

**Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting  
December 5, 2012  
3:00-5:00 pm, Virginia Dare Room  
John Lepri, Chair**

*Approved February 6, 2013*

<b>Agenda Item &amp; Presenter</b>	<b>Discussion/Motion</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Welcome: <i>Senate Chair John Lepri</i>	The Senate Chair opened the meeting at 3:04. Two Senators were absent because of exams. Chancellor was absent due to a concurrent Board of Trustees meeting; the Provost was expected to arrive late due to the Board meeting as well.	
Review/Approve Minutes of November 7, 2012: <i>Senate Chair John Lepri</i>	Minutes of the November 7, 2012 Faculty Senate meeting were presented for review and approval.  Motion to accept: Patti Sink Second: Deb Bell The Chair called for a vote: Unanimous Approval	Minutes approved by Unanimous Vote
Review Agenda: <i>Senate Chair John Lepri</i>	The agenda was presented for review and modification; no changes were made.	
UNC Faculty Assembly Report <i>Patti Sink Chair-Elect</i>	The Provost not having yet arrived, Lepri proposed that Patti Sink present her report from the UNC Faculty Assembly meeting.  All Senators present were referred to the summary of the November 30, 2012 meeting as presented in a handout while Sink emphasized the key points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic aspects of strategic planning, i.e., an agreement between the North Carolina Community Colleges and the UNC System to have a common core in place by 2014;</li> <li>• Common general education competencies across UNC universities facilitating ease of transfer of course work from North Carolina's Community Colleges to UNC Universities</li> <li>• Setting and reaching degree attainment goals – to achieve 32% baccalaureate degree attainment by 2018, emphasizing increasing the success and timelines of UNC students' graduation as well as meeting North Carolina workforce needs;</li> <li>• Update on state and federal legislators including a push to invite state legislators to campuses to attend classes and interact with faculty and students rather than solely with administrators in an effort to increase their awareness and appreciation of the academic environment, goals, and competencies</li> <li>• Cathy Rigsby summarized at the end of the day the work of six Faculty Assembly committees, which resulted in three resolutions having to do with general education, minimum general education competencies, and optional retirement program employer contribution rate.</li> </ul>	

Remarks: Provost  
David Perrin

The Provost arrived from the Board of Trustees meeting and was asked by the Senate Chair to give his remarks:

**Update on the three Dean searches**

- School of Health and Human Sciences --7 semifinalists interviewed; narrowed to 3 finalists interviewed further:
  - Celia Hooper, Dean, School of Human Health and Sciences
  - Jay Graves, Dean, College of Health, University of Utah;
  - Kelli Brown, Interim Dean, College of Health and Human Performance, University of FloridaAnonymous Feedback has been received from all stakeholders; Search Committee will meet on 12/5; Committee Chair will meet with Provost on 12/7/12.
- School of Music, Theater, and Dance—9 semifinalists interviewed; narrowed to 3 finalists interviewed further:
  - John Richmond, Director, School of Music, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
  - Jonathan Santore, Chair, Department of Music, Theater and Dance, Plymouth State University
  - Sara Baird, Chair, Music Department, Auburn UniversityAnonymous feedback has been received from all stakeholders; Search Committee will meet on 12/14; Committee Chair will meet with Provost TBD.
- School of Nursing—3 semifinalists interviewed; 2 finalists interviewed further:
  - Patricia (Trish) Morton, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs, University of Maryland School of Nursing
  - Robin Remsburg, Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Services; Director, School of Nursing, George Mason University.Anonymous Feedback has been received from all stakeholders; Search Committee will meet on 12/12; Committee Chair will meet with Provost TBD

The Provost noted that over 500 people were contacted for each search in all, including those who recommended candidates; great effort was expended in gathering individuals from diverse backgrounds, including outreach to HBCUs as well as a number of national associations.

**Update on the Downtown University Campus:**

- **General Background** –The Provost gave general background of the effort as an initiative of Opportunity Greensboro. A planning team began their work in September 2011; a second phase of planning has just been initiated, which will deliver facility financing and site options in April/May 2013, along with feasibility studies for the potential programs.
- **Programs**—The Planning team has identified the most likely programs for a shared downtown campus:
  - Health Sciences and Nursing
  - Executive Education and Leadership
  - Degrees Matter ( a program to encourage area residents with partial degrees to complete their degrees)
  - Global Opportunities Center (Higher education institutions and Community partners working to expand global opportunities for individuals and businesses. The Center would include both academic programs and business support services.)

