Meeting Agenda
Wednesday, April 6, 2016      3:00 – 5:00 p.m.      Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House

3:00 p.m.
Call to Order and Introductory Remarks
   Anne Wallace, Chair of the General Faculty and Faculty Senate

3:03 p.m.
Approval of the March 2, 2016 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes [Enc. A]
   Jim Carmichael, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

3:05 p.m.
Remarks Dana
   Dunn, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

3:20 p.m.
Elections
   Stoel Burrowes, Senate Elections Committee Chair
   Faculty Senate Chair, Secretary, and P&T Committee [Enc. B]

3:35 p.m.
Committee Report
   Anthony Chow, Research Grants

3:45 p.m.
Committee Report
   Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair [Enc. C]
   University Promotion & Tenure Regulations on “early” decisions

3:55 p.m.
Committee Report
   Gary Rosenkrantz, ad hoc Committee on KIN 220

4:15 p.m.
Presentation
   Dan Perlman, Online Learning Committee Chair
   Online Education [Enclosures D, E, F]

4:50 p.m.
New Business/Old Business
   Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair

Adjourn

UPCOMING EVENTS:
Meeting of the General Faculty
(Including discussion of the COACHE Faculty Survey Results)
April 20, 2016, Alumni House, Virginia Dare Room, 3-5p

Next Meeting of the Faculty Senate
May 4, 2016
3-5p, Alumni House, Virginia Dare Room

Refreshments are available at 2:30 p.m. for Senators to meet and greet faculty colleagues.

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 for Faculty Senate Office, 336-334-5345/mlwolfe@uncg.edu
Minutes
Wednesday, March 2, 2016  3:00 – 5:30 p.m.  Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House

Call to Order and Introductory Remarks
Anne Wallace, Chair of the Faculty Senate

The Chair greeted the Senate, remarked on the new Lucite podium, and reminded. Senators to use the microphones provided on the tables to make their remarks.

Anne Wallace: March has trotted in like a lamb this year—thanks for being here on this beautiful spring day. I think we have a fair number of folks absent because of "the cold." I hope the rest of you can stay healthy through these changes of weather.

At the end of the meeting I’ll mention this again, but just in case: the March 16 Senate Forum will be led by a panel from the Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Committee. The topic will be "Faculty and Curricular Issues," of course as these manifest in our efforts to recruit and retain a diverse faculty supported by an engaged community. That would be us, the engaged community. These are after all Faculty Senate Forums, chosen because they bear directly on the Senate’s work, and I don’t think that a topic could get more central to our responsibilities than "faculty" plus "curriculum." Come join in, and bring a buddy.

As you update your calendars, please also note that the April 20 Meeting of the General Faculty will include a report from the Provost’s Committee on the COACHE survey results. So this will, as it were, close the loop opened by the Provost’s summary of COACHE results at the Faculty Convocation this fall. As you remember, the Provost’s Committee was charged with exploring the survey data and recommending actions we might take to address the issues raised by faculty who participated. So, again, come join in, and bring two buddies this time.

You may perceive a theme here, and you’re right. For a while now I’ve been thinking about various conversations I’ve heard about whether the Faculty Senate is "representative" of the faculty as a whole. After a while, I began to realize that the term "representative" was sliding around on us a bit. In common parlance we use that term to describe a smaller group that includes a proportional mixture of all the different constituencies of the category as a whole. So we may say that our faculty is not "representative" (or reflective) of our student population—by which we mean that the distribution of ethnic or gender characteristics, or other demographic categories, in the faculty is not proportional to that distribution in the student body.

That’s one kind of "representative," and I think it’s pretty hard to dispute a critique that Faculty Senate is not representative in those terms. It’s a little hard to know what sort of demographics we should choose, of course. Research and teaching faculty? Professional "age," that is, time of service? Gender and ethnicity? Hiring category? And if we wanted to have this kind of proportional representation, how would we manage that?

But there is another meaning of "representative," one particular to governance of all kinds, and in this sense the Faculty Senate is absolutely representative of UNCG’s faculty. The Senate is the formal legislative body elected by and from the General Faculty. Senate represents the faculty in considering, debating, and making recommendations on all University matters of concern to faculty; and Senate represents the faculty in making decisions and recommendations about curricular matters, the core of our academic mission.

Now we’re not really a "Senate" in American terms. We are organized more like the House of Representatives, with proportional representation from the academic units, the "electoral divisions." So if you want proportionality, there it is—not perhaps what people think of first, but absolutely essential in governance terms.

What about the question of whether the Faculty Senate accurately reflects the collective or various views of the faculty? Well, here’s where we come to the crux of the matter: the Senate only does this if the faculty elect people who either share their various views, or who they trust to judge in their place as decisions and recommendations are made.
And that's up to us, to the Faculty ourselves. If the Faculty Senate doesn't work as we think it should—if the range of views is not sufficient or not "representative"—then we as faculty must vote the rascals out, and vote new folks in. Or—here's a thought—maybe even stand for election ourselves.

In the next few months the General Faculty will elect a new GF Secretary and two delegates to the UNC Faculty Assembly. The Faculty Senate will elect a Chair-Elect, a Secretary, and a new member of the UP&T Committee. These are not sought-after positions, to say the least—but should they not be? Or rather, should we, collectively as a faculty, not take interest and care to nominate and elect the people we want to represent us, in the governance sense? Because they will: this body is the formal, elected representative arm of the GF, and whoever is elected will represent us.

These times are not easy. I hear people speak of demoralization—and that's true. People worry about time and effort expended without result, or without the results we desire—and that happens. But have we decided to leave our work? To abdicate from our positions? To cease to be faculty? If not, then is our involvement not essential, whatever the troubles we face?

