Call to Order and Introductory Remarks

Anne Wallace, Chair of the General Faculty and Faculty Senate

- **Ballots for the At-large Senate Committees** will go out very soon (probably tomorrow morning), with closing date of Monday, April 17.
  - Committees with vacancies:
    - Government
    - Due Process
    - Grievance
    - Faculty Assembly Delegation

- **April 19 General Faculty Meeting** will include a few business items and remarks from the Provost. I anticipate a fairly short meeting, and that's good, because we can then adjourn to the reception at the Faculty Center. As we did after Fall Convocation, Faculty Senate joins with AAUP and UTLC in sponsoring a reception—this time, "well done, and happy (almost) end-of-year!", plus some brief remarks on the UTLC's mentoring program.

- **May 3 Faculty Senate meeting** will be the last Faculty Senate Meeting of the year and will include discussion of proposed revisions to Academic Integrity Policy and Univ. P&T Committee elections (of which more later in an email).

Approval of the March 1, 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
  - Shared brief update on the UNC GA’s Strategic Planning Initiative
    - effort has currently turned to the development of metrics to track institutions’ progress toward goals tied to the plan
    - 9 metrics that will be considered by GA:
      - low-income enrollment: defined as Pell eligible
      - rural enrollment
      - low income completions
      - 5 year graduation rates
• undergraduate degree efficiency measure--on-time graduation
• achievement gaps in UG degree completion
• critical workforces
• research productivity

■ There is a negotiation between GA and campuses to determine foci
  • 5 in the top category
  • 3 in the middle category
  • 1 to sustain/not necessarily improve upon
  • This process will unfold between now and possibly May

■ How will these metrics and our progress impact the institution?
The funds that GA periodically award (most often through requests
for proposals for particular areas) will be tied in the future on
initiatives that will have an impact on these metrics

○ Brief preview of a couple of items on the upcoming BOG agenda
  ■ May meeting has 2 items up for approval:
    • new degree program: Bachelors in Professional Studies
      program (fully online)--has been in development for 2
      years, to operate starting new Fall
    • 2 Millennial Campus districts proposed:
      ○ Gate City: focused on Health & Wellness
      ○ Tate Street corridor: focused on the Arts

■ Provost recently began series of budget meetings with direct
  reports (deans of colleges and schools)
  • budgets by Deans will submitted
  • goal will be to become in a state of readiness to allocate
    resources
  • goal is that budgets will be finalized by end of this fiscal
    year

■ Budget--no clear prognosis on what state budget means for
  University
  • surplus could bode well but talks about tax cut could
    influence surplus that would come to UNCG
  • Enrollment growth, if funded or largely funded, would still
    bring us substantial resources which will be used to make
    investments in hires and other areas of the University

• Questions from the Floor
  ○ Has the University experienced any effects of the fixed tuition?
    ■ University will experience effects--this year is the start of the fixed
      tuition and will be locked for the next 4 years (8 consecutive
      semesters) for this cohort
    ■ Impact of locking tuition for 4 years means the recent increase
      approved by BOG at 3% means the increase gets pulled down to a
      fraction of the original percentage because of this tuition fix
  ○ Do we lose funds if students drop out?
    ■ we do not lose funds
the penalty in fixed tuition comes to the student who takes longer than 8 semesters to complete--increase in tuition will occur based on the then-current rate
  ● points to the need of faculty to be sound advisors and help students graduate in 8 consecutive semesters
○ Does this fixed tuition apply to graduate students?
  ■ Only applies to undergraduate students
○ Will there be any faculty involvement with the Title IX policies
  ■ Julia Jackson-Newsom shared that there will be faculty involvement--she has emailed Anne Wallace for participation
○ Request that the Provost give a copy of the 9 metric areas--Provost will
  ■ should be visible on the UNC GA website
○ Does 8 semester tuition fix include transfer students?
  ■ there is a formula for transfer students so that students do not start clean with 8 semesters
  ■ goal was to not penalize community college transfers as well as not provide them with any advantage
○ Provost asked for any questions or clarifications on the Senate Budget Committee Questions responses that she submitted--no questions asked

