



Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, May 3, 2017
3:00pm-5:00pm
Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House
(Approved 9/6/2017)

Call to Order and Introductory Remarks

Anne Wallace, Chair of the General Faculty and Faculty Senate

- And it's May. Once again, we're almost there, right at the edge of the most over-planned 12 weeks of the year, our energy low and our hopes high. It will seem like only a moment until we're back in this room again, feeling refreshed but wondering what happened to the time. When we do reconvene, it'll be Andrea up here at the bully pulpit—so you'll have to forgive me if I take this last opportunity to once again wax philosophical.
- Of all the perspectives from which to consider faculty governance, the Senate Chair is peculiarly poised at the intersection, or confluence, of two quite different power structures. One of these is historically and essentially hierarchical. We all know the accepted genealogy: the American university derives from the European university, and so from the medieval Catholic Church. Apparently there are good arguments to be made for influence from the Islamic madrasah as well, but these arguments do not alter the fundamental historical shape, the depending of power down through a structure toward, and including, teachers and students. Most often we identify this hierarchal structure with "administration," and map it with boxes and connecting lines, the most important boxes at the top. As faculty we also participate in this hierarchical arrangement—which one can see at each Commencement when we put on those medieval robes, complete with rank and guild insignia.
- But the other power structure, the one we generally speak of as "faculty governance," has become increasingly democratized. Since the AAUP began to articulate ideas of shared responsibility among governing boards, administration, and faculty in the early twentieth century, the institutional expressions of faculty participation in governance have increasingly resembled the structures of a democratic republic, with representative bodies like this Senate deriving their authority from the whole body of a university faculty. The Senate's members, officers, and many committees are elected, now from a voting faculty that includes all full-time faculty regardless of rank or condition, or from inside units and departments. Even the appointed Senate committees elect their own chairs.
- So what we've got here is a republic wrapped in a kingdom, like the Republic of San Marino existing within the borders of the Roman Empire--except that it's more complicated than that, because the two power structures interpenetrate (see appointed Senate committees, above). It's possible that if we had set out to create problems, we could not have done a better job of it, and it takes a large number of people working pretty constantly to knit the whole thing together.
- Many of the difficulties the Senate Chair confronts at the multiple borders of these structures have to do with their different senses of time, and of efficacy. The republic is a deliberative, iterative place, where one mark of success is noisy, prolonged debate. One of the fundamental reasons for its democracy, after all, is that "the faculty" is made up of individual faculty, each one of us

trained to independent thought and skeptical inquiry, and all rather different from each other. But on the other side of the border, people are trying to complete discrete tasks with timelines set by those in the higher-up boxes, the people with greater authority and broader responsibilities—and all of their clocks tick faster.

- It's easy to get frustrated with this situation, to ask, "Why bother?", and people on both sides of the borders do regularly ask that. Why should we participate in governance, faculty ask, when it seems that almost everything is driven by outside forces and top-down processes? Meanwhile, across the border, people ask why it takes the faculty so long to get something done. Can't they just drive through to a rational consensus in a more timely fashion? What are all those committees doing, and why does it take them so long?
- I want to propose something counter-intuitive: what if, instead of thinking of this situation as dysfunctional, we think of it as highly functional in its ability to prevent certain very serious problems? The top-down, hierarchal structure is, after all, vulnerable to the very same problems as the medieval church—and as the corporate world of our own time: decision-making too far separated from the everyday operations of the institution, over-consolidation of power, the cult of the "strong man," even, at times, genuine corruption. On the other hand, even a robust republic can get caught in the loop of its own self-reflective discourse, and we do need to actually get things done, on large scales as well as small.
- To my mind, the answer to our conundrum—the republic wrapped in the kingdom—is not to reject, or diminish, one or the other, but to treat them as sources of balance and mutual renewal. We're not going to find that perfect condition in which faculty governance and university administration can chug along, ever in balance with each other. Continuing work and engagement, continuing belief in each other, continuing ethical vigilance—these, I think, must be the elements of that dynamic balance through which we can achieve our mutual goals: teaching, learning, scholarship, engagement.
- And so we'll be back next fall, at it again, no doubt with the same senses of frustration—but carrying on, recreating what is needed, day by day. I'll be back too, in a different roll, and so will take just one more moment now to thank the Senate team, the people with whom I've worked most closely. No amount of time is enough, nor phrases eloquent enough, to express my real debts, and so I'll keep it to this: Andrea, Brad, Steve, and Mary Lea—THANK YOU.
- And thanks to all of you for listening.