Let me challenge you to be involved, and to foster involvement, on a new scale. Talk among yourselves, and speak with your colleagues in the larger faculty. Find and nominate our best leaders and thinkers and speakers. This is a time of change, when our university has begun a new part of its history. We have a chance to re-engage in university governance, to renew our commitment to the Faculty Senate as the representatives—in all the best senses—of the faculty.

Thank you for letting me share these thoughts with you.

**Approval of Minutes**

*Jim Carmichael, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:*

The Secretary called for motion to approve the minutes of February 5, 2016. So moved and seconded. Minutes approved.

**Remarks**

*Dana Dunn, Provost*

I have several announcements. First, very good news: 49 individuals have been tenured and/or tenured and promoted. Second, a very tragic piece of news is the death of a student, Tabarron Glenn, 19, Psychology student. Tabarron passed away in the Tower Village Residence Hall earlier this week. There will be a memorial service on Moran Commons at 7 pm. Third, I have received 16 applications for Provost’s Fellows. I am very pleased and look forward to reviewing the applications. I also want to comment on our two Dean searches. The School of Education Dean search did not move forward with any of the candidates we interviewed. We have extended the deadline to April 1 and will likely be interviewing additional candidates this semester. The College of Arts and Sciences will be hosting their fourth and final candidate this week.

Q: How many faculty leave per year?
A: Across all full time faculty, I’d estimate 35-40, about half are retirements, and half are unsuccessful retentions. This is an estimate. I have accurate dates in the office I can provide.

**Committee Reports**

*David Carlone, General Education Council*

When I reported to you three months ago, in December, I focused my report on how the Council is working to promote transparency and faculty participation across three areas of work, curricular change processes, use of assessment data, and program refinement.

Much of the work this spring semester has engaged the first of those three areas, curricular change. Council members have reviewed 24 proposals for courses that are new to our General Education Program. We have also worked to recertify existing Program courses. We have reviewed about 150 courses for recertification in the categories of Fine Arts, Literature, Philosophical, Religious, and Ethical Perspectives, and Natural Sciences. That is a heavy workload, so I want to commend the dedication and diligence of the Council members. I’ll also commend the work of Lynn Wyrick in the UTLC. Lynn is vital to our work, both because of her administrative acumen and her wisdom.

This work is often enjoyable. We have a number of provocative and rigorous courses from around the institution in our General Education Program.
Now, as we have reviewed these proposals we have had a number of important deliberations about how to ensure the quality and intentionality of our Program. For example, we have had to decide how to interpret guidance from Faculty Senate and SACS around when a course crosses over from being a general education course to being a specific education course. Courses that are too specific to a major are probably not appropriate for general education. We have also discussed the role of pre- and co-requisite courses in general education. There are differences among Council members on such issues, and we will be returning to them in latter part of the semester.

Although the bulk of our work has been on proposals, we have had some time to take on a few other matters. Again partly with transparency and participation in mind, we: 1) are developing a General Education Institute for the window between Commencement and the start of summer school, 2) have charged the new Ad Hoc Recertification Committees in the areas of Historical Perspectives, Reasoning and Discourse, and Non-Western Global Perspectives. This spring, faculty on these committees will use assessment data to evaluate SLOs, make revisions, if needed. In the fall, these materials, such as SLOs, will be applied to courses seeking recertification. 3) Finally, we are reviewing our processes with an eye toward next year. We know some things work well and some things might work better, and we are recruiting new members.

I can take any questions you might have.

Kathy Williams, Student Learning Enhancement Committee

I will be rotating out of the Chairmanship and will be replaced by Jenny Dale. Ray Cowan will rotate off, and we need new volunteers! We evaluate all programs at UNCG. The assessment process is very straightforward: we assign programs to one of three categories—meets standards, approaches standards, does not meet standards. There is a two year formal assessment rotation. In 2015, we evaluated 85/160 programs, of which 30 (37%) were acceptable; 38 (46%) were in the middle category; and 14 (17%) did not meet standards. The SELC also awards programs that have done an exceptional job, and this year, those programs are the BS in Accounting Finance and the BS PHE in Community Health Education. Two final thoughts on this year’s process: this was the first time individual faculty did not have to deal with the Compliance Assist program. Jodi Pettazzoni arranged to have all the data physically input from her end. As a result, fewer errors were made.

Resolutions to Amend Faculty Senate Bylaws:

Resolution #FS030216/1, To Revise the Charge of the Budget Committee Removing Overlap with the Faculty Professional Development Compensation & Welfare Committee and Clarify Its Educational Role

Bell read the resolution and explained its clarification of the relationship between the two committees.

Q: Several years ago, Senator Deb Bell raised the roof to determine changes in the faculty/administration ratio, and where resources were going. In January 2014, we were supposed to have a report and develop a mechanism to identify where resources were going.

Several respondents offered comments indicating that the Budget Committee developed a template for tracking this and other budgetary issues. While the Budget Committee now feels these particular reports may be unsustainable as Committee work because of complexity of data, Bell (though no longer a Committee member) has continued to fill in data, which has been very helpful. There was agreement among the respondents that faculty and Faculty Senate remain very interested in access to the details of the budgetary process.

Dunn: Charlie Maimone and I would be glad to provide a report. [Note: the Provost and VC for Business Affairs are ex officio members of the Budget Committee.]

In favor of endorsing the resolution? 25. Against 0. Abstain 2. Passed.

Resolution #FS030216/2, To Revise the Composition of the General Education Council

Bell read the resolution, and explained that librarians are now permitted membership as voting rather than ex officio members.

In favor of endorsing the resolution? 28. Against 0. Abstain 0. Passed unanimously.

