

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting  
September 3, 2014  
3:00 p.m., Virginia Dare Room  
Spoma Jovanovic, Faculty Senate Chair**

*Approved October 1, 2014*

<b>Agenda Item &amp; Presenter</b>	<b>Discussion/Motion</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<p>Welcome, Approve Agenda &amp; Remarks: <i>Senate Chair Spoma Jovanovic</i></p>	<p>The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and asked that April 2014 minutes wait for approval until the October meeting. Guests were recognized: Sean Farrell of the Staff Senate, Simone Stevens of the Student Government Association, Elizabeth Warren of the Graduate Student Association, and Board of Trustees Chair Susan Saffron.</p> <p>The theme for the Faculty Senate 2014-2015 year is higher education’s relevance and role in a democracy to promote the public good. The text of the Chair’s remarks are here:</p> <p>Robert Self, a history professor and author who grew up in North Carolina and now teaches at Brown University says, “Though our individual fates differ, we have a collective destiny, too.” It is with that thought that I hope we can move forward this year. We are individuals with distinct views and contributions to make and collectively, we are connected. Together, we will shape what is yet to come.</p> <p>The challenges to the value of higher education in society today are omnipresent. Faculty members are required to defend what previously was an assumed public good. Our response cannot be one of silence or compliance if we want to reclaim the relevance of higher education in society today. We can and should speak out as public intellectuals—through a discourse of critique and importantly, with a discourse of possibility, too—to ensure that this place matters... to us, to our students, to the community, and to the public good.</p> <p>At UNCG, we must be aware of the political climate and cultural conditions that surround us. Market deregulation, the downsizing of tenured faculty, the inequity of non-tenured faculty compensation, the instrumentalization of education, and the rise of authoritarian practices within our state exist. And so, we have a choice: do nothing or step into the political domain to assert where and how higher education is relevant today.</p> <p>We also need to teach our students how to be active citizens equipped with the history, understanding, and critical reasoning necessary to use their voices to craft a society of their own, not merely accept the work of our Southern legislators who NY Times columnist and author George Packer described as “a captive tool of corporate ideology.”</p> <p>If we are distressed by the impact of deep budget cuts and the corporate takeover of education and government institutions, then we need to do what perhaps previously we did not have to do. We need to reclaim the value and honor of education as intimately connected to democracy. To do anything less is to stay mired in the destructive influence of hopelessness.</p> <p>Over 36% of the Millennials live in the South, so what we do here matters all that much more. Our students are confronted with problems of epic proportion. In our state, we have allowed policies and practices to exist that result in 1 in 4 children living in poverty, and we know that there is only a fifty-fifty chance of them ever getting out of that impoverished condition. When some of our students want to believe racism no longer exists, we have to remind them in our teaching practices that it does exist, and that it is built, unfortunately into the fabric of our state’s policies where of those children living in poverty, 74% are Black or Hispanic.</p>	<p><b>Agenda Approved</b></p>