Approval of the April 5, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

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

- No corrections.
- Minutes passed.

Provost Remarks & Questions from the Floor

Dana Dunn, Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor

- Remarks
 - Provost Dunn thanked those faculty and staff who were recognized yesterday with excellence awards
 - Provost Dunn raised “food for thought” for the Senate: the format of our awards ceremony and the manner in which these are carried out is the way we would like our awards process carried out
 - Combined faculty and staff recognition, which can get lengthy at times
 - Provost wanted to query faculty for suggestions; she has heard suggestions to split faculty and staff award recognition programs; possibly combining faculty awards with a General Faculty Mtg--please forward any thoughts or suggestions to the Provost
 - Provost shared things happening this summer occupying much of her time

- Physical changes occurring to the campus over the next couple of years (replacing McIver Building, moving of at least 24 academic units); Spring 2018 will be the start of demolition of McIver
 - Website linked off Provost's website with updates on the McIver project
 - Continuation of Banner Student Implementation project--will occur in an intense mode this summer
 - In Fall, Faculty will be solicited for input for this project with a goal of implementing an online curriculum system
 - Group of faculty will begin work this summer for intensive activity related to a review of the General Education Curriculum should the resolution pass at this Faculty Senate mtg.
 - Questions from the Floor
 - None

Retired Faculty Association

Pamela Williamson, Faculty Fellow to the Provost & Associate Professor, Specialized Education Services, Director of Graduate Studies and Doctoral Program Coordinator, SES Department

- Presentation
 - Pamela reviewed a slideshow with the Senate
 - Results of faculty survey and focus groups
 - Response rate was 25.1% (184 retired faculty, 397 tenured faculty)
 - 3 groups
 - Retirees
 - Tenured faculty returning in the near term
 - Tenured faculty not retiring in the near term
 - 91% responded that establishing a Retired Faculty Association was a good idea
 - Pam looked at current Retired Faculty Associations in NC (NC State, UNC-CH)
 - Focus Groups: 6 retirees and 7 still employed with 5 colleges and schools (including the Library) represented
 - Next steps
 - May 15 will be the date that a steering committee will convene to discuss collected data, review governance documents from other NC institutions (especially NC State), and establish an action plan
- Questions and discussion
 - Senator asked what is the difference between this association and what current retired individuals have access to or do (taking/auditing classes, etc.)
 - Vision is that this would be an organizational process where formal and informal activities would become more organized under a centralized umbrella--some people may not be aware of benefits once they retired
 - Would this organization be self-governed or under the umbrella of UNCG?
 - Would initially have some support from UNCG to get going but would hopefully move to self-sustaining
 - Could the name be possibly changed?
 - The steering committee would consider this in their deliberations

Resolution from Academic Policies Committee

Colleen Fairbanks, Chair; Donna Nash, AI Task Force Members

- Resolution #FS05032017/1: To Revise the Academic Integrity Policy (*Enc. B*)
- Committee asked to review the AI policy by the AI Task Force Committee
- Donna shared information about the AI Task Force
 - Started in Fall 2016 and met almost weekly to review documents from Dean of Students office and compared policies from 20 other institutions
 - Definitions were looked to be revised to accommodate new technology and distance (online) learning

- Sanctions, new procedures for AI hearing, etc. were reviewed and revised
- Colleen shared broad outline of what was changed in the policy:
 - Re-establish faculty oversight of the policy
 - Establish an unauthorized behaviors policy to update on some behaviors not previously addressed
 - Another goal was to separate out the AI Hearing process and the Student Conduct process
 - Establish an inclusion of students rights to due process and confidentiality
 - Organizational and terminology items were also updated
- Colleen read the resolution to the Faculty Senate
- Questions from floor
 - Can you summarize the difference between AI and Student Code of Conduct
 - AI is more academics and the Student Code of Conduct is more related to student behaviors
 - Provost shared that it is commonplace for Student Affairs professionals to be trained to investigate student conduct issues but with AI violations, ethical violations are typical and some faculty are reluctant to turn over control of the process over to others who may not be trained in this area.
 - Is the AI part of the change really change or is it just taking out the Code of Conduct aspect of it
 - A significant change is the hearing process--AI hearings and Student Conduct were essentially the same process
 - Committee wanted to make the document more organizationally sound, including student rights policy
 - Senator shared he found it hard to understand what was new with this policy versus the old policy--there were no track changes so it's hard to know exactly what the Senate is voting on
 - Changes are still part of a procedural document that are still being reviewed by the Dean of Students Office
 - Exact procedural document is very detailed; Dean of Students shared that procedures are separate from the policy and will be uploaded online for further review
 - Anne Wallace shared that she reviewed the policy and procedures documents with Brett Carter (DOS) and Rob Guttentag and made the decision that the procedures part of the policy was the area that needed to be addressed first
 - Senator shared that with the AI policy, faculty don't have the ability to have a violation be permanent on a student's record but that automatically goes against the no withdrawal/drop or retake a course clause
 - DOS shared that they don't want the student to be able to immediately drop the course until the situation is reconciled
 - DOS shared that if the paperwork isn't received from the faculty, then the DOS won't record
 - Senator shared he was worried about the serial offender who could repeat such behavior again in another course
 - Anne asked for other concerns for this specific aspect of the policy
 - Gallery member who was part of AI Task Force said they discussed being more or less strict with the sanctions
 - **Clarification about Faculty Committee that was in abeyance but is now coming back into activity**
 - Subcommittee would not be involved with specific cases but would
 - Anne shared that this committee would not be a subcommittee of the Academics Policy Committee but is linked in to the Faculty Senate
 - The committee would actually be an advisory group
 - Senator suggested amending Section 6 items e & f by adding at end of each item: “, except with the consent of the instructor within whose course the violation occurred.”
 - Question raised that student could retake the class but would not have the initial grade removed