In favor of endorsing the resolution? 25. Against 0. Abstain 2. Passed.

Rules suspended to permit revision of Agenda: 27. Against 0. Abstain 1.
The Chair then rearranged the order of agenda items, as the following minutes indicate.

**New Business/Old Business**

*Anne Wallace, Senate Chair*

**Maria Sanchez, Humanities Network Planning Event**

This will occur on March 30, 3-5PM in the Faculty Center with Lisa Levenstein and others to explore ways to promote each other’s’ work and foster more interdisciplinary knowledge.

**Beth Barnhardt, Scholarly Communications Committee**

In Spring of 2015 The Provost and University Library sponsor and Open Education Resource Grant and in Fall of 2015 it will be put into practice. If as many as ten $1,000 grants are awarded, that could result in up to $150,000 of savings.

**Presentation**

*Omar Ali, Interim Dean of the Honors College*

“Cultivating Creative Learning through Improvisation and Play”

Many of our students are poor and working-class and they are operating in a largely middle-class environment: the university. It requires code-switching which we can help them learn. Related to this, employers tell us that soft skills are crucial; interpersonal skills are what is needed not only to navigate the academic environment but the larger professional world, starting with job interviews. In various ways we help teach our students how to improvise, which is a valuable tool in society; it is also valuable in helping our students become more resilient. By relating to students as if they are more developed in certain areas of life (speaking and presenting, for instance) they develop. By virtue of relating to students ‘ahead of themselves’ (cf. Lev Vygotsky, Lois Holzman) they grow and learn. We do this in various ways and places across campus—from the SELF Design Studio in the School of Education where students, for instance, build a circuit by throwing them into a situation where they can, to foreign language courses in the College of Arts and Science where professors relate to students as if they already speak a certain language (before they know how to) and the School of Nursing program where nursing students work with patients in a simulation room with actors. Improvisation and play build connections between groups of people. Becoming a community of learners is crucial (the importance of teams or a cohort). We do this as well through Monday Play! at the Faculty Center every Monday where faculty, staff, and students engage in open improvisation and play. We can get better at teaching each other how to affirm and build on what each other says or does (the concept and practice of “Yes, and” in improv theatre). By doing this we help cultivate creative learning environments at UNCG and we may serve as a national model in these ways.

Q: Several Senators offered comments on the difficulties of translating these concepts in a distance education environment.

Ali encouraged Senators and others interested in these ideas to contact him at oahali@uncg.edu

**Adjourn**

Move to adjourn. Seconded.

Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

*Jim Carmichael*

Secretary, Faculty Senate

*Pending approval 4/6/16*
Chair-Elect (2006-2007)
The Chair-Elect shall be tenured member of the General Faculty and a non-voting member of the Faculty Senate. The term of the Chair-Elect shall be one year, alternating with the term of the Past-Chair. The Chair-Elect shall succeed the Chair upon expiration of the Chair's term.

Chair (2007-2009)
The Chair shall be a tenured member of the General Faculty and shall preside over the Faculty Senate, and the business portion of the General Faculty Meetings. The Chair shall represent the General Faculty at all meetings of the Board of Trustees. The Chair shall serve a two-year term, but may not serve two consecutive terms as Chair-Elect/Chair/Past-Chair, or any combination of these offices separately or in aggregate. The Chair is a voting member of the Faculty Senate, but shall vote only in cases of a tie.

Past-Chair (2009-2010)
The Past-Chair shall be a tenured member of the General Faculty and a non-voting member of the Faculty Senate, and shall advise the Chair on matters related to Faculty Senate business. The term of the Past-Chair shall be one year, alternating with the term of the Chair-Elect.

Nominee Andrea G. Hunter, PhD

My focal interest is in institutional practices related to equity, diversity, and inclusion; however, I am broadly interested in transformative leadership within higher education. Below I provide an overview of my approach to scholarship and my emergent scholarship as a public intellectual that inform my interest in shared governance and university leadership. I also highlight my experience and leadership in the areas of equity, diversity, and inclusion and in faculty governance.

Critical Scholarship and Public Thought
Knowledge generation as well as bringing a critical analysis to public issues have been at the heart of my approach to scholarship. I pursued a career in the academy and social research for two reasons, first, to contribute to and challenge the knowledge base on African Americans and their families and, second, I deeply understood that the political narrative(s) about race that social science either supported or disrupted had implications for black lives. A related aim of my work is to reveal subjugated knowledge(s) which are those experiences, understandings, and knowledge that are often hidden from view within the academies of science and its prevailing paradigms. I have also expanded the reach of my writing to traverse the constructed divide between academic and public thought. In 2012, I began a year of writing columns for the Greensboro News and Record where I explored themes of race, politics, and culture; and identity, memory, and history in social and political life. Currently, I am completing a collection of personal essays entitled: A colored girl speaks: Meditations on race and other magical things. This collection also mirrors my interest in social issues and social change and their implications for psychologies, human development, and intergroup relations as well as social justice which is reflected, too, in a special issue of the Journal of Social Issues (2015) which I co-edited with Abigail Stewart entitled: The social past in the personal present: Psychology, history, and social justice. These themes, and a critical perspective, have informed my approach to equity, diversity, and inclusion within higher education as well as faculty governance.