	<p>Our challenges are great, but our opportunities are as well. If we can effectively teach our students how to engage with the world, cognizant of the political landscape, economic hardships, and cultural fractures that leave too many with too little, then we can tip the scales of justice toward equality not inequity and toward compassion for, rather than fear from one another.</p> <p>Education has an enormous power to influence and shape our knowledge, but even more important than that, it can shape our actions based on knowledge not fear. We can no longer be what Henry Giroux calls “gated intellectuals” walled off from the political, social, and ethical fissures in our community. Our job, as I see it, is to critique anti-democratic actions, imagine possibilities for a future that invests in the common good, and prepare ourselves and our students to participate in meaningful dialogue, with critical reason, in order to assume the social responsibility inherent in democratic life. The work we do here and now in this body, Faculty Senate, and in our committees, in our classrooms, in the community, and all over campus, matters.</p>	
<p>Remarks: <i>Chancellor Linda Brady</i></p>	<p>This has been a difficult year for UNCG, but we are starting to see some positive signs. There is some good news surrounding enrollment, thanks to Bryan Terry and his team. We have new leadership with Provost Dana Dunn and Charlie Maimone, Vice-Chancellor of Business Affairs. I am firmly committed to improving communication, on campus and off. I am appreciative of Faculty Senate Chair Spoma Jovanovic and her leadership. This week, our Board of Trustees’ lunch will include attendance by 37 faculty members for us all to get to know and understand more of campus affairs. On Friday, three faculty members will share their research with the Board of Trustees and explain how it connects to UNCG’s mission: Victoria Jacobs of Teacher Education and Higher Education; Susan Letvak from the School of Nursing; and Nicholas Oberlies of the Department of Chemistry.</p> <p>As we begin our strategic plan visioning, we can anticipate some fierce conversations entered into with respect around, for example, how we reconcile teaching versus research, and access versus academic quality. We need to ask, “What we would do if we could do anything and not fail?”</p>	
<p>Remarks, <i>Provost Dana Dunn</i></p>	<p>The Provost expressed her appreciation of the Chair’s remarks on the relevance of higher education. She spoke briefly of her first four weeks on campus, and especially her pleasure in meeting students, faculty members, and staff where she witnessed pockets of excellence and commitment at every turn.</p> <p>Provost Dunn introduced a new Academic Learning Spaces Committee with Faculty Senate representation from Lynda Kellam who chairs the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee.</p> <p>The Provost outlined, briefly, Strategic Plan Visioning Process, with the first part dedicated to “Planning to Plan” during the fall months. For this, there will be an October Faculty Forum and discussions at every unit, as well as with alumni, students, and the staff senate. By December, we should have information to share with the yet un-constituted Strategic Planning Committee.</p> <p>Finally, the Provost urged the Senate to build a working relationship based on trust. She offered that while at the University of Texas at Arlington, the Faculty Senate there commended her for her strong communication and rapport with faculty. When asked about her techniques to garner trust, the Provost answered that she believes it is vital to listen, engage in respectful dialogue, work collectively on issues, and then explain the reasons for decisions made.</p>	
<p>Annual Reports: Action Items Passed by Faculty Senate <i>Patti Sink, Past Faculty Senate Chair; Jim Carmichael, Faculty Senate Secretary; Jenny Dale, Undergraduate</i></p>	<p>Sink briefly recapped the Faculty Senate Year-End Report for 2013-2014 noting actions items approved by the Faculty Senate and General Faculty; Carmichael referred to 2013-2014 Faculty Senate Committee Reports and thanked the committee chairs for submitting them in a timely manner; Dale highlighted in the 2013-2014 Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Report the challenges involved in approving courses designed and proposed by the Division of Continual Learning and the new work involved with reviewing five accelerated degree programs this year; Klase’s 2013-2014 Graduate Studies Committee Report included discussion of the new requirements for dissertation committees to receive approval from IRB before dissertation topics can be approved as well as a redefinition of graduate full time status and online doctoral programs.</p>	

