government Resolution #FS04052017/2

Changing the FTLC Committee to the Professional Development Committee

Purpose: This resolution seeks to change of name for the committee formerly known as the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons Committee to the Professional Development Committee.

Rationale: The purpose of the committee was to advise the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons personnel on programs for developing teaching expertise in the faculty. The name of this organization has changed to the University Teaching and Learning Commons (UTLC) and its mandate has broadened to include other concerns. In addition, the locus of professional development activities is beyond the UTLC and found in the individual schools and in UNCG Online. Finally, the nature of the faculty at UNCG has changed to incorporate non-tenure track and clinical positions who engage in teaching and learning.
To Change the Name and Charge of the Faculty Professional Development, Compensation and Welfare Committee to the Faculty Professional Compensation and Welfare Committee

Greg Bell, Government Committee Chair

WHEREAS the Committees of the Faculty Senate should periodically review their charge and membership to ensure that the committee is functioning as intended, and
WHEREAS with the proposed changes to the name and charge of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons Committee, the role of faculty development would be subsumed by the new committee, and
WHEREAS issues of faculty professional compensation and welfare are important to all faculty, including both non-tenure track and tenure track faculty, and
WHEREAS the role of the Director of the Faculty Learning and Teaching Commons as ex officio is made unnecessary by the removal of development from the charge of the committee, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED That the name of the Faculty Professional Development, Compensation, and Welfare Committee be changed to the Faculty Professional Compensation and Welfare Committee and the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, Article II, section 2.3 be changed as follows:

Faculty Professional Development, Compensation and, & Welfare Committee

Charge: The purpose of the Faculty Professional Development Compensation and Welfare Committee shall be to support the role of faculty members as learned professionals. The committee shall review and make recommendations on matters concerning professional status and effectiveness in the areas of teaching, research, and service. All matters, including salary and benefits are relevant, including but not limited to standards of professional performance; professional rights and privileges; working conditions; standards for teaching loads and reduction in load for research and service assignments; research and other leaves of absence; and programs for the enhancement of faculty professional abilities and effectiveness, including participation in seminars, workshops, colloquia and other professional development programs, professional travel and similar activities. Regarding salaries, the committee shall make periodic and timely reports to the Faculty Senate regarding items such as comparison of salaries among the electoral divisions, gender differences in salaries, and salary inequities between new appointments and continuing appointments in similar disciplines.

Membership: One (1) voting General Faculty member from each electoral division, plus one (1) Senator. Among the membership, at least one non-tenure track faculty member shall serve on the committee. Ex officio and nonvoting: Director of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons.

Context for Faculty Government Resolution #FS04052017/3

Removing Development from the Faculty Professional Development, Compensation, and Welfare Committee.

Purpose: This resolution seeks to change the charge and the name of the Faculty Professional Development, Compensation and Welfare Committee to remove the development component, which is now the purview of the new Professional Development Committee.

Rationale: With the proposed changes to the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons Committee to encompass Professional Development Committee, the role of faculty development would be subsumed by the new committee and the charge to the new committee. We propose the clause pertaining to faculty development is removed. We are also proposing that a member of the Non-Tenure Track Committee serve as a member of the Faculty Professional Compensation and Welfare Committee to ensure representation to the committee; we propose that each unit continue to have on member represented on the committee. Given that the development charge is being removed from the responsibility of the committee, the need to have the Director of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons serve as ex officio is no longer relevant.
Resolution #FS04052017/4
Resolution on Faculty Accessibility
Presented by Colleen Fairbanks and Wade Maki

WHEREAS, faculty utilize a variety of methods to be available for students including email, text messages, set office hours, appointments, videoconferences; and

WHEREAS, the diverse student needs, preferences, schedules, and modes of course delivery require varying methods of access between students and faculty; and

WHEREAS, fixed office hours alone do not always address the needs of students or make efficient use of faculty time; and

WHEREAS, technology enables multiple methods of access and improved scheduling of appointments beyond set office hours; and

WHEREAS, transparent communication of expectations is essential to the success of the university community; therefore;

BE IT RESOLVED, That the following language be added to the Faculty Handbook:

The faculty of UNCG affirm a commitment to be accessible to the students we serve. All faculty will include in every syllabus information about the methods students can use to access faculty outside of class. Faculty will respond to students seeking access via these methods in a timely fashion. A minimum of two hours per week of availability is expected. Faculty availability will be clearly explained in the syllabus and be appropriate to the course. Units, departments, or programs may create additional procedures or requirements appropriate to their program delivery methods or student needs.