Leadership in Faculty Governance and Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
During my 16 years as a UNCG faculty member, I have been involved in departmental, school, and university service (including leadership roles) with a primary focus on equity, diversity, and inclusion and faculty governance. These efforts include: Chair, Race and Gender Institute (Theme: Breaking
Silences: Addressing Race, Gender, & Sexual Orientation in the Southern Academy, 2002-2003); Institutional Review Board (1999-2004, 2005); HDFS Graduate Studies Committee (1999-2003); HES Faculty Council (2005-2009); President, HES Faculty (2008-2009); Faculty Senate (HES/HHS, 2010-2013); Faculty Senate Liaison, Research Policies Committee (2010-2013); Chair, HDFS Faculty Search Committee (2006); Committee on Due Process (2007-2009, member and Chair); HDFS Administrative Council (2008-2009, Associate Professor Representative); Chair, HDFS Diversity and Inclusive Goals Committee (2010-2012); University Program Review Committee (2011-2012); Chancellor’s Advisory Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusive Excellence (2012-present); Co-Chair, Subcommittee on Faculty Recruitment, Promotion and Tenure, Chancellor’s Advisory Committee for the Office of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusive Excellence (2014); Faculty Senate Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (2015-present, incoming Chair Fall 2016); and Director, HHS Office of Diversity and Inclusion (2012 to present) which was recognized with The Association of Schools of Allied Health Cultural Pluralism Award (2015). Finally, I believe in the promise of faculty leadership and in the importance of strong faculty governance to support the progressive development of the university as we meet the needs of our students, the local community, and the State of North Carolina.

Faculty Senate Secretary
The Secretary shall be a member of the General Faculty, and shall serve a two-year term, staggered with the term of the Chair. The Secretary may be re-elected to one additional term of two years. The Secretary shall record and oversee the distribution of the minutes of the Faculty Senate. The Secretary shall maintain an accurate set of Faculty Senate Bylaws.

Nominee Robert Bradley Johnson, PhD
As a faculty member in the Higher Education program within the School of Education, I work with students at the Masters and Doctoral levels who are studying to become full-time professionals within the field of Student Affairs and Higher Education. I try to practice what I preach (theory-to-practice); therefore, I am seeking the Secretary of the Faculty Senate position because I feel it is important to become engaged in the life of the institutional environment in which I work. Prior to becoming a full-time faculty member, I served in UNCG's Office of Housing & Residence Life for over 16 years. During that time, I was heavily involved in the daily life of not only the Division of Student Affairs, but also the University. I have previously served as Secretary for the Staff Senate, where I carried out similar duties to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. I was involved with monthly meetings with the Chancellor to discuss issues and concerns of the staff constituency of the University. Additionally, I have also served in executive-level roles within professional organizations at the local and state level, the most recent of which as President of the North Carolina College Personnel Association (current term is ending this May). I would like to extend my service and contribute to the Faculty/Academic Affairs aspects of the University by serving on the Faculty Senate as its Secretary.

BRAD
University Promotion & Tenure Committee Nominee,
Joseph M. Starobin, Ph.D.

University Promotion and Tenure Committee

Charge: The major purpose of the committee is to provide faculty counsel to the Chancellor in accord with the Promotion, Tenure, Academic Freedom, and Due Process Regulations (The Regulations) Section 4.B.iii.b. The committee will also annually review The Regulations as mandated in The Regulations Section 10.

Membership: The Committee on Promotions and Tenure shall consist of the Chair of the Faculty Senate and six tenured Senators elected to two-year staggered terms by a majority vote of the Faculty Senate. The Chair of the Faculty Senate shall serve as the chair of the Committee and shall be a voting member. No department may have more than one member on the Committee at the same time, with the exception of the Chair of the Faculty Senate. No member, other than the Chair of the Faculty Senate, may serve successive terms on the committee. No faculty member who is a candidate for promotion may be a member of the Committee their year of candidacy. In the event that there are not enough tenured faculty members on Faculty Senate to serve on this committee, nominations for the remaining committee members will be solicited from the General Faculty and elected to the committee by the Faculty Senate.
P&T Regulations: proposed revisions

*Italics identify proposed clarifications*

**Revision #1**
[current]

4.A.ii. Nominations receiving all positive or all negative reviews by the department faculty, the department head, the unit’s Committee on Promotions and Tenure, and the dean will not normally be reviewed by the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure; however, the provost may require that any nomination be reviewed by this committee.

[proposed]

1.A.i. Nominations that fail to receive all positive or all negative reviews (those receiving split votes) across all relevant entities by the department faculty, the department head, the unit’s Committee on Promotions and Tenure, and the dean will normally be reviewed by the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure. *No other nominations are routinely reviewed by the University Committee; however, the Provost may, at his or her discretion, require that any nomination be reviewed by this committee.*

**Revision #2**
[current]

4.B.iii.a. The provost shall organize the portfolios forwarded from the unit for review by the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure, attend its initial meeting to review procedures and criteria, and shall consult with the Committee on its review of recommendations and documents forwarded from the unit.

[proposed]

4.B.iii.a. The Provost shall *identify and make available those portfolios, if any, which the Provost elects to have the University Committee review.* The Provost shall attend the University Committee’s initial meeting to review procedures and criteria, and shall consult with the University Committee on its review of recommendations and documents forwarded from the unit(s).

**Revision #3**
[current]

1
4.B.iii.a.(1)
As specified in section 4.A.ii., nominations receiving all positive or all negative recommendations by the department faculty, the department head, the unit’s Committee on Promotions and Tenure, and the dean will not normally be reviewed by the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure.

[proposed]

4.B.iii.a (1)
As specified in section 4.A.ii., nominations failing to receive all positive or all negative recommendations by the department faculty, the department head, the unit’s Committee on Promotions and Tenure, and the dean will normally be reviewed by the University Committee.

Revision #4 (two consecutive sections in this revision)

4.B.iii.b (2)
The University Committee on Promotions and Tenure will review all portfolios submitted to it by the Provost.

