



*Minutes*

*Wednesday, May 6, 2015*

*3:00 – 5:30 p.m.*

*Virginia Dare Room, Alumni House*

### **Call to Order and Introductory Remarks**

*Spoma Jovanovic, Chair of the Faculty Senate*

Acting Chancellor Dunn is nearby at the Board of Trustees meeting and will join us as soon as she can. Thank you for agreeing to meet a bit longer today to address the many items before us.

For education to thrive, to live up to its fullest potential, requires that we invest *more* in education. The same is true for the future of democracy and the public good toward which we all work.

Some might ask, what does Faculty Senate have to do with the future of democracy and the public good but I know UNCG's Senators are very aware of the connection. It should be obvious to others as well that faculty and higher education more broadly, have a deep responsibility to advance a society informed by reason and good will. And, it is by doing the very things that are in our charge that we accomplish an admittedly lofty, but nevertheless compelling ideal that provides real benefits to our students, communities, and global partners.

As we conclude what was admittedly a difficult year, I'd like to take a moment to reflect on what remains our vital charge of the Faculty Senate, a body designed to promote academic excellence, protect academic freedom, and insist upon shared governance....all in the service of advancing democracy and the public good. When we approve policies and regulations, we do so by discussing and deliberating the merits and drawbacks before voting for a way forward as we did with 14 resolutions this year. When we insist that our teaching and review of it promote high educational standards, as articulated in spirited debates in this room, we fulfill our obligation to prepare students for the complex world they enter as citizens. When we stand together to promote the welfare of all in the university community, as we were called upon to do this year in highly visible ways, that position demonstrates the power of collective action that underlies the very premise of democracy.

To do the work of governance on this campus and in our communities requires considerable effort. Here at UNCG, we have 25 Faculty Senate Committees who together offer important counsel to our administration that this year has prompted important conversations on the budget, our values, conflicts of interest, and free speech, among other topics. Our hard work and dedication to preparing generations of students to encounter large scale global problems, develop unforeseen opportunities in our communities and in commerce, and to live with uncertainty on a grand scale, is valuable work, yet there are those who question if what we do is enough. It is too easy to say, higher education as we know it must simply change, as if we stand apart somehow from the changing world in which we live. We are all evolving, and in fact, we the faculty have created sometimes, and responded to other times, the many changes that are part of our daily lives. From our university there are great innovations and new understandings that have emerged from the sciences, music, and humanities in basic, applied and community engaged scholarship. We are change makers, to be sure.

The Faculty Senate shares a responsibility with all faculty, staff, administration, our Board of Trustees, and our UNC system' to communicate the important contributions of higher education for a democratic society. I am so proud to have been able, with you, to uphold the Faculty Senate's role in doing that this year! I'd like to express special thanks to: Jim Carmichael, the Faculty Senate's secretary for many years now. Jim is steadfast in preparing notes and materials for archiving that serve this body well. More than that, Jim's love for education and passion for the faculty here at UNCG make him a local hero. His other role as president of the State chapter of AAUP demonstrates, tangibly, his enduring commitment to faculty. Patti Sink, our past Faculty Senate chair, remains a champion of UNCG. She knows the rules, procedures, and processes that make this body run it's smoothest. Her knowledge provided valuable support to the Senate leadership team this year. Patti will be the Chair of the Faculty Government Committee next year, a wonderful post for which we should all be thankful she has accepted so that she can continue to contribute. Eileen Kohlenberg, our Parliamentarian, has a distinguished career here at UNCG that includes service as Faculty Senate Chair years back. I was grateful for her leadership then, and am especially appreciative that she agreed to serve his year to ensure we stayed true to the rules and spirit of Robert's Rules of

Order. She did so with a kind of grace that defines her being. Anita Tesh you may recall was our initial Chair-elect this year, but due to a procedural mistake, stepped down from that office. While she served in that position, and even afterwards, Anita provided a view and grounding on policies and procedures that reached for the highest ethical interpretation. She has accepted a position at UNC Chapel Hill for next year—their gain, our loss to be sure. Anne Wallace was elected Chair-elect half-way through the academic year and immediately thrust into the Chancellor Search Process, which we know she managed ably, representing the faculty so well. I look forward to standing beside her next year as she continues to offer her remarkable insights, care, and goodness to represent and lead our faculty at UNCG. Finally, I want to say thank you to all of you who have shared information with your colleagues, considered important issues with thoughtfulness, and challenged one another to explain why one route forward is better than another. Those actions and the considerable time you have invested with Faculty Senate are truly impressive.