Rationale: While faculty at UNCG are available to students outside of class there are, as yet, no defined university-wide guidelines for faculty accessibility. Students and administrators have requested that basic guidance be provided to all faculty concerning faculty accessibility. A survey of peer institutions shows that such guidance is common. Additionally, providing guidance enables heads/chairs/directors to set expectations for their faculty. This resolution offers a university wide baseline commitment of faculty accessibility to students while retaining the flexibility of units/heads/chairs/directors to best serve the needs of their particular students and programs.

Process: In Fall 2016 the Faculty Senate was informed that the Academic Policies and Regulations Committee was asked to address the need for an office hours policy at UNCG. The committee collected and evaluated several policies from peer and other institutions. These policies were shared with the Senate prior to the December 2016 meeting. The Committee presented an update to the Senate at the Dec 7, 2016 meeting. In addition, a survey was sent to all Senators to be shared with constituents. During spring 2017, the committee reviewed the survey results and moved forward a resolution to the Senate leadership. Based upon the feedback from the Senate leadership and Provost, the Committee revised and passed the resolution now before you. This resolution was also reviewed by the Faculty Professional Development, Compensation, and Welfare Committee.
Resolution #FS04052017/5
Resolution to Revise the Academic Good Standing Policy
Presented by Colleen Fairbanks and Wade Maki

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate was previously required to adopt a UNCG academic standing policy that was in compliance with the Board of Governors’ Regulation 400.1.5[R] on “Fostering Undergraduate Student Success”; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate adopted the most recent academic standing policy on the condition that the policy could be modified if data indicated the policy was negatively impacting the academic progress of undergraduates; and

WHEREAS, longitudinal data from Fall 2014 to Fall 2016 has illustrated the negative effect the aforementioned policy has had on undergraduate retention, graduation, and academic success with an increase in students on academic probation, suspension, and dismissal; and

WHEREAS, modifying the current academic standing policy will prevent students with strong GPAs from facing academic probation, suspension or dismissal, while still monitoring timely degree completion; and

BE IT RESOLVED, that the current policy on Academic Standing broaden the definition of Academic Warning to include students who have GPAs of 2.0 or better but who have not completed 67% of their courses.

_____________________

Current Bulletin Copy

Hours Warning

Hours Warning will occur when an undergraduate student in their first semester at UNCG successfully maintains a minimum 2.0 cumulative GPA but only earns 50%–66.99% of their semester hours, which are locked at the end of the drop/add period.

Students who fall on Hours Warning will be required to satisfy all of the following requirements during the next term of enrollment:

- Maintain a minimum 2.0 cumulative GPA
- Earn 67% of their semester hours each term
- Enroll in and successfully complete the requirements of the Academic Resources & Knowledge (ARK) Program

Failure to satisfy all of the Hours Warning requirements above will result in Academic Probation at the end of the warning term.
Proposed Bulletin Copy

Academic Warning

Academic Warning will occur when an undergraduate student maintains a minimum 2.0 cumulative GPA but earns less than 67% of their semester hours, which are locked at the end of the drop/add schedule adjustment period.

Students who fall on Academic Warning will be required to satisfy all of the following requirements during their next term of enrollment:

- Maintain a minimum 2.0 cumulative GPA
- Earn 67% of their semester hours each term
- Enroll in and successfully complete the requirements of the Academic Resources & Knowledge (ARK) Program

Failure to meet the requirements for Academic Good Standing while on Academic Warning may result in Academic Probation. A student who is able to maintain a 2.0 cumulative GPA but does not earn 67% of their semester hours will continue on Academic Warning each consecutive semester until the required minimum percentage of hours is earned.
February 16, 2016
Faculty Assembly Meeting
Prepared by Spoma Jovanovic, with Anne Wallace

Chair’s Opening Remarks

The Faculty Assembly Chair, Gabriel Lugo, begins by noting the value of truth and integrity...excellent ideals to guide Faculty Assembly, higher education, and life itself. Gabriel also reported that an amendment was introduced to HB 39, a bill designed to reduce the number on the Board of Governors from 32 to 24. The amendment called for several ex-officio members to be added to the BoG including the Chair of the Faculty Assembly. The amendment failed 34-11, but that a legislator introduced the amendment is movement in the right direction.