4B.iii.b (3)
The Provost and the chair of the University Committee on Promotions and Tenure will prepare independent recommendations on each portfolio, for submission to the chancellor. The Committee’s recommendations must include tallies of the votes for and against a nomination.

[proposed]

4.B.iii.b (2)
The University Committee on Promotions and Tenure will review only those portfolios submitted to it by the Provost.

4.B.iii.b (3)
When the Provost elects to have portfolios reviewed by the University Committee, the Provost and the committee will prepare independent recommendations on each portfolio, for submission to the Chancellor. The committee’s recommendations must include tallies of the votes for and against a nomination.

Please note that there are other small edits, mostly capitalization, not summarized here but visible in the "Redline Ver 2" document.
Background Information for the Senate Online Education Committee’s Presentation to the UNCG Faculty Senate April 6, 2016

Key Points of This Background Statement

- There are many individuals and units involved in UNCG’s delivery of online education but there is no central orchestration of UNCG’s online activities.
- Nationally, and at UNCG, the number of students taking online courses has been a major source of growth in higher education in recent years.
- UNCG has 33 Distance Education programs (26 graduate, 7 undergraduate).
- More than 20 percent of UNCG credit hours are from online courses, with over half of UNCG’s students (as compared with under 30 percent nationally) taking online courses.
- Online enrollment is roughly equally divided between Distance Program courses and courses for main campus students.
- Following a 2003-08 UNCG plan and a Provost’s Committee in 2011-12, the Senate Online Education Committee was established in 2012 to “To study issues pertaining to the development, delivery, assessment and enhancement of online learning courses and programs at UNCG.” Wade Maki was the first Chair of the Committee.
- In 2014-15, the Committee discussed but did not make a recommendation on Quality Matters (and issues of certification or mandatory preparation of online instructors).
- The Committee operates largely as an advisory, advocacy and policy type body.
- Nationally over 50 percent of faculty have a somewhat skeptical attitude toward the quality of online.
- Statistical analyses of hundreds of studies show little difference in the learning outcomes of traditional classroom and online education.
- UNCG’s online Biology 105, with higher student grades and a lower dropout rate than the face-to-face class, is a good example of effective online education.
- A more limited body of evidence suggests that so-called hybrid or blended courses that combine classroom instruction with online learning surpass both traditional classroom instruction and fully online delivery.
- During 2015-16 the Online Committee used a subgroup model to work on issues; the subgroups focused on (a) Nuts and Bolts, (b) Faculty Development, and (c) Coordination. The fall was devoted to exploring domains in which UNCG could take steps to enhance the university’s online education. Throughout the year the Committee or its members took opportunities to advocate for various enhancements. The presentations to Senate will report on issues, and especially progress being made.
- Kerri Richardson will first present on Resources and Logistics, Laura Pipe will present on faculty development, and Matt Loyd will present on the development of a Library portal to provide the UNCG community with a source to learn about units involved in UNCG’s online education and available resources.
- Hopefully the presentation will foster discussion: The Committee looks forward to Senator’s questions and their input regarding: What will make the Library’s portal of online information most useful? Does UNCG need a person or office with responsibility for the overall coordination of UNCG’s online education? How would that role be structured?
The purpose of this brief is to provide contextual information as a background for the presentation members of the Online Education Committee will present to the Senate on April 6th, 2016. The brief will discuss the history and operation of the Committee as well as some general information about online education.

The History and Charge of the Senate Online Education Committee

Online education has been a part of UNCG course delivery for some years. For instance, there was a 2003-2008 Distance Education Plan. In 2010-11, Provost Perrin established a Committee on Online Education that reported to the Dean’s Council. The Committee identified four principles (e.g., equality of education, equality of services) and advanced seven recommendations. Three of the Committee’s recommendations pertained to financial matters. Another called for recognizing and rewarding faculty who develop and teach online courses.

A fifth recommendation called for centralization of and funding for mission-critical online services. The Provost’s Committee mentioned servers, course management systems, software and the like. As we shall see in our presentation, this year’s Senate Online Education Committee has been concerned with coordination of online activities and discussed whether there is a need for some centralization at both the services and pedagogical levels.

The Senate Online Education Committee was approved on April 18, 2012. At the April 4, 2012 Senate meeting, Provost Perrin paid tribute to Norman Brown, who was retiring as Dean of the Division of Continual Learning (DCL). Later in the meeting Josh Hoffman, Senate Chair, spoke about the role of the Faculty Senate in online learning and announced he would be asking the Senate to establish a Committee. At the next Senate meeting, after modest rewording, the resolution to establish the Online Education Committee was unanimously passed. It indicated the membership of the Committee and the Committee’s charge, which was stated as follows:

To study issues pertaining to the development, delivery, assessment and enhancement of online learning courses and programs at UNCG. It shall also facilitate the development, delivery and taking of online learning courses and programs, and work to enhance the quality of distance learning courses.

Regarding the Committee’s early activities, Wade Maki, the first Chair of the Committee, has written as follows:

The committee was created but not called to order during the first year. The second year (when I arrived) is when we reviewed ideas and brought forth a resolution for priority registration (which the Senate approved). The third year we looked at standards, particularly Quality Matters [an online course certification program], which had significant costs attached.

The Committee did not make a recommendation regarding standards or the issue of whether faculty teaching online should be required to have mandatory training or be certified in any way. While Wade was chairing the Committee, the Committee did advocate for keeping the IT Help Desk open for longer hours to coincide with when online students might be seeking assistance. That has been implemented. The Committee also discussed with DCL representatives development of the Ready to Teach and Ready to Learn modules. These modules have now successfully come to fruition.
Before turning to the current year’s operation of the Online Education Committee, a few observations about online education are warranted.