In closing, I'm grateful for the challenging and in-depth conversations that marked this year's Faculty Senate—conversations in these meetings, by email, in scheduled forums, and in unscheduled moments. Thank you for making the investment in dialogue and deliberation necessary to foster trust and invite collaboration with our administration and communities. I said at the outset of this year, from this position at the podium that we have to be engaged, public intellectuals, willing to critique the antidemocratic forces at work, willing to imagine possibilities for a future that invest in the common good, and willing to equip ourselves and our students with the tools to participate in meaningful dialogue, with critical reason, to demonstrate the social responsibility necessary for engaging with the admittedly difficult issues of our time. I think we did that well and in ways that will enable us to welcome a new Chancellor, build deeper bonds with our Provost Dana Dunn, and forge productive, important relationships within our university and outside of it. Thank you!

### **Approval of Minutes**

*Jim Carmichael, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:*

Presentation of plaque to Spoma Jovanovic, 2014-2015 Faculty Senate Chair.

April 1, 2015 minutes presented.

Carmichael called for motion to approve. So moved and seconded. Minutes approved.

### **Resolutions**

*Susan Shelmerdine, Academic Policies and Regulations Committee #FS05062015:01*

To Approve the Academic Calendars for 2016-17 and 2017-18

Shelmerdine read the resolution and gave a brief explanation of various changes. Bell moved to accept. No second necessary. **Passed unanimously.**

*Patti Sink, #FS05062015:02* To Create and Include the Faculty Committee on Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion within the UNCG Faculty Senate Bylaws.

Sink called forward Rod Wyatt, Gerald Holmes, and Vidya Gargeya to present the resolution to make the Chancellor's Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Equity, Diversity and Inclusion a permanent Senate Committee. Bruce Kirchoff, Chair of the Faculty Government Committee explained proposed changes in accordance with Constitution and By Laws.

Kohlenberg made a motion to accept the revisions.

Carmichael moved, Bell seconded. **Approved unanimously.**

Discussion ensued and a friendly amendment was proposed to change the term "Within" to "In".

Question called. **Passed unanimously.**

### **Committee Briefs**

*Carla LeFevre, Faculty Welfare Committee*

For the past two years, our committee has been in discussion about methods for determining salary increases. These discussions will continue next year. For now, we have strongly recommended to the Provost that any merit increases should involve examination of all annual reviews dating back to the year of our last appreciable merit increase, and that additionally, salary compression should be addressed annually in a meaningful way. Also, we expressed our preference for the new three-tier evaluation system over potential systems involving a larger number of tiers. Our primary efforts this year have been the restructuring of the current Policy for Faculty Extended Illness, Disability, and Family Medical Leave. Research for this task included a thorough examination of the applicable

policies for all of the universities in our state system. Additional resources included a collection of reports of the widely varying past experiences of faculty who have requested parental leave here.

Our first step was to re-format the current policy to include sections and bullet points for easier reading, and to separate into two different sections information regarding Extended Illness or Disability from that of Parental Leave.

Second, current wording leaves it up to the department head and/or dean to approve or not approve the requested leave; therefore, we propose the following change: For illness or disability, the new wording states: “the department head will recommend leave if the need for leave is readily evident or if it is supported by sufficient medical verification in the view of the department head.” New wording for parental leave with salary continuation states: “A faculty member who functions as a primary caregiver for a child will, upon request, be granted salary continuation.” I need to note that since the summary was sent to you, upon advice from the Provost, we have since removed the term “primary caregiver” to ensure an understanding that both mothers and fathers are eligible for the leave. One caveat, is that it would be a financial burden to the university and potentially a logistical challenge to a single department, to cover full leaves when both parents employed at UNCG. ECU has a system in place specifically for these situations, and that option is currently being investigated. Our current parental leave with pay is allowable for only sixty days. Currently, nine of our state universities allow up to a semester of paid parental leave. We believe our current allowance is not only insufficient, it also poses a potential issue for recruitment and retention of faculty. Therefore, we have recommended an increase in the allowable length of parental leave with pay to “up to a full semester (or 12 weeks over 2 consecutive semesters (exclusive of academic breaks).”

The next proposed change involves the tenure clock. Currently, those who are granted leaves for either extended illness or parental leave must negotiate extension of the tenure clock with the department head and dean. Our new policy proposes that: an automatic one-year extension of the tenure clock will be granted, and, post-tenure review will be delayed automatically by one year. The revisions you have also propose an opportunity for a faculty member to opt out of these extensions. However, in a recent meeting, the Provost made a very good case for removing this option, because of the potential for self-sabotage in a case where a faculty member inaccurately projects the full impact of the leave. The committee agreed with this because faculty do instead have the option of going up early for tenure, if, in consultation with the department head, it is determined that the leave has not negatively impacted his or her dossier.