Margaret Spellings’ Comments

Sometime the legislature is a “fact free zone” she says, but she’s there talking about the issues of free speech, guns on campus, needed resources, and more. On technology, other states are way ahead of us. UNC Online is a "bulletin board" that is unclear at best and confusing at worst. President Spellings also expressed concern about how we are using/might use technology to aid and enhance strategic planning, particularly around access, completion, and affordability goals. On strategic plan...we need to work on changing the financial aid distributions here in the state. For instance, students are eligible for full aid even if only taking 12 hours. But taking 12 hours won’t lead to graduation in 4 years.

Questions to Pres. Spellings included these of particular interest:

1. What do you think will happen at federal level that might impact us?
   MS: I know Betsy DeVos. She doesn’t have a higher ed. agenda as far as I know. We’ll try to be involved with her. At the Dept. of Education, technology will be a priority. I think DoE activity will be focused on community colleges and workforce training. It’s in our interest for her to be successful. I hope that the DoE doesn’t walk back on DACA formed under the Obama Administration and will be speaking to DeVos about this.
2. What are we doing about our “old” technology? We have a lot of deferred maintenance.
MS: We’re asking for flexibility in R & R funds so that Chancellors can address the needs on their campuses. Trump Administration is dedicating money for technology infrastructure—we need a NC plan to get some of that money. For those of you with horror stories, we need those!

3. Lateral entry teachers—many feel they don’t have support to get additional courses they need. Can technology help these teachers?
MS: Here is a scoop—there will be significant legislation about teacher preparation, so get ready!

4. In 2015, Elizabeth City State University was threatened with closure. What is the current opinion of the legislature regarding ECSU? Our aviation program is expensive—what feedback do you have for our campus?
MS: Yesterday, senators visited ECSU and it was a home run. They “endorsed” ECSU. Any discussion of closure is in the past. We need the capacity of ECSU to meet our strategic plan. On the aviation program, we’re asking for $2 million for accreditation for that program.

UNC Online Task Force by Tim Petty, GA Faculty Fellow

Tim Petty is an NCSU professor in Biology (26 years), online instructor, and former distance education coordinator and program director (administration). Principal role now in GA Academic Affairs is to lead the online task force, but not technically on the task force. He filled in background on the Task Force (which rose out of the March 2016 Boston Consulting Group report) and work on progress to date (mostly identifying multiple goals).

Gloria Campbell-Whatley, GA Faculty Fellow on “Climate,” diversity and inclusion (UNCC professor with background is in special education), described ongoing efforts to "infuse inclusion" in curriculum. To learn about and promote global and cultural concepts infused in syllabi, she has hosted 24 focus groups at App State so far and will be hosting inclusion institute (3-5 days) to be held at NCA&T, UNCW, UNCA.

Drew Moritz, VP for State Gov’t. Relations

Legislature back in session as of January 25, 2017. Moritz's summary included these items of particular interest:
UNC’s Strategic Plan was approved so that's being used to push requests for money.

Tax revenues estimate is NC will have +$552 million by the year end, non-recurring money (from personal and corporate taxes and more sales tax income than anticipated). Indicates better economic health and can be used for bonuses.

Recurring dollars for raises are harder to find for personnel. 1% employee raise would cost $8.5 million.

Some unfriendly bills are likely to arise, including: NC Gap 2.0, a “truth in education” bill on reporting costs/value of degrees, an open carry (guns) bill (Sheriff BJ Barnes of Guilford County is opposed to this bill), and a “Restore campus free speech” bill based on Goldwater Institute model language.

A positive sign is that UNC system is seeing more draft bills than ever before, showing more early engagement with UNC from legislators. The key is to watch closely and determine if and when to intervene.

**Junius Gonzales & Kim Van Noort, Academic Affairs** offered a report including these items of particular interest:

- **Competency Based Education** summit planned for May funded by Gates Foundation.

- **New GA Faculty Fellows**—Karin Peterson, UNCA (dept. chair development); Mark Lammers, UNCW (success rates and demographics of rural students); Vidya Gargeya, UNCG (summer). *Congratulations, Vidya!*

- **Personnel Changes**—Looking to hire VP of Student Affairs (previously Tracy Ford) and Director of Community College Partnerships (new position).

**Jim Martin, FA Parliamentarian.** gave a brief explanation of the nomination and election process for new FA officers and FA Executive Committee members. Officers may be any member of the UNC faculty; Executive Comm. members are drawn from among the delegates themselves, so nominees must be continuing or re-elected.

**Andrew Kelly, Sr. Vice Pres. for Strategy and Policy,** gave an update on the UNC Strategic Plan, reviewing the process and resulting plan, and pointing out the metrics now attached to the plan’s goals.

The Faculty Assembly then entered the closed plenary session.