**The Types, Growth and Effectiveness of Online Education**

*Types of Delivery.* In discussing online education a couple of distinctions are worth noting. First there are various categories of courses. Table 1 shows the fourfold category system used in the *Online Report Card Tracking Online Education in the United States.* Although various reports and research studies differ in their precise usage of terms, three commonly identified categories of courses are (a) traditional, face-to-face, (b) online, and (c) blended or hybrid in which students have some face-to-face class meetings and do some work online in lieu of face-to-face meetings.

At UNCG it is important to distinguish between Distance Programs where students do not need to come to campus versus online delivery of courses that are part of main campus programs. The fees for students in distance programs differ from the fees paid by main campus students taking online courses. In some instances one instructor teaches yoked sections containing both Distance Program and main campus students who are registered in two separate sections.

Table 1. Types of Courses Identified in the *Online Report Card Tracking Online Education in the United States*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of Content Delivered Online</th>
<th>Type of Course</th>
<th>Typical Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Course where no online technology used — content is delivered in writing or orally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 29%</td>
<td>Web Facilitated</td>
<td>Course that uses web-based technology to facilitate what is essentially a face-to-face course. May use a learning management system (LMS) or web pages to post the syllabus and assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 79%</td>
<td>Blended/Hybrid</td>
<td>Course that blends online and face-to-face delivery. Substantial proportion of the content is delivered online, typically uses online discussions, and typically has a reduced number of face-to-face meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80+%</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td>A course where most or all of the content is delivered online. Typically have no face-to-face meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Growth of Online Delivery.* Online education has been a rapidly growing sector of higher education both nationally and at UNCG. The left panel of Figure 1 shows the growth of students taking at least one online course nationally since 2002 (Bidwell, 2014). Between 2002 and 2013 it increased roughly 460 per cent. Five in every eight university Presidents and Chancellors surveyed in 2015 considered online education important to their university’s long-term strategic plan (Allen & Seaman, 2016).
Figure 1 also shows that enrollments proportionally have increased at UNCG during the last three years. In 2014-15, 23 per cent of credit hours involved online delivery. Those credit hours were divided roughly equally between Distance Program courses and main campus courses. Of the credit hours involving online delivery, roughly 1 in 8 involved blended delivery and rest were part of fully online courses.

UNCG currently offers 33 online programs, 26 at the graduate level and 7 at the undergraduate level. Slightly over 50 per cent of UNCG undergraduates have taken an online course compared to less than 30 per cent nationally (Allen & Seaman, 2016).

A key question pertains to the quality of online education. In a recent national survey of over 21,000 faculty members were asked if “online courses can achieve student learning outcomes that are at least equivalent to those of in-person courses?” (Straumsheim, Jaschik, & Lederman, 2015). Faculty are generally skeptical: 53 percent disagreed vs. only 17 percent who agreed. (The rest were undecided.) With under 30 percent of their ranks being skeptical, university Presidents and Chancellors have a more positive view of online education (Allen & Seaman, 2016). By a ratio of nearly two to one (32% vs. 17%), senior university administrators are likely to agree (vs. disagree) that faculty attitudes are a significant obstacle to expansion of online education (Allen & Seaman, 2016).

Online Delivery: An Engine of Growth Since 2002

**U. S. Online Education Growth 2002-13**

Source Babson Survey Research Group

Students Taking at Least One Online Course (In millions)

**UNCG Online Education Growth 2012-15**

UNCG Office of Institutional Research

Proportion of UNCG Credit Hours Delivered Fully or Partially Online

Figure 1. The Growth of Online Education

*The Effectiveness of Online Delivery.* Hundreds of studies have been done comparing learning outcomes for traditional versus online delivery of courses. Summarizing 16 meta-analyses of these studies, Bernard and colleagues concluded: “there is wide variability among studies, from those strongly favoring DE [Distance Education] to those favoring CI [Classroom Instruction]” but overall “there is little difference in these two instructional patterns” (p. 88). Furthermore, they found that “only a few substantive moderator variables have yielded any
information about what makes DE/OL and CI different” (p. 89). In other words, overall online education is roughly as effective as traditional classroom instruction in fostering learning. Thus, it appears that online delivery fares better than faculty attitudes would imply.

Fewer studies have been done comparing blended delivery with classroom and online delivery. Means, Toyama, Murphy, and Baki (2013) have done a highly regarded synthesis of these studies. They restricted their investigation to studies that satisfied multiple criteria of rigor. Their result showed that blended delivery was superior to either purely classroom instruction or purely online delivery. Face-to-face interaction among students and between the students and the instructor were factors associated with superior outcomes.

UNCG’s Biology 105 is a good example of effective online education. The course manifests the good qualities that can be built into online delivery. Malcolm Schug did an analysis of his Biol 105 students when he was teaching via both forms of delivery. Malcolm used the same text for both sections and followed the same general curriculum but made modest adjustments related to the form of delivery. The online section rated higher on the two criteria Malcolm used: The mean course grade for the online students was 6 percent higher than for the face-to-face students. Furthermore, 11 per cent more students in the online (vs. the face-to-face) section successfully completed the course.

Malcolm comments on the superiority of the online delivery as follows:

I believe much of the effect is simply that when they take the course online, they must be working in the course very regularly because there are two quizzes or case studies due every week. I can't require this much in a campus class venue teaching 100-200 students. The grading would be prohibitive. Online it is automatic so [it is] easy to quiz them a lot. The website is also entertaining so many of them enjoy logging in and completing the lesson readings. For example the final case study investigates the biological basis of zombies as a mechanism to teach physiology.