- **Financial Rationale**—If we move some programs from the colleges and universities to a shared space, we give expansion space to programs that are currently constrained on their home campuses; provide space for new programs that do not have a home; compliment nearby undergraduate programs; create space efficiencies, for example classroom space and executive education space have the same the same features). Specifically for nursing, if we combine some nursing programs, they can share lab space and equipment; the program can take engaged nurses and nursing students at almost every level: RN to BSN, Doctoral nursing study, and continuing education. We thereby have an opportunity to meet a national need for nurses, and more importantly, do it in a unique way. It makes financial sense.
- **Differentiates Greensboro**
  - The Center would showcase Greensboro as a college town; bring visibility to a thriving downtown; show innovative thinking (capitalizing the strength of our colleges and universities to create new and better jobs in Greensboro) and demonstrate that Greensboro is developing our future workforce in a proactive way.
- **Possible Sites**—the team is currently reviewing 4-5 different sites. It will identify a list of important criteria and then go through an objective process that will determine the best location for such a facility.
- **Facility Size**—at present, the team anticipates a facility in the 80,000-100,000 sq. ft. range.
- **Facility funding**—the financial model will likely include revenue from leased space and grants. The Planning Committee will develop these details over the next 5-6 months.
- **Funding the Planning Effort**—the funding for the next phase of planning is approximately \$225,000. Action Greensboro foundations have committed \$75,000; the companies and institutions of Opportunity Greensboro have committed \$75,000; the city of Greensboro has been asked to commit the remaining \$75,000.
- **Next Steps**—over the next 5-6 months, the planning committee will complete the needs analysis; examine best practices for this type of facility; visit University Executive Education and Conference Centers; research health sciences simulation labs; and commission a downtown Economic Impact Study.
- **Leadership for this Effort**—Opportunity Greensboro: A Business and Collegiate Partnership is a consortium of business and higher education leaders who are working to further the connections between businesses and our colleges and universities (Provost represents UNCG on a Campus Implementation Team)

**Tuition Increases**

Tuition increases were passed by the Student Affairs Committee of The Board of Trustees:

- 4% increase for in-state undergraduate and graduate students, which will amount to \$153 and \$175 respectively;
- 1% increase for out-of-state students resulting in the same respective dollar amounts (\$153, \$175) being added to their tuition bills
- \$2.6 million in revenues to be generated – 25% for need-based financial aid, 3% for graduate student tuition waivers, 66% for faculty retention with the remainder to be used for academic advising and career advancement

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The increase will be voted on by the full Board and then be sent forward to the Board of Governors and General Administration to go into effect for the 2013-2014 academic year.</li> </ul> <p><b>Questions/Comments</b></p> <p>What other uses are contemplated for the Downtown University Campus?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The team is looking at a Spokane collaborative model of where to expand.</li> </ul> <p>Concern expressed over the impact of tuition increases on students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Senate was reminded that the Board of Trustees approved 4% increase last year, and deferred a second 4% per cent increase until this year to see how the economy panned out. The \$153 approved last year is matched by the \$153 this year with 25% of the money is going to our neediest students.</li> </ul>	
<p><i>Resolution #FS12052012-01 To Allow for the Participation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty in The UNCG Faculty Senate</i></p>	<p>Bruce Kirchoff, Chair of the Faculty Government Committee, was called forth to present Resolution #FS12052012-01: <i>To Allow for the Participation of Non-Tenure Track Faculty in The UNCG Faculty Senate.</i></p> <p>Bruce read the resolution and Susan Collins, also a member of the Faculty Governance Committee, offered points of clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>voting members of the General Faculty include Non-Tenure Track Faculty (NTTF), who already elect Faculty Senators; they want to be able to serve as well as vote for others</li> <li>concerns were raised by the Graduate Studies Committee that NTTF serving on Faculty Senate would be in position to vote on matters involving graduate courses/programs/matters – it was pointed out that not all Senators on Faculty Senate are members of the graduate faculty;</li> <li>in response to the concern about filling the position of a member whose appointment is not renewed, mechanisms are already in place</li> <li>the University P&amp;T committee membership self selects those who are eligible to serve - there is no need to change the membership guidelines;</li> </ul> <p>Josh Hoffman made a motion to add the following language in the Be It Resolved statement: "...who are voting members of the General Faculty..." the motion was seconded by Beth Barba and the vote to accept the wording change was approved by unanimous vote.</p> <p>After more discussion, Patti Sink called the question to end to the discussion; the Senate voted 19 (yea), 7(nay) and 0 (abstain) to end discussion. Following, a vote was taken to approve the resolution as amended: 27 (yea), 0 (nay), 1 (abstain). The text of the amended section of the resolution is as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Be it Resolved, that the Senate endorses the development of eligibility guidelines for non-tenure track faculty, <b>who are voting members of the General Faculty</b>, to stand for election to the Faculty Senate and instructs the Faculty Government Committee to submit to the Senate a resolution implementing these guidelines, with any necessary changes to the <i>Constitution of the Faculty</i>.</p>	<p>Resolution #FS12052012-01 Approved, as amended, by Majority vote</p>
<p><i>Resolution #FS 12052012-02 To Endorse UNCG's</i></p>	<p>Vidya Gargeya and John Sopper, Co-Chairs of the Quality Enhancement Plan, presented the resolution <i>To Endorse UNCG's selection of Topics for its Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Options.</i></p>	<p>Resolution #FS12052012-02 Approved by</p>