<p>Curriculum Committee; Kenneth Klase, Graduate Studies Committee.</p>		
<p>Resolution #FS-09032014-01, To Amend the Constitution of the Faculty to Allow Tenured General Faculty Members to Serve as Officers of the Faculty Senate Faculty Government Committee, Bruce Kirchoff, Chair</p>	<p>Kirchoff and Jovanovic explained the unusual circumstances leading to this resolution to amend the Constitution. The Faculty Senate voted for Anita Tesh to be Chair-Elect in a spring 2014 election. However, since the Constitution required that the Chair-Elect be elected <i>from the Senate</i>, a mistake, inadvertently, had been made since Tesh was not then a Senator. The Elections Committee will arrange for a new election for Chair-Elect in December 2014.</p> <p>The Resolution called for two main changes: to make it possible for Chair, Chair-Elect, and Secretary candidates to come from the General Faculty; and to have the parliamentarian's service dismissed by the Chair <i>or</i> a vote of the Faculty Senate. Senate members discussed the merits of experience of Senate membership as a requirement for leadership but also recognized that allowing elected leadership to come from anyone in the General Faculty was an option the Elections Committee should have. Senators also deliberated on the role and oversight desired for the parliamentarian. The resolution clarifies that the parliamentarian is not an officer of the Senate.</p> <p><b>WHEREAS</b>, the current Constitution of the Faculty only allows members of the Faculty Senate to serve as officers of the Senate, <b>and</b></p> <p><b>WHEREAS</b>, it has become increasingly difficult to find senators willing to serve as officers, <b>therefore</b></p> <p><b>BE IT RESOLVED</b> that <i>SECTION 1. Composition of the Faculty Senate, SECTION 4. Officers of the Faculty Senate</i>, and <i>SECTION 5. Terms of Senators</i> of <b>ARTICE II: THE FACUTY SENATE</b> shall be revised as indicated on the attached copy of the Constitution with Track Changes, to address the following issues (changes from the current constitution in <b>bold</b>), said changes having been approved by the Faculty Senate at the September 3, 2014 meeting.</p> <p>The chair, chair-elect, and secretary will be elected by the Faculty Senate <b>from a pool of candidates that includes anyone on the General Faculty</b>.</p> <p>The Parliamentarian <b>can be removed by the chair</b>, or by a vote of the senate.</p> <p>The chair-elect and chair, <b>if they were senators, will resign their senate seats once they begin their service as officers</b> and thus will need to be replaced by their electoral divisions. This also means the <b>chair-elect will not vote</b> and that the chair votes only in case of a tie per Robert's Rules.</p> <p><b>BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED</b> that the wording on line 506 be changed to make it consistent with that used in the rest of the constitution: "5 working days" instead of "7 calendar days."</p> <p>The resolution, with minor amendments carried with two opposed and two abstentions. Because the resolution involves changes to the Constitution, it will be put forth to the next General Faculty meeting for a vote.</p>	<p><b>Resolution Approved</b></p>
<p>Faculty Workload Policy/Faculty Priorities 2014-15, Spoma Jovanovic, Chair</p>	<p>The Faculty Workload Policy, revised to comport with General Administration policy was presented to the Faculty Senate for information, not for a vote. No major changes were made, and the Dean's Council has reviewed the policy.</p> <p>The Chair reviewed a preliminary list of priorities for Faculty Senate attention this year to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Freedom of expression;</li> <li>2. Shared governance;</li> </ol>	

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Education in budgeting and planning;</li> <li>4. Strategic planning</li> <li>5. Voting rights and registration</li> <li>6. An ad hoc committee on inclusion, equity, and diversity</li> <li>7. Faculty Handbook</li> <li>8. Faculty Senate Scholarship</li> <li>9. Non-Tenure Track Faculty priority needs;</li> <li>10. Faculty “boot or re-boot camps.”</li> </ol> <p>The Chair invited Senators to attend Faculty Senate agenda planning meetings and sent around a sign-up sheet.</p> <p>Stoel Burrows asked Senators to consider serving on the University Promotion and Tenure and Committee.</p> <p>The last item on the agenda, Undergraduate Studies and Enrollment Management restricting, was tabled.</p>	
Small group discussions	<p>Additional priority areas for work by Faculty Senators include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. More faculty and student input in university decisions and more listening from administration on its initiatives</li> <li>2. Salary Compression/Equity and pay raises that are overdue.</li> <li>3. Open conversation between faculty and administration about the assumed appropriateness/value of on-line courses and on-line courses combined with class teaching.</li> <li>4. Campus-wide deliberations on technological initiatives that are driving teaching initiatives.</li> <li>5. Consider revising the policy for maintaining “good academic standing.” Current policy seems excessively punitive.</li> <li>6. Transparency and regular reports to Senate about the size of the administration compared to faculty, with comparison to peer institutions.</li> <li>7. Morale/faculty sense of community: how can we rebuild it?</li> <li>8. Summer school planning/projection and budgeting improvement. (Can summer teaching be part of a faculty member’s annual teaching load, not on top of load?)</li> <li>9. Improving our relationship and communication with the Legislature through education for faculty members, staff, and students.</li> <li>10. Consider how to best use Faculty Assembly to address issues to the Board of Governors, General Administration, and Legislature.</li> </ol>	
<p>GEC Committee’s Resolution #FS-09032014-02 To Clarify the Procedure for Granting Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive Markers <i>Jonathan Zarecki, GEC Committee Chair</i></p>	<p>GEC needed to close a loophole regarding Speaking Intensive/Writing Intensive (SI/WI) courses. The current documents said that SI/WI requirements were “supervised” by GEC; however, with the dissolving of CAC, GEC needed to be able to approve SI/WI markers.</p> <p><b>WHEREAS</b>, the General Education Council is charged with ongoing review and maintenance of the General Education goals, assessment of student achievement of these goals, oversight of the General Education requirements, and approval of requests for GEC markers and designations, and</p> <p><b>WHEREAS</b>, the Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive Committees are supervised by the General Education Council, and</p> <p><b>WHEREAS</b>, the definition of ‘supervised’ has never been codified in writing, and</p> <p><b>WHEREAS</b>, there is an urgent need to clarify the working relationship between the Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive Committees and the General Education Council,</p>	<p><b>Resolution Approved</b></p>