The Operation of the Senate Online Committee in 2015-16

The Committee mostly operates through advocacy efforts and recommending policy. It includes ex-officio staff members but the Committee itself does not have the resources to implement programs, etc. Through its members, in 2015-16 the Committee was concerned with various issues including:

- Fostering opportunities for faculty to acquire training in online delivery
- Identifying the substantial diversity of individuals involved in UNCG’s online educational activities and considering ways of achieving greater coordination among them
- Discussing whether photos should be added to class lists (an Ad hoc Administrative group has meet to discuss this)
- Talking to the Registrar regarding difficulties students in distance programs have registering in courses at other universities and having grades reported to UNCG (Good news: The UNC Online system grade submission is now automated.)
- Calling attention to the issues around the recognition of blended courses in the registration system (An ad hoc admin group to meet)
In being considered as a person to lead the Committee in 2015-2016, Dan Perlman took a pragmatic approach. Consistent with the charge to the Committee, as goals for the year, he said he would like to identify steps UNCG could take to enhance the university’s online education. These might be recommendation of policies, working with units doing service delivery, distribution of information to faculty and/or students, and the like. He indicated his hope that significant concrete steps could be accomplished within a year.

During the fall the Committee met and three subgroups were established: (a) Nuts and Bolts, (b) Faculty Development, and (c) Coordination. The decision to have these particular groups was based in part on being a Senate Committee concerned with a faculty perspective and partially on preliminary ideas on domains in which activities might produce beneficial results. During the fall these groups worked independently trying to identify potential needs and thinking of ways of meeting them.

During the fall exploration phase (and indeed throughout the year) the premise that there are multiple parties involved in online education at UNCG was supported. A non-exhaustive list of groups and individuals includes:

- The participants themselves (faculty teaching online courses and students taking them),
- Units concerned with pedagogy and assisting in the production of online courses (University Teaching and Learning Commons [UTLC], DCL),
- Working groups (The Distance Education Program Directors, Instructional Technology Consultants),
- Various units that provide educationally supportive services to students (the Library, Information Technology Services, the Office of Accessibility Resources & Services),
- Administrative units with some involvement with online education (The Registrar’s Office, the Cashiers and Student Accounts Office, and less directly The Office of Institutional Research, the Provost’s Assessment and Accreditation unit),
- The Department chairs (or other departmental leaders) and support staff who decide upon and set up departmental teaching timetables, and
- Ad hoc events (the Power-up program).

Although there are many strengths in UNCG’s offering of online education and much to be praised, it is also apparent from talking to faculty and others in the trenches that there are some glitches in how the day-to-day operation of online education works. There is no systematic overarching mechanism to have the various parts talking with one another on a regular basis.

By the end of the fall semester it did appear that progress could be made in what might be considered the nuts and bolts of online delivery, faculty development, and coordination. After the fall semester the Online Education Committee functioned largely in terms of working clusters that morphed out of the earlier subgroups. In the Committee’s presentation to the Senate Kerri Richardson will first present on Resources and Logistics, Laura Pipe will present on faculty development, and Matt Loyd will present on the development of a Library portal to provide the UNCG community with a source to learn about units involved in UNCG’s online education and available resources. The presentation will end with a bidirectional question and comment period.
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Appendix A

The 2015-16 Members of the Online Education Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Barnes*</td>
<td>Staff Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Carroll</td>
<td>Music, Theater and Dance (Music)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Cranford*</td>
<td>Registrar’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andre Hill*</td>
<td>Undergraduate Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine (Kate) Hill</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolanda Hyde</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Jay Lennartson</td>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences (Geography)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Loyd*</td>
<td>Div of Continual Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Perlman (Chair)</td>
<td>Health and Human Sciences (Hum Dev &amp; Fam Stud)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Pipe*</td>
<td>Undergraduate Studies, UTLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Remsburg*</td>
<td>Provost’s Council of Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Rhew*</td>
<td>Business Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerri Richardson</td>
<td>Education (Teacher Ed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper Roehm</td>
<td>Senate Liaison (Marketing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Sarbaum</td>
<td>Business (Economics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Southern*</td>
<td>Student Government Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Sutton*</td>
<td>Information Technology Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ex Officio

1 Lisa Henline was the Registrar’s Representative earlier in the year

2 Gloria Thornton, a member of the Committee in previous years, was the IT representative earlier in the year until her job responsibilities changed
From DCL

Ready to Teach: Ready to Teach is a new series of four 30-minute modules on planning, developing, teaching, and evaluating online courses, all accessible online by computer, phone, or tablet, at readytoteach.uncg.edu. The modules share the latest insights from fellow UNCG instructors, instructional technology consultants, and researchers on teaching and developing online courses. Practice exercises, worksheets, tips, and videos are thoughtfully designed for instructors to pick and choose according to their interests and specific needs.

From the UTLC

PowerUp, Summer Teaching Institutes (May 10-12): PowerUp is back! This is a multiple day workshop on developing online courses. Participants will complete Ready to Teach prior to the workshop, as well as observe a few online courses. Come with questions and ideas for this interactive workshop.

Week with Dr. Brian Udermann (June 6-10): The UTLC: Teaching Innovations Office (TIO) will be hosting Dr. Brian Udermann, Director of Online Education and Professor in Exercise & Sport Science at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. Dr. Udermann directs the online initiatives at Wisconsin-La Crosse, including course development, evaluation and faculty support.

Online Learning Incubator (June 6-10): This multiple day incubator is structured for faculty to develop and prepare a course to be offered online (including hybrid courses). Dr. Udermann will work with faculty on their individual questions and concerns, in addition to offering workshops related to pedagogy, evaluation and delivery. Incubator will run Monday through Friday 1pm – 5:30pm, UTLC will provide coffee, snacks and lite breakfast.