Government Committee Resolutions
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 (Enc. C)
    ■ This resolution is seeking to make the ad hoc committee a permanent committee within Faculty Senate
    ■ Greg read the resolution to the Senate
    ■ Anne reminded that motions from Government Committee do not require second motions
    ■ Note changes to Resolution in notes
    ■ Question from floor about the 25% of committee being tenure track and/or tenured faculty and 1 voting Faculty member being from each electoral division
      ● Committee realized could be difficult with rotating of membership but left these requirements/decisions to the Committee on Committees
    ■ Question from floor: Does the Senate Liaison vote?
      ● Anne clarified that unless the liaison is explicitly excluded, then the liaison is a voting member. No committee charges that she could think of at that moment include such an exclusion.
    ■ Question from floor: Does charge/mission change for this committee?
      ● Anne shared that charge does not change once committee becomes permanent committee within the Senate
Question from floor: The name seems to be problematic given that the name suggests faculty who “lack something” in their work and responsibilities—suggestion for us to keep thinking about this
  ● Greg acknowledged that this issue has been raised before but the Committee doesn’t know how else to address it
Statement from floor: NTT faculty in their department is called Academic Professionals
  ● Anne shared a variety of titles used for NTT faculty—difficulty is that none of these are applied universally and none of these more clearly recognize the value of these faculty over others
Anne called for a vote of Senate; unanimous vote to pass resolution. Resolution passed.
  ○ Resolution #FS04052017/2: To Change the Name and Charge of the Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons Committee to the Professional Development Committee (Enc. D)
    ■ this change is linked to the next resolution (#FS04052017/3) where “Professional Development” is removed from the name of that Committee
    ● Greg read the resolution to Faculty Senate
    ■ Question from the floor: If we’re taking out teaching and learning, this seems like a major change and that professional development doesn’t limit itself to teaching and learning but where is it that we’re going to have a committee to deal with teaching and learning?
      ● Anne shared that by liaising with UTLC is to broaden the scope of the committee and not to limit or exclude teaching and learning
      ● Senator shared that their perspective indicated that teaching and learning
        ○ Senator shared “professional development” does seem to include teaching and learning and the UTLC Director is listed as someone who is/was involved with the development of this resolution, teaching and learning should not be overlooked in the work of this committee.
    ■ Anne called for a vote of Senate; unanimous vote to pass resolution. Resolution passed.
  ○ 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 (Enc.E)
    ■ Greg read this resolution to the Faculty Senate
    ■ Question from the floor: understand the logic of decoupling UTLC from the Professional Development but don’t understand the logic
of uncoupling UTLC from Professional Compensation and Welfare

- Laurie Kennedy Malone stated that the rationale was to remove the charge of development since it was going to be the charge of the new committee instead of this current committee

- Question from the floor: Why have 2 committees instead of just 1?
  - Anne shared that committee conversations debated this idea--not adding committee but changing charges of the 2 committees
  - Made sense given the role of the old FTC versus the new UTLC
  - Laurie shared there have been more issues related to Welfare and Compensation and that issues related to professional development were not addressed as much or as often

- Anne called for a vote of Senate; unanimous vote to pass resolution. Resolution passed.

Resolutions from Academic Policies Committee

Colleen Fairbanks, Chair, and Wake Maki, Senate Liaison

- Resolution #FS04052017/4: On Faculty Accessibility (Enc. F)
  - Colleen shared these concerns were brought forward by Provost as well as student concerns
  - Rationale: to make sure students knew how to access faculty outside of classroom
  - Peer institutions were surveyed to locate policies on their websites--varied policies were discovered
  - Faculty Senators were also surveyed for thoughts and suggestions on faculty accessibility policy
  - Committee tried to do 2 things:
    - make sure faculty are making themselves available to students--acknowledging there are many ways by which faculty can be accessible
    - communicate accessibility in course syllabi
    - a minimum of 2 hours per week is expected for faculty to be available to students
  - Committee is not mandating set office hours or requiring faculty to be available by particular means; also not trying to override existing unit/departmental policies
  - Question from the floor: For online classes, there is always a challenge: can you provide an example of how this would be into effect for these courses?
    - Provide means of accessibility in course syllabi and set parameters by which faculty can be reached
  - Statement from floor: Senator shared they went beyond giving their Google number and provided their mobile phone and found that students
did not abuse this method and response time to each text/communication was no more than 30 seconds.