	<p><b>BE IT RESOLVED</b>, that the charge of the General Education Council be amended to the following:</p> <p>The General Education Council is charged with the ongoing review and maintenance of the General Education goals, assessment of student achievement of those goals, oversight of the General Education requirements, and the approval of requests for GEC categories and markers. The execution of these charges may include the establishment of ad hoc committees or the involvement of faculty consultants, as needed. The Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive Committees are appointed by the Council, and are charged by the Council with the review and approval of all proposals for Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive markers. The committees will report approved proposals to the Council and the Registrar for administrative disposition.</p> <p>The resolution carried, unanimously.</p>	
<p>GEC Committee's Resolution #FS-09032014-03 To Revise the Student Learning Outcomes for the GMT General Education Category <i>Jonathan Zarecki, GEC Committee Chair</i></p>	<p>Zarecki detailed a resolution to recertify the GMT (Mathematics) marker.</p> <p><b>WHEREAS</b>, the General Education Council is charged with ongoing review and maintenance of the General Education goals, assessment of student achievement of these goals, oversight of the General Education requirements, and the approval of requests for GEC markers and designations, and</p> <p><b>WHEREAS</b>, the review of UNCG's General Education program and its courses is a continuous process that requires faculty guidance and participation, and</p> <p><b>WHEREAS</b>, regular recertification of General Education courses is necessary in order to ensure that GEC courses continue to meet the learning outcomes for which they were approved, and</p> <p><b>WHEREAS</b>, a committee of faculty who teach Mathematics (GMT) courses that was convened by the General Education Council has recommended a revision of the Mathematics (GMT) student learning outcomes in advance of the next scheduled recertification of Mathematics (GMT) courses, therefore</p> <p><b>BE IT RESOLVED</b>, that the student learning outcomes for General Education courses carrying the Mathematics (GMT) category designation be amended to the following:</p> <p>Mathematics (GMT)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reason in mathematical systems beyond data manipulation.</li> <li>2. Formulate and use mathematical models to solve real-world problems.</li> <li>3. Communicate mathematical solutions clearly and effectively.</li> </ol> <p>Resolution passed unanimously.</p>	<p><b>Resolution Approved</b></p>

<p>Faculty Morale Survey, <i>Carla LeFevre, Chair, Faculty Professional Development, Compensation &amp; Welfare Committee</i></p>	<p>LeFevre presented the results of the spring 2014 faculty morale survey that had a 45% return rate from 485 faculty. 85% reported there was a definite or serious morale problem on campus. Sources of positive morale were identified as collegiality among faculty, gratitude from teaching, and gratitude from research. Sources of negative morale included salary compression/equity, decisions about budget allocation, lack of shared vision, and an administration that does not value transparency. The Office of Institutional Research reviewed the results, with qualitative responses categorized.</p> <p>When the floor was open to comments and questions, Senators expressed concern over lack of clarity in the Likert scale (was 1 high or 5 high?), the desire to see open-ended responses shared with faculty, and the survey's lack of adequate representation from assistant and non-tenure track faculty. LeFevre stated that she has all of the raw data, but that the committee felt they could not share it due to concerns for anonymity. Suggestions from the floor included de-identifying the data, a standard research practice. Some Senators said that repeating parts of the survey or running focus groups could be next steps, but other Senators feared that activity would be repetitive and/or not useful.</p>	
<p>Adjournment <i>Spoma Jovanovic, Faculty Senate Chair</i></p>	<p>The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.</p>	<p><b>Meeting Adjourned</b></p>

Respectfully submitted,  
Jim Carmichael  
Secretary, Faculty Senate 2014-2015