Dr. Udermann will be available in the afternoon to meet with key partners regarding the development of UNCG’s online support. If you have suggested partners, or would like to be included, please contact Laura Pipe (lmpipe@uncg.edu).

Teaching Certificates Program: The UTLC: TIO will be debuting several Faculty Development Teaching Certificates this fall (2016). This includes certificates related to pedagogy, assessment and online learning. (Faculty who participate in PowerUp will receive a certificate for online and hybrid learning.) These are non-credit bearing certificates, open to all faculty. Participating faculty members will complete four topic-specific workshops in order to receive the certificate.

Online Learning or Hybrid Certificate: This certificate is being planned by a working group that includes assessment, faculty and ITCs (Instructional Technology Consultants). Workshops will include pedagogy, assessment and delivery of online courses.

New Faculty Orientation

New Faculty Orientation is planned for August 15, 16. August 16th (Tuesday), the UTLC: TIO will host the 2nd Annual Teaching and Scholarship Colloquium. A dedicated session track will be presented on various topics related to online learning. The Teaching and Scholarship Colloquium is open to all faculty members.

If faculty or departments have specific session requests for this time, please contact Laura Pipe (lmpipe@uncg.edu).

Online Learning Committee (April 2016)
Senate Online Learning Committee
Dan Perlman, Chair
Presentation to UNCG Faculty Senate
April 6, 2016
Presentation Topics

• Highlights of the Background Paper
• Resources and Logistics (Kerri Richardson)
• Faculty Development Initiatives (Laura Pipe)
• The Library Portal: A Coordination Initiative (Matt Loyd)
• Bidirectional Discussion
Highlights of the Background Information

• Online education has been a growth engine nationally and at UNCG in recent years
• Over 20 percent of UNCG’s credit hours are from online courses
• There are many individuals and units involved in UNCG’s online education delivery but their endeavors are not systematically coordinated
• Despite faculty skepticism, online education produces learning outcomes comparable to face-to-face delivery
• Hybrid (aka blended) courses are especially successful
Resources & Logistics
Kerri Richardson
OARS Resources

• Tailored to meet individual needs
• Proactive stance to help students
• Online learning in particular lends itself well to students with disabilities
• Screen reading assistants
Logistics with Online/Distance Learning

• Additional clarification needed
• Separate procedures for departments to schedule online & distance courses
• Dance among three units: Office of Assessment and Accreditation to approve the site, DCL to enter the course, URO to provide a required footnote
• Communication between units
Logistics with Online/Distance Learning cont..

• Clarity among procedures
• Clarity of what an "online program" means and how tuition is affected by the campus (D or M) attached to the course entry
• All policies need to be communicated to faculty in a clear, easy-to-find policy.
Updates on Faculty Development
Laura Pipe

• Ready to Teach (DCL), also Ready to Learn

• PowerUp, Summer Teaching Institutes (May 10-12) (UTLC:TIO)

• Summer Online Incubator with Dr. Brian Udermann (June 6-10) (UTLC:TIO)

• Component of New Faculty Orientation (UTLC:TIO)

• Teaching Certificate for Online Learning to debut Fall 2016 (UTLC:TIO)

• UTLC is adding a new Academic Technology Developer position
Online Education Resources Portal
Matt Loyd
Online Education Resources Portal

New to Online Education?

› Ready to Teach
  How to Plan, Develop, Teach, and Evaluate online courses

› Canvas and WebEx
  Resources and Support for Learning Management Systems

› Accessibility
  Ensuring online courses are accessible for all students

› Library Resources
  Instructional services available for online or distance courses

Search Resources

Or Browse By

School or Unit: Item 1

Type of Resource or Alphabetically:

Not sure where to start?

• Use our directory. Find out who on campus can help you with what in online education.
• Use these selected introductory resources to help!
Online Education Resources Directory

Instructional Technology Consultants -
Your first step when planning or designing a course online

Katherine Hill, Electronic Resources Librarian
240 Jackson Library
336.334.4300
klhhill@uncg.edu
pedagogy, multimedia, ejournals, campus policy

Katherine Hill, Electronic Resources Librarian
240 Jackson Library
336.334.4300
klhhill@uncg.edu
pedagogy, multimedia, ejournals, campus policy

Division of Continual Learning -
Campus wide organization that can consult with you on...

Katherine Hill, Electronic Resources Librarian
240 Jackson Library
336.334.4300
klhhill@uncg.edu
pedagogy, multimedia, ejournals, campus policy

Katherine Hill, Electronic Resources Librarian
240 Jackson Library
336.334.4300
klhhill@uncg.edu
pedagogy, multimedia, ejournals, campus policy

Not sure where to start?
Use these selected introductory resources to help!
General Conclusions

• UNCG has many exemplary online activities but some hassles still persist in making everything work
• Per its charge, the Senate Online Education Committee has been working in multiple ways to facilitate the development, the quality and smooth, hassle-free delivery and taking of online learning courses and programs
• Progress is under way regarding coordination
• Progress is under way regarding faculty development
• More is to be done
Looking to The Future
A Bidirectional Discussion: Your questions, Our Questions, Comments

• Your questions

• What will make the library portal most useful for you? Are you interested in contributing?*

• Akin to the Provost’s Committee’s call for centralization of services, does UNCG need an administrator to serve as a hub for main campus and distance online delivery?

* Contact Kate Hill at kmhill6@uncg.edu
References


• ONLINE REPORT CARD TRACKING ONLINE EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES (2016) [http://onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/onlinereportcard.pdf](http://onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/onlinereportcard.pdf)

• SCOTT JASCHIK & DOUG LEDERMAN EDITORS THE 2014 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF Faculty Attitudes on Technology. Inside Higher Ed, 1015 18th Street NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20036