The final recommendation of the Committee may be difficult to implement; however the Committee believes it is vitally important. Under the current policy, it is the responsibility of the department to bear the financial burden for covering the teaching responsibilities of those granted a paid leave. This is highly problematic for a number of reasons.

Many small departments do not have the financial resources to cover these costs. As such, these costs can result in a faculty member’s colleagues being called upon to cover courses for that instructor, resulting in an overload for these colleagues, and causing much resentment toward a faculty member who is taking the leave. The new policy recommends that these costs be centralized at the University level. We suggest the following wording:

The cost of substitute personnel is the responsibility of the Office of the Provost. In recommending approval of a leave to the Provost, the department head and dean will provide the following information: (1) a plan for covering the responsibilities of the faculty member for the duration of the leave and (2) the anticipated cost of substitute personnel. The Provost’s Office will provide no more than \$3500 per 3-hour class for substitute personnel. In summation, I am very pleased to report that Provost Dana Dunn has concurred with nearly all of the proposed changes. This issue of centralization of the incurred costs for paid leaves has yet to be resolved, as it will be some time before she can make a determine the availability of funds.

Discussion ensued. Small departments do not often have funds to hire adjuncts, resulting in overloading of colleagues and resentments. Moreover, one senator had to use her research leave since her child was born two weeks into the semester. Also, the question of coming up early for promotion and tenure was aired at length and clarification sought on the question of whether the burden of proof is harder if candidate chooses early review (in which case their case is reviewed by the University Promotion and Tenure Committee). The answer is, it is not supposed to be. Tenure is not about time, it is about quality.

#### *Lynda Kellam, Faculty Scholarship*

Kellam announced the results of the scholarship search: 29 applicants, of whom 20 were eligible. With \$13,000 available, eight candidates received \$1,000 each. They are Faris Almbaslat, Angela Hairston, McKenna Karmanik, Savanah Lillen, Greydon Toone, Miranda Weavil, Ian McKenzie and Rocky Ankeiny (the last two are conditional).

*Stoel Borrowes, Election Committee*

A ballot for four vacancies on the university P&T Committee distributed and the proposed candidates were elected: George Dimock, Anthony Taylor, Beverly Faircloth and Paul Steimle.

*Wayne Journell, Budget Committee* Journell encouraged senators to review the report at leisure, and he thanked members of the committee who had put in a great deal of effort, particularly Deb Bell, George Michel, and Kelly Burke. He also thanked Spoma Jovanovic and members of the administration who have worked patiently to make clear items in the budget members did not understand. Work will continue next fall.

*John Lepri, Faculty Assembly*

The report from Charlie Peruse indicates that state revenue is up, but faculty salaries are still a sticking point with the loss of talented people across the system in spite of a benefits increase. GECC is focused on critical thinking. The Faculty Assembly passed two resolutions, one pertaining to the closure of Centers, and the other seeking clarification in the Presidential Search Process. Spoma Jovanovic was elected to the Executive Committee of Faculty Assembly for 2015-2016, representing 4 delegate institutions. A question about why UNCG wasn't among institutions listed in the Governors proposed bond package elicited a response from Provost Dunn. The administrative staff is working hard to make sure we are included in the bond package if one comes out of the legislative even though the Governor did not include us. Lepri reminded senators that students are still our most important advocates. Jovanovic pointed out that one of Lepri's student's parent had singled him, Rob Cannon, and his department out for praise in the academic success of their progeny in today's edition of the *News and Record*.

*Kenneth Klase, Graduate Studies Committee*

Appointment to Graduate Faculty Policy

Language has been changed in policy to permit participation of adjuncts in some area, to distinguish between faculty who earned their doctorate without a dissertation and those who did especially with regards to the nursing practitioners' doctorate. Discussion concerned decline of full time tenured faculty, clarification of clinical faculty, and existing programs in which clinical faculty play or have played a role (writing center, Doctorate of Music Arts). Some faculty members remain uneasy about "non-traditional" doctoral programs, although they have existed on the UNCG campus for at least 31 years.

**Presentations**

*Bob Hensen, Curriculum Reform Task Force*

The Task Forces recommends a new form for the course approval process, they have initiated organizational and procedural changes, and conducted a survey that will result in improved communications in the fall. These changes were presented to the state for endorsement and endorsement was received.