- Senator shared concern with making a change like this after so many people/offices have reviewed this document
 - Amending Senator shared this would allow a little clemency in instances when it is warranted
 - Colleen shared that she knows that faculty are sometimes reluctant to submit AI. Paperwork because they do not want to hurt a student's academic record
 - This may encourage faculty to submit AI violations without imposing a penalty that they may not want to give
 - Senator shared that policy puts more pressure on faculty
 - If student claims responsibility, student doesn't have to go to panel; but if faculty member thinks it is still a serious case, a hearing can still be convened
 - DOS shared that it becomes management issue with their office if faculty are simply wanting violations recorded in their office but don't want sanctions to happen
 - DOS--student can retake a course but the new grade cannot replace the grade previously earned in the course
 - Amendment was seconded; neighs had it; amendment does not pass to the resolution
- Anne called vote for resolution; resolution passed unanimously

Resolution from General Education Council

David Carlone, General Education Council Chair

- Resolution #FS05032017/2: To Approve a Self-Study of the General Education Program (*Enc. C*)
 - David shared that a year ago, it was recommended for the committee to take up the discussion of possibly suggesting a review of the general education curriculum
 - 3 documents in the packet: resolution, committee charge, and SACSCOC guidelines regarding general education
 - David read the resolution to the Senate
 - Questions from the floor
 - Senator asked about the way voting members would be chosen
 - List was generated of prospective people by General Education Council as well as Deans; individuals would be contacted to gauge their interest in serving on the committee
 - Anne called for a vote to approve the Resolution: Resolution was approved unanimously

Senate Elections Committee Report

Sam Miller, Elections Committee Member

- Sam Miller reported for Stoel Burrowes
- Nominations for Univ. P&T Committee--3 vacancies
 - Sudha Shreeniwas---approved
 - Tara Green--approved
 - Febrice Lehoucq---approved

Remarks

Andrea Hunter, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

- Andrea acknowledged the closing of Anne's term as Faculty Senate Chair and asked Senators to reflect on Anne's leadership
- Chancellor Gilliam shared reflections on Anne's leadership
 - Acknowledged Anne's service on the Chancellor's search committee that brought him to UNCG
 - Credited Anne with helping with the development of his administration and showing him around during his first year
 - Acknowledged Anne's stalwart advocacy for the faculty and with keeping him up to date on faculty concerns, especially related to strategic planning
 - Acknowledged Anne's work with building a strong relationship with Staff Senate

- Anne was a very steady presence during the transitioning of administrations
- Chancellor Gilliam acknowledged Anne's love of Harry Potter and Jane Austen
- Andrea shared Anne's steadying force with the Faculty Senate to better serve as a voice for the faculty
- Video presentation/montage of various UNCG community members reflecting on Anne's leadership of Faculty Senate
 - Andrea thanked Wade Maki for making the video for Anne
- Andrea and Faculty Senate leadership presented Anne with a plaque for her service
- Brad Johnson presented a framed appreciation of Anne's service and asked Senators to please sign the matte before they leave.

Announcements

- Commencement: Friday, May 12, 2017, 10:00am in the Greensboro Coliseum

Adjournment

- Move to adjourn. Seconded
- Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
 Brad Johnson
 Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Approved 9/6/2017