- Concern still shared by Senator that expectation from online students is that faculty accessibility is 24/7
- Statement from floor: Issue may be with wording that minimum of 2 hours a week; how are these 2 hours measured
  - If limits are not set on availability, then there may be an expectation that you’re available 24/7
  - Follow-up discussion shared that this policy with minimum could in effect make us less accessible
  - Wade Maki also reminded Senators that unit/department policies would layer on top of these expectations to provide more parameters for availability
- Statement from floor: If we explicitly set a low bar, it erodes expectations and provides the opportunity that people will lower their expectations and guidelines and could make us look bad
- Provost asked Senators to consider how this language would look to someone outside the University
  - shared that she doesn’t see this as responsive in any way to the concerns brought forward by students to her for face-to-face interaction with faculty
  - could have uneven landscape across departments and units for faculty availability
  - asked the Senate to consider further discussion on this important issue
  - this statement is at odds for what the Provost and Chancellor are championing UNCG as being to outside constituencies
- Colleen shared information from surveys that showed that even with specific office hours, not all students would be served with specific hours
- Statement from floor: Policy seems to read that faculty could be available over email and adequately cover availability requirement; suggestion is to separate out email from other means
- Statement from floor: recommendation to take out the 2 hours a week expected and let the rest of the policy stand
- Statement from floor: suggestion to have policy that address in-person office hours as well as policy that addresses other means by which faculty can be accessed
  - Colleen shared that Canvas can be used to vary hours available for students
  - Anne shared that Committee wanted to make it clear that faculty needed to be available to classes for a reasonable time and that faculty were flexible with courses that may have other/different expectations for availability
- Statement from floor: Email concern raised by Senator earlier is a concern because some faculty could interpret
- Anne offered options available:
- Send resolution back to the committee for further work/modification
- Bring forward an amendment to the resolution and call for a vote
  - Senator asked if committee reviewed Faculty Handbook to see how/if other important policies were covered and handled
    - Wade shared original version of resolution did not include the 2 hour clause but was later added based on feedback received on original version
  - Provost asked if department heads/chairs were surveyed; they may call for more clarity as to how they are to approach such matters
    - Wade shared that some department chairs and deans responded and asked for the committee to not override their ability to do things with their own faculty
    - Colleen shared that as a chair, she does not want the responsibility of checking office hours of their faculty each week
  - Senator shared that the minimum of 2 hours a week be expected be eliminated and more importance be placed on the “Faculty will respond to students seeking access via these methods in a timely fashion.”
  - Motion to strike the minimum of 2 hours per week; seconded by another Senator
    - Senator asked if the improvement was approved by the Provost
      - She said it is improved but it doesn’t address the original request by students (who were not polled to see if program/department specific) who were reluctant to reach out to faculty; felt more comfortable if something was set that they know they’d be welcomed by the faculty
      - Would still like to see some specific expectation for face-to-face availability
    - Colleen shared that when she met with students, she asked students about being able to meet with faculty because stated office hours were not conducive for meeting and they all shared this has been a concern
    - Statement from floor: We have an opportunity to have a dialogue as to what would serve our students best
      - some standard of availability of faculty
      - some soft policy to accommodate students who can’t make standard office hour
      - some sense of control of accessibility for online courses (?)
    - Statement from floor: Senator liked the original statement mentioning the 2 hours minimum; the key is to be very specific about availability and response time on course syllabi for students; need to give faculty guidance as to what to put in syllabi to be more clear to students
    - Senator asked for some guidelines for face-to-face courses and online courses be established
Senator cited the last sentence in resolution (“Units, departments, or programs may create additional…”) and asked if this statement could be moved earlier in the resolution and if this would be more effective in learning students’ needs and how to best meet those needs.

Anne called for vote for motion to strike the 2 hour minimum: hand vote 14 ayes; 10 nays; ayes have it and the sentence is stricken from the resolution.