*Murphie Chappell, Title IX Coordinator, Title IX Basics*

Chappell gave a review of Title IX definitions and applications with regards to sexual assault, sexual harassment, and gender discrimination. She remarked that HR 2016, known as the Campus Sexual Violence Act, had passed last year, and encouraged faculty with concerns to contact the office. Kuperberg noted that as a Professor, she had been accused of harassment because students did not like what she said in her Sociology course on sex, and that instances like this were bound to have a chilling effect on academic freedom. Jovanovic noted that many federal laws had had such a chilling effect in recent years.

*Lawrence Jenkins and Julia Jackson-Newsome, Conflict of Interests & External Activities for Pay*

The year has been devoted to a review of policies and procedures. With regard to external activities for pay, General Administration has been reviewing and revising the system-level regulations on External Professional Activities for Pay to ensure they comply with new federal regulations. Although popular wisdom notes a 20% limit on outside work for pay, that has never been written down in policy, but is now being included. Also the existing policy has not been clear on whether part time employees should report external activities. The new revised policy will give campuses flexibility to interpret how they would like to handle this.

With regard to conflict of interest, an online system for reporting annual disclosures that was developed by UNC Chapel Hill is being adapted to meet the needs of our campus. This system will streamline the process and should be substantially less confusing, while providing better quality information for determining whether or not conflicts exist. The Task Force will complete its work in the fall

**Remarks, Dana Dunn, Acting Chancellor**

The Provost gave a brief update on the Building Bonds Issue that she and the administration are working to amend through the Legislature. She thanked the various committees for all their hard work this year, commented on the spectacular student and faculty awards ceremonies she has attended, and hoped to see Senators at the Commencement ceremony.

**New Business/Old Business**

*Anne Wallace, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect, Forecast for 2015-2016*

When I saw that my task was to "forecast" next year's work, I couldn't resist the metaphor . . . I began to wonder what such a forecast might have sounded like for this past year, had it been possible to predict with any accuracy. I'm afraid it might have sounded like this: "colliding warm and cold fronts may be expected to produce high winds, large hail, extensive flooding, and scattered tornados. Earthquakes are possible: stay alert for tsunami warnings." It has been a very rough year. I do not mean to make light of the serious events and issues that have confronted us, and sometimes caused us to confront each other, as we have struggled to find a way forward. But, if I may stay with the meteorological metaphor a little longer, it does seem that the clouds are a little lighter, the rain abating, and that we may be beginning to enjoy what the British call "bright intervals."

These are visible in the accomplishments of Faculty Senate this year—the establishment of the Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee and of an Ad Hoc Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee, for instance--and in the reports coming from committees and offices across campus, including the UNCG Values Committee and Bryan Terry's enrollment management office. And I feel that the campus mood has shifted toward a more optimistic, hopeful mood: we recognize the beginning of a new chapter in our University's life, and the possibilities that this new chapter offers.

But there is a lot of work ahead of us. The arrival of our next Chancellor will be just the first stage in a period of perhaps unprecedented transition, marked by searches for 3 deans, a General Counsel, Assoc. VCs of PR and HR—I know I've left out other important changes (like the 5 or 6 department heads stepping out in the College alone), but you get the idea. (By fall 2016 the Chancellor will be, relatively speaking, an old hand, and Provost Dunn and Vice Chancellor Maimone will be the equivalent of 20-year veterans.) The delayed Strategic Planning effort will begin in earnest. Many important issues will compete for our attention, as today's agenda and those of previous meetings suggest.

I imagine it's usual, in this forecast, for me to identify particular initiatives or policy considerations that I would like us to undertake. But rather than listing issues and initiatives for future agendas, I'd like to take this opportunity to think with you about the larger contexts of our work. I have heard from faculty who were very troubled, indeed angered, by the conflicts, the confrontations, the strong protests, that emerged this past spring and this fall, in a variety of contexts, but most notably after the dismissal of 3 University Relations staffers. Some faculty experienced these protests as disruptions that damaged the work of the Senate. I have also heard from faculty who feel affirmed by the openness of critique and the supportive actions of the Senate, and relieved at the honest expression of differences during a time of crisis. From their viewpoint, these confrontations, although difficult, opened the way toward positive changes in the future. These differing reactions to the events and expressions of the past year may be heard across the University, as well as among faculty and Faculty Senators. So my thoughts follow these various reactions to our collective crisis, to raise these questions:

What roles will Faculty Senate play in the changes and, yes, the controversies that will inevitably unfold next year? How shall we carry out our responsibilities in university governance and the larger university community, in a time of extraordinary change and equally extraordinary promise?