<p><i>Selection of Topics for its Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Options</i>  <i>Vidya Gargeya, Co-Chair, QEP</i></p>	<p>Ben Ramsey called the question to have the resolution put before the Senate; Steve Yarborough provided the second to the motion and discussion ensued:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• can forums be reopened? yes</li> <li>• how were the proposals selected? Vidya gave a review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 25 proposals received in one-month period including additional revisions; proposals were ranked from one to ten; there were three meetings in all to consider which proposals were most worthy, and ran these by SACS leadership team (Chancellor, Provost, Reade Taylor)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• what purpose does the Faculty Senate vote/approval serve? – to endorse the proposals</li> <li>• is this stamp of approval given to all five proposals or, do we keep going with process? – the vote is for process,</li> <li>• what happens after the Faculty Senate vote? --there will be a referendum for the main proposal</li> <li>• will these be voted on by students too? -- Yes.</li> </ul> <p>A vote was taken on the resolution:  Be It Resolved, that the Faculty Senate endorses further development and consideration of the five following QEP topic ideas leading to the determination in Spring 2013 of a single topic idea for UNCG’s QEP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal C: Community Engagement</li> <li>• Proposal E: Global Engagement</li> <li>• Proposal D: Communication Enriched Curriculum</li> <li>• Proposal W: Informed and engaged Citizenship</li> <li>• Proposal Z: Interdisciplinary Problem Solving</li> </ul> <p>Vote to endorse: 22 (yea), 2 (nay), 4 (abstain)</p>	<p>Majority vote</p>
<p><i>Resolution #FS 12052012-03 To Revise the Charge of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Removing Overlap with Responsibilities of the General Education Council</i>  <i>Chair John Lepri</i></p>	<p>Senate Chair Lepri read the resolution and explained the need for it, i.e., to remove language within the charge of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee that refers to activities for which the direct responsibility now falls under the purview of the General Education Council, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• serving as the oversight committee for administration of all aspects of the General Education Core (GEC), including oversight of the ten GEC category committees and the GEC Assessment Committee and final designation of courses for GEC credit.</li> <li>• Overseeing the adherence to the General Education Program (GEP) by the units, and providing for the required annual and five-year reviews of the GEP an the GEC committees</li> </ul> <p>The vote was taken amend the charge to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee with the following result: 27 (yea), 0 (nay), 1 (abstain)</p>	<p>Resolution #FS12052012-03 was approved by majority vote</p>
<p><i>Report/Presentation: Data Management Policy</i>  <i>Christina Rodriguez, Chair, Research Policies Committee</i></p>	<p>Christina Rodriguez, Chair of the Research Policies Committee, shared with the Senate the importance of the newly established data management policy and asked that it be widely distributed to faculty (<a href="http://policy.uncg.edu/research_data">http://policy.uncg.edu/research_data</a>) The bottom line is that any data collected, products produced, etc. while on campus belong to the University and ownership extends to disposal. The following are excerpts from the <b>Policy on Access to and Retention of Research Data</b> that was presented to the Senate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the intent of this policy is to provide for the creation of an</li> </ul>	

	<p>environment that maximizes the ability of investigators and the institution to ensure that research data are stored, retained, made accessible for use and reuse, and/or disposed of, according to legal, statutory, ethical and funding bodies' requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Policy on Access to and Retention of Research Data applies to all University faculty, staff, postdoctoral fellows, students and any other persons, including consultants, involved in the design, conduct or reporting of research performed at or under the auspices of the University regardless of the funding source for the project.</li> <li>• The Principal Investigator (PI) of a research study is the primary custodian/steward of Research Data and Materials generated in the context of that study. The PI provides scholarly leadership and bears primary responsibility for technical, programmatic, fiscal, and administrative requirements of the project, working in partnership with the department, division, and university administration to manage and protect the Research Data and Materials produced at the University.</li> <li>• Any violation of this policy by faculty or staff may be considered "misconduct" under EPA policies (faculty and EPA non-faculty) and "unacceptable personal conduct" under SPA policies. Violations of law may also be referred for criminal or civil prosecution.</li> </ul>	
<p><i>Report/Presentation: Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons Patrick Lucas</i></p>	<p>Patrick Lucas gave a brief report of the newly constituted Faculty Teaching and Learning Commons, which reflects the university's learning-centered approach and embraces innovative teaching, collaborative opportunities and creative ways for faculty to reach out to each other and to others through their work: development &amp; training as it impacts students; development &amp; training as it impacts faculty and staff. He shared that the faculty mentoring program is expanding to NTT faculty and Graduate students; Faculty Fellows under Neal Thacker, now has scanning services. (see attachment) Hot button issues are online learning and experimental learning.</p>	
<p>Adjournment: <i>Senate Chair John Lepri</i></p>	<p>The Chair called for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 5:00. Motion to Adjourn: Ramsey Second: Carmichael The Chair called for a vote. All in favor.</p>	<p>Motion to Adjourn approved by Unanimous Vote</p>

Respectfully submitted,

*Jim Carmichael (bjb)*

Jim Carmichael

Secretary of the Faculty Senate 2012-2013