Anne shared options for this resolution:
- A “no” vote sends it back to the committee for further work.
- A “yes” vote could support the resolution with the new wording of the 2 hours a week minimum being removed.

Parliamentarian shared that the resolution could not come back in exactly the same form/wording if defeated, but could return in a modified form.

Question from floor: Does this resolution focus primarily on undergraduate students or are graduate students included as well?

Graduate education seems to be different in terms of faculty interaction between undergraduate and graduate student populations.

Wade shared that last sentence addresses that in terms of individual units and departments addressing availability of faculty.

Motion proposed to table this resolution; motion seconded; no discussion.

Anne called for vote; ayes have majority, *the resolution is tabled*.

**Resolution #FS04052017/5: To Revise the Academic Good Standing Policy (Enc. G)**

- BOG mandated policy change; students with GPA under 2.0 or who haven’t completed 67% of their courses would be placed on academic probation.
- Colleen read the resolution to the Faculty Senate.
- Students who drop courses they are having difficulty in would be responsible for just the courses they are currently taken; they would not be penalized by including courses they have dropped.
- Senator asked about possible consequences of Financial Aid and requiring students to complete percentage of coursework? --need to complete 67% before consequences occur.
- Anne called for vote: *passed unanimously.*

**UNC Faculty Assembly Report Feb. 20 Meeting (Enc. H)**

*Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair*

- Thanks to Spoma, who got me to edit this report to a reasonable length in text! Anna couldn't be here today, so I'm bringing the report to you from our delegation.
- This will be the even shorter version:
- Gabriel Lugo, Chair of FA, opened with an inspiring call for faculty to safeguard the integrity of our universities and carry on the search for truth ("truthiness?"). He also remarked on the changes to BOG, and ongoing (not yet successful) efforts to seat several ex-officio members, one of who would be FA chair.
- President Spellings addressed FA, as she regularly does, and foregrounded several concerns: UNC’s online profile, which she feels needs updating in several
ways; the uses of technology to advance the SP goals of access, completion, and affordability; and financial aid distributions in the state, which she feels need change to support those same three areas of concern.

- We heard reports from: UNC Online Task Force; the GA Fellow on "Climate," diversity and inclusion; Drew Moritz, the VP for State Gov't Relations; Junius Gonzales, Senior VP for Academic Affairs; and Andrew Kelly, Sr. VP for Strategy and Policy. I'll be glad to answer any questions you might have about the details in the agenda packet report, but will bring forward only one particular item: Vidya Garyega will be a GA Fellow this summer. Congratulations to Vidya, and thanks for adding to UNCG's visibility there in Chapel Hill.

- Preparations went forward for Faculty Assembly leadership elections, which will take place at our April 21 meeting. I will note that officers of FA do not have to be delegates: any member of the UNC faculty is eligible. So . . .

- When we meet April 21, in addition to electing the leadership, we'll be discussing possible resolutions on cuts to higher Ed, and on the so-called "Free Speech" bill (H527) that has been introduced to the legislature. Our theme for this last meeting of the year is—"Academic Freedom."

**Nomination of Honorary Degrees Committee Member**

*Stoel Burrowes, Senate Elections Committee Chair*

- Stoel shared that Spoma Jovanovic has been nominated for membership onto this committee
- Anne reminded that the Honorary Degrees Committee is not a Committee of the Faculty Senate
- No further nominations were received from the floor
- Anne called for vote to recommend Spoma as the Faculty Senate nominee for membership on the Honorary Degrees Committee.
- Nomination of Spoma Jovanovic, unanimously approved by voice vote.

**Announcements**

- Faculty Forum on April 19, 2017 from 3pm-5pm
  - Reception immediately following in the Faculty Center
  - Refreshments provided by UTLC, Faculty Senate, & AAUP
- Next Meeting of the Faculty Senate: Wednesday, May 3, 2017, 3pm-5pm in the Virginia Dare Room of the Alumni House

**Adjournment**

- Move to adjourn. Seconded
- Adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Brad Johnson,
Secretary of the Faculty Senate

*Approved May 3, 2017 Faculty Senate Meeting*