I believe that our first priority, not only in Faculty Senate and among faculty, but across the University, must be building bridges across what have sometimes seemed, in this heavy weather we've experienced, unbridgeable gaps of understanding and feeling.

Here is a thing that I've observed twice now, at two universities, in the stress of two different extended crises. When times are good, when leadership seems stable and controversies are small or readily settled, when money is abundant and the university growing, everyone settles in, settles back. Understandably we all come to rely on the relative stability: things will work themselves out, we feel. We become complacent in good times, which seem to be "natural" and "usual." But the dark side of this comfortable security is that we allow the relationships and structures that might connect us to break down or wither away, because we don't need them. And then, when the bad times come and we find ourselves in conflict, we realize that we've lost touch with each other. Understanding across constituencies, which we assumed was just fine, has somehow waned—and now, in the heat of the crisis, we try to explain our views with little success, because it takes time to build and sustain these relationships.

When I say "we," you understand, I do not mean only faculty. That is, and I want to be very clear about this, I am not suggesting that faculty are somehow "to blame" for this condition, but rather that this complacency developed throughout the University. I think that the most difficult work accomplished by the Chancellor Search Committee was not vetting the dossiers or selecting three promising candidates to recommend. I think our toughest work was to hear each other, to understand our different positions and desires for UNCG, our different visions of the future. Naturally our constituencies—faculty, staff, students, and so forth—created some alliances, but the more important alliances, in the end, were the ones that allowed the exchange of priorities across those constituencies and the movement toward some common ground. This meeting of the minds was not easy and it was not certain, and—here's my main point—it cannot last, unless we undertake now to build the mechanisms of understanding into our future relationships.

How will we do that? I have some ideas, probably pretty obvious ones, so I'll need your help in thinking what to do. We already have excellent relations with Staff Senate, and I think we should enhance them. Faculty and Staff are the lifers, as it were, the long-term professionals whose work life (and much else) centers in the University. We live here, very often for decades, and the more closely faculty and staff can work together, the better for the University, I believe.

We need to build bridges with our Board of Trustees, to understand the responsibilities they carry as Board members as well as to let them get to know us, not only as participants in university governance but also as faculty in our everyday working lives. There could be structural ways to do this, including more regular participation and attendance by Faculty Senate officers and by Senators at Board meetings that would benefit us all. It would also be beneficial, I think, to engage in one-on-one "mutual mentoring" through which faculty members and Board members could get to know the shape of each other's lives. This could be carried forward as Board members step out and new members are appointed, so that it becomes an expected feature of our University's life.

Students, alums, community members—across all constituencies, I would like to see us build better structural bridges and informal traditions that could carry us into the future. And here inside Senate, too, I believe, we could work more closely and understand each other even more deeply than we have come to in this last hard year.

Conflict is never without consequences, but sometimes the only way forward lies through a time of harsh disagreements. I suppose I'm inclined to see things this way: I was born and grew up in Kansas, where the state motto is "Ad Astra per Aspera," "to the stars through difficulty." But what I do not believe in, is suppressing or ignoring history. The new chancellor will have a lot of listening and understanding to do, and I'll promote that as best I can, as I know you will. But it is also true that the next chancellor will be a person coming into a big new job, in a new place. I believe that each of the three candidates have excellent capabilities and intentions. All three are well aware of the recent portion, at least, of our difficulties, and the next chancellor will learn more--from various perspectives, to which it will be our job to contribute. At the same time, I want to give this person the breathing room that each of us would expect, if it were our big new job, to listen, to begin to understand, and to build relationships that will endure. I believe that we must begin openly--not fresh or from zero with respect to our own history, perhaps, but fresh in the sense that we refrain from reflexive suspicion of the new chancellor's motives. Where critiques must be offered, in these early months, I hope they can be offered honestly, directly, but without accusation.

The rebuilding of trust that we all seek depends, I believe, on this double task: the enactment of trust among us, all the way to the chancellor's chair; and a clear-eyed care for our University that finds expression in honest, open critique. As faculty, we always carry a special responsibility to question and push back if we believe that we are going down the wrong path: our long-term commitments to our institution, our expertise in many fields, and the special protections that many of us enjoy, make this our particular responsibility. If the time comes that vigorous protest must again be mounted, then that will again be our task. But in the next year or two, I hope we can frame our responsibilities in the first, great tasks of building trust, fostering collaboration, opening communications, throughout the University community. I am ready and eager to join you in these tasks as we open a new chapter in UNCG's history.

### **Adjourn**

Move to adjourn by Karper, seconded by Bell.

Respectfully submitted,

*Jim Carmichael,*

Faculty Senate Secretary

*Minutes Approved September 2, 2015*